

**U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Roseburg District, Oregon**

Galagher Commercial Thinning Harvest

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

The Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District of the Bureau of Land Management has analyzed a proposal called the **Galagher Commercial Thinning Harvest**. In the proposed action commercial thinning harvest and density management of young growth timber would occur in the Upper Umpqua Watershed located in Sections 9, 17, and 19; T24S, R6W, W.M. The Environmental Assessment (EA), OR-104-01-03, contains a description and analysis of the proposed action. A summary of the analysis contained in the EA shows:

- 1). Approximately 450 acres were analyzed for potential harvest activity which represents less than 0.3% of the watershed landbase.
- 2). The project would not be expected to impact any special status plants or cultural resources (EA, page 12).
- 3). The actions anticipated under this analysis are covered under the *Formal consultation and written concurrence on FY 2003-2008 management activities (Ref.# 1-15-03-F-160)* with the US Fish & Wildlife Service which concluded (pg. 29) that the project was “. . . not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the spotted owl, murrelet and bald eagle, and are not likely to adversely modify spotted owl or murrelet critical habitat . . .”.
- 4). Informal consultation with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA – fisheries) has been completed. Their Letter of Concurrence (February 17, 2004) concurred with BLM’s determination “. . . that the proposed project is NLAA [not likely to adversely affect] . . .” for the Oregon Coast [OC] coho salmon.

This proposal is in conformance with the *"Final - Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/EIS) dated October 1994 and its associated Roseburg District Record of Decision and Resources Management Plan (RMP) dated June 2, 1995*. This proposal is located on lands within the Matrix Land Use Allocations. The RMP permits “. . . timber harvest and other silvicultural activities in that portion of the matrix with suitable forest lands, according to management actions/directions . . .” (RMP, pg. 33). The RMP (pg. 25) also permits silvicultural practices within the Riparian Reserves in order to “. . . acquire desired vegetation characteristics needed to attain Aquatic Conservation Strategy [ACS] objectives.” This proposal would also help to provide “. . . a sustainable supply of timber and other forest products that will help maintain the stability of local and regional economies . . .” (RMP pg. 3). Two alternatives were analyzed: the "no action" and the proposed action alternative. Road decommissioning as well as road renovation and improvement would also be accomplished on certain existing roads as well as the renovation of two pump chances as part of the proposed action.

Summary of Effects of the Proposed Action

Context (What?)	Intensity (How Much?)	Reason for not being Significant
Potential increase in noxious weeds and invasive non-native plants. (EA pg. 18, para. 3).	Disturbance on 450 ac. or less of the project area.	Equipment cleaning and seeding and mulching bare soil with weed-free seed would reduce the potential for invasion.
Soil compaction and loss of productivity - spurs (EA pg. 18, para. 5) - ground-based logging (pg. 19, para. 1)	Spur construction (3 ac. of previously disturbed trails and 2 ac. of undisturbed land). Ground-based logging on 180 ac. (42% of project area).	1. “. . . the amount of area in main skid trails, log decks, and landings would not exceed the plan maintenance threshold of 10 percent . . . (EA, pg. 19, para. 1). 2. “In the long-term, soil productivity would be at least maintained at the fifth field scale on BLM land considering natural healing (a very slow process) occurring throughout the watershed as well as amelioration efforts. (EA, pg. 25, para. 5).”
Slight short-term (ten years or less) increase in the probability of harvest-related landslides and flows on the potentially unstable slopes that would be thinned (EA pg. 19, para. 3).	35 acres of potentially unstable slopes (8% of project area).	“. . . the occurrence of any landslide . . . would be expected to be within the range of natural variation . . . The effect of landslides on soil productivity would likely be small since the landslides that might occur would likely be widely scattered and small in size (less than 0.1 acre)” (EA pg. 20, para. 2).
Potential for sediment delivery to streams from road construction (EA pg. 21, para. 2).	9 ac. of road right-of-way (2% of project area).	1. Construction would be minimized within riparian areas. 2. Dry season operation on dirt spurs. 3. Decommissioning all new construction and waterbar and block after use.
Vegetation removal could result in short-term increases in water yield and peak flows (EA pg. 22, para. 1).	Reduced vegetative cover on 431 ac.	“. . . there may be slight short and long-term increases in peak flows of smaller storm events; this effect would decrease over time. Increases in peak flows would not affect channel morphology since increases are only detectable on storm events with a less than two year return interval . . .” (EA pg. 22, para. 3).
Potential for sediment delivery to streams from timber hauling (EA pg. 20, para. 3).	Approx. 30 miles of haul road.	“. . . any sedimentation resulting from the haul road activity would not be measurable and is not expected to be above existing background levels within the stream channels when PDC’s (pg. 7-8) are applied” (EA, pg. 20; para. 3).
Disturbance to spotted owl nesting behavior (EA pg. 24, para. 5).	Harvest within 0.25 mile of known spotted owl site (34 ac.).	Restrictions (March 1st to June 30th) would mitigate disturbance effects.

Finding of No Significant Impacts:

I have reviewed the tests of significance as described in 40 CFR 1508.27 (see attached). Based on the site specific analysis summarized in the EA and noted above, it is my determination that the proposed action does not constitute a major federal action with significant impacts to the quality of the human environment therefore an Environmental Impact Statement does not need to be prepared. In accordance with the Standards and Guidelines (S&G's, pg. B-10) I find that "the proposed activity is consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives" and "meets" or "does not prevent attainment" of those objectives.

Glenn W. Lahti
Swiftwater Field Manager (Acting)

Date

Test for Significant Impacts. (40 CFR 1508.27)

1. Has impacts (both beneficial and adverse) determined to be severe? Yes No
Remarks: No identified impacts are judged to be severe.
2. Has significant adverse impacts on public health or safety? Yes No
Remarks: Considering the remoteness of the project to local population centers, and the design criteria governing the proposal (EA, pg. 5 through 11), the likelihood of the project affecting public health and safety is remote and speculative.
3. Adversely effects such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains or ecologically significant or critical areas including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks? Yes No
Remarks: Reviews (Cultural, Recreation, Wildlife, Hydrology and Fisheries) do not show that the proposed action would adversely affect any of the above characteristics (EA, Appendix E).
4. Has highly controversial effects on the quality of the human environment? Yes No
Remarks: No controversial effects were noted as a result of environmental analysis or public review.
5. Has highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involves unique or unknown environmental risks? Yes No
Remarks: The analysis does not indicate that this action would involve unique or unknown risks.
6. Establishes a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? 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 directly related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? Yes No
Remarks: We find that this action would not have a cumulatively significant impact on the environment beyond that already identified in the EIS.
8. Has adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places? Yes No
Remarks: Site review and SHPO consultation shows that this action would not adversely affect any sites, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

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?

Aquatic Species	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
Botanical Species	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
Terrestrial Species	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No

Remarks: Consultation with NOAA - fisheries (February 17, 2004) concurred with BLM's "not likely to adversely affect" determination for listed fish. Botanical surveys did not identify the presence of any T&E plants therefore consultation was not required. Formal consultation with the FWS (February 21, 2003) for FY 2003-8 programmatic actions concluded that activity is "... not likely to adversely affect spotted owls and murrelets ...".

10. Threatens to violate Federal, State, local, or tribal law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment? Yes No

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