



# 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: [OR\\_CoosBay\\_Mail@blm.gov](mailto:OR_CoosBay_Mail@blm.gov)

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



### **In Reply Refer To:**

1792(OR-120)  
EA OR128-06-06  
Remote Control

***November 21, 2008***

Dear Citizen:

Enclosed is a draft finding of no significant impact (FONSI) to conduct regeneration harvest and associated road activities analyzed in the "Remote Control Environmental Assessment" (EA OR-128-06-06). This project is designed to implement management objectives described in the BLM Coos Bay District Resource Management Plan and Northwest Forest Plan. The environmental assessment analyzes a no-action alternative and a proposed-action alternative.

The Myrtlewood Field Office analyzed the effects of conducting regeneration harvest on 193 acres in the Matrix land-use allocation, conducting 1.2 miles of new road, decommissioning 1.1 miles of road, and snag creation within the Riparian Reserve land-use allocation. The proposed timber sale units are located in T. 29 S., R. 10 W., Sections 9, 16, 28, and 29.

You are encouraged to read the EA and comment on the appropriateness of the FONSI prior to the end of the 15-day comment period, December 09, 2008. This EA is located on our BLM web site at <http://www.blm.gov/or/districts/coosbay/plans/index.php>. A Decision Document will be published prior to the implementation of the project.

Comments, including names and street addresses of respondents, will be available for public review at the address above during regular business hours (8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.), Monday through Friday, except holidays, and may be published as part of the EA document or other related documents. Individual respondents may request confidentiality. If you wish to withhold your name or street address from public review or from disclosure under Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your written comment. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public inspection in their entirety.

Questions should be directed to Aimee Hoefs at (541) 751-4498. Written comments on the EA and appropriateness of the FONSI may be sent to:

BLM Coos Bay District  
Attn: Aimee Hoefs  
1300 Airport Lane  
North Bend, OR 97459-2000

You may e-mail your comments to: [OR\\_CoosBay\\_Mail@blm.gov](mailto:OR_CoosBay_Mail@blm.gov), RE: Remote Control EA OR128-06-06, Aimee Hoefs.

Sincerely,

*/s/Paul T. Flanagan*

Paul T. Flanagan  
Myrtlewood Field Manager

Enclosure



# 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: [OR\\_CoosBay\\_Mail@blm.gov](mailto:OR_CoosBay_Mail@blm.gov)

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



### In Reply Refer To:

1792 (OR-120)  
EA-OR-128-06-06

**“Draft” FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)  
For the  
Remote Control Environmental Assessment  
EA-OR-128-06-06**

### I. Introduction

An Interdisciplinary Team has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Remote Control Project located within the Myrtlewood Field Office of the Coos Bay District Bureau of Land Management. This EA is hereby incorporated by reference. Within this document, the team analyzed two alternatives: a no-action alternative and a proposed action alternative. The no-action alternative describes the effects of not conducting management activities on these lands at this time. The proposed action alternative describes the effects of conducting regeneration harvest on 193 acres, constructing 1.2 miles of new roads, decommissioning 1.1 miles of road, and snag creation. The locations for the units are T. 29 S., R. 10 W., Sections 9, 16, 28, and 29. Regeneration harvest would occur in the Matrix land-use allocation and snag creation would occur within the Riparian Reserve.

### II. Background

The Coos Bay District (CBD) of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is under the direction of the Final Coos Bay District Proposed Resource Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement (USDI-BLM 1994) and its Record of Decision (USDI-BLM 1995), and the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on Management of Habitat for Late Successional and Old Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl (FSEIS), commonly referred to as the “Northwest Forest Plan” [NFP] (USDA-FS; USDI-BLM 1994a) and its Record of Decision (USDA-FS; USDI-BLM 1994b) as supplemented and amended by:

*Management of Port-Orford-cedar in Southwest Oregon Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (USDA and USDI 2004), and its Record of Decision (USDI 2004).*

*The Final Supplement to The 2004 Environmental Impact Statement to Remove or Modify The Survey and Manage Mitigation Measure Standards and Guidelines (USDA and USDI BLM 2007) and its Record of Decision (USDI 2007).*

This EA is also tiered to and in conformance with the *Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States* (USDI 2007b) and its Record of Decision (USDI 2007c).

As stated in the ROD for the NFP, 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 included in Chapter 4 of the Remote Control EA.

### **III. Finding of No Significant Impact**

I am adopting the EA, which indicates that there would not be a significant impact on the quality of the human environment from the implementation of any of the alternatives. 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 the context and intensity of the impacts described in the EA.

#### Context

The proposed activities are not national or regional in scope. The Remote Control EA comprises 193 project acres. The units are all located within the Sandy Creek sub-watershed (6<sup>th</sup> field) of the Middle Fork Coquille River watershed (5<sup>th</sup> field). The project acreage comprises 1.5% of the total acreage (12, 731) of the Sandy Creek sub-watershed.

#### Intensity

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

Any impacts, both beneficial and adverse, are not significant as they are consistent with the range and scope of those effects analyzed and described in the 1994 Coos Bay District Final Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement to which the EA is tiered.

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

The proposed activities would not significantly affect public health and safety. Adherence to the Oregon Smoke Management Plan (OAR 629-43-043) and 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.

*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 of the proposed activities are not highly controversial. Six comments were received in response to Scoping for this project (January 25 – February 27, 2006). Comments focused on project design and implementation. No comments were received that I consider highly 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. The environmental effects are fully analyzed in Chapter 4 of the EA.

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

The proposed project does not establish a precedent for future actions or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant effects.

*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. The interdisciplinary team considered the proposed action in the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions. No cumulatively significant effects to resources are predicted, as discussed in Chapter 4 of the EA.

*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))

- Consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service has been completed. The Service has determined that implementation of the proposed action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the northern spotted owl or the marbled murrelet or adversely modify their critical Habitat.
- Analysis of the proposed action has resulted in a determination that there would be “no effect” to Oregon Coast coho salmon.
- The proposed action would also not result in adverse effects to Essential Fish Habitat as designated by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA; 16 U.S.C. 1855 as amended).

*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.

Based on the analysis of potential impacts contained in the Remote Control environmental assessment, 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 regeneration harvest activities 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 *Record of Decision/Resource Management Plan* for the Coos Bay District.

***DRAFT***

***November 21, 2008***

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul T. Flanagan  
Myrtlewood Field Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date