



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

COOS BAY DISTRICT OFFICE

1300 AIRPORT LANE, NORTH BEND, OR 97459

Web Address: <http://www.blm.gov/or/districts/coosbay> E-mail: BLM_OR_CB_Mail@blm.gov

Telephone: (541) 756-0100 Toll Free: (888) 809-0839 Fax: (541) 751-4303

In Reply Refer To:

5400/1792 (ORC030)

DOI-BLM-OR-C030-2010-0001-EA

Fairview NWFP Project

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

for the

Fairview NWFP Project Environmental Assessment

DOI-BLM-OR-C030-2010-0001-EA

I. Introduction

An Interdisciplinary Team has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Fairview NWFP Project located within the Umpqua Resource Area, Coos Bay District, Bureau of Land Management. Within this document, the team analyzed two alternatives: a No-Action Alternative (Alternative 1) and a Proposed Action Alternative (Alternative 2). The No Action Alternative describes the effects of not conducting management activities on project lands at this time. The Proposed Action Alternative describes the effects of managing tree densities on approximately 7,344 acres designated as Matrix and Riparian Reserves. This alternative also includes approximately 31.2 miles of new road construction, 69.1 miles of road renovation or improvement, and 24.5 miles of road decommissioning. The location of the project area is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Legal Description for all Units

Township	Range	Sections
T. 26 S.	R. 12 W.	25, 26, 35, & 36
T. 26 S.	R. 13 W.	11, 13
T. 27 S.	R. 11 W.	7, 17, 19
T. 27 S.	R. 12 W.	2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 23, 25, 27, & 33

II. Background

This EA was developed under the management direction of the 1995 Coos Bay District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (1995 ROD/RMP). The analysis supporting this decision tiers to the *Final Coos Bay District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement* (USDI 1994). The 1995 Record of Decision is also supported by, and in conformance with, the *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl (Northwest Forest Plan)* and its *Record of Decision* (USDA and USDI 1994a) as supplemented and amended.

On March 31, 2011, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia vacated and remanded the administrative withdrawal of the Coos Bay District's 2008 Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (Douglas Timber Operators et al. v. Salazar).

The EA process was initially started under the 1995 Coos Bay RMP and contains design features from that RMP. Nonetheless, this project is consistent with the goals and objectives of both the 1995 and 2008 ROD and RMP.

This EA is also tiered to and in conformance with the:

- *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement For Amendments to the Survey & Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation, Measures, Standards and Guidelines* (USDA/USDI 2000) and its *Record of Decision* (USDA/USDI 2001).
- *Management of Port-Orford-cedar in Southwest Oregon Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement* (USDA/USDI 2004b) and its *Record of Decision* (USDA/USDI 2004c).
- *Coos Bay Integrated Noxious Weed Program* (EA OR120-97-11) (USDI 1997).

Through these documents, the BLM, in conjunction with other Federal land agencies, is directed to conduct watershed analysis (WA), and to implement restoration projects to aid in the recovery of water quality and aquatic, riparian, and terrestrial habitats.

As stated in the Record of Decision for the Northwest Forest Plan, the Aquatic Conservation Strategy (ACS) was developed to restore and maintain the ecological health of watersheds and aquatic ecosystems on public lands within the range of Pacific Ocean anadromy. Consistency of the proposed alternative with the ACS objectives is described in Chapter 3 of the Fairview NWFP Project EA (pp. 49-58).

III. Finding of No Significant Impact

The EA effects analysis indicates that there would not be a significant impact on the quality of the human environment from the implementation of either alternative. This finding and conclusion is based on my consideration of the Council of Environmental Quality's (CEQ) criteria for significance (40 CFR 1508.27), both with regard to context and intensity of the impacts described in the EA.

Context:

The proposed activities are not national or regional in scope. The Fairview NWFP Project comprises approximately 7,344 treatment acres. Table 2 summarizes treatment acres by watershed/subwatershed.

The proposed action would occur within the Matrix and Riparian Reserve land use allocations as designated by the 1995 Coos Bay District ROD/RMP. The RMP anticipated the need to conduct silvicultural treatments within: (1) the Matrix to supply a sustainable supply of timber, and promote tree survival and growth; and (2) Riparian Reserves to restore or maintain the objectives of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy.

Table 2: Treatment Acres by Analysis Area Subwatershed

Watershed (5th field)	Sub-watershed (6th field)	Treatment Acres	Percent of Sub-watershed
North Fork Coquille River	Hudson Creek	4,192	18.2%
North Fork Coquille River	Middle Creek	137	0.4%
North Fork Coquille River	Johns Creek	41	0.2%
South Fork Coos River	Daniels Creek	342	1.3%
Coquille River	Beaver Slough	418	3.1%
Coquille River	Cunningham Creek	1,333	6.2%
Coos Bay Frontal Pacific Ocean	Isthmus Slough	58	0.3%
Coos Bay Frontal Pacific Ocean	Catching Slough	823	4.9%
Analysis Area Total		7,344	4.2%

Intensity:

Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(1))

Impacts, both beneficial and adverse associated with either alternative, are not significant as they are consistent within the range and scope of timber management effects analyzed and described in the 1994 Final Coos Bay District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement to which this EA is tiered.

Public Health and Safety (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2))

The proposed activities would not significantly affect public health and safety. Smoke management from pile burning would adhere to the Oregon Smoke Management Plan (OAR 629-43-043). The State of Oregon Administrative Rule No. 340-108, *Oil and Hazardous Materials Spills and Releases*, would minimize impacts to Air Quality and from Solid/Hazardous Wastes.

Unique characteristics of the geographic area (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3))

The proposed activities will have no impact on unique characteristics of the geographic area such as historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime or unique farmlands, wetlands or floodplains, Wild and Scenic Rivers, wilderness, or ecologically significant or critical areas. The individual areas within the Fairview NWFP Project EA are located at previously disturbed sites, and the silvicultural prescriptions would help restore the natural physical environment.

Degree to which effects are likely to be highly controversial (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(4))

The effects on the quality of the human environment for the proposed activities are not highly controversial. The Coos Bay District has been operating under the management direction of the Resource Management Plan since 1994. Thinning and restoration treatments are not considered controversial.

Degree to which effects are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(5))

The possible effects of the proposed activities on the quality of the human environment are not highly uncertain and do not involve unique or unknown risk.

Consideration of whether the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant impacts (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(6))

The proposed projects do not establish a precedent for future actions or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant effects. The timber management program on BLM-managed lands in western Oregon is well-established and this project would not establish a new precedent.

Consideration of whether the action is related to other actions with cumulatively significant impacts (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(7))

There are no significant cumulative effects identified by this assessment. This includes impacts to forest vegetation, wildlife, water resources, fisheries, botany, soil resources, and carbon storage. Although there would be removal of vegetation within the Riparian Reserves, potential adverse impacts to resources are eliminated or substantially avoided by the implementation of no-harvest buffers along streams.

Scientific, cultural, or historical resources, including those listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8))

The proposed activities would not affect districts, sites, highways, structures or objects listed in, or potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Nor would the activities cause a loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.

Threatened or endangered species and their critical habitat (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9))

- The Umpqua Field Office initiated consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in accordance with Section 7(A)(4) of the Endangered Species Act . A letter of concurrence was received from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS, 2010) in which they concur that the proposed actions are not likely to adversely affect the northern spotted owl or the marbled murrelet.
- The proposed action has been determined to have “no effect” to federally threatened Oregon Coast coho salmon and its associated Critical Habitat. Based on analysis by the Fisheries Biologist, we also find that the proposed action would not adversely affect Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) as designated by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA; 16 U.S.C. 1855 as amended). Therefore, consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service is not warranted. This conclusion further supports a finding of no significant impact.

Any effects that threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local laws or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10))

The proposed activities would not violate Federal, State, or local laws imposed for the protection of the environment. These include the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act.

Analysis has also concluded that implementation of the proposed actions would not contribute to the need to list any Special Status Species as identified in BLM Manual 6840 and BLM OR/WA 6840 policy.

Pursuant to Executive Order 13212, the BLM must consider the effects of this decision on the President's National Energy Policy. As there would be no impact to the exploration, development, or transportation of undeveloped energy sources from the proposed action, a Statement of Adverse Energy Impacts is not required.

Conclusion:

Based on the information and analysis contained in the EA (DOI-BLM-OR-C030-2010-0001-EA), I have determined that the proposed action 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 proposed silvicultural treatments and associated road management activities are within those anticipated and already analyzed in the *Final Coos Bay District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement* and would be in conformance with the 1995 *Record of Decision/Resource Management Plan* for the Coos Bay District.

/s/ A. Dennis Turowski

10/17/2011

A. Dennis Turowski
Umpqua Field Manager

Date