FY 2000 Commercial Thinnings

SWIFTWATER FIELD OFFICE

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

The Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District, Bureau of Land Management, has analyzed a proposal called the **FY 2000 Commercial Thinnings**. In the proposed action commercial thinning harvest of young growth timber would occur in the Upper Coast Fork of the Williamette River, Elk Creek and Little River Watersheds located in Sections 23 and 27, T21S R4W; and Section 7, T27S R2W; W.M.
The Environmental Assessment (EA), OR-104-00-07, contains a description and analysis of the proposed action. A summary of the analysis contained in the EA shows:

1). Approximately 650 acres were analyzed for potential harvest activity.

2). The project would not be expected to impact any special status plants (EA, page 9) or cultural resources (EA, page 15).

4). The EA (pg. 15) anticipated a “may effect, not likely to adversely affect” for the spotted owl and murrelet. Formal consultation with the US Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS) has since been completed. The Biological Opinion (May 31, 2001) concluded that the action is ". . . not likely to adversely affect spotted owls, murrelets and their critical habitat”.

5). The EA (pg. 15) anticipated a “may affect, not likely to adversely affect" for the Oregon Coast coho salmon and the Oregon Coast steelhead trout. Judge Hogan of the US District Court (District of Oregon) ruled in Alsea Valley Alliance v. NMFS that the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) decision to list the coho salmon was arbitrary and unlawful. As a result of the September 10, 2001 ruling, consultation with NMFS is no longer required because no listed species are affected.

This proposal is in conformance with the *"Final - Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement* (PRMP/EIS) dated October 1994 and its associated *Roseburg District Record of Decision and Resources Management Plan* (RMP) dated June 2, 1995. This proposal is located on lands within the Matrix and Little River Adaptive Management Area Land Use Allocations. The RMP permits ". . . timber harvest and other silvicultural activities in that portion of the matrix with suitable forest lands, according to management actions/directions . . ." (RMP, pg. 33). This proposal would also help to provide ". . . a sustainable supply of timber and other forest products that will help maintain the stability of local and regional economies . . ." (RMP pg. 3). Two alternatives were analyzed: the "no action" and the proposed action alternative.

Finding of No Significant Impacts: I have reviewed the tests of significance as described in 40 CFR 1508.27 (see attached). Based on the site specific analysis summarized in the EA and noted above, it is my determination that the proposed action does not constitute a major federal action with significant impacts to the quality of the human environment therefore an Environmental Impact Statement does not need to be prepared. I further find that the proposed activity is consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives and meets or does not prevent attainment of these objectives.

_____ _____

Jay K. Carlson
Swiftwater Field Manager

Date

Test for Significant Impacts. (516 DM 2 Appendix 2)

1. Has significant adverse impacts on public health or safety? ( ) Yes (**T**) No

Remarks: Considering the remoteness of the project to local population centers, and the design features governing the proposal, the likelihood of the project affecting public health and safety is remote and speculative.

2. Adversely effects such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains or ecologically significant or critical areas including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks? ( ) Yes (**T**) No

Remarks: Reviews (Cultural, Recreation, Wildlife, Hydrology and Fisheries) does not show that the proposed action would affect any of the above characteristics (EA, pg. 19).

3. Has highly controversial effects? ( ) Yes (**T**) No

Remarks: No controversial effects are noted as a result of environmental analysis or public review.

4. Has highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involves unique or unknown environmental risks? ( ) Yes (**T**) No

Remarks: The analysis does not indicate that this action would involve unique or unknown risks.

5. Establishes a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? ( ) Yes (**T**) No

Remarks: The advertisement, auction, and award of a timber sale contract allowing the harvest of trees is a well-established practice and does not establish a precedent for future actions.

6. Is directly related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? ( ) Yes (**T**) No

Remarks: We find that this action would not have a cumulatively significant impact on the environment beyond that already identified in the EIS.

7. Has adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places? ( ) Yes (**T**) No

Remarks: The Cultural Report does not indicate that this action would not adversely affect any sites, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

8. Has adverse effects on species listed or proposed for listing on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species or have adverse effects on designated Critical Habitat for these species?

Aquatic Species	( ) Yes	(**T**) No
Botanical Species	( ) Yes	(**T**) No
Terrestrial Species	( ) Yes	(**T**) No

Remarks:. Consultation with NMFS is not required as a result of the Hogan ruling (Sept. 10, 2001). Botanical surveys do not indicate the presence of any T&E plants. Consultation by FWS did not result in a "jeopardy" call for T&E species.

9. Requires compliance with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplains Management), Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands), or the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act? ( ) Yes (T) No

Remarks: Area is not within a floodplain. "The selected alternative complies with Executive Order 11990 . . ." (ROD, pg. 51). Project has been coordinated with FWS.

10. Threatens to violate Federal, State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment. ( )Yes (T) No

Remarks: We find that this action would not threaten a violation of Federal, State, local or tribal law imposed for the protection of the environment.