

Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Project

Final Decision and Decision Rationale for Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic
Timber Salvage Project

Environmental Assessment Number OR080-07-07

October 2007

United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Oregon State Office
Salem District
Marys Peak Resource Area

Multiple sections of Benton, Lane, Lincoln and Polk Counties within the Oregon Coast
Range

Responsible Agency: USDI - Bureau of Land Management

Responsible Official: Trish Wilson, Field Manager
Marys Peak Resource Area
1717 Fabry Road SE
Salem, OR 97306
(503) 375-5968

For further information, contact: Gary Humbard
Marys Peak Resource Area
1717 Fabry Road SE
Salem, OR 97306
(503) 315-5981



As the Nation's principal conservation agency, the Department of Interior has responsibility for most of our nationally owned public lands and natural resources. This includes fostering economic use of our land and water resources, protecting our fish and wildlife, preserving the environmental and cultural values of our national parks and historical places, and providing for the enjoyment of life through outdoor recreation. The Department assesses our energy and mineral resources and works to assure that their development is in the best interest of all people. The Department also has a major responsibility for American Indian reservation communities and for people who live in Island Territories under U.S. administration.

BLM/OR/WA/AE-07/077+1792

I. Introduction

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has conducted an environmental analysis for the Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Project, which is documented in the Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Environmental Assessment (EA # OR080-07-07) and the associated project file. The Proposed Action of the Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Project EA is to remove a portion of the blow down and damaged trees within LSR (Late-Successional Reserve), RR (Riparian Reserve), Matrix and AMA (Adaptive Management Area) LUAs (Land Use Allocations) to reduce the potential for bark beetle infestations. The proposed action will also decrease overall fire hazard and resistance to control the spread of fire and while reducing the potential removal of wood fiber due to illegal firewood and/or timber theft and also improve feasibility for tree planting. Timber sales will be offered in Fiscal Year 2007 and 2008. Trees will be ground based and skyline yarded on approximately 90 acres annually (180 acres total). A Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was signed on August 20, 2007 and the EA and FONSI were then made available for public review.

Changes to the Project Design Features

Since the release of the EA, the IDT has identified the need to update some information after further field reconnaissance. Changes relating to road decommissioning within the Beck Road project area (Selected Action Map sheet 1 of 17), is described below, which also describes any changes to the analysis and determination of effects as presented in the August 20, 2007 EA.

Within the Beck Road project area temporary dirt surfaced roads totaling approximately 750 feet will be fully decommissioned after use. This could include blocking access, piling slash, grass seeding exposed surfaces, and water-barring. To ameliorate compaction, facilitate restoration of native vegetation, and to prevent subsequent road use by the public, the road surface will be tilled or subsoiled using grapples of a tracked excavator. Subsoiling will not occur under the dripline of residual trees.

Changes to the Environmental Effects

This action has the potential to return approximately 0.3 acre of forested land (currently designated as non-forest road) to a moderately productive forest condition.

II. Decision

The decision documented in this DR (Decision Rationale) is based on the analysis documented in the EA. This decision authorizes the implementation of only those activities directly related to and included within the timber sales.

I have decided to implement the Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Project as described in the proposed action (EA pgs. 11 and 12) hereafter referred to as the “selected action”. The selected action is shown on the maps attached to this Decision Rationale. This decision is based on site-specific analysis in the Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Project Environmental Assessment, the supporting project record and management direction contained in the Salem District Resource Management Plan (May 1995), which are incorporated by reference in the EA.

The following is a summary of this decision.

- The removal of a portion of the blowdown trees on approximately 90 acres annually (180 acres total) of BLM managed lands within the Marys Peak Resource Area.
- The cutting and yarding of trees will be accomplished utilizing wheeled or tracked equipment operating off of the existing roadway and skyline yarding equipment.
- Larger accumulations of debris along existing roads will be either machine piled or hand piled. All machine and hand piles will be burned.
- All design features and mitigation measures described in the EA (pp. 13-17) will be incorporated into the timber sale contracts.

III. Compliance with Direction:

The analysis documented in the Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage EA supplements analyses found in the *Salem District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement*, September 1994 (RMP/FEIS). This project has been designed to conform to the *Salem District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan*, May 1995 (RMP) and related documents which direct and provide the legal framework for management of BLM lands within the Salem District (EA pp. 3 & 4). All of these documents may be reviewed at the Marys Peak Resource Area office.

Survey and Manage Species Review

Marys Peak RA is aware of the August 1, 2005, U.S. District Court order in Northwest Ecosystem Alliance et al. v. Rey et al. which found portions of the *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement to Remove or Modify the Survey and Manage Mitigation Measure Standards and Guidelines* (January, 2004) (EIS) inadequate. The Marys Peak RA is also aware of the recent January 9, 2006, Court order which:

- set aside the 2004 Record of Decision *To Remove or Modify the Survey and Manage Mitigation Measure Standards and Guidelines in Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern spotted Owl* (March, 2004) (2004 ROD) and
- reinstate the 2001 *Record of Decision and Standards and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measure Standards and Guidelines* (January, 2001) (2001 ROD), including any amendments or modifications in effect as of March 21, 2004.

The order further directs "Defendants shall not authorize, allow, or permit to continue any logging or other ground-disturbing activities....unless such activities are in compliance with the provisions of the 2001 ROD (as amended or modified as of March 21, 2004)".

The litigation over the amendment that eliminated the Survey & Manage mitigation measure from the Northwest Forest Plan does not affect the Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage.

I have attached the documentation of the wildlife and botany compliance reviews undertaken by resource area staff with my concurrence and signature. Therefore, based on the preceding information regarding the status of surveys for Survey & Manage wildlife and botany species and the results of those surveys, it is my determination that the Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic

Timber Salvage project complies with the provisions of the 2001 ROD, as amended or modified as of March 21, 2004. For the foregoing reasons, this decision is in compliance with the 2001 ROD as stated in Point (3) on page 14 of the January 9, 2006, Court order.

IV. Alternatives Considered

The EA analyzed the effects of the proposed action and the no action alternatives. No unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (section 102(2) (E) of NEPA) were identified. No action alternatives were identified that will meet the purpose and need of the project and have meaningful differences in environmental effects from the proposed action (EA Section 3.2). Complete descriptions of the "action" and "no action" alternatives are contained in the EA, pp. 31-55.

V. Decision Rationale

Considering public comment, the content of the EA and supporting project record, the management direction contained in the RMP, I have decided to implement the selected action as described above. The following is my rationale for this decision.

1. The selected action:

- Meets the purpose and need of the project (EA section 1.4), as shown in *Table 1*.
- Complies with the *Salem District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan*, May 1995 (RMP) and related documents which direct and provide the legal framework for management of BLM lands within the Salem District (EA pp. 3 & 4).
- The Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage project is in full and complete compliance with the 2001 Survey and Manage FSEIS and ROD. This project is in compliance with Judge Marsha Pechman's January, 2006 ruling on the 2004 Record of Decision for Survey and Manage Standards and Guidelines, as stated in Point (3) on page 14 of the January 9, 2006, Court order in Northwest Ecosystem Alliance et al. v. Rey et al. (DR Appendix B and C – Compliance with Survey and Manage Direction). No additional surveys are planned for the area as currently designed.
- Will not have significant impact on the affected elements of the environment (EA FONSI pp. 1-4) beyond those already anticipated and addressed in the RMP EIS.
- Has been adequately analyzed.

Table 1: Comparison of the Alternatives with Regard to the Purpose of and Need for Action (EA section 2.1)

Purpose and Need (EA section 1.2)	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)
Within LSR, RR and AMA stands within the Northern Coast Adaptive Management Area where the majority of trees blew down: reduce the risk of beetle kill which might degrade or destroy adjacent forest stands and the risk of fire killing the remaining live trees or adjacent stands by reducing high surface fuel loadings in areas adjacent to roads open to the public. An additional need for the proposed salvage activities within the LSR and RR and AMA stands is to redistribute excess CWD from project blow down areas to areas known to be CWD limited, and occupied by fish.	Does not meet this purpose and need. If an infestation occurred, it could result in the death of numerous adjacent live trees. This could result in the delay of late successional forest by reducing future large tree, down wood and snag development. Fuel loadings would not be reduced, thus fuel hazard would increase substantially. If a fire did start, its potential spread could be catastrophic, resulting in potential crown fire and a high death rate of vegetation. Concentrations of blow down are localized near headwaters on non-fish bearing streams. The 'no action' would retain on site all CWD materials. The 'no action' would maintain CWD levels below desirable conditions on nearby fish bearing streams, and remain recruitment limited for sometime in the future.	Meets. Removal of some of the blow down trees will meet the need to reduce the risk of infestations that could result in the death of many green trees within and adjacent to the proposed project areas. The reduction of fuel loadings will reduce fire intensities if a fire did start and will reduce the death of adjacent live trees and vegetation. Redistributing excess CWD from project blow down areas to areas known to be CWD limited, and occupied by fish, will restore distribution and complexity patterns at greater rates over the 'no action'.
The proposed salvage within Oregon white oak, woodland and meadow habitat would restore habitat on areas formerly characterized by very low conifer density. The removal of conifer blow down trees is needed to restore the habitat and to manage understory vegetation and fuels to meet habitat objectives.	Does not meet this purpose and need. Maintaining the blow down of conifer trees would prevent future site preparation (piling/burning) needed to restore oak/woodland/meadow habitat.	Meets. The removal of conifer blow down trees will provide the necessary site preparation needed to restore oak/meadow habitat. The removal of conifer blow down trees will more closely resemble historic habitat.
Within the Matrix LUA, produce a sustainable supply of timber, maintain a healthy forest ecosystem with habitat to support plant and animal populations and protect riparian reserves and water resources.	Does not meet purpose and need. Would not supply timber for market. The project areas where the majority of standing trees blew down would likely develop more slowly than if a portion of the blow down trees were removed.	Meets. Will offer approximately 90 acres annually (up to 180 acres) of timber for sale. Minor species in the stands will be maintained on site. It will meet the immediate need for the continued development of late successional forest conditions by reserving existing snags and CWD. The proposed action will unlikely alter the current condition of aquatic systems either by affecting their physical integrity, water quality, sediment regime or in-stream flows.
The removal of blow down trees within all LUAs would provide access to permittees and the public; reduce the likelihood of theft.	Does not meet purpose and need of reducing timber theft as without removal of blow down trees from the project areas, potential theft would continue.	Meets. Reduces the potential for timber theft by removing trees within road prisms blocking roads. The removal of blow down trees within all LUAs will also provide access to permittees and the public.

2. The no action alternative was not selected because it does not meet the Purpose and Need directly, or delays the achievement of the Purpose and Need (Table 1).

VI. Public Involvement/ Consultation/Coordination

Scoping: A letter asking for scoping input on the proposal was mailed on June 7, 2007 to adjacent landowners and individuals who expressed an interest in management activities in the resource area as a whole or in this area. Letters were also sent to the Confederated Tribes of Grande Ronde; Confederated Tribes of the Siletz; Federal, State, County and local government organizations; and Special Interest groups. Two responses were received during the scoping period. A summary of the responses received was included in EA Section 7.0. – Response to Scoping Comments.

Comment Period and Comments:

The original EA and/or notice of availability of EA were mailed to approximately 21 agencies, individuals and organizations on August 23, 2007. A legal notice was placed in three local newspapers (*Polk County Itemizer, Gazette Times and Newport News Times*) soliciting public input on the action from August 23 to September 21, 2007. One comment letter (Oregon Wild) was received. Responses to their comments can be found in Section VIII of the Decision Rationale.

Consultation/Coordination:

Wildlife: To address concerns for potential effects to spotted owl critical habitat, the proposed action was consulted upon with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, as required under Section 7 of the ESA. Consultation for this proposed action was facilitated by its inclusion within a programmatic BA (Biological Assessment) that analyzes all projects that may modify the habitat of listed wildlife species on federal lands within the Northern Oregon Coast Range during fiscal years 2007 and 2008. The resulting Letter of Concurrence (ref# 1-7-2006-I-0190, dated October 3, 2006) concurred with the BA that this salvage action was not likely to adversely affect spotted owl critical habitat. This proposed action has been designed to incorporate all appropriate design standards set forth in the BA which form the basis for compliance with the Letter of Concurrence.

Fish: A determination has been made that the proposed Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage project includes both 'No Effect' action areas and 'May Affect' action areas to ESA listed threatened Upper Willamette River steelhead trout. These determinations were primarily derived from the distance of listed fish and critical habitat from treatment areas and proposed haul routes.

Proposed actions which 'May Affect' would comply with existing programmatic consultation and relevant design criteria, or would need additional consultation coverage. Existing programmatic consultations covers log removal associated with road prism salvage and log removal for in-stream restoration projects. Road prism salvage is covered under NOAA NMFS *Endangered Species Act Section 7 Informal Consultation and Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Essential Fish Habitat Consultation for Three Programmatic Categories in Northwestern Oregon*. Log removal for in-stream restoration is covered under NOAA NMFS *Endangered Species Act Section 7 Formal Programmatic Consultation and Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Essential Fish Habitat Consultation for Fish Habitat Restoration Activities in Oregon and Washington, CY2007-CY2012*. Due to the programmatic nature of this EA, other salvage actions may occur which could not be specifically addressed under this assessment. Any future activities which 'may affect' listed UWR steelhead trout, and

are not covered under the existing programmatic consultations, would require separate consultation in order to comply with ESA.

Protection of EFH as described by the Magnuson/Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act and consultation with NOAA NMFS is required for all projects which may adversely affect EFH of Chinook and coho salmon. The proposed actions in the FY 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage EA are not anticipated to adversely affect EFH. This determination is primarily due to the distance of EFH from treatment areas and proposed haul routes. Actions determined to adversely affect EFH and are not covered under the existing programmatic consultations would be consulted on, most likely concurrently with any additional ESA consultation, with NOAA NMFS.

Compliance with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy

On March 30, 2007, the District Court, Western District of Washington, ruled adverse to the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA-Fisheries) and USFS and BLM (Agencies) in *Pacific Coast Fed. of Fishermen's Assn. et al v. Natl. Marine Fisheries Service, et al and American Forest Resource Council*, Civ. No. 04-1299RSM (W.D. Wash)(PCFFA IV). Based on violations of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Court set aside:

- the USFWS Biological Opinion (March 18, 2004),
- the NOAA-Fisheries Biological Opinion for the ACS Amendment (March 19, 2004),
- the ACS Amendment Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS) (October 2003), and
- the ACS Amendment adopted by the Record of Decision dated March 22, 2004.

Previously, in *Pacific Coast Fed. Of Fishermen's Assn. v. Natl. Marine Fisheries Service*, 265 F.3d 1028 (9th Cir. 2001)(*PCFFA II*), the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ruled that because the evaluation of a project's consistency with the long-term, watershed level ACS objectives could overlook short-term, site-scale effects that could have serious consequences to a listed species, these short-term, site-scale effects must be considered.

Within the Marys Peak Resource Area, the BLM manages approximately 128,457 acres, the U.S. Forest Service manages 192,019 acres and other landowners manage 1,236,640 acres. Table 2 describes the amount of forest greater than 80 years old and the amount of riparian area within 100 feet of streams on BLM managed lands in the RA. Forest conditions have been generally influenced by such activities as timber harvest, wildfire, and road building within the watersheds. The 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Project area is located where tributaries flow towards both the coast and the Willamette Valley.

Table 2: Total acres of BLM managed land, % of BLM managed lands with stands greater than 80 years old and % of BLM lands within 100 feet of streams

5th-field Watershed	Total BLM managed lands (acres)	% of BLM managed lands with forest greater than 80 years old	% of BLM managed lands within 100 feet of a stream
Beaver Creek-Waldport Bay	327	39	23
Big Elk Creek	2,686	44	25
Deadwood Creek	200	21	26
Devils Lake-Moolack Frontal	128	7	11
Drift Creek	1,240	81	15
Five Rivers-Lobster Creek	15,291	33	28
Lake Creek	304	3	4
Long Tom River	11	7	1
Lower Alsea River	12,903	50	25
Lower Siletz River	2,800	44	23
Lower Yaquina River	40	0	19
Luckiamute River	8,263	35	22
Marys River	6,597	12	22
Middle Siletz River	18	100	15
Mill Creek-South Yamhill River	12,274	15	29
Rickreall Creek	3,093	8	29
Rock Creek-Siletz River	1,445	29	30
Salmon River-Siletz River	2,979	32	18
Salt Creek-South Yamhill River	96	27	6
Upper Alsea River	41,408	37	26
Upper Siletz River	12,168	18	28
Upper South Yamhill River	3,454	13	19
Upper Yaquina River	459	39	17
Yachats River	273	0	36

Review of Aquatic Conservation Strategy Compliance:

I have reviewed this analysis and have determined that the project meets the Aquatic Conservation Strategy in the context of PCFFA IV and PCFFA II [complies with the ACS on the project (site) scale]. The following is an update of how this project complies with the four components of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy, originally documented in the EA, Table 3, p. 14. The project will comply with:

Component 1 – Riparian Reserves: Maintaining canopy cover along all streams and the wetlands will protect stream bank stability and water temperature. Riparian Reserve boundaries will be established consistent with direction from the *Salem District Resource Management Plan*.

Component 2 – Key Watershed: The 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage project area contains the following key watersheds: North Fork Siletz River/Warnicke Creek, Drift Creek-Siletz River, Drift Creek Alsea River, Tobe Creek and Upper Lobster Creek. Currently, only Tobe Creek Key Watershed will be affected (removal of individual trees within the road prism) by the proposed action.

Component 3 – Watershed Analysis: Watershed analysis was completed for all affected watersheds within the project area. Findings from the watershed analyses were incorporated into this EA (pgs. 37, 39 and 50).

Component 4 – Watershed Restoration: Reducing the amount of blow down timber in the project area, treating the residual fuels, planting seedlings and utilizing a portion of the blow down trees for in-stream structures will result in long-term restoration of coniferous forest and aquatic habitat. In addition, I have reviewed this project against the ACS objectives at the project or site scale with the following results: The no action alternative does not retard or prevent the attainment of any of the nine ACS objectives because this alternative would maintain current conditions. The proposed action does not retard or prevent the attainment of any of the nine ACS objectives.

Table 3: Project’s Consistency with the Nine Aquatic Conservation Strategy Objectives

Aquatic Conservation Strategy Objectives (ACSOs)	Alternative 2 (EA section 1.3)
1. Maintain and restore the distribution, diversity, and complexity of watershed and landscape-scale features.	Does not prevent the attainment of ACSO 1. Treatments will likely reduce the potential for bark beetles to kill live green trees, thus protecting the remaining stands diversity and complexity locally. The small scale of the proposed project will have no effects on distribution, diversity, and complexity at a watershed scale. Treatments adjoining roads will protect remaining stands from fire risk and protection to surrounding stands from catastrophic impacts thus protecting the distribution, diversity, and complexity.
2. Maintain and restore spatial and temporal connectivity within and between watersheds.	Does not prevent the attainment of ACSO 2. Long-term connectivity of terrestrial watershed features will be improved by increasing the availability and proximity of functioning riparian habitat.
3. Maintain and restore the	Does not prevent the attainment of ACSO 3. Stream

Aquatic Conservation Strategy Objectives (ACSOs)	Alternative 2 (EA section 1.3)
physical integrity of the aquatic system, including shorelines, banks, and bottom configurations.	protection zones adjacent to all surface water will maintain the physical integrity of the aquatic system.
4. Maintain and restore water quality necessary to support healthy riparian, aquatic, and wetland ecosystems.	Does not prevent the attainment of ACSO 4. No measurable effects to water quality will be anticipated from the proposed action. Stream buffers of at least 50 feet will eliminate disturbance of streamside vegetation; no trees will be cut/removed from the stream bank or where roots are stabilizing the stream bank.
5. Maintain and restore the sediment regime under which aquatic ecosystems evolved.	Does not prevent the attainment of ACSO 5. The proposed project is designed to minimize the risk of a mass soil movement event (slump/landslide). Stream protection zones and project design features will minimize any potential sediment from harvest, burning, and road-related activities from reaching water bodies.
6. Maintain and restore in-stream flows sufficient to create and sustain riparian, aquatic, and wetland habitats and to retain patterns of sediment, nutrient, and wood routing.	Does not prevent the attainment of ACSO 6. The proposed alternative will not measurably alter in-stream flows. The proposed timber harvest will affect only 0.014% of the forest cover in the Marys Peak RA watersheds – well below the 20% threshold for measurable effects. Removal of downed trees will not affect flows.
7. Maintain and restore the timing, variability, and duration of floodplain inundation and water table elevation in meadows and wetlands.	Does not prevent the attainment of ACSO 7. Project design features, such as stream protection zones, coupled with the small percent of vegetation proposed to be removed, will maintain groundwater levels and floodplain inundation rates.
8. Maintain and restore the species composition and structural diversity of plant communities in riparian areas and wetlands.	Does not prevent the attainment of ACSO 8. Vegetation management within the Riparian Reserve will help restore structural diversity. Treatments will also reduce beetle kill and fire hazard thus protecting species composition and diversity from radical changes.
9. Maintain and restore habitat to support well-distributed populations of native plant, invertebrate and vertebrate riparian-dependent species.	Does not prevent the attainment of ACSO 9. The stream protection zone maintains populations of riparian dependent species. Retaining diverse CWD features in the RR, consistent with design features, should maintain habitats disturbed from blow down events while at the same time reducing beetle mortality and fire hazards in the remaining stands thus protecting the habitat of native plants, invertebrates, and vertebrate riparian dependent species.

VII. Conclusion


I have determined that change to the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI – August - 2007) for the Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Project is not necessary because I've considered and concur with information in the EA and FONSI. The comments on the EA were reviewed and no information was provided in the comments that lead me to believe the analysis, data or conclusions are in error or that the proposed action needs to be altered. There are no significant new circumstances or facts relevant to the proposed action or associated environmental effects that were not addressed in the EA.

There are no significant impacts which have not been adequately analyzed, or any significant impacts beyond those already analyzed, in the *Salem District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement*, September 1994 (RMP/FEIS) to which this environmental assessment is tied. Therefore, supplemental or additional information to the analysis in the RMP/FEIS in the form of a new environmental impact statement is not needed.

Protests: In accordance with Forest Management Regulations at 43 CFR 5003.2, the decision for timber sales will not become effective or be open to formal protest until the Notice of Sales are published "in a newspaper of general circulation in the areas where the lands affected by the decision are located". Protests of sales must be filed within 15 days of the first publication of the notice. For this project, the Notice of Sales will be published in the *Polk County Itemizer Observer, Gazette Times and Newport News Times* newspapers on or around January 31, 2008.

Contact Person: For additional information concerning this decision, contact Gary Humbard (503) 315-5981, Marys Peak Resource Area, Salem BLM, 1717 Fabry SE, Salem, Oregon 97306.

Authorized Official:


Trish Wilson, Field Manager
Marys Peak Resource Area

10/25/07
Date:

VIII. Appendix A: Response to Public Comments Received on the Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Project (EA #OR080-07-07)

Note: This section addresses comments on the Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Project received during the public comment period, which ended September 21, 2007. Two comment letters were received from J.K. Hockema (8/27/07) and Oregon Wild (9/20/07). The comments, (in italics type), may have been paraphrased for clarity or conciseness, but the complete text of the comment was available to the Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) making the response. The full text of the comment letters is available in the Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Project NEPA file.

Oregon Wild (September 20, 2007)

1. Comment: *"The proposed action alternative involves salvage of up to 180 acres of dead and down trees per year. This project is not site-specific. BLM cannot accurately describe the impacts of salvage if they don't know where it will occur."*

Response: As stated in the EA (pp. 1, and 11) the proposed action involves the salvage of up to 90 acres of blow down trees per year. It could entail up to 180 acres total (within a 2 year

time span). As stated in the EA (pg. 3), all actions will be implemented using project design features and mitigation measures, (EA Section 2.2.2). The EA describes the environmental effects of the removal of a portion of blow down trees through the implementation of the design features. This project has accurately described the impacts of timber salvage since it was designed to be in conformance to the *Salem District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan*, May 1995 (RMP) and related documents which direct and provide the legal framework for management of BLM lands within the Salem District (EA pp. 3 & 4).

As long as sales are designed to meet the following criteria they will be allowed to proceed:

- Areas will be less than 15 contiguous acres.
- No more than 90 acres per year will be treated.
- Will meet the purpose and need.
- No road construction is needed.

2. Comment: *There is no valid ecological basis for this project. This proposal treats dead and down trees as bad when they are in fact good. BLM says that removing dead trees will reduce the risk that bark beetles will increase and invade and degrade or destroy adjacent green trees. The BLM has not established that beetle kill causes degradation or destruction of forest qualities that the Northwest Forest Plan is trying to encourage. If beetles kill some trees, that means more dead and down wood habitat which is in short supply (especially in the Oregon Coast Range) would be available to meet ecosystem objectives. The BLM should leave extra dead wood to compensate for (a) harmful practices on non-federal lands, and (b) past practices on BLM lands that have created a long-term deficit of dead and down trees.*

Response: The EA acknowledges the ecosystem value of dead and downed wood. For those benefits, snags and significant quantities of downed trees will be retained under the proposed design features. In matrix land use allocations, 2 trees per acre of stand average or greater diameter will be left, in other land use allocations (LSR, Riparian Reserve, AMA) 6-16 trees per acre will remain. This is expected to result in some bark beetle mortality in adjacent stands, but much less than if all the downed material remained. The purpose and need of the proposed action is to reduce the risk of tree mortality due to bark beetle infestation or wildfire. The reason salvage has been allowed within the LSR Land Use Allocation under the Northwest Forest Plan is because the risks posed to late successional forest by large concentrations of downed wood has been acknowledged. For example, the two proposed Cold Springs units are group windthrow patches in a mid-seral plantation of LSR along well traveled roads and both units lie in close proximity to important old-growth patches. Limited removal of blowdown as specified in this EA will minimize bark beetle damage and significantly reduce fire hazard in this location. On September 8, 2007 a wildfire started less than 1/4 mile from these two salvage units and burned 425 acres through adjacent clearcuts and young plantations (see 1500 Road Fire, <http://www.inciweb.org/incident/982>). Luckily none of these blowdown units were in the path of the fire. We believe this fire underscores the importance of reducing wildland fire hazard adjacent to key old-growth patches.

The strategy for managing coarse wood (snags and downed wood) in the LSR has been put forth in the Late Successional Reserve Assessments, for the LSRs within the planning area. Managing to those standards is expected to produce adequate levels of downed wood over the spatial and temporal scale of the LSRs.

3. Comment: *A century of human influence has pushed forest ecosystems far outside the natural range of variability. To be consistent with the Northwest Forest Plan and to help recover at-risk species, all future management actions must be designed to move forest ecosystems towards the middle of the range of variability. All salvage harvest will move forests in the wrong direction (further toward the extremes). Recent research covering the Oregon Coast Range shows the current dead wood condition is outside the Historic Range of Variability. Stands with very low dead wood are currently dominant but rarely occurred historically. Salvage harvest is inexcusable in this day and age because it will only create more of the legacy-deprived forest types that are far in excess of natural range of variability, while reducing legacy-rich forest types that are far below natural range of variability.*

Response: After salvage, levels of downed wood will still be greater than prior to disturbance. All pre-existing downed wood will remain, augmented by 2-16 additional trees per acre.

Forest stands are well outside the historic range of variability in terms of age class (the landscape is dominated by younger stands). As these stands age, natural processes of density mortality, and small disturbances, as well as management actions will increase the abundance and quality of coarse wood on BLM lands.

4. Comment: *Felling and removal of large trees, whether they are alive or dead, removes large material that is normally handed down from one stand to the next. The loss of this material has serious adverse consequences for wildlife, hydrology, soil, etc. These legacies are often described as “lifeboats” that allow species to persist in post-disturbance forests and/or return more rapidly to post-disturbance forests. The NEPA analysis must account for all the values provided by snags and down wood and the effect of removing these legacy structures.*

Response: The NEPA analysis accounts for the values provided by snags and down wood (EA p. 38 and 39), and the effects to wildlife species from removing a portion or leaving it all are compared (EA p. 39 and 40). The ecosystem values are expected to be maintained by design features that require retention of a portion of the downed wood and reserve all trees over 80 years old (i.e. large legacy trees) in the LSR land use allocation (see EA pages 12 and 16).

5. Comment: *The NEPA analysis must recognize that salvage treatments reduce snag habitat, if for no other reason than the removal for safety reasons. Even when snag removal is not an intentional design feature, hazard tree felling normally occurs in all treatment areas. Korol et al (2002) found that large snag habitat is below historic range of variability, and in the future would attain historic levels only in roadless and wilderness areas.*

Response: We agree that snags and dead wood are important legacy features that should be retained in treatment units, and we understand your concern that safety/operational issues should not diminish these structures. We believe the design features for the protection of existing down logs and snags as stated in the EA (pg. 16) provides the necessary protection for these resources and removes any incentive for needlessly felling or removing them.

The Marys Peak RA will be enhancing recently harvested density management projects by

creating snags and CWD (girdling/falling/leaving average stand diameter reserve trees); falling and leaving on site trees that are encroaching on and ultimately impeding the survival of the live crowns of old growth trees and by falling trees into live streams for LWD enhancement purposes. Approximately \$40,000/year will be spent on these types of habitat enhancement projects from Fiscal Years 2008 through 2010.

The Marys Peak RA collected pre harvest (2000) and post harvest (2003) snag and CWD data within a LSR enhancement project (Crooked Alder) to determine the effectiveness of CWD enhancement in conjunction with the timber sale contract requirements. The data indicates that overall, the volume of CWD increased from 244 cu/ft/ac to 3,164 cu/ft/ac and the number of pieces of CWD increased from 7.5 pieces/ac to 120 pieces/ac. Since 2001, when implementing LSR enhancement projects, the Marys Peak RA has included the reservation of all existing CWD and the creation of new CWD within the timber sale contract. We understand that CWD is an important component of late successional forest conditions and will continue to enhance this condition through LSR projects.

In addition, there are several blowdown areas throughout the resource area that will be left untreated. These areas will allow natural processes to occur while providing the ability to monitor and compare effects between untreated and treated stands.

6. Comment: *Ohmann et al (1994) found that non-federal forestlands do not retain enough snags to support viable wildlife populations, so federal managers, likely need to retain more snags on federal lands to compensate.*

Response: The NFP and RMP did not address activities on private land. Subsequently, the EA did not address activities on private lands. The EA is in conformance with the RMP and meets the standard and guidelines of the NFP

7. Comment: *Given the current extent of the road network and the historic extent of logging, the cumulative effects analysis must recognize the inherent conflict between “forest management” (past, present and future) and snags and all their values. Please consider all the many values of snags and down wood presented in Rose, C.L., Marcot, B.G., Mellen, T.K., Ohmann, J.L., Waddell, K.L., Lindely, D.L., and B. Schrieber. 2001.*

Response: The NEPA analysis accounts for the values provided by snags and down wood (EA p. 38 and 39), and the effects to wildlife species from removing a portion or leaving it all are compared (EA p. 39 and 40). The Wildlife Biological Evaluation completed and incorporated into the EA for this project cites Rose, C.L., B.G. Marcot, T.K. Mellen, J.L. Ohmann, K.L. Waddell, D.L. Lindley, and B. Schreiber. 2001.

8. Comment: *The ecological importance of decaying wood is especially evident in coniferous forests of the Pacific Northwest. Large accumulations of decaying wood provide wildlife habitat and influence basic ecosystem processes such as soil development and productivity, nutrient immobilization and mineralization, and nitrogen fixation.*

Response: The proposed action includes the design feature leaving all existing down woody debris and the redistribution of course woody debris in areas where an excess occurs to areas where low amounts are present. This action will result in a better long term soil condition in the area of the salvage. The proposal also includes only the removal of some of the existing

blowdown timber, not all of it. This will lead to an increase in the amount of LWD in the units compared with the pre-blow down event.

9. Comment: *Since the publication of Thomas et al. and Brown, new research has indicated that more snags and large down wood are needed to provide for the needs of fish, wildlife, and other ecosystem functions than was previously recommended by forest management guidelines in Washington and Oregon. For example, the density of cavity trees selected and used by cavity-nesters is higher than provided for in current management guidelines.*

The abundance of cavity-using species is directly related to the presence or absence of suitable cavity trees. Habitat suitability for cavity-users is influenced by the size (diameter and height), abundance, density, distribution, species, and decay characteristics of snags.

Response: We agree that the size and abundance of snags as well as live cavity trees will significantly affect the quality of habitat for many cavity-using wildlife species. This proposed action is only intended to salvage windthrown trees (down logs). Design features stated on pages 12, 13 and 16 will provide protection to existing snags, live cavity trees and retention of appropriate amounts of CWD.

10. Comment: *Some data support a linkage between intensive management (especially depletion of decaying wood) and reduced forest biomass productivity, particularly on less productive sites. Lower productivity is attributed to nutrient losses from managed forests, reduced nutrient availability in older stands, and decreased nutrient storage, particularly in the soil. Depletion of soil organic matter has been cited as a primary factor contributing to declining forest productivity and biodiversity in the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere.*

Response: Please see comment #8. The proposed action will result in an increase in both LWD and CWD based on the pre-blow down event.

11. Comment: *Setting a goal of 40% of habitat capability for primary excavators, mainly woodpeckers, is likely to be insufficient for maintaining viable populations. Numbers and sizes (dbh) of snags used and selected by secondary cavity-nesters often exceed those of primary cavity excavators. Clumping of snags and down wood may be a natural pattern, and clumps may be selected by some species, so that providing only even distributions may be insufficient to meet all species needs.*

The decline of species associated with late-successional forest structures, as well as the prolonged time needed to produce wood legacies, suggests that it is both ecologically and economically advantageous to retain legacy structures across harvest cycles wherever possible, rather than attempt to restore structures that have been depleted.

Response: As noted in the response to Comment #9 above, we agree that snag size and abundance are important for many species of wildlife and we have proposed design features that will protect existing snags (EA pages 12 and 16).

12. Comment: *The federal forest agencies now recognize that current methods and assumptions concerning snag habitat standards are outdated, and the old snag standards do not ensure enough snags to meet the intent of the standard, yet the agencies have not adjusted*

their management plans to account for this new information nor have they developed new standards that are consistent with the latest scientific information.

The BLM should be managing for levels of coarse woody debris that more accurately mirror levels characteristic of the natural disturbance regime (Agee 2002). The agency must avoid any reduction of existing or future large snags and logs (including as part of this project) until the applicable management plans are rewritten to update the snag retention standards.

Response: The strategy for managing coarse wood (snags and downed wood) in the LSR has been put forth in the Late Successional Reserve Assessments for the LSRs within the planning area. Managing to those standards is expected to produce adequate levels of downed wood over the spatial and temporal scale of the LSRs.

13. Comment: *The agency must recognize and account for the short-comings of DecAID and cannot rely on DecAID to provide the project-level snag standards because:*

- *DecAID is a tool designed for plan level evaluations,*
- *DecAID itself has not been subjected to NEPA analysis and comparison to alternatives,*
- *DecAID is an inadequate tool for the purpose.*

Before relying on DecAID, the agency must prepare a comprehensive NEPA analysis to consider alternative ways of ensuring viability of all species dependent upon snags and dead wood. While it is true that the “potential population” or “habitat capability” method is no longer considered scientifically valid, the agency has not yet considered a full range of alternative methods to replace the habitat capability method mandated in the forest plans.

Response: A NEPA analysis of snag modeling tools and their applicability to Northwest Forest Plan standards (and Salem RMP standards) is beyond the scope of this EA. Furthermore, as noted in the response to Comment #9, snags and live cavity trees are not the intended object of this proposed salvage harvest. This EA proposes to salvage windthrown trees (down logs) only and will provide protection to existing snags and live cavity trees.

14. Comment: *The agency’s analysis of snag retention and habitat for cavity dependent species is faulty at both a programmatic level and at a project level. The agency must defer any decision on this project until it reviews all the available new information and amends its management plan standards to provide adequate snags for wildlife and all other ecosystem functions.*

Response: An amendment to the BLM management plan is beyond the scope of this EA and is not applicable to this proposed action since snags are not the intended object of this salvage harvest. This EA proposes to salvage windthrown trees (down logs), and will provide protection to existing snags and live cavity trees.

15. Comment: *The NEPA analysis failed to consider significant new information on pileated woodpeckers. Determining pileated woodpeckers population potential based on nesting sites alone will not provide adequate habitat for viable populations of this species. This new information is not recognized in current management requirements at the plan or project level.*

Response: As noted in several comment responses above, snags are not the intended object of this proposed salvage harvest. This EA proposes to salvage windthrown trees (down logs), and will provide protection to existing snags and live cavity trees.

16. Comment: *New science indicates that in landslide prone landscapes almost half of instream wood comes from outside the riparian area. This indicates that the total watershed must be managed to meet the ACS objective of healthy streams.*

Aquatic Conservation Strategy objective #5 requires the agency to “maintain and restore the sediment regime under which aquatic ecosystems evolved” including “the timing, volume, rate, and character of sediment input, storage, and transport.” ACS Objective #8 calls for maintaining “distributions of coarse woody debris sufficient to sustain physical complexity and stability” The objectives require retention of abundant trees and wood especially large wood that provides long-lasting ecological services.

Response: The BLM agrees that upslope sources may contribute large wood to instream habitat. Reeves et al (2003)¹ noted the importance of upslope sources for large wood contribution to instream habitat. McDade et al (1990)² noted that approximately 47% of instream wood could not be accounted for in a survey of near by stream sources, suggesting the importance of upslope recruitment. Source areas for large wood beyond the contributing lands adjacent to the stream channel are made up of both upland and riparian areas. However, wood recruitment does not occur from all areas in the watershed. Delivery of wood is a physical and process based function derived from past disturbance and transport potential derived from slope and geologic stability variables.

As noted in the EA the BLM developed design features intended on protecting and enhancing large wood recruitment potential. On Matrix, LSR, and AMA Land Use Allocations all treatments areas will be limited to Low and Medium landslide risk grounds as documented in Watershed Analysis or are considered highly unlikely to increase slide risk through site specific clearance by a Hydrologist or Soils Scientist (pg 15). Avoiding or minimizing activities within at-risk sites will protect potential future recruitment. Hazardous situations (determined by the area engineer and hydrologist) may arise where removal of wood is expected to provide greater resource protection compared to leaving material onsite. Under these circumstances salvage of trees may occur to protect resource values.

Within riparian reserves the instream large wood objectives will be met, or the salvage will not be expected to contribute to instream habitat, before removing timber from the riparian reserve (pg 16). To assess both conditions review will occur by water and fisheries resources specialists. The proposed action allows salvage within RR only on grounds rated as low risk of landslide as documented in Watershed Analysis or by site specific clearance by a Hydrologist or Soils Scientist. A Stream Protection Zone (where no cutting or yarding is permitted) will be established for all channels with a distance of at least 50 feet or to slope break, which ever is greater. Except for within the road prism, no activities will be allowed

¹ Reeve, G.H., K.M. Burnette, E.V. McGerry. 2003. Sources of Large Wood in the Main Stem of a Forth Order Watershed in Coastal Oregon. Canadian Journal of Forest Research. 33:1363-1370.

² McDade, M.H., F.J. Swanston, W.A. McKee, J.F. Franklin, and J. VanSickle. 1990. Source Distances for Coarse Woody Debris Entering Small Streams in Western Oregon and Washington. Canadian Journal Forest Research. 20:326-330.

within the SPZ. These design features will be expected to protect sediment regimes and stream channels.

17. Comment: *The agency must do away with the caveat that they will protect snags “except where they create a safety hazard.” This is based on a false choice between snags and safety. The agency can just buffer snags from activities that involve workers, then all ecologically important snags can be protected. The agency must consider this as an alternative to their proposed “management by caveat.” The agency should save the snags by avoiding the activity in the hazard zone around the snags. The NEPA analysis must at least disclose how many large snags will be protected vs. felled for safety under the preferred alternative.*

Response: We understand your concern that safety/operational issues should not diminish that large diameter snags are important legacy features and should be retained in treatment units. We believe the design features for the protection of existing down logs and snags and the retention of as stated in the EA page 16 removes any incentive for needlessly felling or removing them.

K.J. Hockema (August 27, 2007)

1. Comment: *Aerial photos provide evidence that at the turn of the century there was not a blanket of “old-growth” within the Oregon Coast Range. There were vast clearings with small openings. The riparian areas were not a solid stand of trees and brush.*

Response: It has been verified within a vast array of documents that old-growth forest did not dominate the landscape of the Oregon Coast Range within the last century. High intensity large and small scale fires burned throughout the Oregon Coast Range leaving their influence on the landscape along with other natural disturbances.

2. Comment: *In the 1950’s the state and federal governments became involved in the management of salmon with the construction of hatcheries and fish traps and the number of salmon soon declined. What current data indicates that installing LWD enhances rearing and spawning habitat for salmon? I question the wisdom of placing large woody debris (LWD) in streams.*

Response: There is an extensive literature base supporting the benefits of LWD contributing to habitat complexity and quantity and fish populations. Various summary sources are available which describe overarching values of LWD insofar as stream function. In the “Natural Process” chapter in Influences of Forest and Rangeland Management on Salmonid Fishes and Their Habitats (1991) a detailed description of stream continuum process are described including the functional value of LWD on habitat conditions and fish populations. In addition other research literature exists documenting the value of LWD affects to habitat including Montgomery and Schmidt (1995) and Beechie and Silby (1997) which documented increases in quantity of pool habitat associated with quantity of instream LWD. Other citations including Cederholm et al (1997) and House and Boehne (1986) documented the relationship between increases in juvenile coho population abundance following placement of LWD instream channels.

3. Comment: *It is time for the BLM to offer timber sales for the small operators to bid on.*

Response: We recently offered two small volume timber sales (Beck Road and North Fork Hazard Tree Removal) which were purchased by relatively small operators. Unless the Small Business Administration (SBA) triggers a timber sale(s) to be set-aside for small businesses or operators, then sales are generally opened to all approved prospective purchasers. Two project areas (Lake Lyons and Beck Road) included in this EA are currently being considered for sale to only small operators. We will continue to consider all options in regards to meeting the needs of marketing timber sales including the sale to small operators.

Appendix B – Compliance with Current Survey and Manage Direction

2001 ROD Compliance Review: Survey & Manage Botany Species

Environmental Analysis File Salem District Bureau of Land Management

Project Name: **Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Exeter** Prepared By: **Ron**

Project Type: Blowdown Timber Salvage Date: July 6, 2007

Location: **(Coast Range physiographic province)** T. 7S., R. 6W., Section 28 SW1/4

S&M List Date: **December 2003.**

Table A. Survey & Manage Species Known and Suspected in the Salem District. Species listed below were compiled from the 2003 Annual Species Review (IM-OR-2004-034) and includes all species in which pre-disturbance surveys may be needed (Category A, C and non-fungi Category B species if the project occurs in old-growth as defined on page 79-80 of the 2001 ROD) and lists known sites of other survey and manage species that are known to occur within the project area. In addition, the table indicates whether or not a survey was required, survey results and site management.

The following survey protocols and literature were used in determining species known range, habitat and survey methodology. All field surveys were completed by intuitive controlled methods.

Fungi:

Survey Protocols for *Bridgeoporus (=Oxyporus) nobilissimus* (Version 2.0, May 1998)

Handbook to Strategy 1 Fungal Species in the Northwest Forest Plan (October 1999)

Handbook to Additional Fungal Species of Special Concern in the Northwest Forest Plan. (2003).

Lichens:

Survey Protocols For Component 2 Lichens (Version 2.0, March 1998)

Management Recommendations for Survey and Manage Lichens (Version 2.0, March 2, 2000)

Survey Protocols for Survey and Manage Category A & C Lichens in the Northwest Forest Plan Area

[Version 2.1 (2003)]

2003 Amendment to the Survey Protocol for Survey and Manage Category A & C Lichens. (Version 2.1 Amendment, September 2003)

Bryophytes:

Survey Protocols For Protection Buffer Bryophytes (Version 2.0)

Vascular Plants:

Survey Protocols for Survey and Manage Strategy 2 Vascular Plants (Version 2.0, December 1998).

All species:

Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species of Oregon; Oregon Natural Heritage Information Center (May 2004).

Species	S&M Category	Survey Triggers			Survey Results			Site Management
		Within Range of the Species?	Project Contains Suitable Habitat?	Project may negatively affect species/habitat?	Surveys Required?	Survey Date (month/year)	Sites Known or Found?	
Fungi								
<i>Bridgeoporus nobilissimus</i> ^{1a}	A	NO	NO	NO	NO ²	N/A	None	N/A
Lichens								
<i>Bryoria pseudocapillaris</i> ^{1a}	A	NO	NO	NO	NO ³	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Bryoria spiralifera</i> ^{1a}	A	NO	NO	NO	NO ³	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Dendriscoaulon intricatatum</i> ^{1c}	A	YES	NO	NO	NO ⁴	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Hypogymnia duplicata</i> ^{1c}	C	YES	NO	NO	NO ⁴	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Leptogium cyanescens</i> ^{1c}	A	YES	YES	NO	YES	7/2007	None	N/A
<i>Lobaria linita var. tenuoir</i> ^{1b}	A	YES	NO	NO	NO ⁴	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Nephroma occultum</i> ^{1c}	C	YES	NO	NO	NO ⁴	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Niebla cephalota</i> ^{1b}	A	NO	NO	NO	NO ³	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Pseudocyphellaria perpetua</i> ^{1c}	A	YES	YES	NO	YES	7/2007	None	N/A
<i>Pseudocyphellaria rainierensis</i> ^{1c}	A	YES	NO	NO	NO ⁴	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Teloschistes flavicans</i> ^{1a}	A	NO	NO	NO	NO ³	N/A	None	N/A
Bryophytes								
<i>Schistostega pennata</i> ^{1b}	A	YES	NO	NO	NO ⁴	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Tetraphis geniculata</i> ^{1b}	A	YES	YES	NO	YES	7/2007	None	N/A
Vascular Plants								
<i>Botrychium minganense</i> ^{1c}	A	NO	NO	NO	NO ⁵	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Botrychium montanum</i> ^{1b}	A	NO	NO	NO	NO ⁵	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Coptis asplenifolia</i>	A	NO	NO	NO	NO ⁷	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Coptis trifolia</i> ^{1b}	A	NO	NO	NO	NO ⁵	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Corydalis aquae-gelidae</i> ^{1a}	A	NO	NO	NO	NO ⁶	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Cyripedium fasciculatum</i> ^{1a}	C	NO	NO	NO	NO ⁵	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Cyripedium montanum</i> ^{1c}	C	NO	NO	NO	NO ⁵	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Eucephalis vialis</i> ^{1a}	A	NO	NO	NO	NO ⁵	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Galium kamtschaticum</i>	A	NO	NO	NO	NO ⁷	N/A	None	N/A
<i>Plantanthera orbiculata</i> var. <i>orbiculata</i>	C	NO	NO	NO	NO ⁷	N/A	None	N/A
Category B Species (equivalent effort surveys needed if project area includes old-growth as defined in 2001 ROD glossary, p. 79-80)								
None. ⁸	B	-	NO	NO	NO ⁸	N/A	None	N/A

Additional Category B, D, E & F known sites located within the proposed project Area

No known sites.								
-----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- ¹ These species are former species of concern; (a) Bureau sensitive, (b) bureau assessment or (c) bureau tracking species.
- ² This species is known from high elevations containing true fir and the only site in the Oregon Coast Range is at approximately 4000 feet on the top of Marys Peak. There are no true firs within the proposed project area.
- ³ This species known range within the NW Forest Plan is along the immediate coast or within the coastal fog zone within sight or sound of the Pacific Ocean but often extending up to 15 miles inland.
- ⁴ These species are known primarily from mature and old-growth, Doug-fir, Western Hemlock and Pacific silver-fir. Field surveys are not required if the species is not known to exist in the proposed project area or in the vicinity, and if it is determined that probable suitable habitat is unlikely to exist in the proposed project area.
- ⁵ These species are not known to occur on Bureau of Land Management lands within the Salem District. These species have no known sites in the Oregon Coast Range physiographic province.
- ⁶ This species is known to occur on Bureau of Land Management lands within the Salem District in the Cascades Resource Area. This species has known sites in the Western Cascades physiographic province but none in the Oregon Coast Range physiographic province.
- ⁷ This species is only known from western Washington. There are no known sites in Oregon.
- ⁸ Surveys are not required. The project area is less than 100 years of age and the project does not meet the definition on page 79-80 of the 2001 ROD.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE: Pre-disturbance surveys and management of known sites required by protocol standards to comply with the 2001 Record of Decision and Standard and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measure Standards and Guidelines (as the 2001 ROD was amended or modified as of March 21, 2004) were completed for Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Project. There are no known Category A, B, C, D, E, and F species within the Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Project.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS :

The original Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Timbersale was surveyed for Threatened and Endangered (T&E) and Bureau Special Status (SS) and Special Attention vascular plants, lichens, bryophytes and spring fungi on May 5th and 6th, 2003. The surveys were completed by intuitive controlled surveys. There were no previous known sites of any of these species, nor were any found during surveys. The timber salvage areas associated with the Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage sale were surveyed on July 5th, 2007 utilizing intuitive controlled surveys. No T&E or bureau special status or survey and manage species were found.

Therefore, based on the preceding information (refer to Table A above) regarding the status of surveys and site management for Survey & Manage botanical species, it is my determination that Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Project complies with the provisions of the 2001 Record of Decision and Standard and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measure Standards and Guidelines (as the 2001 ROD was amended or modified as of March 21, 2004). For the foregoing reasons, this contract is in compliance with the 2001 ROD as stated in Point (3) on page 14 of the January 9, 2006, Court order in Northwest Ecosystem Alliance et al. v. Rey et al.

Trish Wilson
 Trish Wilson, Field Manager
 Marys Peak Resource Area, Salem District BLM

10/25/07
 Date

2001 ROD Compliance Review: Survey & Manage Wildlife Species

Environmental Analysis File

Prepared By:

Salem District BLM – Marys Peak Resource Area

Gary A. Licata, Wildlife Biologist

Project Name: Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Project

Date: 06/26/07

Survey & Manage List Date: Dec. 19, 2003

Table A. Survey & Manage Wildlife Species. The species listed are known to occur in the Salem District or are suspected to occur according to the following protocols; *Survey Protocols for Amphibians under the Survey & Manage Provision of the Northwest Forest Plan v3.0* (1999), *Survey protocol for the Great Gray Owl within the Range of the Northwest Forest Plan v3.0* (Jan. 2004), *Survey Protocol for the Red Tree Vole v2.1* (Oct. 2002) and *Survey Protocol for S&M Terrestrial Mollusk Species v3.0* (Feb. 2003) or to the *Survey Protocol For Aquatic Mollusk Species From The Northwest Forest Plan Version 2.0* (Oct. 1997).

SPECIES	S&M CATEGORY	SURVEY TRIGGERS			SURVEY RESULTS			SITE MANAGEMENT?
		Within range of the species?	Project contains suitable habitat?	Project may negatively affect species/habitat?	Surveys Required?	Survey Date (month/year)	Sites Known or Found?	
Vertebrates								
Larch Mountain Salamander ¹ (<i>Plethodon larselli</i>)	A	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Great Gray Owl ² (<i>Strix nebulosa</i>)	A	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oregon Red Tree Vole ³ (<i>Arborimus longicaudus</i>)	C	Yes	No	No	No	NA	NA	NA
Mollusks								
Puget Oregonian ⁴ (<i>Cryptomasix devia</i>)	A	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Crater Lake Tightcoil ⁵ (<i>Pristiloma arcticum crateris</i>)	A	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Evening Fieldslug ⁶ (<i>Deroceras hesperium</i>)	B	Yes	No	No	No	NA	NA	NA
Columbia Dusksnail ⁷ (<i>Lyogyrus</i> n. sp. 1)	A	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Basalt Juga ⁸ (<i>Juga [Oreobasis]</i> n. sp. 2)	A	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

NA = Not Applicable

- ¹ In the Salem District, the range of the Larch Mountain salamander is only in the very northern portion of the Cascades Resource Area, within 14 miles of the Columbia River, east of the confluence with the Sandy River according to *Survey Protocols for Amphibians under the Survey & Manage Provision of the Northwest Forest Plan v3.0* (1999) pages 262 and 269.
- ² In the Salem District, the range of the great gray owl is only within the Cascades Resource Area. Pre-disturbance surveys for great gray owls are required if the project area has meets the conditions outlined in the *Survey Protocol for the Great Gray Owl within the range of the Northwest Forest Plan v3.0*, January 12, 2004) which gives the following guidance: The required habitat characteristics of suitable habitat in Oregon Western Cascades Physiographic Province include: (1) large diameter nest trees (38-42 inch dbh in mixed conifer/fir/oak/madrone), (2) forest for roosting cover, and (3) proximity [within 200m] to openings that could be used as foraging areas (page 13). Suitable nesting habitat adjacent to natural openings smaller than 10 acres is not necessary to be surveyed (page 5). The stands should be in proximity to natural-openings and pre-disturbance surveys are not suggested in suitable nesting habitat adjacent to man-made openings at this time (pg. 14).
- ³ In the Salem District, surveys for red tree voles are required to be conducted only in suitable habitat of the North Mesic Zone of their range. The southern portion of the Marys Peak Resource Area (Alsea River Watershed) and the Willamette Valley are not within the North Mesic Zone.
- ⁴ In the Salem District, the range of *Cryptomastix devia* is limited to the Tillamook Resource Area and Clackamas County and Multnomah County in the Cascades Resource Area.
- ⁵ In the Salem District, *Pristiloma articum crateris* is suspected to occur above 2,000 feet elevation in the Cascades Resource Area only. This species is "limited to perennially wet situations in mature conifer forests, among rushes, mosses and other surface vegetation or under rocks and woody debris within 10 m of open water in wetlands, springs, seeps and riparian areas, generally in areas which remain under snow for long periods in the winter." Unless these specific habitats will be disturbed, no surveys are necessary.
- ⁶ In the Salem District, *Deroceras hesperium* has the potential to occur in all three resource areas however it is "limited to moist surface vegetation and cover objects within 30 m (98 ft.) of perennial wetlands, springs seeps and riparian areas." Unless these specific habitats will be disturbed, no surveys are necessary. Where habitat is present, equivalent-effort pre-disturbance surveys are required for this species.
- ⁷ *Lyogyrus* n. sp. 1 is a Columbia Gorge endemic, found on both sides from east and south of Portland to Hood River, Oregon. Most sites are in Gorge tributaries; a few other sites occur in drainages originating from near Mount Hood, Oregon, to Mount St. Helens, Washington. In the Salem District, it is likely to be found only in the Cascades Resource Area, and only in cold, pure, well-oxygenated springs within a few miles of the Columbia River in Multnomah County.

8 *Juga n. sp. 2* is a Columbia Gorge endemic, and is found sporadically in springs in the central and eastern portions of the Columbia Gorge on the Oregon side only in Hood River and Wasco counties, Oregon, including sites in Mount Hood National Forest and sites in Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area. In the Salem District, it is likely to be found only in the Cascades Resource Area, and only in cold, pure, well-oxygenated springs within a few miles of the Columbia River in Multnomah County.

Statement of Compliance. There are no known sites and pre-disturbance surveys are not required to comply with the *2001 Record of Decision and Standard and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measure Standards and Guidelines* (as the 2001 ROD was amended or modified as of March 21, 2004); also complies with any site management for any Category B, D, and E species as identified in the 2001 ROD (as modified).

The salvage project area is not within suitable habitat for the red tree vole or the evening fieldslug.

Therefore, based on the preceding information (refer to Table A above) regarding the status of surveys and site management for Survey & Manage wildlife species, it is my determination that Fiscal Year 2007/2008 Programmatic Timber Salvage Project complies with the provisions of the *2001 Record of Decision and Standard and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measure Standards and Guidelines* (as the 2001 ROD was amended or modified as of March 21, 2004). For the foregoing reasons, this project is in compliance with the 2001 ROD as stated in Point (3) on page 14 of the January 9, 2006, Court order in Northwest Ecosystem Alliance et al. v. Rey et al.

Signature:

Date:

PRINTED NAME, Josh Wilson Resource Area Manager

10/25/07