DECISION NOTICE
and
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
for the
Holland Moonsalt Timber Sale
Environmental Assessment
USDA Forest Service-Umpqua National Forest
Cottage Grove Ranger District
Lane County, Oregon

The Holland Moonsalt Timber Sale Environmental Assessment (EA) documents a no-action alternative and two action alternatives that would accomplish commercial timber harvest, precommercial thinning, activity fuel treatments, tree planting, noxious weed treatments, soil rehabilitation, various forms of road work, and other connected actions in the Layng Creek Watershed on the Cottage Grove Ranger District, Umpqua National Forest.

The Layng Creek sixth level subwatershed is located east of the City of Cottage Grove on the Cottage Grove Ranger District (CGRD), Umpqua National Forest (UNF), and is part of the Row River 5th level watershed. The 42,195 acre subwatershed is located in all, or portions of T20S, R1E, sec. 31; T21S, R1E, sec. 5-9, 16-18, Willamette Meridian, Lane County, Oregon.

The project area is located within the boundaries of the Umpqua National Forest, in the Layng Creek sixth-level watershed, in Lane County, on the Cottage Grove Ranger District. The Umpqua National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP), as amended is the principle policy under which this action was developed. An analysis of the proposal was conducted in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the implementing regulations of 40 CFR 1508. The purpose and need for the proposed action is described in detail in Chapter 1 (EA page 7).

Decision

I have decided to implement Alternative Three as described in the Holland Moonsalt Timber Sale Project EA (pages 24-30). This decision also includes two non-significant amendments to the 1990 Umpqua National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (EA page 13).

My decision to implement Alternative Three is based on information contained in the administrative record, including the EA, Appendix A (response to public comments), the scoping summary, the project design features and management requirements described in Chapter 2 of the EA, and the effects analysis described in Chapter 3 of the EA (pages 47-203). This decision also includes the implementation of best management practices, project design features, monitoring and management requirements (EA pages 34-45).
Details of Alternative Three

- Commercial thinning 1,186 acres of timber stands using helicopter, ground-based, and skyline logging systems in both the matrix and riparian reserve land allocations to generate about 15.6 million board feet (mmbf) of timber. No thinning would occur on 364 acres of riparian or unique habitat areas, or where protection of rare plant species and soils is a concern.

- Treating activity-created fuels on 766 of the thinned acres by underburning, machine piling, and hand pile and burning.

- Five landings for helicopter logging would be used. These landings would be located in already disturbed areas. Each opening would be approximately ¾ acres.

- No new system roads would be constructed. Approximately 2.3 miles of existing temporary roads would be used, and another 0.5 miles of temporary roads would be constructed. All temporary roads would be obliterated after use.

- Road reconstruction work includes replacement of twenty six 18-inch ditch relief culverts and 1 stream crossing. Road grading and ditch line maintenance would occur on 62.4 miles of existing road.

- Utilizing the existing Silverstairs rock pit as the rock source for the road work.

The areas to be harvested would utilize a combination of skyline (576 acres), helicopter (126 acres), and ground based (484 acres) harvest systems.

The connected and similar actions through the use of timber sale receipts or other funding sources are disclosed in Chapter 2 and are summarized here (EA pages 21-22):

Connected and Similar Actions

- 3,558 snags to be created by girdling;
- 1.4 acres of revegetation of bare ground for erosion control;
- 120 acres of predicted noxious weed treatments within harvest units, along roads and other areas of disturbance. Approximately 0.2 acres of false brome and 3.5 acres of knapweed proposed for chemical treatment; the remaining acres proposed for mechanical treatment.
- 271 acres of precommercial thinning in young plantations;
- Seven fire sumps would be maintained. This maintenance includes: the addition of rock to sump access roads; the excavation of filled-in gravel, soil, and vegetation within the existing sumps; vegetation brushing and mowing along sump access roads;
- Two culverts, would be upgraded to reduce potential erosion concerns (1700-916 Road, mile post 0.4 and 1790 Road, mile post 8.1) and one culvert would be upgraded to allow for fish passage (1790 Road, mile post 2.8).
- 2.76 miles of road would be decommissioned and removed from the road system. Roads 1700-632 (2.06 miles), 1790-172 (0.3 miles), 1790-512 (0.1 miles) and 1790-514 (0.3 miles).
- A total of 10.26 miles of road inactivation (removing culverts, installing water bars, and blocking entrances) of existing system roads. These roads are listed
in the Holland Moonsalt EA on page 22. Note: the 1700-632 road within this list on page 22 would be decommissioned, not inactivated. All other roads listed will be inactivated.

- Five culverts would be upgraded to reduce potential erosion concerns. These culverts are located on the 1746-763 road at mile posts 0.36, 0.8 & 2.02 and on the 1746-707 road at mile posts 0.75 & 1.09.

**Project-Level Forest Plan Amendments**

Two project-level Forest Plan amendments are proposed to be implemented. Most of the standards and guidelines in the 1990 Umpqua LRMP were developed in the context of even-aged harvest of most of the remaining old-growth forest. They were crafted to protect areas from major impacts of logging and site preparation, and to retain areas of old growth timber to both help mitigate loss of habitat and to reduce risks associated with disturbance. The level of disturbance associated with thinning and gap creation in dense second-growth stands is substantially less than that of clearcutting and broadcast burning old growth. In this context, the following project-level Forest Plan amendments are proposed in order to meet the purpose and need in practical and cost-effective ways.

1. This project level Forest Plan amendment would allow thinning up to the boundary of hardwood stands, rock outcrops, and dry meadows and within 50 feet of wet meadows in areas designated as unique habitat (Ref. Proposed Action). Currently, prescription C5-1 states that no timber harvest is permitted within 150 feet of inventoried openings; natural meadows, rock outcrops, talus slopes, or other natural openings with high wildlife values, such as hardwood stands. Vegetation manipulation or structural improvement may occur if it is designed to enhance wildlife (LRMP IV-200). One purpose of the project is to restore species and structural diversity in stem exclusion stands (dense closed canopy forest). Thinning up to the boundary of hardwood stands, rock outcrops, and dry meadows and within 50 feet of wet meadows would meet this purpose by allowing for the development of larger diameter trees, which would benefit wildlife habitat. Additionally, this treatment would reduce competition between hardwoods and conifers (favoring hardwoods) and hinder conifer encroachment into meadows, both of which would maintain habitats important for wildlife.

2. Similar to above, prescription C5-1 would have to be amended to allow yarding corridors within two dry unique habitats in unit 16 and a mosaic in unit 12. For both units, the existing road at the top would be used to skyline yard trees with at least one end suspension to minimize potential disturbance. These second growth trees are relatively light with full and flexible crowns which would minimize potential impacts as compared to the initial disturbance created when this stand was clear cut in 1948.

**Best Management Practices, Management Requirements, Project Design Features, and Monitoring**

This decision also includes implementation of Best Management Practices as required by the Clean Water Act and as disclosed in the EA. The monitoring items that will be implemented include:

- In order to initiate and finalize the restoration prescription, all temporary roads would be reviewed by the Sale Administrator prior to restoration activities. The
effectiveness of the temporary road restoration prescription in preventing erosion and providing suitable plant habitat may be monitored by a resource specialist.

The Silviculturist would review marking guides and prescriptions for designate by description (DxD) with the presale crew prior to marking, and would monitor for quality on a sample of each type of prescription as funding and staffing allows. It is expected that the prescriptions would meet plus or minus 10 percent of the target. If not, remarking or amending the silvicultural prescription would be necessary.

The levels of effective ground cover would be monitored by the Forest Service as the project progresses. If monitoring determines that effective ground cover goals are not being met, site specific recommendations would be developed by the sale administrator, soils scientist or fire/fuels management. To determine if soil management objectives are being met, monitoring would include representative samples of each yarding method, fuels treatment, subsoiling project design features, and tree mortality along treatment areas (S&G#11, LRMP IV-71). Ground skidded units shall be given high priority for soils monitoring.

Field surveys indicated approximately 11% of the project acres have high probability for heritage resources. However, dense vegetation and duff in some units hampered field survey. Implementation of the timber sales may expose soil, thereby providing better ground visibility than was typical during surveys. Table 6, page 45 of the EA lists the high probability areas that would be scheduled for monitoring during and/or after project implementation in order to protect undiscovered heritage resources.

**Decision Rationale**

I have decided to implement Alternative Three because it fully addresses the purpose and need. In meeting the purpose and need, Alternative Three reduces stand density, thereby improving species and structural diversity, and improving stand fire resiliency in the gentle valley bottom, gentle mountain slope and steep landscape areas (EA pages 4-7), while producing timber in an economically sustainable manner. Based on the expected return to the Federal government shown in Table 11 in the EA (pages 57-58), Alternative Three would be above cost.

The decision to select Alternative Three instead of the Proposed Action is due to the costs of reusing the 1700-632 road along with the expensive multispan logging that would be required in units 1, 2 and 3. The cost to log units 1, 2 and 3 would typically be less expensive using multispan logging systems than helicopter logging, however the economic efficiency of locating skyline corridors around some of the challenging terrain in these units and the need for full suspension across the streams would drive costs up considerably. In addition, road 1700-632 is in need of extensive road maintenance before the road can be used for log haul. Eventually, all of the culverts and existing road failures along the outer portion of this road would have to be replaced and repaired. The costs to complete this work would exceed the value of the timber in these units. When adding together the present costs of implementing Alternative Two along with future costs of reconstruction of the 1700-632 road, Alternative Three would be more economically viable than the proposed action. Helicopter logging units 1, 2 and 3 would maintain the option of managing these stands into the future without incurring the expense discussed above.
In addition, Alternative Three addresses the concern that reopening and maintaining road 1700-623 would affect the recreational experience associated with the Hardesty inventoried roadless area.

Other Alternatives Considered
Chapter 2 of the EA includes a description of the other alternatives considered in detail. The following briefly summarizes those alternatives. The reason I did not select those alternatives are described below.

Alternative One: Under this no-action alternative, no actions would be taken to thin over-dense managed plantations, work on roads, treat activity fuels or accomplish connected actions such as culvert upgrades, noxious weed control, tree planting, or precommercial thinning.

This alternative was not selected because it would not meet the need for action.

Alternative Two: This alternative is the proposed action. It would meet the need to restore species and structural diversity, resulting in the same amount of harvest as Alternative Three. The difference in this alternative is management of the 1700-632 road which would be re-opened and maintained to access the skyline (multispan) portions of units 1-3. Road 1700-632 is in need of extensive road maintenance before the road can be used for log haul. Eventually, all of the culverts and existing road failures along the outer portion of this road would have to be replaced and repaired and the costs to complete this work would exceed the value of the timber in these units. The cost to log units 1, 2 and 3 would be less expensive using multispan logging systems than helicopter logging, however, the economic efficiency of locating skyline corridors around some of the challenging terrain in these units and the need for full suspension across the streams would drive costs up considerably. When adding together the present costs of implementing Alternative Two along with future costs of re-opening and maintaining of the 1700-632 road, Alternative Three would be more economically viable than the proposed action.

Alternative Two is thoroughly described on pages 15-24 of the EA. It includes: Commercial thinning 1,186 acres of timber stands using helicopter (60 acres), ground-based (484 acres), and skyline (642 acres) logging systems in both the matrix and riparian reserve land allocations to generate about 15.6 million board feet of timber. No thinning would occur on 364 acres of riparian or unique habitat areas, or where protection of rare plant species and soils is a concern. Activity-created fuels would be treated on 766 thinned acres by underburning, machine piling, or hand piling and burning. Five existing landings would be used for helicopter logging. No new system roads would be constructed. Approximately 2.3 miles of existing temporary roads would be used, and another 0.5 miles of temporary roads would be created. All temporary roads would be obliterated after use. Road reconstruction work includes replacement of twenty six 18-inch ditch relief culverts and one stream crossing culverts. Road grading and ditch line maintenance would occur on 62.4 miles of existing road. The existing Silverstairs rock pit would be utilized as the rock source for road work.

The connected actions for Alternative Two are described on pages 21-22 of the EA. The one difference is the 1700-632 road would be inactivated under Alternative Two. In Alternative Three this road is decommissioned.
Alternatives Considered, but Eliminated from Detailed Study

An alternative was considered that limited temporary road construction in response to comments received during scoping. It was evaluated in relation to the number of acres of thinning that would be accessed per mile of new temporary road construction. This proposed alternative would increase logging costs substantially on about 63 acres, and would not result in a cost-efficient proposal. In addition, the new temporary roads that would be constructed in both action alternatives average less than 1/10th of a mile in length and provide access for a substantial number of stands. Therefore this alternative was eliminated from further study, because without a cost-efficient proposal, the purpose and need would not be met.

Public Participation and Scoping

Scoping was conducted as part of the analysis process. The scoping process for the Holland Moonsalt Timber Sale is described on page 9 of the EA. The Forest Service listened to all input and addressed as many concerns as possible during development of the proposed action. Formal scoping (a process used to surface issues) began after the proposed action was developed and the project was first listed in the January 2009 Umpqua National Forest Quarterly Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA). A scoping notice and field trip announcement was sent to the public in mid January 2009 with the intent of introducing the proposed action and soliciting issues. Ten members of the public attended a February 2009 field trip, which raised comments and concerns. Follow-up consisted of letters, e-mails and phone conversations. The Holland Moonsalt Project File contains a scoping summary that details the scoping comments received for the project.

Scoping generated one issue that drove an alternative (EA page 11) to the proposed action (Alternative Three); issues were resolved by further discussion and clarifying the proposed action (EA pages 11-12). The no action alternative (EA page 15) was also analyzed. A detailed scoping summary is in the Holland Moonsalt Analysis File.

During the 30-day comment period, 4 written comments were received. I read and considered the comments that were submitted to me prior to making my decision and I have responded to those comments in detail (Appendix A of the Analysis File).

I received comments that were supportive of this project; comments were also received that requested that I consider the impacts of the project on several topics, such as natural disturbance processes, variability/thinning prescriptions, late successional habitat development, snags and large wood, riparian and large wood, forest carbon analysis, road decommissioning, economics, created gaps and our interpretation of the Umpqua National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.

After reviewing those comments and documents, I am certain that we considered and used the best available science in our analysis and that I am fully informed of the effects of the proposal and the benefits and consequences of my decision.

Finding of Forest Plan Consistency

Standards and Guidelines

This decision tiers to the Umpqua National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement (Forest Plan, 1990). I have ensured that the decision is consistent with the Forest Plan goals, objectives, and standards, as amended
with this project. All applicable Forest Plan standards and guidelines are listed and discussed throughout Chapter 3 of the EA (pages 47-203). Alternative Three, as it amends the Forest Plan, is fully consistent with all applicable standards and guidelines.

**Aquatic Conservation Strategy (ACS)**

Based on the project level evaluation of the environmental effects documented in the EA, I find that the project is consistent with and does not prevent attainment of the nine objectives of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy (ACS) as described in the 1994 Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl. The activities within the Riparian Reserve land allocation comply with Riparian Reserve Standards and Guidelines as discussed on EA page 153. All nine objectives have been discussed throughout the EA (pages 2-7, 65-66, 75, 131-134, 153, 157, 159, 164-165, 167, 172-177, 182-184, 188, 191-192). Moreover, Alternative Three was designed to contribute to the maintenance and restoration of natural disturbance processes based on the watershed analysis recommendations, thus helping to maintain the 5th level watershed over the long term, as detailed throughout Chapter 3 of the EA.

**Watershed Analysis and Roads Analysis**

I have considered the Layng Creek Watershed Analysis and its iteration and the Holland Moonsalt Roads Analysis. These intermediate analyses (intermediate between the Forest Plan and the site-specific EA) provided a foundation for the development of the proposed action and Alternative Three. The project implements numerous recommendations from the watershed analysis. The relevant recommendations are listed throughout Chapter 3 of the EA (pages 47-203).

**Consistency with National Forest Management Act [16 USC 1604(g)(3)]**

I find this decision to be consistent with the 2005 National Forest Management Act implementing regulations at 219.12(b)(2), specifically:

A. This project complies with and considers the economic and environmental aspects of resource management (EA Chapter 3);

B. This project implements the 1990 Umpqua LRMP, as amended and as such, provides for diversity of plant and animal communities based on the suitability and capability of the Matrix land allocation;

C. This project contains monitoring (as described previously) to ensure that management activities will not produce substantial and permanent impairment of the productivity of the land;

D. The 1,186 acres of thinning authorized by this decision produces approximately 15.6 million board feet of timber, and is part of the Umpqua National Forest’s annual sale quantity (ASQ) of about 45 million board feet, this ASQ is less than what was estimated in the 1994 Northwest Forest Plan. As such, this project complies with this subsection by not exceeding the current ASQ.

E. This project only harvests timber from National Forest System lands on lands that: (i) will not be irreversibly damaged; (ii) can be adequately restocked; (iii) protect streams and water bodies from damage and adverse impacts; and (iv) the harvest systems selected were not selected primarily because they give the greatest return or output of timber.
F. The clearings that create gaps within the stands are used only where objectives for stand diversity are being met and where the natural disturbance process is being approximated; impacts have been assessed and appropriate protection measures prescribed; they will blend with the natural terrain; are prescribed for the appropriate forest type; and the clearings do not exceed 1 acres in size, which is well below the maximum limit for areas to be cut in one harvest operation.

National Forest Management Act Determination of Significance-Forest Plan Amendment

This decision is being made under the Forest Service planning regulations (36 CFR 219) which allow plan amendments to be made using the procedures from the 1982 planning regulations during the three-year transition period (36 CFR 219.14(b)(2). This amendment is being made using the 1982 procedures.

FSH 1909.12, Section 5.32, outlines the factors to be used to determine whether a proposed change to the LRMP is significant or not significant, based on National Forest Management Act requirements. A discussion of each of these four factors follows and is detailed on pages 164-165 of the EA.

1. Timing. Determine whether the change is necessary during or after the plan period. In most cases, the later the change, the less likely it is to be significant for the Forest Plan. The proposed amendments are necessary now in order to efficiently thin the second growth stands in the Holland Moonsalt Planning Area. The LRMP was written in 1990 when the assumptions were that most harvest would be done through clearcutting of old-growth; this project focuses on thinning second growth stands. Currently, the LRMP is 19 years old and is scheduled for revision. The plan is currently at the end of the planning cycle. Therefore, timing is not considered to be a significant factor related to the amendments.

2. Location and Size. Define the relationship of the affected area to the overall planning area. In most cases, the smaller the area affected by the change, the less likely it is to be a significant for the forest plan. The proposed amendments are specific to Layng Creek subwatershed, and apply only to a subset of the 1,185 acre treatment in the planning area. Given the acreage of the Forest (about 1,000,000 acres) the proposal affects less than one percent of the land area. Therefore, the location and size of the area involved in the proposed amendment are not considered to be significant.

3. Goals, Objectives, and Outputs. Determine whether the change would alter long-term levels of goods and services projected by the forest plan. The proposed amendments would not change existing goals or outputs as defined by the Forest Plan and would not result in changes in the level of goods and services currently being produced, which are consistent with levels projected by the LRMP. Therefore, the goals, objectives, and outputs are not considered to be a significant factor related to the proposed amendment.

4. Management Prescription. Determine whether the change in a management prescription is only for a specific situation or whether it would apply to future decisions throughout the planning area. A Forest Plan amendment for the recent Doris, Curran Junetta and Crawdog EAs allow thinning up to the boundary of the hardwoods and other unique habitats, will be used. In
addition, this project includes an amendment that would yard through two pre-disturbed unique habitats. These amendments would be site-specifically used for the Holland Moonsalt project. No permanent changes to the Standards and Guidelines or Management Prescriptions would occur. The Rail 2 Timber Sale Project, planned for the foreseeable future, may also prescribe some of the same practices and require some of the same amendments. However, that project is in the very early stages of planning and it is not known whether or not some of the amendment language proposed for this project would be used. Therefore, the change in management prescription is for this specific situation and project, and is not considered to be a significant factor related to the proposed amendment.

After consideration of these factors, I have concluded that the proposed amendment would not represent a significant change to the LRMP.

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Based on the documentation in the Holland Moonsalt EA and Analysis File, I have determined the following with regard to the context of this project:

The Holland Moonsalt Timber Sale project implements direction set forth in the Umpqua National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, as amended by the Northwest Forest Plan. The Umpqua National Forest is comprised of over 1 million acres; the Cottage Grove Ranger District encompasses about 88,700 acres of the Forest. The Layng Creek 6th Level Subwatershed is comprised of just over 42,195 acres within the Cottage Grove Ranger District. The 1,186 acres of Alternative Three authorized with this decision will implement thinning, burning, and other connected activities on about 2.8% of the Layng Creek subwatershed, just over 1.3% of the Cottage Grove Ranger District, and one tenth of 1% of the Umpqua National Forest. Given the area affected by the project at both the watershed, District, and Forest scale, I find that the effects of the project are not significant as disclosed throughout Chapter 3 of the EA (pages 47-203), and will have a negligible effect at the watershed, District, and Forest scale.

Based on the documentation in the Holland Moonsalt EA and the Analysis File, I have determined the following with regards to the intensity of this project:

1. The Environmental Assessment provides sufficient information to determine that this project will not have a significant impact (either adverse or beneficial) on the land and its natural resources (EA pages 47-203), including air quality (EA pages 197-200), or water quality (EA pages 155-162).

2. Considering the remoteness of the project in relation to local and regional population centers and the measures taken to ensure compliance with the Clean Air Act (EA pages 197-200 and 203), the Clean Water Act as discussed on EA pages 155-159, and 203 and the use of a BMP checklist during implementation (EA pages 34-45, and BMP checklist analysis file), the likelihood of the project affecting the public's health and safety is low.

3. The supporting documentation located in the EA and in the Analysis File for the Holland Moonsalt EA provides sufficient information to determine that this project will not negatively affect any known unique characteristics of the geographic area such as park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, inventoried roadless areas, or ecologically critical areas (EA pages 202-203).
4. The degree of controversy with regard to effects on the quality of the human environment are limited and considered not significant. Four comment letters were received during the 30-day comment period. Based on my review and consideration of these comments, documentation of our answers in Appendix A, and personal discussions that the District Ranger and interdisciplinary team have had with members of the public since scoping, I find that there is no scientific controversy with the project. Most of the comments received consisted of requests to not amend the plan or to further reduce road building. This limited controversy does not satisfy the threshold for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

5. Similar types of harvest, fuel treatments, tree planting, road work, and other connected actions have occurred previously on the Umpqua and on other National Forests. No impacts to the human environment that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks have been identified in Chapter 3 (EA pages 47-203) of the analysis.

6. The proposed commercial thinning, burning, and associated activities are well established practices on the Umpqua National Forest and on the Cottage Grove Ranger District and do not establish a precedent for future actions (past activities and present and on-going activities documented in the EA pages 47-51).

7. I have reviewed the impacts of those past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions described in the Environmental Effects Section of the Holland Moonsalt EA and find that this action will not have a significant cumulative impact on the environment (EA pages 47-203).

8. The Cultural (Heritage) Resources Report and the associated disclosure in the EA (pages 196-197) reveal that no prehistoric sites will be impacted. Management requirements and monitoring are included (EA page 45) under Alternative Three, that will protect any prehistoric cultural sites that may be found during implementation. No direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to cultural resources are expected to occur.

9. Based on the information disclosed in the Holland Moonsalt EA (pages 111-129 and 143-151), the wildlife and botanical biological evaluations, and the biological opinion letter issued by the US Fish and Wildlife Service (July 1, 2009), I have determined that this action will not jeopardize any species listed or proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act.

10. Laws imposed for the protection of the environment provided the framework for the 1990 Umpqua National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP), as amended. From the documentation provided in Chapter 3 (EA pages 47-203) of the Holland Moonsalt Timber Sale Thin EA, I find that the project activities do not threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law imposed for the protection of the environment (EA pages 203).

From the preceding, I find that Holland Moonsalt Timber Sale Project does not constitute a major Federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is not necessary.

**Implementation**

I have reviewed the Holland Moonsalt EA and its associated analysis file. I feel there is adequate information within these documents to provide a reasoned choice of action. I
am fully aware of the short-term adverse environmental effects that are disclosed in Chapter 3 (pages 47-203) of the EA. I have determined that these short-term impacts will be outweighed by the long-term benefits of implementing the restorative thinning of 1,186 acres under Alternative Three. Implementing this project will cause no unacceptable cumulative impact to any resource. There will be no impact to cultural resources, consumers, civil rights, minority groups, environmental justice, or women. There are no unusual energy requirements for implementing Alternative Three (EA pages 196-197 and 202-203).

Implementation may occur, but not before the 15th business day following the date of appeal disposition. In the event of multiple appeals, the implementation date will be established following the last appeal deposition (36 CFR 215.9(b)). If no appeal is filed, implementation may begin on, but not before, the 5th business day following the close of the appeal filing period (36 CFR 215.9(a)).

**Procedure for Changes during Implementation**

Minor changes may be needed during implementation to better meet on-site resource management and protection objectives. In determining whether and what kind of further NEPA action is required based on any such changes, I will consider the criteria for whether to supplement an existing Environmental Assessment in 40 CFR 1502.9(c) and FSH 1909.15, sec. 18, and in particular, whether the proposed change is a substantial change to the intent of the selected alternative as planned and already approved, and whether the change is relevant to environmental concerns. Connected or interrelated proposed changes regarding particular areas or specific activities will be considered together in making this determination. The cumulative impacts of these changes will also be considered. For example, thinning unit boundaries may be modified if site conditions dictate and if other resource objectives can be met. Minor adjustments to unit boundaries may be needed during final layout for resource protection, to improve logging system efficiency, and to better meet the intent of my decision. Temporary road locations were estimated during field reconnaissance; adjustments to those locations are likely to be necessary in order to minimize impacts to the area. Many of these minor changes will not present sufficient potential impacts to require any specific documentation or action to comply with applicable laws.

**Administrative Review**

My decision is subject to administrative appeal (CFR 215.11). Organizations or members of the general public may appeal my decision according to 36 CFR Part 215. The 45-day appeal period begins the day following publication of this decision in the Roseburg News Review, the newspaper of record. The Notice of Appeal must be filed with the Appeal Deciding Officer:

- Regional Forester, USDA Forest Service  
  Attn. 1570 Appeals  
  PO Box 3623  
  Portland, OR  97208-3623

  Business Hours: 8:00 am-4:30 pm  
  Fax: 503-808-2255, Email: appeals-pacificnorthwest-regional-office@fs.fed.us

It is the responsibility of those who appeal a decision to provide the Regional Forester sufficient written evidence and rationale to show why my decision should be changed or
reversed. The appeal must be filed with the Appeal Deciding Officer in writing. At a minimum, an appeal must include the following (36 CFR 215.14):

1. Appellant's name and address, with a telephone number, if available;
2. Signature or other verification of authorship upon request (a scanned signature for electronic mail may be filed with the appeal);
3. When multiple names are listed on an appeal, identification of the lead appellant and verification of the identity of the lead appellant upon request;
4. The name of the project or activity for which the decision was made, the name and title of the Responsible Official, and the date of the decision;
5. Any specific change(s) in the decision that the appellant seeks and rationale for those changes;
6. Any portion(s) of the decision with which the appellant disagrees, and explanation for the disagreement;
7. Why the appellant believes the Responsible Official's decision failed to consider the substantive comments and;
8. How the appellant believes the decision specifically violates law, regulation, or policy.

Contact Person
For additional information concerning the specific activities authorized with my decision, you may contact:

Laurie Bernstein
Holland Moonsalt Interdisciplinary Team Leader
78405 Cedar Park Road
Cottage Grove, OR 97424
541-767-5000, Business Hours: 8:00 am-4:30 pm
Fax: 541-767-5075
Email: lbernstein@fs.fed.us

/s/ Clifford J. Dils       7/17/2009
Clifford J. Dils       Date Signed
Forest Supervisor
Umpqua National Forest

7/23/2009       Date Published