

**DECISION NOTICE  
and  
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT  
for the  
Pick-Up Salvage Harvest  
Environmental Assessment**

**USDA Forest Service  
Ochoco National Forest  
Big Summit and Prineville Ranger Districts  
Crook County, Oregon**

## I. INTRODUCTION

An environmental assessment (EA) has been completed that describes salvage harvest of down trees in the Hash Rock Fire area. This EA is available for review at the Prineville Ranger District office in Prineville, Oregon. The EA was prepared by an interdisciplinary team and is based on the need to recover the economic value of down trees and provide timber products to the economy.

## II. DECISION AND RATIONALE

Based on the analysis documented in the Pick-Up Salvage Harvest EA, I have decided to select Alternative 2, the proposed action. Under Alternative 2, salvage harvest activities will occur. Approximately 54 trees will be harvested along Forest Roads 3300-213, 3300-215, 3300-225, 2600-200, 2600-220, 2600-224, 2600-250, 2600-300, 2600-310, 2600-360, and 2600-650. No new or temporary roads will be constructed. All slash will be lopped and scattered.

No downed trees would be removed from any RHCA (Riparian Habitat Conservation Area). In Alternative 2, one tree is proposed for removal in the Hamilton Creek RHCA. After reviewing both specialists' input and public comments, I have decided that removing this tree will not be beneficial to the Hamilton Creek RHCA.

I have reviewed the EA and have determined that there is adequate information to provide a reasoned choice of action. In making my decision, I considered information related to the purpose of and need for action and public comments.

I have selected Alternative 2 because it would recover the economic value of down trees and would provide timber to the economy. I believe that the socio-economic needs of local counties, including forest products and forestry-related employment, are important. I also recognize that offering timber sales is important to local communities in providing job opportunities.

Alternative 1 was not selected because it fails to meet the objectives for this project and would not contribute timber products to the local economy.

### III. ALTERNATIVES

In addition to Alternative 2 (the proposed action), the no action alternative was considered in detail.

Under Alternative 1, the no action alternative, salvage harvest activities would not occur.

### IV. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Scoping letters were sent to individuals, organizations, and other governmental agencies informing them of the proposed action and asking for their input. Five comment letters were received. Responses received during the scoping process revealed concerns related to highest and best use of downed logs, costs in preparing the EA, soil impacts, restoration goals, recovering commercial value, and protecting healthy forests adjacent to the burn area. These comments are included in the project record.

A legal notice requesting comments on the Pick-Up Salvage Harvest Environmental Assessment (EA) was published in the Bend Bulletin newspaper on February 9, 2001. Copies of the EA were mailed to those individuals and organizations that provided comments or otherwise expressed an interest in the project. Three comment letters were received during the comment period. Responses received during the comment period revealed concerns related to riparian areas, soils, wildlife, the adequacy of the environmental analysis, and the stated purpose and need for the project. An appendix describing these comments is attached to this decision.

### V. FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

I have determined that implementation of the actions described in Alternative 2 of the Pick-Up Salvage Harvest EA will not significantly affect, either individually or cumulatively, the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not needed.

I have considered the following factors in making this determination.

1. The actions described in Alternative 2 would be limited in scope (40 CFR 1508.27(a)). The location and extent of the actions is described (EA, p. 3) and displayed on the proposed action map (EA, p. 6). The effects were considered in a local context; no effects

were identified that would be important on a regional or national scale.

2. The actions described in Alternative 2 consider impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(1)).

3. The actions described in Alternative 2 would not significantly affect public health or safety (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)).

4. The actions described in Alternative 2 would not significantly affect any unique characteristics of the geographic area such as historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)). My determination is based on the discussion of effects found in the EA, Chapter 3. There are no park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas located within or adjacent to the project area. Three cultural resource sites were located within the project area and would be avoided and protected during salvage operations.

5. The actions described in Alternative 2 do not involve effects on the human environment that are likely to be highly controversial (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(4)). Public comment regarding this project is focused primarily on riparian areas, soils, wildlife, the adequacy of the environmental analysis, and the stated purpose and need for the project. Effects on riparian areas are described in the EA on pages 11-12 and 14-15. Effects on soils are described in the EA on pages 10-11. Effects on wildlife are described in the EA on pages 8-10, 11-12, and 14-15.

6. The actions described in Alternative 2 would not involve effects that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(5)).

7. My decision to implement the actions included in Alternative 2 does not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(6)). I have made this decision based on the overall consistency of the proposed activities with Forest Plan standards and guidelines.

8. The effects of implementing the actions included in Alternative 2 would not be significant, individually or cumulatively, when considered with the effects of other past and reasonably foreseeable future actions (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(7)).

9. I have determined that the actions described in Alternative 2 do not adversely affect or cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)). The effects of the actions on heritage resources are described in the EA on page 7. Additional information on heritage resources is located in the Project Review for

Cultural Resources Report for the Pick-Up Tree Salvage. No scientific resources are located within the project area.

10. The actions described in Alternative 2 do not adversely affect any endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)). Biological Evaluations for threatened, endangered, and sensitive plants, wildlife, and aquatic species were completed and concluded that implementation of Alternative 2 would have no effect on federally listed species. Biological Evaluations are located in the project file.

11. The actions described in Alternative 2 do not threaten any violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)). The actions are consistent with Forest Plan direction which has been found to be consistent with existing environmental statutes and regulations. The analysis addresses the effects of the actions in sufficient detail to provide a reasoned choice among the alternatives.

## VI. OTHER FINDINGS

Federal regulations (36 CFR 219.10(e), 9/30/1982) require that permits, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other activities carried out on the Big Summit and Prineville Ranger Districts are consistent with the Ochoco National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, as amended (Forest Plan). Accordingly, I have reviewed my decision against Forest Plan direction, and I have determined that Alternative 2 complies with all applicable Forest Plan direction, including both Management Area and Forest-Wide standards and guidelines.

## VII. IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of this project will not occur for a minimum of 50 days following publication of the legal notice in The Bulletin newspaper, Bend, Oregon. If an appeal is filed, implementation will not occur for a minimum of 15 days following disposition of the appeal. If multiple appeals are filed, the disposition date of the last appeal will control the implementation date.

## VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

My decision to implement Alternative 2 of the Pick-Up Salvage Harvest EA is subject to appeal pursuant to 36 CFR 215. Any written notice of appeal must be consistent with 36 CFR 215.14, content of an appeal, including the reasons for the appeal. Any appeal must be filed with the Regional Forester, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, ATTN: 1570 Appeals, P.O. Box 3623, Portland, Oregon 97208-3623. Appeals must be filed within 45 days of the date that the legal notice appears in The Bulletin newspaper.

For further information, contact Cathy Lund (Project Leader) at 3160 NE Third Street, Prineville, Oregon 97754, or via telephone 541-416-6500.

---

ARTHUR J. CURRIER  
District Ranger

DATE

---

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/lookout/pickup/decisionnotice.html)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/lookout/pickup/decisionnotice.html>

Last Update: 5/25/01

R.A. Jensen