

“DRAFT”

**Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI)**

**O.M. Hubbard II  
Density Management Study**

Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District  
EA# OR-104-07-07

The proposed commercial thinning and density management would occur on one unit (approximately 135 acres) of mid-seral, second-growth forest located in the Upper Umpqua 5<sup>th</sup> Field Watershed in Section 19 of T. 25 S., R. 7 W. and Section 24 of T. 26 S., R. 8 W., Willamette Meridian. There is an additional 97 acres of untreated, mid-seral stands and 14 acres of early-seral stands that are also part of the study but are not proposed for harvest. Of the 135 acres of treatment, no acres would be removed for the development of spur roads.

This project is within the General Forest Management Area (83 acres) and Riparian Reserve (52 acres) Land Use Allocations and would approximately 763 thousand board feet (763 MBF) of timber available to support local and regional manufacturers and economies. This project is in conformance with management direction from the ROD/RMP.

**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 would 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:** After treatment, down woody debris would increase marginally over the project area depending on the type of treatment. Slash piles, totaling approximately 12 acres, would be burned at logging landings (EA, pg. 28).

Machine generated piles at landings would be burned to reduce concentrated fuel loads. Remaining fuels generated would be predominately small, less than three inches in diameter, and would be

scattered over the harvest area. The additional amount down woody debris would not dramatically increase the fire risk to the area. (EA, pg. 28).

Treatment of logging slash by prescribed fire has the potential to affect air quality locally. Burning would 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 would 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 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 (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (3))?

Yes  No

**Remarks:** Unique geographic characteristics (such as those listed above) are absent from the project area and would not be affected.

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

Yes  No

**Remarks:** Adjacent landowners, downstream water rights users, and the general public were notified of the proposed O.M. Hubbard II project through a letter (March 19, 2007), a public field trip held (May 31, 2007), and the Fall 2007 Roseburg District Planning Update (EA, pgs. 48-49). While comments were received during the public field tour, thus far no comments have been received that I would consider highly controversial.

In addition, the EA for O.M. Hubbard II will be released for a 30-day public comment period prior to the issuance of a decision.

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

Yes  No

**Remarks:** The risks to the human environment from the proposed project were analyzed and found not to be highly uncertain or unique (EA, pgs. 17, 57-59).

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 would 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 to forest vegetation (pg. 21), wildlife (pgs. 26-28), fire and fuels management (pg. 28), soils (pg. 30-31, 32-33, 34), hydrology (pgs. 37-38), and fish populations and habitat (pg. 40) were analyzed in the O.M. Hubbard II EA and found not to be significant.

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:** Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act under the guidance of the 1997 National Programmatic Agreement and the 1998 Oregon State Historic Preservation Office protocols has been completed (EA, pg. 48). The project area was inventoried for cultural resources and none were discovered (May 1995, June 2007 [EA, pg. 15-16]). The Oregon State Historic Preservation Office concurs with the Swiftwater Field Office's determination of "no effect" on cultural resources within the O.M. Hubbard II project area (June 1995) (EA, pgs. 15-16).

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  Yes  No

Fish Species  Yes  No

Wildlife Species  Yes  No

**Remarks:** Surveys did not identify the presence of any federally threatened or endangered botanical species; therefore the proposed action would have no effect on listed botanical species (EA, pg. 46).

On November 27, 2007, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) notified the OR/WA BLM that the Oregon Coast coho salmon was proposed for listing as threatened under the ESA (EA, pg. 38). The Swiftwater Field Office has determined that the proposed O.M. Hubbard II project is a "*may effect, not likely to adversely affect*" for the proposed threatened Oregon Coast coho salmon (EA, pg. 40, 48).

The nearest EFH is located more than two miles downslope of the project. Oregon Coast coho and steelhead were surveyed for up to two miles downstream of the project and were not detected. Presumably, there is a barrier to anadromous fish migration downstream of the project on Hubbard Creek but the exact location of the barrier is unknown (EA, pg. 40). The proposed project would not adversely affect EFH in Hubbard Creek or its tributaries (EA, pgs. 41, 48). Therefore, there are currently no further consultation obligations with the National Marine Fisheries Service (EA, pg. 48).

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 (EA, pg. 48).

A Letter of Concurrence was received from the US Fish and Wildlife Service (*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 and density management activities are not likely to adversely affect Northern spotted owls and are not likely to adversely affect the Northern spotted owl as a result of disturbance (pgs. 19-20).

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 murrelets within Zone 2 (pgs. 6, 10; Ref. # 1-15-05-I-0596).

Project design features (EA, pgs. 11-15) would be implemented in compliance with the letters of concurrence.

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 insure that O.M. Hubbard II Density Management Study would be consistent with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws. The impacts of the silvicultural treatment on the human environment would 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 would 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 O.M. Hubbard II Density Management Study would not have a 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 silvicultural treatment would be within those anticipated and already analyzed in the *Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement* (PRMP/EIS, 1994) and would be 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