Lower Siuslaw
Landscape Management Project

Decision Notice and
Finding of No Significant Impact

Siuslaw National Forest
South Zone Ranger District
Lane County, Oregon

September 2002

Lead Agency: **USDA Forest Service**

Responsible Official: **Gloria Brown, Forest Supervisor**
Siuslaw National Forest
4077 Research Way
Corvallis, OR 97333
(P.O. Box 1148, 97339)

For Information Contact: **Paul Thomas, South Zone Planning Mgr.**
South Zone Ranger District
4480 Hwy. 101, Building G
Florence, OR 97439
(541) 902-6985 or (541) 563-3211

E-mail Address: pgthomas@fs.fed.us

Project Background, Area, and Needs

The Lower Siuslaw Landscape Management Project (the Project) includes actions designed to accelerate the development of late-successional forest habitat and enhance water quality and stream function on National Forest System (NFS) lands.

The project area includes about 74,000 acres of the Lower Siuslaw 5th-field watershed just east of Florence, Oregon or about 40 air miles west of Eugene, Oregon. The project area is located in portions of Townships 17, 18, and 19 South; and Ranges 9, 10, and 11 West; Lane County

Two needs (issues) requiring actions in the Project area were identified in chapter 1 of the Project environmental assessment (EA):

- To speed the development of late-successional habitat in late-successional and riparian reserves.
- To improve watershed function.

The decision to be made is whether to implement actions designed to meet the Project needs by selecting Alternative 1 (preferred alternative), or to postpone these actions by selecting Alternative 2 (no action).

My Decision

I have decided to implement all the actions described under Alternative 1 of the Project EA, except for adding large wood to Sweet and Walker Creeks. Action will be deferred on these creeks, affecting about 2 miles of stream reach. A decision to implement this portion of the Project EA will be made after heritage resource surveys are completed for areas where ground-based equipment will access streams and concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Office is received. In making this decision, I have reviewed the Project EA, its appendices, and other project-file documents—including the associated biological opinions, and the comments received during the 30-day public comment period.

The following activities under Alternative 1 will speed the development of late-successional habitat in late-successional and riparian reserves:

Commercial and precommercial thinning and associated activities

- ✓ Commercially thin about 3,707 acres of plantations, including about 3,354 acres in riparian reserve, 237 acres in late-successional reserve, and 116 acres in matrix (map 2 and appendix B-3);
- ✓ Reopen about 1.0 mile of classified (Forest system) roads in reserves--including about 0.3 mile in riparian reserve--by removing vegetation and minor slides from road surfaces (map 4 and appendix B-3);
- ✓ Temporarily reopen about 17.9 miles of unclassified roads (original logging spur roads) in reserves--including about 10.6 miles in riparian reserve--and about 0.6 mile of unclassified road in matrix by removing vegetation and minor slides from road surfaces (map 4 and appendix B-3);

- ✓ Build about 0.8 mile of temporary road in reserves--including about 0.53 mile in riparian reserve--and about 0.03 mile in matrix (map 4 and appendix B-3);
- ✓ Remove about 4,932 cubic yards of unstable sidecast material from 38 road locations (map 2);
- ✓ Create about 230 snags (28 to 36 inches in diameter) in natural stands adjacent to commercially thinned plantations, as mitigation for snags that were cut inside plantation boundaries during initial harvest;
- ✓ Develop future snags in thinned portions of plantations by inoculating about 3,554 trees with native fungi; 20% of the future snags will serve to mitigate snags that were cut inside plantation boundaries during initial harvest (appendix B-2);
- ✓ Increase the coarse wood component in commercially thinned plantations in late-successional reserves by leaving about 11,557 trees on the ground, to mitigate loss associated with past harvest practices (appendix B-2);
- ✓ Precommercially thin about 1,854 acres of young plantations in reserves, including about 1,520 acres in riparian reserve and 42 acres in matrix (map 3);
- ✓ Create and maintain about 55 acres of early-seral habitat to provide minimum diversity of seral conditions in late-successional reserve; new early-seral habitat will be created in matrix portions of commercially thinned plantations (map 2); and
- ✓ Plant a mixture of shade-tolerant conifers and hardwoods in about 711 acres of existing plantations.

Most activities would be implemented over the next 10 years, including KV projects, with commercial thinning timber-sale contracts awarded in FY 2003.

The following activities under Alternative 1 will improve watershed function:

System road activities

- ✓ Decommission about 14 miles of road, including about 8.9 miles in riparian reserve (map 4); and
- ✓ Close about 63 miles of road to vehicular traffic, including about 33 miles in riparian reserve (map 4).

Hydrologic function and water-quality activities

- ✓ Place about 365 large conifers (90 trees less than 32 inches diameter at breast height and 275 trees up to 36 inches diameter at breast height) from designated areas and about 160 small conifers from plantations along about 13.5 miles of stream on federal land and about 6 miles of stream adjacent to private land (map 5);
- ✓ Plant about 60 acres of shade-tolerant conifers and various hardwoods along alder-, brush-, or meadow-dominated riparian areas (map 5);
- ✓ Release existing planted conifers **(**47 acres**)** and natural conifers **(**80 acres**)** from competition with alder and other vegetation **(**map 5**)**;
- ✓ Remove about 6,824 cubic yards of fill material from 33 stream crossings on classified and unclassified roads, including those proposed for decommissioning;
- ✓ Remove about 12 barriers to fish passage; and
- ✓ Riparian thin (noncommercial) 145 acres of plantations in riparian reserves (map 5).

Activities would begin in FY 2003, with most completed in 5 years.

Project design criteria, including mitigation and monitoring requirements (EA, appendix A), will be incorporated to ensure protection of natural resources.

Reasons for the Decision

My decision was based on several factors. Alternative 1 was selected because it best meets the Project needs described in chapter 1 of the Project EA. Project actions are designed to protect affected resources in the short term and maintain or enhance the quality and productivity of these resources in the long term.

Alternative 1 best meets the Project needs:

- To speed the development of late-successional habitat in late-successional and riparian reserves:

  The Forest's legacy lies in its abundance of land in late-successional and riparian reserves. Forests on the coast also have very high growth rates. The Siuslaw offers a rich potential for successfully creating late-successional habitat with old growth characteristics at a landscape level. Most of the Siuslaw has been heavily harvested in the past and plantations are densely stocked with Douglas fir. Research has clearly shown that the current landscape of densely packed, uniform stands of Douglas fir are a long way off from the complex and diverse old growth forests we are trying to achieve. Thinning of these stands speeds the growth of the remaining trees and allows them to develop both horizontally and vertically. Variable thinning (thinning at different levels in different areas) and underplanting after thinning with other tree species also increases stand diversity and complexity. Leaving some trees on the ground adds to the richness on the forest floor, creating habitat as well as supplying critical nutrients. Creating snags provides a multitude of nesting and roosting opportunities. We believe these actions, as described in Alternative 1, are necessary to accelerate the development of healthy late-successional habitat.

- To improve the health of watersheds and associated aquatic ecosystems:

  The Lower Siuslaw project area has about 817 miles of perennial and intermittent streams—some provide important fish habitat, some supply water to a municipal watershed, and some streams do both. Water quality and quantity are directly tied to watershed health. All of the actions in Alternative 1 are designed to restore or improve the watershed by increasing the diversity and complexity of aquatic habitat, by reconnecting or removing barriers to natural processes, by maintaining or improving stream shade, and by ameliorating unnatural conditions.

  Many of the streams, or portions of streams, are not healthy and are too warm to provide quality habitat for fish. Often, unhealthy streams lack debris that allows gravel to build up and provide fish spawning habitat, connectivity to slow-moving water for smolts during floods, or both. Valley-bottom roads keep some streams from flowing naturally. In other areas, roads block fish passage between tributaries and mainstems, and interfere with natural landslides that move upslope trees and debris into streams. Alternative 1 will

improve fish habitat and water quality by adding large wood to about 21.5 miles of stream and by making up to 4 miles of stream more easily accessible to fish. Planting conifers in riparian areas along key stream reaches will eventually provide shade to help reduce water temperatures. The decommissioning of roads, particularly valley-bottom and mid-slope roads, will restore natural hydrologic processes, and reduce the risk of human-caused landslides.

Alternative 1 also best meets my expectations for holistic and integrated restoration. No unacceptable cumulative effects to any resource are expected. Many beneficial effects will accrue from implementing the Project, and the risk associated with any potential negative effects, discussed in chapter 3 of the Project EA, is acceptably low.

Alternative 2, the no-action alternative, does not create obvious negative effects, but it also does not meet any of the Project needs. And, without some restorative actions, some watershed conditions—including water quality and fish habitat—would continue to degrade.

In my review of the Project EA, its appendices, and other project-file documents, I believe the information provided to me is adequate for a reasoned choice of action. I am fully aware that the selected alternative will have some unavoidable adverse environmental effects such as disturbance to wildlife (EA, pages 72 and 73), irreversible resource commitments such as continued use of existing roads (EA, page 73), and irretrievable commitment of resources such as loss of vehicular access through the Forest as roads are closed or decommissioned (EA, page 73). I have determined, however, that these risks will be outweighed by the likely benefits.

In making this selection, I have also reviewed information in the administrative record, including but not limited to the Siuslaw Forest Plan (1990), as amended by the Northwest Forest Plan (1994); the Lower Siuslaw Watershed Analysis (1998); the Late-Successional Reserve Assessment, Oregon Coast Province Southern Portion (1997); consultation files and records involving the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service; public and other agency comments; and applicable laws and regulations.

Alternatives Considered

Before selecting Alternative 1, I considered Alternative 2 (no action) and five other alternatives that were eliminated from detailed study in the Project EA.

Alternative 2, no action

Alternative 2 (no action) is fully described in chapter 2 of the Project EA, page 23. The analysis of the effects of Alternative 2 is disclosed in chapter 3 of the Project EA. The no-action alternative forms the basis for a comparison between meeting the project needs and *not* meeting the project needs. This alternative provides baseline information for understanding changes associated with Alternative 1 and expected environmental responses as a result of past management actions.

Alternatives considered but eliminated from detailed study

Several alternatives were considered by the Forest Supervisor, largely based on public scoping comments. The following alternatives represent those that were considered, but for various reasons, were eliminated from detailed study.

Commercial harvest of mature timber on matrix lands--The Lower Siuslaw watershed analysis recognized that commercial harvest of mature, natural stands would be consistent with the Northwest Forest Plan. Currently, there are about 30 patches of mature stands in designated matrix areas of the Lower Siuslaw Landscape Management Project. The patches cover 150 acres, average about 5 acres in size, and range from less than 1/10 acre to about 37 acres. Preliminary evaluation of these stands and experience with similar stands in the watershed indicate that if they were surveyed for marbled murrelets, there would be more than a 90% chance that each stand is occupied. Current standards require that occupied stands, along with all suitable habitat within a one-half mile radius, be designated as late-successional reserve. If any of the remaining matrix lands contained mature stands, the controversy associated with harvesting mature timber--along with required protection measures for other listed species and survey-and-manage species--would likely delay or prevent any proposed timber harvest if the lands were included in a landscape-scale project. Therefore, an alternative that would harvest mature timber in matrix lands was not fully developed.

Base resource actions on the location of the primary and secondary road system--The Siuslaw Access and Travel Management Guide (USDA 1994) was developed in response to declining road maintenance funds. The guide identified a network of roads to be maintained open with emphasis on connecting state and county roads or communities. A key component of the guide was a mechanism to establish funding priorities and maintenance levels under which road maintenance funds would be expended. The guide presumed that projects, such as commercial thinning, would generate or provide sufficient funds to maintain roads required to access a given project. Although the guide identified roads on which appropriated road maintenance funds could be expended, it made no decisions about nor was it designed to determine the continued need for roads to be maintained with other funds. Late-successional reserve assessments and watershed analyses were developed to help identify resource management priorities and activities on the landscape. Because the access and travel management guide was prepared before these documents were available, it does not reflect the resource needs identified by those documents. Therefore, an alternative to develop resource actions based solely on the location of the existing primary and secondary road system was not fully developed.

Treatment of the solitary Tilden plantation—The solitary plantation (14 acres) in the Tilden subwatershed was considered for commercial thinning. Because of its isolation (surrounded by private land) and lack of access, this plantation will not be treated. By not treating the plantation, no actions are planned for the Tilden subwatershed under this project. Thus, the subwatershed was not included as part of the project planning area.

Treat 30% of the managed stands to achieve low density or 40 trees per acre—Based on the past precommercial thinning history of plantations in the Lower Siuslaw watershed, stands generally are not suited for applying this level of treatment. If this treatment were applied to stands, there would be a risk of not meeting the Project needs due to catastrophic events such as windthrow.

Single-entry treatment of all managed stands—Considerable thought was given to determine whether a one-time only thinning entry is desirable for all 25 to 50 year-old stands. The planning team and I felt strongly that this alternative provided too much risk to stands. In this scenario, managed stands across the landscape would be thinned to about 40 to 50 trees per acre and associated activities such as stand underplanting would be completed. Stands would then be allowed to develop old-growth conditions on their own. A landscape populated by stands with minimum numbers of trees leaves little room for mortality from natural events such as strong winds or insect infestation. In addition, the variability between stands would be limited. Tappeiner et al. (1997) and Oliver and Larson (1996) advocate the use of several prescriptive residual overstory levels across a landscape. Carey et al. (1999) says that diversity in treatment is critical to meeting existing and future needs of wildlife. Variability and diversity are the keys to recapturing many of the forest functions.

Because of the current level of uncertainty with single-entry treatment, the Forest Supervisor decided it was better to take a more conservative approach to stand management and development at this time. As information is obtained about a single-entry treatments through studies such as the Five Rivers Landscape Management Project Final EIS management study (USDA 2002a), it may become a viable silvicultural tool in the future.

Help from the Public and Other Agencies

To help identify public concerns about the proposed project, interested citizens, organizations, regulatory agencies, and local governments were informed about this proposal. Public comment on the proposed project was solicited through the Siuslaw National Forest's quarterly "Project Update" publications, public scoping letters, and the Siuslaw News newspaper in Florence, Oregon. Scoping letters were mailed on June 8, 2001. A news release was published in the Siuslaw News on June 9, 2001. Comments were requested by June 25, 2001. Twelve (12) persons responded to this request.

Industrial timber landowners and rural residents are concerned about maintaining legal access to their lands, as well as alternate routes to Highway 126 should access be blocked as a result of landslide or fire. Others are concerned about methods for plantation stocking control, cumulative effects of actions, additional clarification of proposed actions, and developing partnerships for watershed restoration. These comments, along with those from past similar projects such as the Five Rivers Landscape Management Project (2002), were used to help identify design criteria (appendix A) for the Project and were addressed in the Project EA, chapters 2 and 3.

Upon completion of the Project EA, a legal notice was published in the Corvallis Gazette-Times (paper of record) on June 7, 2002, informing the public that the Project EA was available for a 30-day review and comment period. Copies of the Project EA were made available at the

Siuslaw National Forest Headquarters in Corvallis, the Waldport Ranger District Office in Waldport, and the Mapleton Ranger District Office in Florence. Copies of the Project EA, appendices A and B, and a cover letter announcing the 30-day review and comment period were sent on June 4, 2002 to those who commented on the proposed project during the scoping phase and to two persons who had requested a copy of the Project EA.

The legal notice and letters identified Alternative 1 as the preferred alternative and indicated the beginning and end of the comment period. The comment process was described and a Forest Service contact person was identified. The 30-day comment period terminated close-of-business on July 8, 2002. Additionally, a news release announcing that the Project EA is completed and available for public review and comment was published in the Siuslaw News (Florence, Oregon) June 19, 2002.Comments on the Project EA were received from the Oregon Natural Resources Council (ONRC) and the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians and are documented in the Project EA, appendix C.

Comments from ONRC are generally positive and supportive of the Project. Some concerns such as logging impacts, leaving down wood and allowing for future recruitment of down wood and in-stream wood, using variable density thinning, and immediate visual impacts were expressed. Most of these concerns are addressed in the Project EA, appendix A (project design criteria). Because of the relatively quick vegetation response in the Oregon Coast Range, visual impacts were not determined to be a major concern.

In their EA-comment letter dated July 3, 2002, the Tribes were generally supportive of the objectives of the Project and requested a delay in implementing project activities (for areas south of Siuslaw River) based on a possible restoration of these lands to the Tribes. I believe delaying implementation of the Project based on potential changes in land status is beyond the scope of this decision. Also, delays in treating stands and decommissioning roads that have high impacts or risks to aquatic resources could jeopardize meeting the Project needs.

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has been consulted about effects on coho through a fisheries biological assessment that was completed for this project on May 29, 2002. In their letter dated July 26, 2002 (NMFS reference # 2002/00595), NMFS has concurred with the determination of the biological assessment that the proposed project is not likely to adversely affect listed Oregon Coast coho salmon or adversely affect essential fish habitat.

In their biological opinions from the following consultation documents, the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) has concurred with our findings that the project will not jeopardize the existence of northern spotted owls, marbled murrelets, and bald eagles. The FWS terms and conditions will be applied to the project design criteria:

- Formal and Informal Program Consultation on FY 2001 Routine Habitat Modification Projects within the North Coast Province, October 4, 2000 (as extended through 2002); FWS reference #: 1-7-00-F-649.

- Concurrence letter for the Lower Siuslaw Restoration Project, November 29, 2001; FWS reference #: 1-7-02-I-121.

- Formal and Informal Program Consultation on FY 2002-2003 Projects within the North Coast Province Which May Disturb Bald Eagles, Northern Spotted Owls, and Marbled Murrelets, April 4, 2002; FWS reference #: 1-7-02-F-422.

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Based on the site-specific environmental analysis documented in the Lower Siuslaw Landscape Management Project Environmental Assessment, I have determined that the activities described do not constitute a major Federal action and would not significantly affect the quality of the human environment; therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is not needed. This determination was made in light of the following factors:

Context

This action is very small in terms of society as a whole. Project activities have been viewed and approved in a Regional context through the Siuslaw National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (USDA 1990) as amended by the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forest Related Species within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl (USDA, USDI 1994). This action only affects a small portion of the Forest, which in turn, is a very small portion of the Region.

The site-specific activities that are authorized and guided by this decision are limited in scope and duration. Some minor adverse effects are expected. However, given the renewable nature of the resources and the high growth rates of coastal vegetation, these effects are expected to be short-term. No long-term adverse effects are expected.

Intensity

1. Project actions will have both beneficial and adverse effects. Adding large wood to streams, decommissioning roads, or commercial thinning may be considered adverse effects. However, I have considered the benefits that the ecosystem will receive from implementing the Project actions and find that the overall beneficial effects to the ecosystem outweigh any short term adverse effects. Further, I find that when considered alone, the adverse effects of this project are not significant (EA, chapter 3).

2. No significant adverse effects to public health or safety have been identified (EA, page 74).

3. The characteristics of the geographic area do not make it uniquely sensitive to the effects of project actions. Past actions of similar intensity in similar areas have not indicated any significant adverse effects (EA, chapter 3).

4. The Lower Siuslaw Landscape Management Project Environmental Assessment has disclosed direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to soil, water, aquatic and terrestrial species, and other components of the human environment. There are no significant

direct, indirect, or cumulative effects anticipated from implementing project actions. Project actions will speed the development of late-successional habitat in late-successional and riparian reserves and improve watershed function. The analysis of cumulative effects considered past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions on National Forest lands as well as for other ownerships in the affected watershed (EA, chapter 3).

5. Based on the pre-project survey and record search of the Project area, actions associated with the Project will have "no effect" (as defined in 36 CFR 800.5 [b]) on any listed or eligible heritage (cultural) resources. Placing large wood in streams with heavy equipment will require on-site monitoring by a certified heritage resource technician or Forest archaeologist during operation of heavy equipment. If a heritage site is discovered during project implementation, work will be stopped until the site is evaluated or the project has been altered to avoid the site (EA, page 66; appendix A, page 5).

6. Based on the aquatic biological assessment and wildlife biological evaluation prepared for the Project, the effects on Federally listed terrestrial and aquatic species are not found to be significant (Biological Assessment, Lower Siuslaw Management Project (fisheries), May 29, 2002; Wildlife Specialist Report for the Lower Siuslaw Landscape Management Project, May 9, 2002; EA, chapter 3; appendix A, pages 1 through 4).

7. The Project is in compliance with relevant Federal, State and local laws, regulations and requirements designed for the protection of the environment. The Project will meet or exceed State water and air quality standards and is consistent with the Oregon Coastal Management Program as required by the Coastal Zone Management Act (EA, page 74, appendix A, page 4).

8. The effects from the Project on the quality of the human environment are not found to be highly controversial (EA, pages 5 and 6).

9. The Project's environmental effects are not uncertain or unknown. Planned actions are similar to those already accomplished on similar lands on the Forest (EA, pages 3 and 4; chapter 3).

10. Actions that will be implemented by the Project do not set a precedent for future actions, because we have implemented similar actions in the past (EA, pages 3 and 4; chapter 3, including page 74).

Other Disclosures

All measures contained in the Project EA, appendix A, and the vegetation management analysis (a project-file document) will be incorporated to comply with the Record of Decision for the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Managing Competing and Unwanted Vegetation published December 1988 and the subsequent Mediated Agreement of May 1989.

The Project will have no significant adverse effects on wetlands, floodplains, farm land, range land, or park land (EA, page 74); land birds (EA, pages 40, 41, and 62); minority groups, civil rights, women, or consumers (EA, page 74); Indian social, economic, subsistence rights, and sacred sites (EA, page 74).

The Project will have no effects on heritage resources, wilderness areas, inventoried roadless areas, and wild and scenic rivers (EA, page 74). Actions will be consistent with the scenic quality objectives for the planning area (EA, pages 53 and 66). Actions will be designed to prevent the spread of invasive plants, including noxious and undesirable weeds (EA, pages 43 and 63). Cleaning of off-road equipment pursuant to Executive Order 13112, dated February 3, 1999, will be required. (EA, appendix A, pages 5 and 13).

Findings Required By Other Laws

Based on the analysis in the Lower Siuslaw Landscape Management Project Environmental Assessment, I find the selected alternative to be consistent with the Siuslaw National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (USDA 1990), as amended by the Northwest Forest Plan (USDA, USDI 1994) and is designed to meet or exceed the objectives of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy as set forth in the Northwest Forest Plan (EA, pages 70 to 72).

The selected alternative is consistent with the National Forest Management Act implementing regulations, including the seven management requirements listed in 36 CFR 219.27, a through g:

a. *Resource protection*—The Project EA includes criteria designed to protect resources and will apply practices as described in General Water Quality Best Management Practices (BMPs), Pacific Northwest Region, November 1988 (EA, appendix A, pages 1 through 21);
b. *Vegetation manipulation of tree cover*—Plantations will be thinned to speed the development of late-successional habitat. Some mature conifer trees will be removed from nearby stands and placed in streams to improve stream function and fish habitat. Riparian planting will accelerate the reestablishment of natural riparian vegetation and provide additional shade to streams in the long term. (EA, pages 2 through 4, 8 through 21, 24, and chapter 3);
c. *Silvicultural practices that apply to timber harvest and cultural treatments*—Plantations will be commercially thinned. Mature conifer will be selectively removed from nearby stands and placed in streams to improve stream function and fish habitat. (EA, pages 2 through 4, 8 through 21, 24, and chapter 3);
d. *Even-aged management in the forest*—No even-aged management is proposed. (EA, page 8);
e. *Riparian area protection*—Special attention has been given to riparian areas by maintaining existing shade and enhancing long-term shade, increasing existing and future large woody debris for streams, and decommissioning roads. These actions are expected to enhance water quality and improve fish habitat in the long term. (EA, pages 2 through 4, 8 through 21, 24, and chapter 3; EA, appendix A);
f. *Conservation of soil and water resources*—The Project is consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives and includes best management practices (BMPs) and other measures designed to protect, enhance, or minimize effects to soil and water

resources. Actions are expected to enhance water quality in the long term. (EA, pages 2 through 4, 8 through 21, 24, chapter 3; EA, appendix A); and

g. *Preserve and enhance the diversity of plant and animal communities*—The project is expected to improve habitat conditions for several plant and animal species. Thinning plantations, creating snags and down wood, and planting trees and shrubs in upland and riparian areas will increase diversity of plant and animal communities. (EA, pages 2 through 4, 8 through 21, chapter 3; EA, appendix A).

Implementation Date

Implementation of this project may not proceed until five (5) working days after the close of the 45-day appeal filing period. Activities, including service contract preparation and solicitation of bids, may proceed immediately.

Administrative Review and Appeal

This decision is subject to appeal pursuant to Forest Service regulations at 36 CFR 215.7. Written appeals must be sent to: Linda Goodman, Acting Regional Forester, ATTN.: 1570 APPEALS, PO Box 3623, Portland, OR, 97208-3623. Any written appeal must be postmarked or received by the Regional Forester within 45 days of the date of publication of the notice for this decision in the Corvallis Gazette-Times. Appeals must meet the content requirements of 36 CFR 215.14.

Contact Person

For further information regarding this project, contact Paul Thomas or Bruce Buckley, South Zone Ranger District, Waldport Office, 1049 SW Pacific Coast Hwy, Waldport, OR 97394, or phone at (541) 563-3211, or e-mail at pgthomas@fs.fed.us or bbuckley@fs.fed.us.

Responsible Official:

_____ _____

Gloria D. Brown Date
Forest Supervisor
Siuslaw National Forest
4077 Research Way
Corvallis, OR 97333