

Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI)

Bare Cupboard Commercial Thinning and Density Management Upper Umpqua Watershed Plan

Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District
EA# OR-104-02-09

Bare Cupboard is a commercial thinning and forest density management project identified in the Upper Umpqua Watershed Plan (EA # OR -104-02-09), the subsequent Upper Umpqua Watershed Plan Decision Record (October 8, 2003), and in the Decision Record for the Bare Cupboard Commercial Thinning and Density Management project (February 16, 2007). Bare Cupboard encompasses approximately 220 acres located in Section 19, T. 26 S., R. 07 W., W.M.

Test for Significant Impacts.

1. Has significant impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (1))?
 Yes No
Remarks: Any impacts will be consistent with the range and scope of those effects analyzed and described in the Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/EIS).

2. Has significant adverse impacts on public health or safety (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (2))?
 Yes No
Remarks: Treatment of logging slash by machine piling and burning at logging landings is the only activity with the potential to affect air quality locally. Slash burning will be accomplished under guidelines established by the Oregon Smoke Management Plan and Visibility Protection Plan to avoid adverse effects. Any impacts to local air quality will be localized and of short duration, consistent with the range and scope of those effects analyzed and described in the Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/EIS, pp. 4-9 to 4-12).

3. Adversely affects such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains or ecologically significant or critical areas including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (3))?
 Yes No
Remarks: Unique geographic characteristics (such as those listed above)

are absent from the project area and will not be affected.

4. Has highly controversial effects on the quality of the human environment (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (4))?

Yes No

Remarks: Public comments provided information that helped in the formulation of the Upper Umpqua Watershed Plan decision (October 8, 2003) and is reflected in both that decision (pgs. 3-9) and in the Project Design Features for the Bare Cupboard commercial thinning and density management project (pgs. 5-11). However, no comments were received that are consider highly controversial.

5. Has highly uncertain or involves unique or unknown risks to the human environment (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (5))?

Yes No

Remarks: The risks to the human environment were analyzed and found not to be highly uncertain or unique (Bare Cupboard Decision Record, Table. 1, pgs. 15-20).

6. Establishes a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (6))?

Yes No

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

7. Is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (7))?

Yes No

Remarks: The cumulative impacts were analyzed and found not to be significant (Bare Cupboard Decision Record, Table 1, pgs. 15-20).

8. Has adverse effects on districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (8))?

Yes No

Remarks: The BLM conducted surveys (October, 2001) for cultural resources and completed Section 106 responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act, in accordance with the 1998 Oregon State Historic Preservation Office protocols (Bare Cupboard Decision Record, pg. 15). No cultural resources were discovered. It has been determined that there would be no effect to scientific, cultural, or historical resources (Bare Cupboard Decision Record, pg. 15).

No Native American religious concerns or values were identified in

association with the project area, so there will be no effect on potential Native American Religious Concerns.

9. May adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (9))?

Botanical Species	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Fish Species	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Wildlife Species	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Remarks: Surveys did not identify the presence of any federally threatened or endangered plants; therefore this action has no effect on listed botanical species (Bare Cupboard Decision Record, Table 1, pg. 15).

The National Marine Fisheries Service determined that the Oregon Coast coho ecological significant unit does not warrant listing under the ESA at this time and therefore withdrew the proposed listing (Fed. Reg., Vol. 71 No. 12, Jan. 19, 2006). Conservation measures incorporated into the project design features will prevent adverse effects to essential fish habitat for Coho salmon and Chinook salmon. The project will not adversely affect essential fish habitat; therefore, consultation with National Marine Fisheries Service is not required (Bare Cupboard Decision Record, Table 1, pgs. 15-16).

In accordance with the Endangered Species Act, consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has been completed for the federally threatened bald eagle, northern spotted owl, and marbled murrelet and for spotted owl critical habitat and murrelet critical habitat (Bare Cupboard Decision Record, pg. 17).

The USFWS concurred that this action is not likely to adversely affect the bald eagle, spotted owl, spotted owl critical habitat, marbled murrelet, or marbled murrelet critical habitat (pg. 30 [Ref. # 1-15-05-I-0511] and pg. 6 [Ref. # 1-15-05-I-0596]). Project design features (Bare Cupboard Decision Record, pgs. 11-15) will be implemented in compliance with the letters of concurrence.

A Letter of Concurrence was received from the USFWS (*Reinitiation of consultation on Roseburg District Bureau of Land Management FY 2005-2008 Management Activities* [Ref. # 1-15-05-I-0511]) dated June 24, 2005 which concurred with the Roseburg District's conclusion that the proposed commercial thinning or density management activities are not likely to adversely affect Northern spotted owl habitat (pg. 19).

The USFWS also concurred with the Roseburg District's conclusion that the proposed commercial thinning and density management activities are not likely to adversely affect the marbled murrelet habitat within Zone 2 (pg.10, Ref. # 1-15-05-I-0511).

In addition, A Letter of Concurrence was received from the USFWS (*Reinitiation of consultation on Roseburg District Bureau of Land Management FY 2005-2008 Management Activities. Disturbance to marbled murrelets* [Ref. # 1-15-05-I-0596]) dated July 20, 2005 which concurred with the Roseburg District's conclusion that the proposed commercial thinning and density management activities are not likely to adversely affect the marbled murrelet as a result of disturbance within Zone 2 (pg. 6)

10. Threatens to violate Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (10))?

Yes No

Remarks: The measures described above ensure that Bare Cupboard Commercial Thinning and Density Management is consistent with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws. The impacts of the silvicultural treatment on the human environment will not exceed those anticipated by the Roseburg District PRMP/EIS.

Pursuant to Executive Order 13212, the BLM must consider the effects of this decision on the President's National Energy Policy. Within the project area, there are no known energy resources with commercial potential. There are no pipelines, electrical transmission lines, or energy producing or processing facilities. As a consequence, there will be no known adverse effect on National Energy Policy.

Based on the analysis of potential impacts contained in the environmental assessment, I have determined that Bare Cupboard Commercial Thinning and Density Management will not have significant impact on the human environment within the meaning of Section 102(2) (c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and that an environmental impact statement is not required. I have determined that the effects of the action are within those anticipated and already analyzed in the *Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement* (PRMP/EIS,1994) and is in conformance with the *Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan* (ROD/RMP) for the Roseburg District, approved by the Oregon/Washington State Director on June 2, 1995.

Marci L. Todd, Field Manager
Swiftwater Field Office

Date