

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

**Whatagas Regeneration Harvest  
Environmental Assessment (EA #OR-104-06-08)**

**Decision Document**

**SECTION 1 – THE DECISION**

**The Decision**

It is my decision to authorize the implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative as described in the Whatagas Regeneration Harvest EA in Section II, pages 6-8 (No. OR-104-06-08); in conjunction with the modifications to road construction and decommissioning based on the new information presented below. The project design features (PDFs) for this alternative are on pages 8-13 of the Whatagas EA. These PDFs have been developed into contract stipulations and will be implemented as part of the timber sale contract.

**New Information & Clarification**

New information since the EA was released for public review has been considered regarding barred owls and temporary spur road #4, but does not alter the conclusions of the analysis. Where appropriate, PDFs have been modified based on this new information.

**Barred Owl**

*Additional Survey Information*

Based on additional surveys, it appears that the barred owl pair previously detected may have nested in the forest stand that contains Units 19AB and 19D and they may have produced two fledglings. During the early part of the nesting season (April – May), a pair of barred owls were detected within the forest stand that contains Units 19AB and 19D. In addition, a pair of barred owl fledglings were observed with two barred owl adults on July 18, 2006 within approximately 0.4 miles of this stand. Based on the combination of this information, it is reasonable to conclude that a pair of barred owls may have used this stand for nesting in 2006. The available survey information is not conclusive on the nesting status of the barred owls nor on the location of the nest because survey efforts for barred owls were restrained so as to avoid harassment to northern spotted owls, which were also detected in the project area (as stated in the EA, pg. 26).

In addition, the effects that barred owls may have upon spotted owls were considered in the EA (pgs. 29, 53-54, 76-81), which included the *Evaluation of the Roseburg*

*District Resource Management Plan Relative to Four Northern Spotted Owl Reports* (September 12, 2005 [EA, pgs. 76-81]). There is some evidence that barred owls may have had a negative effect on spotted owl survival in Washington, but little evidence has been found for such effects in Oregon and California (EA, pgs. 29, 78). The risks currently faced by spotted owls, which includes barred owls, are comparable in magnitude to those faced by spotted owls in 1990 (EA, pg. 79), when it was listed as threatened. Furthermore, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service did not consider the current risks to the spotted owl sufficient to reclassify the species as endangered at this time (EA, pg. 79).

### Mitigation

The RMP directs that known and future raptor nest sites not protected by other management recommendations will be protected by providing suitable habitat buffers and seasonal disturbance restrictions (pg. 39). Since a nest site for barred owls could not be verified, a nest core will not be established. However, the stand suspected of having barred owl nesting is currently 129 acres in size and following implementation of the action alternative 65 acres of habitat suitable for nesting will remain after regeneration harvest in a single contiguous patch. An additional 31 acres of suitable nesting habitat will also remain but will not be contiguous with the aforementioned patch of habitat. The 86 acres of habitat remaining following regeneration harvest will provide sufficient nesting opportunities for the barred owl pair suspected of nesting in the vicinity of the project area.

In addition, seasonal restrictions from March 1st – July 15th will be applied to Units 19AB and 19D; unless surveys indicate: 1) barred owls not detected, 2) barred owls present, but not attempting to nest, or 3) barred owls present, but nesting attempt has failed.

### **Temporary Spur Road #4**

Temporary spur road #4 was previously described in the EA (pg. 7) as a combination of new construction (470 feet) and re-construction (1,085 feet) that would be decommissioned by blocking with a trench barrier, water-barring, subsoiling, and mulching with logging slash where available or with straw if logging slash is not available (pg. 8). However, temporary spur #4 falls under an existing reciprocal right-of-way agreement and the permittee does not give permission to decommission this road as previously described.

Therefore, temporary spur #4 has been re-numbered as the 25-4-13.2 road and will include 470 feet of new construction and 1,085 feet of re-construction. The 470 feet of new construction on BLM-administered land will be decommissioned by water-barring, subsoiling, and mulching with logging slash where available or with straw if logging slash is not available and the 1,085 feet of re-construction on private land will be decommissioned by blocking with a trench barrier, water-barring, and seeding and mulching.

## **25-30 Percent Late-Successional Old Growth**

To clarify, the analysis of the amount of late-successional old growth forest remaining in connectivity/diversity block #93 presented in the EA (pgs. 18, 37, 39) updates and replaces the analysis initially presented in the 1998 silvicultural report (pg. 3). A public comment was received noting the apparent discrepancy between the 2006 EA (26 percent late-successional forest post-harvest) and the 1998 silvicultural report (19 percent late-successional forest post-harvest).

The increased amount of late-successional forest remaining in Block #93 is due to: (1) increased accuracy in mapping of forest stands since 1998 resulting in 28 more acres of late-successional forest in the block and (2) eight acres less of regeneration harvest proposed under the Whatagas project since 1998.

## **Project Summary**

The Whatagas project includes harvest (harvest of mature timber followed by re-establishment of a new forest stand) of 115 acres. The action will occur on nine units of mature and old-growth forest (aged between 150 and 250 years) located in the Calapooya Creek Fifth-Field Watershed in Sections 7, and 19; T25S R3W, and Section 13; T25S R4W; W.M. This project is within the Matrix Land Use Allocation and is designed to help meet the Roseburg District's annual harvest commitment. Units 7A, 7B, 7C, and 7E are in General Forest Management Area (GFMA) and Units 19AB, 19C, 19D, 13A, and 13B are Connectivity/Diversity Block (C/D). Whatagas will provide approximately 3,315 MBF of merchantable timber available for auction.

The EA analyzed potential harvest activities on 195 acres. This decision authorizes approximately 115 acres of regeneration harvest on nine units (49 acres on C/D, 66 acres on GFMA) and approximately three acres of road right-of-way clearcut (0.7 acres on C/D, 1.6 acres on GFMA, and 1.0 acre on private industrial timber lands). Skyline cable yarding will be used on 90 acres and helicopter yarding on 25 acres. Up to 10 acres of incidental ground-based yarding were assumed in the analysis.

Approximately 2,165 feet (25-4-13.2 road; spurs #1, #2, #3, #5, and #8 [0.4 miles]) of temporary road will be constructed. In addition, approximately 1,710 feet (25-4-13.2 road; spurs #6, and #7 [0.3 miles]) of temporary road will be re-constructed using existing old road beds, for a total of approximately 3,875 feet (0.7 mi) of temporary road. The 25-4-13.2 road will be a combination of both new construction (470 feet) and re-construction (1,085 feet). A majority of temporary road construction will take place within the units; approximately 1,150 feet (0.2 miles) will take place outside of harvest unit boundaries.

This project includes the decommissioning of road numbers 25-3-19.7A, and temporary spurs #1, #2, #3, #5, #6, #7, and #8 by blocking with trench barriers, water-barring, subsoiling, and mulching with logging slash where available or with straw if logging slash is not available (0.6 mile). Decommissioning of road numbers 25-3-19.3, 25-4-24.1A4, and 25-4-13.2 will include blocking with trench barriers and water-barring (0.5 mile). The 25-3-7.5 road will be decommissioned by blocking with trench barriers (0.01 mile). The 25-4-12.0 road has been blocked by the Lone Rock Timber Company at its junction with the 25-3-7.0 road and the BLM portion is naturally decommissioned. Roads near the junction of the 25-3-7.0 and 25-3-7.1 roads will be blocked to prevent unauthorized off-road use which is currently a source of road erosion,

sedimentation, and soil instability. The roadbed will be water-barred and the ditches maintained to prevent erosion.

Approximately 28 acres will be broadcast burned on the harvest units, 87 acres will be hand-piled and burned on the harvest units, and one acre will be hand-piled and burned on the clearcut right-of-way on private timber lands. Approximately 7,700 feet of fire trails would be constructed by hand, prior to ignition, around the perimeters of the units to be broadcast burned.

This decision is subject to administrative remedy under 43 CFR § 5003.2 and 5003.3.

### **Compliance and Monitoring**

Compliance with this decision will be ensured by frequent on the ground inspections by the Contracting Officer's Representative. Monitoring will be conducted as per the direction given in Appendix I of the RMP (pgs. 189-209).

## **SECTION 2 – THE DECISION RATIONALE**

### **Decision Rationale**

The Project Design Features (PDFs) described in the EA (pgs. 8-13) and as modified by the new information in this Decision will minimize soil compaction, limit erosion, protect slope stability, protect wildlife, protect air and water quality, and protect fish habitat, as well as protect other identified resource values. I have reviewed the resource information contained in the EA and new information presented in this decision. This decision recognizes that impacts could occur to some of these resources; however, the impacts to resource values will not exceed those identified in the *Final - Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement* (PRMP/EIS). This decision provides timber commodities resulting from silvicultural treatments whose effects to the environment are within those anticipated and already analyzed in the PRMP/EIS.

Section II of the EA describes two alternatives: a "No Action" alternative and a "Proposed Action" alternative. The No Action alternative was not selected because it would not meet the objectives from page 4 of the EA to: provide a sustainable supply of timber and other forest commodities, contribute to the Roseburg District's Allowable Sale Quantity of 45 MMBF, conduct regeneration harvest in stands that are beyond the Culmination of Mean Annual Increment, or comply with Section I of the O&C Act. In addition, the EA did not identify any impacts under the proposed action alternative that would be beyond those identified in the PRMP/EIS.

### **Connectivity/Diversity Block Management**

#### *Intensity (How much?)*

The project has 49 acres within Connectivity/Diversity Block #93 (EA, pgs. 16-17).

Reason(s) for not being Significant

This action meets RMP guidance for forest management within Connectivity/Diversity Blocks as described in the EA on the following pages: 150-year area control rotation (pg. 17), 25-30 percent late-successional old growth (pgs. 18, 39), best ecological functioning stands (pg. 18), interior habitat (pgs. 18, 39), and landscape analysis (pgs. 18-20).

**Fuels Management**

Intensity (How much?)

The down dead woody will increase from 27 to 53 tons per acre immediately following harvest (EA, pgs. 16, 38). Prescribed fire treatments will reduce the DDW to 43 tons per acre and will consume most of the small (< 1 inch) diameter fuels.

Reason(s) for not being Significant

The increase in fire risk from regeneration harvest is mitigated by reducing the amount of small fuels, which are necessary to ignite the larger fuels (EA, pg. 38). In addition, one of the primary sources of fire in the project area are roadside ignitions from cigarettes, vehicles, and arsonists. The increase in fuel loading from down dead woody material is therefore also mitigated by targeting pile burning along roadsides (EA, pg. 38).

**Cultural Resources**

Intensity (How much?)

Surveys (April 1998) were conducted for cultural resources and Section 106 responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act were completed, in accordance with the 1998 Oregon State Historic Preservation Office protocols. No cultural or historic resources were identified (EA, pg. 21).

Reason(s) for not being Significant

There will be no impacts to cultural or historical resources.

**Botany & Noxious Weeds**

Federal Threatened & Endangered Species

Intensity (How much?)

Surveys were completed for the Federally threatened (FT) Kincaid's lupine and the federally endangered (FE) rough popcorn flower (June, 2006) and no sites were discovered (EA, pg. 20).

Reason(s) for not being Significant

No impacts to these two federally listed plant species will occur since there are no known sites within the project area.

Survey & Manage (S&M) Species

*Intensity (How much?)*

There are three lichens and three vascular plant species that require surveys within the project area. Surveys were completed June 2006 and no sites of these, or any other, S&M botanical species were discovered (EA, pg. 20).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

There will be no impact on S&M botanical species.

Bureau Sensitive (BS), Assessment (BA), and Tracking (BT) Species

*Intensity (How much?)*

Surveys were completed (June, 2006) and no sites were discovered.

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

No impacts to BS, BA, or BT botanical species will occur since there are no known sites within the project area.

Noxious weeds

*Intensity (How much?)*

There are scattered infestations of Himalayan blackberry and Scotch broom within the project area. The infestations are predominantly within the road prisms or previously used logging landings. The project area was treated in 2002 and will continue to be treated following the Roseburg District Integrated Weed Management Plan (EA, pg. 21).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

The project area will be monitored for treatment effectiveness and follow up treatments will be conducted as necessary. The PDFs included in this project will minimize the spread of noxious weeds (EA, pg. 12).

**Fisheries**

Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for Coho Salmon and Chinook salmon

*Intensity (How much?)*

There is no EFH for Coho salmon or Chinook salmon within or adjacent to the harvest units (EA, pg. 24).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

Project will not adversely affect EFH; therefore consultation with National Marine Fisheries Service is not required.

Bureau Sensitive (BS), Assessment (BA), and Tracking (BT) Species

*Intensity (How much?)*

Umpqua Chub (BS) and Pacific Lamprey (BT) are suspected within the project area and Oregon Coast coho salmon (BS) and Coastal Cutthroat (BT) are documented in the Calapooya Watershed (EA, pg. 23). PDFs will minimize soil erosion and sedimentation effects to aquatic species and aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 8-11).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

Fish habitat and fish populations will not be incrementally affected by the actions authorized by this decision (EA, pg. 50).

## **Hydrology**

### Peak Flows

*Intensity (How much?)*

There will be no change in peak flows due to effects from roads (EA, pg. 43) and increases in large peak flows will be unlikely to occur due to timber harvest (EA, pg. 44).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

There will be a low probability of an effect to channel erosion (EA, pg. 44).

### Sedimentation

*Intensity (How much?)*

PDFs will minimize soil erosion and sedimentation effects to aquatic species and aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 8-11).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

Affects to substrate will be negligible and discountable (EA, pg. 50).

### Stream Temperature & Water Chemistry

*Intensity (How much?)*

The actions authorized by this decision will not increase stream temperature and will not change the water chemistry (EA, pg. 46).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

There will be no effect to stream temperature or water chemistry.

## **Soils**

### Landslides

*Intensity (How much?)*

Landslides that might be caused by the action will likely be small (< 0.1 acre) and have little impact on productivity (EA, pg. 48).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

The actions authorized under this decision will have inconsequential additions to landslide cumulative effects (EA, pgs. 48-49).

### Soil Productivity

*Intensity (How much?)*

There will be a small net loss of soil productivity at the site level over one rotation, i.e. 80 years or more (EA, pg. 48).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

At the action area scale (Gassy Creek drainage and Gilbreath Creek catchment), soil productivity will be maintained or slightly improved over one rotation because of the very slow natural healing of other old ground-based impacts and because subsoiling of much of these trails that are still in a compacted state would occur when other mid-seral stands are thinned or later when they are regeneration harvested (EA, pg. 48).

## **Wildlife**

### *Federal Threatened & Endangered Species Consultation*

*Intensity (How much?)*

In accordance with the Endangered Species Act, consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has been completed for the federally threatened (FT) bald eagle, northern spotted owl, and marbled murrelet and for spotted owl critical habitat and murrelet critical habitat. The Biological Opinion (BO) for the re-initiation of consultation on Roseburg District Bureau of Land Management FY 2005-2008 Management Activities (Ref. # 1-15-05-I-0512) was completed August 29, 2005 (EA, pg. 61).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

The BO (pg. 101) rendered by the USFWS concluded that “Adverse effects caused by the proposed action . . . are not considered significant [to spotted owls] because: (1) the Northwest Forest Plan conservation strategy considered such reductions, which the Service has concluded will not jeopardize the continued existence of spotted owl (USDA/USDI 1994; Appendix G); (2) new information on the spotted owl (Courtney *et al.* 2004) affirmed the validity of the habitat-based spotted owl conservation strategy of the Northwest Forest Plan; and (3) the spotted owl population on the District is stable.” (EA, pg. 61). PDFs (EA, pgs. 11-13) will be implemented in compliance with the BO.

### *Bald Eagle*

*Intensity (How much?)*

Based on 2006 surveys, the nearest nest site (Huntley Creek) is approximately 1.6 miles away. No suitable habitat will be removed or modified and no noise/visual disruption will occur.

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

No disruption effects to bald eagles will occur and suitable nesting habitat will not be modified.

### *Noise/Visual Disruption of Northern Spotted Owl Nesting Behaviors*

*Intensity (How much?)*

There are one or two non-nesting, pairs of northern spotted owls (2006 nesting season) and two known owl activity centers (Field Creek and Norris Creek) within 1.2 miles of the project area (EA, pg. 26). Seasonal restrictions to prohibit logging during the nesting season will be applied to the harvest units unless protocol surveys

indicate that spotted owls are not detected, non-nesting, or nesting has failed (EA, pg. 12).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

No disruption effects to spotted owls will occur.

*Northern Spotted Owl Habitat*

*Intensity (How much?)*

Two known owl activity centers (Field Creek and Norris Creek) within 1.2 miles of the project area (EA, pg. 26). Regeneration harvest, and road right-of-ways associated with the harvest, will remove 117 acres of suitable nesting, roosting, and foraging habitat for spotted owls (EA, pg. 52).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

Based on the biological assessment provided by the Roseburg District, the Service concluded that regeneration harvest was likely to adversely affect spotted owls. In the BO (Ref. # 1-15-05-I-0512, pg. 79), the Service concluded although some sites on the Roseburg District would be rendered non-viable, the effect is not expected to appreciably reduce the likelihood of spotted owl survival and recovery, noting that such declines were anticipated in the Northwest Forest Plan, and that the best available information indicates that there is no reason to believe that the conservation strategy of the Northwest Forest Plan is flawed.

Even if the actions authorized by this decision will reduce the likelihood of successful reproduction in the two known owl activity centers (Field Creek and Norris Creek), this would not be a significant effect beyond those consequences expected from timber harvest as considered in the NWFP, and the Roseburg District RMP (EA, pg. 53).

*Critical Habitat for the Northern Spotted Owl*

*Intensity (How much?)*

This project is not within designated spotted owl critical habitat (EA, pg. 26).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

There will be no effect to spotted owl critical habitat.

*Marbled Murrelet*

*Intensity (How much?)*

The project area occurs beyond the inland range of the marbled murrelet (EA, pg. 27).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

Therefore, there will be no effect to marbled murrelet habitat or to the species (EA, pg. 27).

Survey & Manage (S&M) Species

*Intensity (How much?)*

There are no S&M wildlife species that require surveys within the project area (EA, pgs. 27-28) and there are no known sites of S&M wildlife species within the project area (EA, pg. 28).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

There is no impact on S&M wildlife species.

Columbian White-Tailed Deer (Bureau Sensitive)

*Intensity (How much?)*

The action will remove 117 acres of habitat usable as shelter and thermal cover for the Columbian white-tailed deer (EA, pg. 54).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

The removal of this shelter and thermal cover would, however, provide more favorable conditions for deer forage to develop which could lead to increased use of the area by Columbian white-tailed deer (EA, pg. 54).

Fringed myotis (Bureau Assessment) and Townsend's big-eared bat (Bureau Sensitive)

*Intensity (How much?)*

Late-seral/old-growth trees and snags present in the units possess the features that make them suitable bat roosts. It is unknown if the Townsend's big-eared bat or the fringed myotis is present within the harvest units because these bats may roost high within the canopy so surveys are not practical (EA, pg. 28).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

It is unknown how many (if any) suitable bat roost trees are actually occupied. Existing snag habitat is expected to be retained in the harvest units due to the protection afforded them by the PDFs (EA, pg. 11). Additionally, green retention trees will serve as legacy habitat features for bat habitat in the regenerating stand (EA, pg. 54).

Northern Goshawk (Bureau Sensitive)

*Intensity (How much?)*

Approximately 117 acres of habitat suitable for the nesting, roosting, and foraging of the northern goshawk will be removed (EA, pg. 54-55). There are currently no known nest sites of northern goshawks within the project area based on surveys done 2005-2006 (EA, pg. 28-29).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

Since there are no known nest sites, no further management of northern goshawks is necessary and this action complies with management direction in the Roseburg District RMP (pg. 49).

*Oregon Vesper Sparrow (Bureau Sensitive) and Purple Martin (Bureau Sensitive)*

*Intensity (How much?)*

Regeneration harvest will provide open habitat with legacy snags that is suitable for colonization by purple martins and Oregon vesper sparrows where currently there is no suitable habitat (EA, pgs. 29, 55).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

Actions authorized by this decision will create suitable habitat for these species (EA, pg. 55).

*Remaining Bureau Sensitive and Bureau Assessment Species*

*Intensity (How much?)*

Evaluation of the remaining BS and BA wildlife species was completed in July 2006 and no known sites or concerns were identified (except for those species discussed previously).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

No impacts to the remaining BS or BA wildlife species will occur since there are no known sites within the project area.

*Bureau Tracking (BT) Species*

*Intensity (How much?)*

There are detections of five BT species in the project area including: (1) northern red-legged frog, (2) olive-sided fly-catcher, (3) Oregon megomphix, (4) Oregon red tree vole, and (5) pileated woodpecker (Appendix F, Wildlife, Table 3).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

Districts are encouraged to collect occurrence data on BT species but they will not be considered as Special Status Species for management purposes (IM-OR-2003-054).

*Barred Owl*

*Intensity (How much?)*

One pair of barred owls is suspected of nesting in the project area (Decision, pg. 1). Regeneration harvest, and road right-of-ways associated with the harvest, will remove 117 acres of habitat suitable for nesting and foraging of barred owls (EA, pg. 55).

*Reason(s) for not being Significant*

A suitable habitat buffer and seasonal restriction for the barred owl nest site will be implemented under this decision (EA, pgs. 12-13, 55; Decision, pgs. 1-2) that complies with direction to manage raptors under the RMP from page 39.

In addition, the effects that barred owls may have upon spotted owls were considered in the EA (pgs. 29, 53-54, 76-81), which included the *Evaluation of the Roseburg District Resource Management Plan Relative to Four Northern Spotted Owl Reports* (September 12, 2005 [EA, pgs. 76-81]). There is some evidence that barred owls may have had a negative effect on spotted owl survival in Washington, but little evidence has been found for such effects in Oregon and California (EA, pgs. 29, 78). The risks

currently faced by spotted owls, which includes barred owls, are comparable in magnitude to those faced by spotted owls in 1990 (EA, pg. 79), when it was listed as threatened. Furthermore, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service did not consider the current risks to the spotted owl sufficient to reclassify the species as endangered at this time (EA, pg. 79).

#### Great Horned Owl

##### *Intensity (How much?)*

A seven acre nest core was established to protect a great horned owl nest site within the project area (EA, pg. 29, 55-56). Approximately 117 acres of habitat suitable for the nesting, roosting, and foraging of the great horned owl will be removed (EA, pg. 56).

##### *Reason(s) for not being Significant*

A suitable habitat buffer and seasonal restriction for the great horned owl nest site will be implemented under this decision (EA, pgs. 12, 55-56) that complies with direction to manage raptors under the RMP from page 39.

### **SECTION 3 – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

For the Whatagas Regeneration Harvest EA, comments were solicited from affected tribal governments, adjacent landowners and affected State and local government agencies. No comments were received from these sources. During the fifteen day public review period for the Whatagas EA (which ended on August 2, 2006), comments were received from four organizations (filed jointly) in opposition and from one organization and one individual in support of the Whatagas project.

Comments opposing the sale were generally non-specific and philosophical in nature, or raised issues that were outside the scope of the EA. Comments that did address specific aspects of the analysis in the EA did not identify issues or concerns not already considered and addressed, nor provide any new information that would alter the conclusions of the analysis. One comment regarding management of Connectivity/Diversity Block #93 as it relates to 25-30 percent late-successional old growth forest was addressed previously in this Decision (pgs. 2-3) for the purpose of clarification.

### **SECTION 4 – PROTEST PROCEDURES**

The decision described in this document is a forest management decision and is subject to protest by the public. In accordance with Forest Management Regulations at 43 CFR § 5003 Administrative Remedies, protests of this decision may be filed with the authorized officer [Marci L. Todd] within 15 days of the first publication date of the notice of decision/timber sale advertisement in *The News-Review*, Roseburg, Oregon.

43 CFR § 5003.3 subsection (b) states that: “Protests shall be filed with the authorized officer and shall contain a written statement of reasons for protesting the decision.” This precludes the

acceptance of electronic mail or facsimile protests. Only written and signed hard copies of protests that are delivered to the Roseburg District Office will be accepted. The protest must clearly and concisely state the reasons why the decision is believed to be in error.

Protests received more than 15 days after the first publication of the notice of decision/timber sale advertisement are not timely filed and shall not be considered. Upon timely filing of a protest, the authorized officer shall reconsider the decision to be implemented in light of the statement of reasons for the protest and other pertinent information available to her. The authorized officer shall, at the conclusion of her review, serve her decision in writing to the protesting party. Upon denial of a protest the authorized officer may proceed with the implementation of the decision.

For further information, contact Marci Todd, Field Manager, Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District, Bureau of Land Management, 777 NW Garden Valley Blvd; Roseburg, OR. 97470, 541 440-4931.

---

Marci L. Todd, Field Manager  
Swiftwater Field Office

---

Date