

United States  
Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
Eugene District Office

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW

Background: The direction for the Eugene District Forest Genetics program includes maintenance of progeny test sites for the continuation of long-term genetics research (Eugene District ROD/RMP - Appendix M Forest Genetics (June 1995)).

Fourteen progeny test sites were established in the Eugene District during FY 1981 as part of the McKenzie Tree Improvement program. These sites are part of a local and regional genetics program for tree improvement of Douglas-fir. The progeny test sites were established on previously harvested areas. The sites were site prepared, fenced, and planted with one year old seedlings from known pedigrees. The trees were planted on a square grid of 9 by 9 foot spacing and have had regular vegetation maintenance treatments to control competing vegetation. The environmental conditions on the site are maintained as uniform as possible so the genetic differences between trees are expressed and can be measured. Five, ten, fifteen, and twenty year measurements have been completed. These sites were pruned to 6 feet in 1993. The sites are currently 23 years old.

The management of progeny test sites was reviewed by the Regional Ecosystem Office (REO) and the Research Monitoring Committee in 1998. The REO found that progeny test plantation activities are appropriate under the research exception, and recommended the activities proceed as planned.

Proposed Action: The trees within 4 progeny test sites will be thinned with manual girdling. Approximately 25% of the trees would be precommercially thinned. The sites to be treated are as follows:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Land Use Allocation</u>
Day Camp	16S 01W 15	12	GFMA
Deer Mountain	18S 01E 23	12	CON
Fall Creek	18S 01E 31	11	GFMA
Perkins Creek	21S 02W 17	8	CON

The Proposed Action is consistent with the *Standards and Guidelines for Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl* (April 1994), and the Eugene District ROD/RMP (June 1995).

Decision: The proposed action described above is approved to be carried out during calendar year 2003.

Rationale: The proposed action qualifies as a categorical exclusion as described in the Departmental Manual (516 DM 6, Appendix 5 C(1)) and does not meet may of the exception criteria. Appendix 5 C(1) states the following: "Land cultivation and silvicultural activities (excluding herbicides) in forest tree nurseries, seed orchards, and progeny test sites."

Prepared by: Philip Kelly  
Tree Improvement Specialist

Date: 11/25/02

Reviewed by: Don Willson  
Acting Landscape Planner

Date: 12/4/02

Approved by: Emily Rici  
Field Manager

Date: 12/4/02

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW**  
**Exception Criteria Review Checklist**

Proposed Action: Tree girdling in progeny test sites

Review the proposed action against each of the 10 criteria listed below. If the project meets one or more of the criteria, it is an exception from categorical exclusion and **MUST** be analyzed in an EA or EIS. To qualify as a Categorical Exclusion the proposed action may not meet any of the criteria. If the criterion does not apply, indicate "Not Applicable." Any mitigation measures (such as contract stipulations or terms and conditions on permits) necessary to ensure that the proposed action qualifies as a categorical exclusion should be identified at the bottom of the page.

Exception Criteria		Comments
1.	Have significant adverse effects on public health or safety	No
2.	Have adverse effects on unique resources (i.e., parks, recreation, refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, wetlands, flood plains, etc.)	No
3.	Have highly controversial environmental effects	No
4.	Have highly uncertain environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks	No
5.	Establish a precedent that could result in significant impacts	No
6.	Be directly related to other actions having cumulatively significant effects	No
7.	Have adverse effects on cultural or historical resources	No
8.	Have adverse effects on species listed or proposed as threatened or endangered or have adverse effect on designated critical habitat for these species.	No <i>CM DEC 3, 2002</i> <i>PJ 12/3/02</i>
9.	Require compliance with E.O. 11988 (flood plain management), E.O. 11990 (protection of wetlands), or the Fish & Wildlife Coordination Act	No
10.	Threaten to violate Federal, State, Local or Native American law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment	No
Mitigation measures needed to qualify as CE: None		

Reviewed By: Don Willson

Date: 12/4/03

Above mitigation measures have been adopted and will be implemented.

Field Manager: Emily Ricci

Date: 12/4/02

OR 090-1791-5  
 (June 1993)