United States Department of Agriculture

Forest Service

May 2010

Environmental Assessment

Catalpa Project

Pleasant Hill Ranger District, Ozark – St. Francis National Forests
Johnson and Newton Counties, Arkansas

For Information Contact:

Mindi Lawson – Pleasant Hill Ranger District

2591 Highway 21

Clarksville, AR 72830

(479) 754-2864 x 2878

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY

The Ozark National Forest is proposing to manage vegetation to improve forest stands, enhance wildlife habitat, and improve recreational opportunities in the **Catalpa** project. The actions we are proposing include enhancing wildlife & fish habitat, regeneration cutting as well as thinning timber for biodiversity, forest health, and visual quality, decommissioning roads (some by gating) while improving others, and reducing the build-up of hazardous fuels through prescribed burning. In addition, we propose constructing one new recreational fish pond approximately 2 acres in size, and managing mineral exploration. The activities would occur on **federal lands only** in an area bounded on the south by Mulberry River Road (Hwy. 215), Johnson County 5261 (Arbaugh Road) on the west, Johnson County 6295 (FS 1495) and Newton County 419 (Cowan Knob Road) on the north, and Carroll Ridge Road (FS 1417A) and Johnson County 5411 (FS 1417) on the east. Activities which are proposed on private land would occur only with the permission of the landowner. The Forest Service will enter into negotiations with those landowners for R.O.W. easements and prescribed burning.

Pine and hardwood stands are recommended for regeneration cutting to perpetuate this forest type and to create a variety of age classes, thereby, promoting diversity; thinning other forest stands is proposed to promote vigor and thriftiness of the remaining trees. Prescribed burning and herbicide/handtool treatments would follow harvesting/thinning of hardwood and pine to: prepare the ground for seedfall or planting, and stimulate wildlife benefits. Timber products in the form of sawlogs, small roundwood, and firewood would be generated by these actions in the near term as well as providing for a future sustainable supply of timber products. Habitat diversity for animals and plants, including threatened, endangered, and/or sensitive species would be maintained or improved by the effects of the timber, wildlife, recreation, and access management. Reduction of wildfire risk by prescribed burning is also proposed as well as closing roads no longer needed for land management. This proposal would maintain or improve the plant and animal diversity to meet overall multiple-use objectives as described in the Revised Land and Resource Management Plan.

Table 1 - Summary of Projects - Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

Activity	Number of Units	Approx. Acres-Miles
Vegetation Management		
Pine Thinning	36 stands	1072 acres
Pine Shelterwood Harvest w/site prep, TSI* & Burn	18 stand	497 acres
Pine TSI & Burning	6 stands	309 acres
Hardwood Thinning	10 stands	322 acres
Hardwood Shelterwood Harvest w/site prep, TSI & Burn	21 stands	785acres
Woodland Restoration Thinning	10 stands	307 acres
Hardwood TSI	5 stands	451 acres
Hardwood Pre-commercial Thinning (PCT) & Burn	7 stands	171 acres
Pine Planting	3 stands	105 acres
Wildlife Stand Improvement (WSI) Thinning & Burning	7 stands	176 acres
Prescribed Fire-Hazardous Fuels-Federal Lands**	All stands	8,553 acres
Prescribed Fire- Hazardous Fuels-Private Lands***	Several	~1900acres
Wildlife Management		
Wildlife Openings-New construction	26 openings	44 acres
Wildlife Openings-New (linear)	5 openings	15.5 acres
Wildlife Openings-existing (chainsaw/herbicide)	4 openings	12 acres
Wildlife Pond Construction/Reconstruction	2 ponds	0.5 acre
Fish Habitat Improvements (Large Woody Debris/Stream Bank Stabilization)	Morgan Hollow Panther Creek	~13 miles
Road Work		
Road Construction	1 rd. section	0.35 mile
Road Reconstruction	0	0
Road Maintenance (Forest & County Roads)	37 rd. sections	45.96 miles****
Road Decommissioning	5 rd. sections	2.6 miles
Temporary Roads	several	5.64 miles
Other		
Future Gas Wells	5	Unknown at this time
Cultural-Heritage Sites	28 sites on private and federal lands	4 on private land/3 not eligible/21 eligibility undetermined

***TSI - Timber Stand Improvement (TSI) includes midstory control and release treatments with handtools/herbicide followed by prescribed burning. Site preparation using herbicide and prescribed burning would occur in regeneration areas.**
**** Prescribed Fire-Federal Lands involve units to be burned for hazardous fuel reduction and wildlife.**
*****Prescribed Fire-Private Lands – pending landowner approval through Wyden and Stevens Agreements only.**
******Road maintenance includes both Forest Service and County roads.**

The proposed action aims to restore ecosystem health and sustainable forest conditions in an area which has been affected by oak decline and exclusion of fire. Vegetative and wildlife diversity would be increased, fuels accumulations would be reduced, forest products would be produced and watershed quality and dispersed recreation quality would be improved in the area.

In addition to the proposed action (alternative 2), the Forest Service also evaluated the following alternatives:

- Alternative 1 – A no action alternative where the present/existing level of management would continue in the analysis area
- Alternative 3 – Alternative 2 excluding herbicide use

Based upon the effects of the alternatives, the responsible official will decide which alternative will be selected to best meet the purpose and need identified for this project area. The District Ranger of the Pleasant Hill Ranger District has the authority to make this decision.

Part 1 – Introduction

Document Structure

The Forest Service has prepared this Environmental Assessment in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other relevant Federal and State laws and regulations. This Environmental Assessment discloses the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts that would result from the proposed action and alternatives. The document is organized into five parts:

- ***Part 1 - Introduction:*** The section includes information on the history of the project proposal, the purpose of and need for the project, and the agency's proposal for achieving that purpose and need. This section also details how the Forest Service informed the public of the proposal and how the public responded.
- ***Part 2 - Comparison of Alternatives, including the Proposed Action:*** This section provides a more detailed description of the agency's proposed action as well as alternative methods for achieving the stated purpose. These alternatives were developed based on significant issues raised by the public and other agencies. This discussion also includes possible mitigation measures. Finally, this section provides a summary table of the environmental consequences associated with each alternative.
- ***Part 3 - Environmental Consequences:*** This section describes the environmental effects of implementing the proposed action and other alternatives. This analysis is organized by resources potentially affected. Within each section, the affected environment is described first, followed by the effects of the No Action Alternative that provide a baseline for evaluation and comparison of the other alternatives that follow.
- ***Part 4 - Consultation and Coordination:*** This section provides a list of preparers and agencies consulted during the development of the environmental assessment.
- ***Part 5 - Appendices:*** The appendices provide more detailed information to support the analyses presented in the environmental assessment.

Additional documentation, including more detailed analyses of project-area resources, may be found in the project planning record located at the Pleasant Hill Ranger District Office in Clarksville, Arkansas.

Background

The Pleasant Hill Ranger District's "order of entry" led to this project proposal. The Revised Land and Resources Management Plan (RLRMP-2005) guides activities for a ten to fifteen year planning period and directs that all land types be inventoried within that timeframe. The Catalpa project area was due for inventory and monitoring. Foremost, this analysis addresses forest health and diversity, as identified by the interdisciplinary team members. This source document is on file at the Pleasant Hill Ranger District office.

Purpose and Need for Action

The purpose of this initiative is to:

1. Restore ecosystem health and sustainable conditions by:
    - Reducing basal area and restoring the historic/natural fire regime.
    - Benefit/increase oak regeneration.
    - Increase plant and animal diversity.

- Reduce fuel loads in order to protect forest ecosystems and private property that are at risk.
- Improve forest health so that stands are more resistant to stress, insects and other pathogens by reducing overcrowded conditions.
- Protecting watershed integrity with responsible forest management via vegetation treatments that will ensure continued diversity and vigorous growth while maintaining high water quality.
- Protecting watershed integrity by closing and decommissioning unneeded roads, thus reducing sedimentation flow into stream channels.

2. Increase habitat potential for early successional, disturbance-dependent species.
3. Increase Forest visitor safety.
4. Provide forest products to the public.

This action responds to the goals and objectives outlined in the 2005 Ozark-St. Francis National Forests Land and Resources Management Plan (the Revised Forest Plan), and helps move the project area toward desired conditions described in that plan. This action is needed for the following reasons:

Ecosystem Restoration and Promoting Sustainable Ecosystems

The project area was historically subject to a more frequent regime of vegetation disturbance from anthropogenic fire. This area is within miles of study sites in which frequent fire return intervals have been documented. Here, mean fire return interval for the period of 1680-1820 ranged from 4.6 to 16 years, for the period of 1821-1880 ranged from 2 to 3.1 years and for the period of 1881-1920 ranged from 1.4 to 5 years. From 1921-2000 mean fire return interval for these study sites ranged from 62-80 years (Guyette and Spetich, 2003). Anthropogenic fire is documented to have played a major role in shaping ecosystem structure in the Ozark Highlands. Documented presence of native peoples in the area prior to the earliest fire scars recorded in this study point to a fire regime with return intervals similar to that documented for the period of 1680-1820. Frequent fire in forest/woodland ecosystems would invariably have produced open, less dense stands with a higher proportion of vegetation adapted to fire. Displacement of anthropogenic fire, creation of barriers to fire such as roads and a long standing policy of fire suppression have led to current forest health problems associated with abnormally dense forest conditions and unsustainable ecosystems. Historically, the lands that are now the Ozark – St. Francis National Forest consisted of fire-dependent woodland and forest ecosystems with well-developed herbaceous understories. Currently, the ecosystem in the project area is considered unhealthy because the area lacks these forest conditions. This absence is due to a century of fire suppression and lack of vegetation management. Existing ecological conditions in the project area include dense, overstocked forest, a shift from the historic plant community composition toward fire-intolerant plant species, lack of herbaceous species diversity, and insect epidemics.

General guidance in the LRMP guides the Forest Service to, “Respond to land, resource, social and economic changes.” Forest health and insect epidemics have become of paramount importance on the Ozark – St Francis within the past few years. A red oak borer epidemic has materialized with affected acreage going from 19,000 acres in 1999 to around 300,000 in 2001. The basic reason for this epidemic can be attributed to excessive forest density resulting in stressed trees. Preliminary field investigations indicate that the red oak

component is being reduced by as much as 85% within the affected areas. The Pleasant Hill District is the hardest hit area of the entire forest. It is where the epidemic first started and where evidence of the epidemic still exists. Preventive action is limited, but it is thought the best hope lies in regeneration and thinning (harvest & salvage). This will accomplish two objectives: first, it will reduce inter-tree competition and relieve the water stress on the remaining trees and help them repel some of the borers, and second, the trees that are harvested will be able to begin stump sprouting which will help to provide a source of young oaks for the future. Instigating a prescribed fire rotation mimicking historic (prior to 1920) fire return intervals following thinning/regeneration harvest would maintain open forest conditions with reduced inter-tree competition. The thinning of pine stands is also important in preventing disease attacks from southern pine beetles. These beetles have been spreading across the south in recent years due to the increasingly hot summers and mild winters. Infestations are now common in areas where the beetle was once relatively unknown. South Carolina, North Carolina and Kentucky have had tremendous outbreaks within the last 5 years. Shortleaf pine has been almost completely wiped out on the Daniel Boone National Forest in Kentucky. To date, only small infestations have been observed on the Ozark National Forest (Magazine District), yet southern pine beetles are common to the Ouachita Mountains and southern Arkansas. Once insect infestations start, it is too late to effectively treat large areas and many acres of trees die rapidly. Prevention is the control method of choice by thinning stands to reduce inter-tree competition and relieve moisture stress. By keeping the trees healthy, beetles are expelled from the trees and never reach epidemic proportions.

Watershed integrity is sustained by vegetatively mimicking the natural occurrences of stand manipulation via timber & wildlife management and prescribed fire.

Improve Wildlife Habitat and Benefit Disturbance-Dependent Species through Establishment of Early Seral Habitat.

The Forest provides a wide variety of habitats that supports a diversity of wildlife species. One of the two most important is the early-successional habitat, (0-10 years old). Five of the Management Indicator Species (MIS) from the LRMP are dependent upon early-successional habitat. Two MIS are dependent upon open forest conditions/woodlands.

These disturbance-dependent MIS species population trends have been analyzed utilizing a variety of sources (AGFC 2001, 2006 & 2007,USDA 2001, USDA 2007 and NatureServe 2006). Population monitoring associated with these sources shows the status of these seven species as such:

- Deer populations have generally increased in the last two decades based on harvest data, but there has been a decline the past 3-4 years and it is possible that this reflects a lag time in response to the decline in early seral habitat and/or poor fawn recruitment on the National Forest.
- Black bear populations are increasing; however, to maintain quality habitat over time, there is a need to maintain early seral habitat.
- Northern bobwhite populations are decreasing due to a lack of pine/oak woodland and native grassland areas.
- Population trends for turkey are stable to declining. This is a result of poor brood recruitment for multiple consecutive years. In addition, downward trends in early-successional habitat would likely produce a negative effect on brood habitat in the

future for turkey.

- Prairie warbler populations are decreasing primarily due to lack of young age-class forest (regenerating forest communities).
- Brown-headed nuthatches are dependent upon open pine forest and woodlands. Populations of this species are stable, but available habitat is a limiting factor.
- Red-headed woodpeckers are dependent upon open oak woodlands. Populations of this species are stable to decreasing. Available habitat is a limiting factor.

For the Forest, the amount of early-successional forest habitat increased slightly from 1986 to 1991 to a total of approximately 1.0% forest wide. From 1991 to 2001 early-successional forest habitat declined forest wide to approximately 0.2%. The amount of early-successional habitat on the Forest is tied very closely to the amount of regeneration harvests the Forest conducts in a given year. This type of harvesting has declined over the years and this has driven the decline in early-successional habitat. Currently, the analysis area is comprised of only 4% of this early-successional forest habitat.

Hunter (2001) identified species of disturbance-dependent birds which are declining in the central hardwoods area. Forty-three of these species potentially occur within the analysis area. Of these, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USDI, 2002) identified 7 of these species as Bird Species of Conservation Concern that are declining in the Central Hardwoods Bird Conservation Region (BCR), and are disturbance dependent species. These 43 species found within the analysis area would benefit from proposed vegetation treatments due to their reliance upon disturbance-associated habitats (Hunter, et al., 2001).

The Need to Reduce Off Highway Vehicle (OHV/ATV) Conflicts with Other Resource Values

Illegal OHV use in the project area (occurring off of designated roads) is causing resource damage and conflicts with other resource uses. Closing and decommissioning roads in the project area will greatly reduce the negative impacts created from illegal OHV use and will thus improve watershed integrity. The new Forest OHV policy designates particular routes on which it is legal to ride on National Forest roads.

The Need to Improve Forest Visitor Safety

Red oak borer-caused mortality and associated oak decline have increased the potential for falling trees/limbs to injure forest visitors. Thinning forest stands near recreation areas and implementing associated silvicultural treatments and prescribed fire will reduce potential hazards and improve visitor safety.

The Need to Provide Wood Products

Meeting the needs of improving wildlife habitat and promoting sustainable ecosystems will provide timber products to the public over the next few years as a by-product. General guidance in the LRMP directs the Forest Service to protect and improve renewable resource quality while maximizing net public benefits. Specific direction contained in the LRMP guides the Forest Service to “Provide a non-declining yield of forest products consistent with land capability, sustainability, protection needs and other resource values.” (LRMP, pp 2-27)

The Proposed Action:

The action proposed by the Forest Service to meet the purpose and need includes several vegetation/habitat management actions. This alternative proposes: even-aged management (EAM) on 1282 acres of pine and hardwood forest (shelterwood,); thinning on 1394 acres of pine and hardwood forest; release/PCT and timber stand improvement (TSI) of hardwood and pine via hand tools and herbicide to relieve them from suppressive competition on 1904 acres; hardwood and shortleaf pine planting; wildlife stand improvement (WSI) thinning on 176 acres; wildlife pond and early-seral opening creation; fish habitat improvement; prescribed fire on 8,553 acres of Federal lands (approximately1900 acres of private lands) consisting of site preparation, wildlife, and fuel reduction, road maintenance of 45.96 miles, road construction of 0.35 mile, and road decommissioning of 2.6 miles. No road re-construction is proposed for this project.

These proposed actions have been slightly modified from the original proposed actions that were sent to Interested Citizens and Forest Neighbors in December 2009; that is, road management and vegetation management activities have been adjusted slightly. This was due to several factors, such as: access was difficult because of terrain and private property was to be avoided as much as possible; current road locations and conditions were revisited and were deemed inadequate for proposed activities; better, more stable road locations have been sited. The table below illustrates the differences in the initially proposed actions and those being proposed now.

Activity	Proposed Initially	Proposed Presently
Road Construction	1 mile	0.35 miles
Road Reconstruction	1 miles	0 miles
Temporary Roading	8 miles	5.64 miles
Road Decommissioning	3miles	2.6 miles
Hardwood Thinning	295 acres	322 acres
Pine Seedtree Harvest	67 acres	0 acres
Hardwood TSI	207 acres	451 acres

Decision Framework

Given the purpose and need, the deciding official reviews the proposed action and the other alternatives in order to make the following decisions:

- Which alternative best meets the purpose of this initiative; that is, to guide this project area toward the goals set forth in the Revised Land and Resources Management Plan (RLRMP).
- Which alternative best meets the purpose of the initiative while producing the least adverse cumulative environmental impacts.
- Which alternative best meets the six strategic goals of the Forest Service's 2004 National Strategic Plan.

Public Involvement

The proposal was listed in the Schedule of Proposed Actions in September 2009 until present. It was provided to the public and other agencies for comment during the initial 30-day scoping (comment) period beginning December 23, 2009 and published in the official newspaper of record, **The Johnson County *Graphic*** – (Clarksville, Arkansas). Using the

comments from the public, other agencies, and internal comments, the interdisciplinary team developed a list of issues to address.

Issues

The Forest Service separated the issues into two groups: significant and non-significant issues. Significant issues were defined as those directly or indirectly caused by implementing the proposed action. Non-significant issues were identified as those: 1) outside the scope of the proposed action; 2) already decided by law, regulation, Forest Plan, or other higher level decision; 3) irrelevant to the decision to be made; or 4) conjectural and not supported by scientific or factual evidence. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA regulations require this delineation in Sec. 1501.7, "…identify and eliminate from detailed study the issues which are not significant or which have been covered by prior environmental review (Sec. 1506.3)…"

Issue Eliminated From Detailed Study

An issue to use no prescribed burning for hazardous fuel reduction, timber stand improvement, and wildlife browse production was considered but not developed. Past experience on the district (and confirmed by the latest scientific evidence) has shown that prescribed fire is needed to ensure pine seedlings are established and that adequate wildlife browse be maintained. It has also become increasingly clear that fire plays a major role in the perpetuation of the historic Ozark Oak-Hickory-Shortleaf pine forest.

Issues Studied in Detail

As for significant issues, the Forest Service identified **three** topics raised during scoping. These issues include:

Issue #1

The cumulative effects of past activities on private lands, together with past and proposed activities on public land, and their impacts on soil erosion, water quality and wildlife habitat.

The measurement indicator for this issue is: tons/acre of current and projected erosion/ sedimentation in the analysis area.

Issue #2

Forest health and sustainable ecosystems.

The measurement indicator for this issue is: acres of public land restored to sustainable conditions and increased biodiversity through implementation of silvicultural, prescribed fire and other vegetation management treatments.

Issue #3

The effects of vegetation management on wildlife/plants/aquatics.

The measurement indicator for this issue is: acres of wildlife/aquatic habitat affected.

The issues addressed in this Environmental Assessment involve contrasts among optional uses of available forest resources. Once analyzed, they were then used by the team to develop project alternatives. All proposals within this EA meet all conditions of the Revised LRMP and Amendments and other applicable State and Federal Laws and Regulations.

Part 2 - Comparison of Alternatives

This chapter describes and compares the alternatives considered for the Catalpa project. It includes a description and map of each alternative considered. This section also presents the alternatives in comparison form, sharply defining the differences between them and providing a clear basis for choice by the decision maker and the public. Some of the information used to compare the alternatives can be based upon the extent of the alternative (for example, the amount of prescribed burning) and some of the information is based upon the environmental, social and economic effects of implementing each alternative (for example, the amount of erosion or the degree of risk to public safety).

Alternatives

ALTERNATIVE 1

No Action

Under the No Action alternative for this project proposal, current management plans would continue to guide administration of the project area. Custodial administration would proceed; however, in-depth, substantive resource management would not be accomplished… with the following consequences:

- Wildlife species needing early-seral habitat would decline.
- In all likelihood, Oak Decline (insect & disease) symptoms would continue unchecked for the foreseeable future.
- Reintroduction of fire disturbance regimes into fire-adapted ecosystems would not occur.
- The forest would continue to age, which may further exacerbate conditions favorable to insect and disease occurrences. A well-distributed mix of age-classes across the landscape is healthier and can more vigorously repel these attacks.
- Vegetative diversity and quality wildlife browse would suffer due to more closed-canopy conditions. Loss of grasses and forbs will reduce populations of small mammals, insect /seed-eating birds, and larger game animals such as turkey and deer.
- Critical levels of fuel such as leaf litter, needle-duff layers, and fallen timber will continue to accumulate, increasing the threat of destructive wildfire occurrence.
- Available water on a dispersed basis for wildlife needs would not be met according to LRMP standards.
- Wood products and revenue that help sustain the local economy would not be generated.
- Air quality would remain good; water quality could potentially decrease as natural sedimentation of unstable roads would continue to occur through bank/sheet erosion during heavy rain events.
- Recreation opportunities will remain enjoyable, although visual penetration into the forest by recreational motorists may decline, especially during the summer. Hunting may be negatively impacted as well as observing wildlife due to closed-canopy conditions. Opportunities to upgrade and stabilize the transportation system within the project area would be prolonged.
- Unstable roads will continue to contribute sediment to water sources.
- Threatened and endangered species that depend upon disturbance (e.g., fire) may decrease.

- Fish habitat improvements would be delayed or postponed.
- Minerals management and exploration will be protracted.

ALTERNATIVE 2

The Proposed Action

Hardwood Shelterwood with Reserves followed by site preparation with herbicide would occur on approximately 785 acres. A shelterwood harvest followed by site preparation application of herbicides would be done to prepare the site for natural oak regeneration. The combination of stump sprouts from desirable species and natural oak seedlings will establish the new stand. This treatment would sustain long-term forest health, provide for the succession of early-seral habitat, and contribute to providing a sustainable forest. The objective of a shelterwood-with-reserves is to open up the stand allowing sunlight to reach the forest floor while leaving an adequate amount of trees to provide seed to help naturally regenerate the site. An average basal area of 20-40 ft^2 would be retained (average spacing between trees would depend on average tree diameter of stand) consisting primarily of red oak, white oak and hickory which, combined with existing advanced regeneration and estimated stump sprouts, would provide an adequate seed source to establish the new stands.

Currently, all 21 stands have adequate advanced regeneration of desirable species that will dominate the site after harvest. However, only four stands have adequate oak regeneration present, which is the desired future condition. After harvest, the stands with adequate desirable regeneration (14 stands) will have herbicide applied to undesirable stems by the "hack and squirt" method. The oak regeneration in the other four stands is currently short in height and not in a position to compete with undesirable regeneration. A pre-harvest TSI treatment would remove the undesirable mid- and understories and allow the oak species to grow in height and let them compete once the shelterwood harvest is done.

Connected Treatments for all Hardwood Shelterwood stands: If natural seeding combined with advanced regeneration fail to adequately establish a new stand, **planting** will be required. **Release** using handtools and/or herbicide would be used, if necessary, to reduce competing vegetation and release desirable hardwood species approximately 5-7 years after the new stand has been established.

Hardwood Thinning of approximately 322 acres would be accomplished. These stands would be the remaining acreage after the shelterwood units have been delineated within the Shelterwood-Thinning boundaries. The objective of hardwood thinning would be to reduce density, increase growth of residual trees, reduce the susceptibility of the stand to insect and diseases, improve habitat for wildlife by increasing vigor of residual hard mast producing trees, and create light conditions that promote advanced oak regeneration. Trees that are suppressed or that have poor form would be targeted for removal as well as mature trees that may be lost due to mortality. Trees of good form, more desirable species, and/or trees close to the correct spacing would be favored over trees that are simply of larger size. Removing approximately 40% of stand density would allow adequate light levels to promote advanced oak regeneration and put these stands in a condition that would ensure sustainability of these forest types. The target basal area would range from 60-80 ft^2 and spacing would depend on the average tree diameter of the stand.

Following thinning, these stands would receive TSI (Timber Stand Improvement) measures because they currently have dense mid- and understories of undesirable species. Thinning these stands would release the undesirable species to become more dominant in the stand. The TSI treatment would be done to encourage oaks and other desirable species to become abundant in the mid- and understories; it would help perpetuate oaks on this site and would allow a regeneration harvest to be considered next entry. Herbicide and Handtool treatments would be done after thinning to remove undesirables and allow desirable species to grow free of competition.

Hardwood Pre-commercial Thinning (PCT): is proposed for 7 hardwood areas, approximately 171 acres. These stands are densely stocked. They need to be thinned out by handtools (powersaw) so that the remaining trees can accelerate their growth and vigor. Actual work would entail cutting the inferior trees that are in direct competition with the target tree.

Hardwood Timber Stand Improvement (TSI): by herbicide/handtools on 5 hardwood stands (451 acres) is recommended to control competition that will allow oak, hickory, ash, maple, cherry and walnut reproduction to thrive. Many of these stands are between 72-85 years old. Actual work would entail cutting inferior trees that are competing with more desirable trees for moisture and sunlight, and then treating the stumps with herbicide to retard resprouting, or directly injecting the stems mechanically with herbicide. Afterwards, a prescribed burn may be employed to further reduce competition and encourage oak regeneration.

Pine Thinning would occur on 1,072 acres (36 stands). Thinning would increase growth of residual trees, reduce the susceptibility of the stand to insect and disease, and improve habitat for wildlife. The pine stands would be thinned to a target basal area of 60-70 ft^2/acre. Trees that are suppressed or that have poor form would be targeted for removal. Trees of good form and/or close to the correct spacing would be favored over trees that are simply of larger size. The target pine spacing would depend on the average DBH of the stand.

Pine Shelterwood Harvest: A basal area averaging 30 square feet per acre (25-30 trees per acre) is retained consisting primarily of large seed-producing pines and some hardwoods. This would occur in 18 stands, approximately 497 acres. Unmerchantable midstory trees may be felled manually or treated by herbicide following timber harvest to reduce competition. Two entries of prescribed fire would be utilized within the first five years of cutting to reduce competing species such as red maple, blackgum and elm. Site preparation using herbicide may be employed if prescribed fire doesn't achieve objectives of reducing competing hardwood species. Subsequent release practices by either handtool or herbicide may be necessary to benefit pine regeneration. Overstory trees retained in the shelterwood unit would not be removed in a second associated entry, but left in place to provide for wildlife habitat needs and vegetative diversity.

Pine Timber Stand Improvement with the use of herbicide/burning:
Burning Only**:** would occur on 309 acres, 6 stands. This burn would count toward the total number of acres proposed for prescription burning (8,553 ac.) These stands were harvested about fifteen years ago using uneven-aged management methods; however, natural pine regeneration has not been able to get established. Burning the understory of these stands with a low to moderate intensity fire will eliminate most of the hardwood brush and expose enough organic material, creating an ideal seedbed for the pine canopy above.

Release**:** two stands will be released by herbicide, about 216 acres; in addition, one will be burned (116 acres) and the other will not be burned (100 acres). Again, these stands were treated with the uneven-aged management system. The 116-acre stand has enough pine regeneration, so it can be burned with a low-intensity "backing" fire to control competition. The 100-acre stand has smaller regeneration present, so fire should be excluded here. Both stands can be treated with herbicide (by "hack 'n squirt" & foliar) to further reduce competition for sunlight and moisture.

Pine planting will occur on three stands, about 105 acres. These stands have inadequate regeneration. To reclaim these areas, pine planting is recommended. Site preparation measures of herbicide treatment and controlled burning should be done to facilitate a successful establishment of fully-stocked stands by hand-planting.

Cmpt	Stnd	LC	FT	Age Year	Ac	HP BA	HS BA	Total Hwd BA	PP BA	PS BA	Total Pine BA	Alt 2 Rx

Table 2. Alternative 2 - Forest Vegetation Management by Compartment

307	1	500	53	1980	61			0				PCT
	8	500	53	1920	40	10	50	60			0	Shelterwood
	9	500	53	1920	26	10	54	64			0	"
	12	500	53	1922	18	20	80	100			0	"
	18	500	53	1919	29	10	65	75			0	"
	19	500	53	1919	38	57	17	74			0	"
	20	500	53	1920	54	24	48	72			0	Shltwd-Thin
	21	500	53	1920	27	20	55	75			0	"
	22	500	53	1922	16	10	80	90			0	Shelterwood
329	3	500	53	1986	31			0			0	PCT
	4	500	53	1986	19			0			0	PCT
	5	500	32	1987	17			0	30	100	130	Shelterwood
	17	500	32	1977	11			0	40	50	90	Thinning
330	2	500	12	2003	100			0			0	TSI (release)
	3	540	32	1983	23			0	140	50	190	Thinning
	4	500	32	1929	19			0	10	60	70	Burn
	6	500	32	1944	12			0	40	60	100	Thinning
	8	500	32	1924	37			0	10	45	55	TSI
	10	500	12	1937	14	20	10	30	0	85	85	Shelterwood
	13	540	32	1983	9			0	85	65	150	Thinning
	15	500	12	1924	18	10	20	30	0	110	110	Shelterwood
	19	500	32	1931	17			0	20	110	130	"
	21	500	32	1956	24			0	70	57	127	Thinning
331	3	500	12	1929	84		20	20	0	60	60	Burn
	4	500	32	1929	45			0			0	Thinning
	5	500	32	1969	19			0	25	105	130	"
	6	500	31	1977	33			0	60	80	140	"
	8	500	32	1932	78			0	0	40	40	Burn
	11	500	31	1981	57			0	40	140	180	Thinning
	12	500	32	1929	74			0	0	60	60	Burn
	17	500	32	1924	39			0	5	105	110	Thinning
	19	500	32	1927	72			0	13	147	160	"
	20	500	32	1917	39			0	0	50	50	Shelterwood
	23	500	53	1924	197	33	40	73			0	Shelterwood-Thin
	24	500	12	1964	45	30	0	30	40	20	60	Thinning
	27	500	53	1923	17	40	40	80				WSI-Woodland
	33	500	32	1919	9			0	10	50	60	Shelterwood
	34	500	32	1949	7			0	80	70	150	Thinning
332	2	500	32	1932	32			0	5	102	107	"
	3	500	53	1904	102	35	60	95			0	Shltwd-Thin
	5	500	53	1904	82	5	97	102			0	"
	7	500	53	1924	102	10	50	60			0	TSI
	15	560	32	1964	12			0	50	90	140	Thinning
	16	500	53	1918	37	5	105	110			0	Shelterwood

Cmpt	Stnd	LC	FT	Age Year	Ac	HP BA	HS BA	Total Hdwd BA	PP BA	PS BA	Total Pine BA	Alt 2 Rx
335	3	500	32	1944	34			0	25	95	120	Thinning
	5	500	31	1964	23			0	40	100	140	"
	6	500	32	1921	49			0	13	95	108	Shelterwood
	7	500	31	1969	65			0	47	57	104	Thinning
	10	500	32	1937	67			0	10	80	90	"
	11	500	32	1994	46			0	30		30	Burn-Plant
	12	500	32	1937	24				0	100	100	Shelterwood
	13	500	12	1935	116		20	20		70	70	TSI (release)-Burn
	14	500	31	1974	66			0	37	80	117	Thinning
	16	500	32	1922	60			0	10	70	80	Shelterwood
	17	500	31	1974	38			0	80	100	180	Thinning
	18	500	32	1917	32			0	0	70	70	Burn
	19	500	32	1917	27			0	5	140	145	Shelterwood
	20	500	32	1922	35			0	0	97	97	"
	25	500	32	1989	40			0	40		40	Burn-Plant
	26	500	32	1909	34			0	0	110	110	Shelterwood
	27	500	32	1933	41			0	0	110	110	Thinning
	29	500	32	1944	27			0	20	135	155	Shelterwood
	30	500	32	1922	60			0	20	60	80	"
	31	500	32	1922	45			0	10	80	90	"
	33	500	12	1924	9	10	30	40	10	80	90	Thinning
	34	500	32	1924	18			0			0	"
336	1	500	53	1934	165	20	60	80			0	TSI
	2	500	53	1982	5			0			0	PCT
	3	500	53	1982	13			0			0	"
	4	500	53	1982	18							PCT
	6	500	53	1920	163	10	70	80			0	Shltwd-Thin
	8	500	53	1924	79	0	70	70			0	TSI
	9	530	53	1914	67	60	30	90			0	WSI-Woodland
	11	500	53	1914	73	20	70	90			0	Shltwd-Thin
	12	500	53	1924	45	10	70	80			0	"
	13	500	53	1934	46	10	60	70			0	Shelterwood
	15	530	53	1916	47	30	60	90			0	WSI-Woodland
	16	500	32	1947	13			0	10	120	130	Thinning
	17	500	31	1983	22			0	65	45	110	"
	19	500	32	1969	6			0	60	50	110	"
	28	500	53	1929	39	14	72	86			0	Shltwd-Thin
	32	500	32	1919	12			0	20	80	100	Shelterwood
675	1	500	12	1919	23	20	10	30	0	60	60	Thinning
	2	500	12	1919	23	10	30	40	0	30	30	"
	3	500	32	1988	19			0	20		20	Burn-Plant
	4	500	31	1974	25			0	70	130	200	Thinning
	5	500	32	1934	28			0	10	120	130	"
	6	500	31	1979	52			0	80	100	180	"
	7	500	32	1934	20			0	10	90	100	"
	12	500	53	1987	25			0			0	PCT
	14	500	53	1929	36	10	70	80			0	TSI

	15	500	53	1935	69	10	60	70			0	TSI
	19	500	53	1921	17	0	100	100				Shelterwood
	22	500	12	1931	21	20	10	30	20	30	50	Burn

Wildlife & Fishery Habitat Improvement

Wildlife Opening Reconstruction

Four existing wildlife openings would be expanded to 2 acres in size. Methods used to accomplish this would be dozing, blasting stumps, herbicide use, disking, and seeding.

Compartment/Stand	Size (ac.)	Other
309/1	2	Carroll Ridge Road (1417A) – adjacent to Catalpa project area
309/3	2	Carroll Ridge Road (1417A) – adjacent to Catalpa project area
328/5	2	Carroll Ridge Road (1417A) – adjacent to Catalpa project area
328/7	2	Carroll Ridge Road (1417A) – adjacent to Catalpa project area
	8 acres	

New Wildlife Opening Construction

Twenty-six new wildlife openings would be constructed. Twenty-two of these wildlife openings would be approximately 2 acres. Size may be less than 2 acres if terrain, slope, etc. doesn't allow for this size. Methods used to accomplish construction of these wildlife openings would include dozing, blasting stumps, herbicide use, disking and seeding. Four wildlife openings would be constructed through girdling and hand-falling of trees which would be followed by cut-surface herbicide application and foliar spraying.

Compartment/Stand	Size (ac.)	Other
330/11	2	
331/2	2	
331/3	2	With linear opening on 94331F and gate 331/4
331/5	2	With gate on unnumbered road @ junction w. 94331A
331/11	2	With gate on new access road to opening
331/26	2	With gate on unnumbered road @ junction w. 94331A
329/1	2	
329/14	2	
332/2	2	With gate on new access road to opening
335/3A	2	With gate on 94675C
335/3B	2	With gate on 94675C
335/10	2	With gate on new access road to opening
335/14A	2	With linear opening on road 94335F and gate
335/14B	2	With linear opening on unnumbered road and gate
335/16	2	With linear opening on 94335E and gate
335/17	2	With linear opening on 94335D and gate
336/14	2	
336/15	2	
676/5	2	With gate on 94675G and gate on 94675D
675/7	2	With gate on 94675B
675/10A	2	With new access road from termination of 94675F to opening
675/10B	2	With new access road from termination of 94675F to opening
	44 acres	

Access Roads to New Wildlife Openings

Some new wildlife openings will require short sections of access road to be constructed.
331/11 – approximately 400 feet
331/26 – approximately 400 feet
332/2 – approximately 500 feet
335/10 – approximately 500 feet
675/10A and 675/10B – approximately 700 total feet to access both openings

Linear Wildlife Openings

Five linear wildlife openings would be constructed surrounding existing roads. Methods used to accomplish this would include dozing, blasting stumps, herbicide use, disking and seeding.

Compartment/Stand	Approx. length (ft.)	Approx. size (ac.)	Other
331/3 & 4	2100	4	Inside/Outside of harvest unit – 94331F
335/14	1320	2.5	Inside of harvest unit – 94335F
335/14	1320	2.5	Inside of harvest unit – unnumbered road
335/16	1320	2.5	Inside of harvest unit – 94335E
335/17	2000	4	Inside of harvest unit – 94335D
		15.5 acres	

Chainsaw/Herbicide Wildlife Openings

Four of these openings would be constructed. Girdling and hand falling of trees would be followed by cut surface herbicide application and foliar spraying would be utilized to construct these openings. Where these occur within commercial harvest units, timber should be marked to a BA of 40.

Compartment/Stand	Size (ac.)	Other
331/10A	3	Outside of commercial harvest unit
331/10B	3	Outside of commercial harvest unit
331/19	3	Inside of commercial harvest unit
336/18	3	Outside of commercial harvest unit
	12 acres	

Wildlife Pond Construction

One new wildlife pond would be constructed. This pond is located in compartment 675, stand 19 and would be approximately ¼ acre in size. The pond would be dozed out and sealed with bentonite.

Wildlife Pond Reconstruction

One wildlife pond would be reconstructed. This pond is located in compartment 335, stand 29 and would be ¼ acre in size. The pond would be dozed out and sealed with bentonite.

Wildlife Prescribed Burning

Fifty-seven stands, totaling approximately 2679 acres, would be treated with prescribed fire for wildlife. First entry with prescribed fire would occur following completion of timber harvest. A second entry with fire is planned for 3-10 years following the 1st entry. Stands to be burned would include all thinned pine stands, all woodland restoration stands (low quality

hardwood), all oak woodland harvest stands (better quality hardwood), and stands adjacent to commercial thinning units which may fall within sale area boundaries.

Compartment/Stand	FTCC	Size (acres)
307/4	5311	(61)
307/6	5311	30
307/11	5311	18
329/11	5311	Portion of stand only (15)
329/17	3212	11
330/3	3211	11
330/7	3212	41
330/7	5311	41
330/11	5307	15
330/21	3212	5
331/2	4712	71
331/4	3212	49
331/5	3212	13
331/6	3112	32
331/9	3211	33
331/10	5307	84
331/11	3112	40
331/17	3212	48
331/19	3212	76
331/21	4711	89
331/24	1212	44
331/26	4712	49
331/31	1212	16
331/34	3212	7
331/27	5312	23
332/2	3212	33
332/7	5312	102
332/15	3212	12
335/1	5311	Portion of stand only (226)
335/3	3212	19
335/4	4711	74
335/5	3112	17
335/7	3112	63
335/8	4712	70
335/9	5311	26
335/10	3212	69
335/14	3112	59
335/17	3112	36
335/22	5311	19
335/27	3212	39
335/33	1212	9
335/34	1212	18
336/1	5312	169
336/8	5312	51
336/9	5311	72
336/15	5312	29
336/16	3212	28

336/17	3111	21
336/19	3211	6
675/4	3112	25
675/5	3212	24
675/6	3112	51
675/7	3212	22
675/9	4711	15
675/10	5311	63
675/15	5310	73
675/14	5312	217
		Total Acres – 2679

Woodland Restoration Thinning –WSI (low quality hardwood)

Ten stands (307 acres) would be thinned for woodland restoration. These stands would be thinned to an average basal area of 40. Force account/contract methods used would include hand-felling, use of a bobcat mounted tree shear, cut-surface herbicide application, and foliar herbicide application. These stands may be commercially harvested as well.

Compartment/Stand	Size (ac.)	Other
307/4	25	5311
307/11	18	5311
330/11	23	5307 – only portion of stand treated
330/12	41	5311 – only portion of stand treated
332/4	13	5306
335/9	22	5311
335/22	34	5311 – only portion of stand treated
336/9	67	5411
336/15	47	5312
331/27	17	5312
Total acres- 307		

Gate Construction

Wildlife habitat improvement through access management is proposed through use of approximately 14 gates. These gates would be installed primarily on access roads leading to newly constructed wildlife openings. This type of management would help reduce disturbance to wildlife, provide increased opportunity for quality hunting, reduce erosion/sedimentation and improve water quality in the watershed.

Compartment/Stand	Road Number	Purpose
331/4	94331F	Linear wildlife opening and 2 wildlife openings
331/5	unnumbered	Road @ junction with 94331A – 2 wildlife openings
331/11	new	Access road to new wildlife opening
332/2	new	Access road to new wildlife opening
335/3	94675C	2 wildlife openings
335/10	new	Access road to new wildlife opening
335/14	94335F	Linear wildlife opening and 1 wildlife opening
335/14	unnumbered	Linear wildlife opening and 1 wildlife opening
335/16	94335E	Linear wildlife opening and 1 wildlife opening
335/17	94335D	Linear wildlife opening and 1 wildlife opening
336/18	94336E	1 wildlife opening

675/7	94675B (2) gates	
675/6	94675G	1 wildlife opening
675/5	94675D	1 wildlife opening
	14 gates	

Fish Habitat Improvements

Large Woody Debris Introduction
Introduction of Large Woody Debris (LWD) to streams is proposed to improve fish habitat along certain stretches of Panther Creek, Dry Hollow, and Morgan Hollow totaling approximately 13 miles. In addition to improving fish habitat in these streams, the introduction of LWD would also provide fish cover and would assist in the formation of creek pools. This work would be accomplished by chainsaw falling large diameter trees into the streams.

Existing Fish Pond Maintenance
Two existing recreational fish ponds would be improved.
Compartment 675, stand 10 – Black Road Pond
Improvements include fixing access road with dozer, fertilizing pond, placement of spawning/cover structures, and stocking sport and forage fish.
Compartment 336, stand 15 – Schoolhouse Pond
Improvements include fixing access road with dozer, increasing pond depth and size, fertilizing pond, placement of spawning/cover structures, and stocking sport and forage fish.

New Fish Pond Construction
One new recreational fish pond would be constructed; approximately 2 acres in size in Compartment 336 stand 18.

Wildlife Pond Reconstruction
One wildlife pond will be reconstructed. This pond is located in 335/29 and will be ¼ acre in size. The pond will be dozed out and sealed with bentonite.

Prescribed Fire

This type of treatment would occur on approximately 8,553 acres of federal lands within the Catalpa project area. Prescribed fire treatments may occur on private lands located within the Catalpa project area (approx. 1,900 ac.), but only after consultation with landowners and a prescribed fire agreement under the Wyden Amendment (Section 334(a) of Public Law 105-83) and/or Stevens agreements in cooperation with the Arkansas State Forestry Commission. Should agreements with private landowners be signed, private lands would be burned under prescription in conjunction with prescribed burns on public lands. Prescribed fire would be utilized for several purposes in the project area. Prescribed fire would serve to re-introduce fire into a fire-adapted ecosystem, promote oak regeneration in canopy openings created by red oak borer damage/oak decline, promote regeneration in shelterwood and seedtree harvest areas, maintain pine/hardwood stands in open conditions, increase herbaceous understory species density and diversity, maintain/restore glades, improve habitat conditions for fire-dependent

special-status plants, increase soft-mast production and reduce potentially hazardous accumulations of fuels on the forest floor, and improve wildlife habitat conditions. The entire project area would be burned on an approximate 3-10 year fire return interval, based upon best available science regarding beneficial fire-return intervals for the project area.

Roadwork

Decommissioning: The transportation system in this project has been assessed to determine the need for closing roads no longer needed for land management. Roads to be decommissioned and closed with gates are displayed on the GIS maps associated with this project proposal. The Roads Analysis Report prepared for this project describes all road decommissioning, closures and reconstruction-maintenance. This document is on file at the Pleasant Hill Ranger District – Clarksville, Arkansas.

Road Decommissioning is defined by 36 CFR 212.1 as activities that result in the stabilization and restoration of unneeded roads to a more natural state. Several of these roads currently traverse natural fluvial systems and concentrations of water may result in possible resource damage. Priorities for decommissioning these roads include access, drainage, stability, erosion, and re-vegetation. These roads will be removed from the transportation system.

Reconstruction, Maintenance, etc.: To access the project area and implement vegetation management, roadwork would be necessary and consist of (approximately) maintaining 45.96 miles of existing Forest Service roads. These roads would be built or maintained to a Level D standard (the lowest Forest Service standard). Level D standard roads can be intermittent-use roads that are closed upon completion of logging and other activities. In general, Level D roads are constructed only for use by high-clearance vehicles like logging trucks or pick-ups and may not be usable during wet weather. Roads designated as temporary roads would be blocked following completion of use, and rehabilitated with seeding and/or natural re-vegetation. Closed temporary roads would be managed as linear herbaceous strips for wildlife in appropriate locations. The number of temporary roads would total approximately 5.6 miles. Temporary roads are not intended to be included as part of the forest road atlas, as they are managed for projects or activities and decommissioned after use. Roads to be maintained are displayed on the GIS maps associated with this project proposal. The Roads Analysis Process (RAP) report prepared for this project describes all road decommissioning, closures and traffic levels. Closures are evaluated as to what type will be used; whether they will be closed with gates, earthen mounds, or other means. Illegal, “renegade” OHV trails would be closed with earthen mounds or gates.

When administrative activities are complete and a forest system road is no longer needed for one or more years, they are closed for resource protection and to improve watershed integrity. Gating has proven to be a more effective method of eliminating illegal motorized vehicle use. Closure denotes storage for future use; the road remains on the forest development transportation system and periodic maintenance may be required.

The newly constructed roads or sections of roads would be open to administrative use only and closed with gates/berns after they are no longer needed.

Table 3. Alternative 2 - Summary of Roadwork – Catalpa

Table 3- Catalpa Project Roads Management

Road No.	Total Road Miles	Open Miles	Closed Road Miles	Existing Rd.-No Treatment	Closure Type	Closure Reason	Decom. Miles	Decom. Reason	Const. Miles	Recon. Miles	Maint. Level	Maint. Req./Miles	Remarks / Mgmt Priority
JO 5440/1003-2	**5.4**	**5.4**									**3**	**5.4**	**From Catalpa east to end of project is maintenance**
1003U	**1.7**	**0.83**	**0.87**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**2**	**1.5**	**Maintenance to "F" road from Hwy 215**
1404	**4.6**	**4.6**									**3**	**4.6**	**Arbaugh Rd; Maint. from Oark to Jct JO 6295**
1416A	**1.2**	**1.2**		**1.2**							**2**		**R.O.W. is obtained from Keith Stepp.**
1417	**5.7**	**5.7**									**2**	**5.7**	**Maint. from Jct 1003-2 to Jct w/1418 @ County line**
1417A	**3.2**	**0**	**3.2**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**2**	**0.9**	**Carroll Ridge Rd.; maint. to stand #17 of C329.**
1417B	**2.0**	**2.0**		**2.0**							**2**		**No Maintenance: not on Coop Agreement-JO5391**
1418	**12.5**	**12.5**									**2**	**6.5**	**Moonhull-Catalpa Rd; maint.**
1419	**1.5**	**1.5**									**2**	**1.5**	**Black Rd; maintenance**
1495	**1.8**	**1.8**		**1.8**							**2**		**No Maintenance: not on Coop Agreement.**
94307A	**1.3**	**1.3**					**1.3**	**Res.Prot.**			**2**		**Decommission-No access across private land**
94307B	**0.28**	**0.28**									**2**	**0.28**	**Maintenance**
94307C			**0.6**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.6**	**Maintenance**
94307D	**0.2**	**0.2**		**0.2**									**No Treatment**
94307E			**0.3**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.3**	**Maintenance**
94330A	**0.2**		**0.2**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.2**	**Maintenance**
94330B	**0.2**		**0.2**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.2**	**Maintenance**
94330C	**1.2**	**1.2**									**2**	**1.2**	**Maintenance and 0.3 or less Temp Road Construction**
94330D	**0.2**	**0.2**									**2**	**0.2**	**Maintenance**
94331A	**3.5**	**3.5**									**2**	**3.5**	**Maintenance all the way to stand 8**
94331B			**0.3**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.3**	**Maintenance**
94331C	**0.2**		**0.2**	**0.2**	**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**		**Existing road**
94331D	**0.5**		**0.5**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**			**0.35**		**1**	**0.15**	**New construction into stand 16, comp 332**
94331E	**1.8**		**1.8**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.8**	**Maintenance**
94331F	**0.9**		**0.9**		**Gate**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.9**	**Maint; after sale will be gated, become linear wl open**
94331G	**0.2**		**0.2**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.2**	**Maintenance**
94332A	**0.4**		**0.4**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.4**	**Maintenance**
94332B	**0.3**	**0.3**		**0.3**							**2**		**Existing road**
94335A	**0.8**		**0.8**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.8**	**Maintenance**
94335B	**0.4**		**0.4**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.4**	**Maintenance**
94335C	**0.8**		**0.8**	**0.8**	**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.8**	**Existing road**

94335D	**1.2**		**1.2**		**Gate**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**1.2**	**Maint; gate install@Jct-1003U; 1/2-mile linearopen.**

Table 1- Catalpa Project Roads Management (cont'd)

Road No.	Total Road Miles	Open Miles	Closed Road Miles	Existing Rd.-No Treatment	Closure Type	Closure Reason	Decom. Miles	Decom. Reason	Const. Miles	Recon. Miles	Maint. Level	Maint. Req./Miles	Remarks / Mgmt Priority
94335E	**0.3**		**0.3**	**0.3**	**Gate**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**		**Existing; linear WL opening**
94335F	**0.3**		**0.3**	**0.3**	**Gate**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**		**Existing; linear WL opening**
94335G	**1.1**		**1.1**	**0.4**							**1**	**0.6**	**Maintenance & Temporary roading**
94335H	**0.4**		**0.4**	**0.4**	**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.4**	**Existing**
94335i	**0.2**		**0.2**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.2**	**Maintenance**
94335J	**0.4**		**0.4**	**0.4**							**1**		**Existing**
94335K	**0.6**		**0.6**	**0.6**	**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**		**Existing**
94335L	**0.2**	**0.2**		**0.2**							**2**		**Existing**
94335M	**0.4**		**0.4**								**1**	**0.4**	**Maintenance**
94336A	**1.3**	**1.3**		**1.3**			**0.3**	**Res.Prot.**			**2**		**1416A for access; 94336A=decommission 0.3 mi.**
94336B	**0.4**	**0.4**		**0.4**							**2**		**Existing**
94336C	**0.1**	**0.1**									**2**	**0.1**	**Existing Gate at the old field**
94336D	**0.1**	**0.1**		**0.1**							**2**		**Existing**
94336E	**1.6**		**1.6**	**0.4**	**Gate**	**Res.Prot.**	**0.3**	**Res.Prot.**			**1**	**0.83**	**Maint/Decom; gate @Jct 1419**
94336F	**1.25**		**1.25**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**	**0.4**	**Res.Prot.**			**1**	**0.8**	**Maintenance**
94336G	**0.8**		**0.8**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.8**	**Maintenance**
94675A	**1.6**		**1.6**		**Berm**	**Res.Prot.**	**0.3**	**Res. Prot.**			**1**	**1.6**	**Maintenance to stand 19, Compartment 675**
94675B	**0.6**		**0.6**		**Gate**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.6**	**Maintenance**
94675C	**0.4**		**0.4**		**Gate**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.4**	**Maintenance; close w/gate @Jct of 94675D**
94675D	**0.7**		**0.7**		**Gate**	**Res.Prot.**					**1**	**0.7**	**Maintenance; gate @Jct of "A" rd.**
94675E	**0.3**		**0.3**								**3**		**Existing**
94675F	**0.13**	**0.13**		**0.13**							**2**		**Road to pond**
94675G	**1.1**		**1.1**	**1.1**	**Gate**						**1**		**No work Proposed**
SR215	**3.0**	**3.0**		**3.0**							**4**		**State maintained (paved)**
unnumbered					**Gate**								**For Wildlife Opening**
unnumbered					**Gate**								**For Wildlife Opening**
Proposed New					**Gate**								**For Wildlife Opening**
Proposed New					**Gate**								**For Wildlife Opening**
Proposed New					**Gate**								**For Wildlife Opening**
			24.92		**14**		**2.6**		**0.35**			**45.96**	

Minerals Management

All of the Federal Lands in T 12N; R 23W and T 12N; R 24W located within the project area are currently leased through the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). There are no leases currently held in T 13N; R 23W and T 13N; R 24W within the project area. The federal lands in this area have not been proven to be highly productive for minerals to date; however, with geologic formations identified such as the Fayetteville Shale, it is projected that the project area will receive some aspect of exploration during the next ten years. This is based upon recent seismic testing in the vicinity of the project area along with the increased number of gas wells being drilled on adjacent districts and on private parcels within the boundaries of the Ozark National Forest. A Surface Use Plan of Operations was recently approved for one gas well within the project area. An additional four gas wells have been proposed within the project area, however, these well locations have not been approved.

ALTERNATIVE 3

No Herbicide

This alternative differs from Alternative 2 (the proposed action) by excluding the use of herbicides. This alternative was developed in response to public comments which relate to the use of herbicides, and its perceived effects upon the environment. Herbicides would not be used, but would be replaced by mechanical and/or hand-tool methods. Generally, hand-tools are not as effective for vegetation manipulation as herbicides; therefore, more applications would be required in this alternative. With implementation of Alternative 3, all other potential management actions would be the same as those described for Alternative 2.

Mitigation Measures

In order to protect the environment and lessen possible negative impacts, the following mitigating measures will be applied to the proposed alternatives. Management Requirements of the Revised Ozark-St. Francis National Forests Land and Resources Management Plan will apply as standard mitigating measures to all proposed activities. Best Management Practices (BMP) Guidelines for Silviculture Activities in Arkansas will also apply as standard mitigation measures for all proposed actions.

The following is a summary of the specific mitigating measures:

1. GENERAL

a. A biological evaluation has been conducted on all areas proposed for management activities. The list of the species surveyed for is in the project file. Any PETS that are found will be protected (FSM 2670.31).

b. Soil productivity will be protected by discing, seeding, and fertilizing haul roads, firelines, and temporary roads.

c. Water quality will be protected by retaining filter strips of vegetation along all perennial streams/springs and defined stream channels. This zone will be 100-150 feet on either side of the perennial streams and 50-100 feet on either side of defined channels; at least 50 square feet of basal area will be retained within each zone. No vegetation will be removed within 20 feet of the bank of a perennial stream and 5 feet of a defined channel (LRMP pp. 3-12).

The Arkansas Forestry Commission Best Management Practices (BMP's) guidelines will be followed.

d. Wildlife den trees will be retained as well as six standing dead snags per acre when available.

2. HERBICIDES

For the herbicides commonly used by the Forest Service in its management activities, Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessments (RA) are prepared. In these documents, the process of risk analysis is used to quantitatively evaluate the probability that a given pesticide use might impose harm on humans or other species in the environment. The Forest Service then incorporates the relevant information from the RA into the appropriate environmental assessment document prepared for herbicide projects that are used to disclose potential environmental effects to the public.

The following general mitigating measures for herbicide use apply to Alternative 2. They are taken from current risk assessments as prepared for the U.S. Forest Service by Syracuse Environmental Research Associates, Inc. (SERA) for all proposed herbicides to be used in implementation of this project (USDA, 1999 and 2003). See section 10 of this EA (Human Health Factors) for more information.

a. Each Contracting Officer's Representative (COR), who must ensure compliance on contracted herbicide projects, is a certified pesticide applicator. Contract inspectors are trained in herbicide use, handling, and application. Herbicides are used in compliance with all Federal, State and local laws and regulations.

b. Notice signs will be clearly posted on herbicide-treated areas.

c. Herbicides will not be applied within 100 feet of private land or a domestic water source, or within 300 feet of a private residence.

d. Herbicides will not be applied within 30 feet of any spring or stream, or within 50 feet of any perennial stream.

e. Herbicides will not be applied within 60 feet of any threatened, endangered, proposed, or sensitive plant. However, after site-specific analysis, the district biologist can prescribe mitigation measures which allow treatment within this zone. Buffers are clearly marked before treatment, so that applicators can easily see and avoid them.

f. Application equipment, empty herbicide containers, clothes worn during treatment, and skin will not be cleaned in open water or wells.

g. Herbicide mixing, loading, or cleaning areas in the field will not be located within 300 feet of a private residence, open water or wells, or other sensitive areas.

h. Accident preplanning will be done, and emergency spill plans (FSM 2109.12, chapter 30) will be prepared.

Additional mitigation measures for Integrated Pest Management adhered to by the US Forest Service are listed in the LRMP pages 3-4, and 3-5.

3. HERITAGE RESOURCES

Heritage resources consideration has been given to all acres where site-disturbing activities are proposed. Findings are discussed in the Heritage Resources Section of this EA. Any other sites found during implementation of this project will be examined and necessary mitigation measures prescribed by the Forest Archaeologist (FLMP, pp. 4-6).

4. PRESCRIBED BURNING

The following is a summary of mitigation measures found in the FEIS, pages 3-397 to 3-408:

a. All prescribed burns require the completion and approval of a prescribed burning plan for each specific project. This plan includes smoke management to comply with air quality regulations and protect visibility in smoke sensitive areas.

b. First entry landscape scale fuel reduction will be implemented by using low- to moderate-intensity burns during the dormant season, generally with flame lengths of two feet or less (Alt. 2&3).

c. Water diversions will be installed and firelines revegetated promptly to prevent erosion.

d. Coordination with neighboring Districts and Fire Dispatch regarding planned ignitions, and analysis of transport winds and mixing heights will be utilized to avoid smoke impacts to major metropolitan areas and other “communities at risk” downwind.

5. MONITORING

All activities will be monitored to ensure mitigation measures are applied.

a. Survival checks will be done to determine the effectiveness of reforestation activities and ensure that the stands have been re-established.

b. Herbicide off-site movement will be monitored on the district. Samples on a percentage of the areas will be taken before, during, and after herbicide applications. They will be analyzed by a certified testing laboratory.

c. Applicable LRMP monitoring and evaluation requirements will be implemented as directed within budgetary limitations. These requirements include measures to

monitor current and past activities in terms of implementation, effectiveness, and validation monitoring levels.

Table 4. Comparison of Alternatives' Effects.

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Soil Resources	Natural erosion continues; unmaintained roads erode	Total expected temporary reduction of soil productivity would be 254 acres (8% of the harvested area)	Total expected temporary reduction of soil productivity would be 254 acres (8% of the harvested area)
Water Resources	No change from current conditions; disrepaired roads contribute to stream sediment	175% increase in sediment by 6th level watershed; concern level = low	175% increase in sediment by 6th level watershed; concern level = low
Air Resources	No change from current conditions	Short term direct effects include: 39,507 tons of CO_2; 1,581 tons of particulate matter	Short term direct effects include: 39,507 tons of CO_2; 1,581 tons of particulate matter
Road Access	Approx. 69 miles of roads; 38 miles of open roads.	45.96 miles of maintenance, 2.6 miles of road decommission; about 25 mi. road closure.	45.96 miles of maintenance, 2.6 miles of road decommission; about 25 mi. road closure.
Heritage Resources	28 recorded sites will continue to deteriorate; no additional surveys would be conducted;no sites would be addressed for their National Register of Historic Places Eligibility	New sites may be discovered, and existing sites would be preserved intact	New sites may be discovered, and existing sites would be preserved intact
Vegetation Resources	As forest ages, they will become more vulnerable to outside elements; decrease in early-seral veg. = decrease in biodiversity	Thinning=1394 acres; even- aged management=1282 acres, indirect/cumulative effects = increase in biodiversity, more benefits to oak regen. from RX fire	Replacing herbicides with handtools would slow regeneration of desirable species. Undesirable species could out compete desirable species without the use of herbicides.
Wildlife Resources	Short term early successionalhabitat in regenerated stands would not occur. Negative indirect impacts to wildlife species. No benefits from Rx Buring	Thinning and wildlife opening creation would yield positive indirect impacts to wildlife, Increased abundance of soft mast species; increased wildlife benefits from increased RX fire and regeneration harvests; re-establishment of native grasses using herbicides	Less herbaceous vegetation abundance and diversity for wildlife due to stump sprouts as a result of no herbicide applications. Reduction of oak/pine regeneration with lack of herbicide use.
PETS	No negative adverse effects would occur to Region 8 sensitive species	Benefit to species which require open and/or fire dependent habitats Implementation of this proposed project may benefit Ozark big-eared bat, gray bat and Indiana bat by providing habitat improvement.	TES bat species would not benefit as much due to decreased vegetation effects/responses as well as prey decreases with no herbicide use.
Wetlands & Riparian Areas	No change from current conditions	No change from current conditions; No timber harvests proposed in riparian areas; BMP's will be followed.	No change from current conditions; No timber harvests proposed in riparian areas; BMP's will be followed.
Human Health	Potential effects of injury and damage to personal property in oak decline areas remain; mainly on travelways and camping/hunting sites	Risks of injury and damage to personal property in oak decline areas reduced; higher potential for worker injury due to timber harvest, TSI, WSI, and burning	Reduce hazard from over mature and dying trees, higher potential for worker injury due to timber harvest, TSI, WSI and Rx Burn, No herbicides would be applied.

Social & Economic Factors	There would be no economic benefits to the local communities resulting from jobs created by timber sales or money to be used for wildlife habitat needs (KV money).	Activities proposed would affect the local economy by supplying timber for local mills, employing loggers to harvest timber, employing people to do site preparation, release, and wildlife habitat improvement work.	Activities proposed would affect the local economy by supplying timber for local mills, employing loggers to harvest timber, employing people to do site preparation, release, and wildlife habitat improvement work.
Recreation	This alternative will not change the recreation use (OHV driving, camping, hiking, mountain bicycling, or fishing) in the project vicinity.	This alternative will not change recreation use (camping, hiking, mountain bicycling, or fishing) in the project vicinity. Some browning of vegetation from herbicide use and burning could occur	Drivers and forest users along county and forest roads may have more occasions to notice browning of vegetation from repeated mechanical or hand work to replace herbicide activities

Part 3 – Environmental Consequences

This section summarizes the physical, biological, social, and economic environments of the affected project area and the potential changes to those environments due to implementation of the alternatives. It also presents the scientific and analytical basis for comparison of alternatives presented in the chart above.

1. Water Resources

Significant Issues Related to the Resource

Issue #1

The cumulative effects of past activities on private lands, together with past and proposed activities on public land, and their impacts on soil erosion, water quality and wildlife habitat.

Existing Condition

Watersheds in the United States are divided into progressively smaller units known as hydrologic units, recognized by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) - as regions, sub-regions, basin, and sub-basin units. This hierarchical division of watershed boundaries is useful for assigning address-like codes to drainage basins. This project area falls within the Arkansas-White-Red region (11), the Lower Arkansas sub-region (1111), the Lower Arkansas-Fourche La Fave basin (111102), and the Frog-Mulberry sub-basin unit (11110201) (USGS-NHD and EPA, 2000; FGDC, 2002). The Ozark-St. Francis National Forest further classifies land areas into progressively smaller units: watersheds and sub-watersheds. The proposed project falls into one watershed unit, the Upper Mulberry River (1111020106) watershed. At the smallest scale, the proposed project is located in three sub-watersheds of this watershed; recognized by the codes 111102010603 (Panther Creek 27,143 acres), 111102010604 (Upper Mulberry River 18,577 acres), and 111102010605 (Mulberry River 29,424).. These sub-watersheds, or 6th level Hydrologic unit codes (referred to as watersheds) will serve as the analysis boundary for the proposed project with respect to water resources. The proposed project area as discussed in this section of the document will consist of the compartment boundaries where activities are proposed.

The project area and the sub-watershed analysis area support streams and rivers that have a dendritic drainage pattern. Dendritic drainage patterns typically have branching tributaries, which can concentrate precipitation across a wide area into one main stream channel. The primary streams that are found in the project area are: Estep Creek, Panther Creek, Morgan Hollow, and Dry Hollow. These streams drain the watersheds and generally flow toward the southwest. These sub-watersheds are tributaries of the Mulberry River which subsequently feeds the Arkansas River. No significant dams or significant-sized bodies of surface water are found within the analysis watershed (USGS, 1999; NHD, 2000). A segment of the Mulberry River in sub-watershed 111102010605 has been designated as not meeting water quality standards for pH by the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality. They do not know the cause for the occasional low pH readings, but they are still studying the cause. There are approximately seven acres total surface areas of small ponds across the analysis area watersheds. Common to this area of the Ozarks, chicken houses are often found concentrated on private lands; in this watershed there are relatively few of these features. A total of nine chicken houses are on the border or within the watershed analysis watersheds.

An absence of chicken houses does not preclude inappropriate application of animal waste within the watershed by private landowners.



The project area geology consists of Pennsylvanian-age clastic sedimentary rocks of the Atoka formation (McFarland, 2004). This formation is predominantly composed of alternating sandstone and shale layers. Furthermore, the formations structure and bulk characteristics do not support particularly good aquifers; in fact, the shale layers act as aquicludes preventing deep-seated infiltration. Therefore, the base flow contributions necessary to maintain perennial streams are highly variable and associated with seasonal climatic precipitation variation and shallow soil properties. This is documented by the Arkansas Geological Commission's (1975) low-flow determination of the Mulberry River which indicates base flows (exceeded 90% of time) of 2.7 CFS and 7-day low flows of 1.4

CFS for a 2-year recurrence interval.



Climate information obtained for the project area was derived from information for the town of Ozone, AR (NRCS-Climate Product). The bars on the above graph indicate average precipitation over a thirty year data period or climatic norm. Mid-winter and late summer are found to be the driest portions of the year; this suggests that stream flow will most likely be the lowest during the late summer.

Research conducted by Rogerson and Lawson (1982) on the hydrological characteristics of mixed hardwood watersheds in the Boston Mountains, reveals some important traits for runoff and stream flows within small ephemeral streams of this area. Runoff should be expected to occur every month except for the driest summer months, and the precipitation required to initiate channel flow is between 12-40 mm (.47-1.5 in). Very large discharges, termed by the authors as those above .1m^3/s, occurred 1.25 times per year and were initiated by precipitation in excess of 75 mm (2.9 in.) on very saturated soils. Soil moisture maintained consistent levels during the vegetation dormant season and correlated with the majority of the runoff periods during this study. During the vegetation growing season, soil moisture levels were found to dramatically drop on account of evapotranspiration, and large summer storms were required to initiate stream flows as a large capacity of soil moisture storage was available for infiltration. Small stream channels known as ephemeral streams and headwater streams commonly carry storm-flows especially during the spring when there is little evapotranspiration and often drenching precipitation. Additional studies by Lawson, et al. (1985) reported that for storm-flow values the average turbidity from these ephemeral streams over a five year period averaged from 19 – 40 NTU in the absence of any vegetation treatment. The authors concluded that as a result of their sampling methodology the results were heavily biased by large turbidity values resulting from a few number of storm flow events. These results are interpreted to indicate that storm flows are initiated by above average rainfall events and on occasion significant precipitation events can drive naturally occurring turbidity values in excess of 19 NTU from ephemeral streams in small undisturbed watersheds.

Within the watershed analysis areas approximately 76% (or 10,113 acres) of the Panther Creek, 70% (or 13,168 acres) of the Upper Mulberry River, and 79% (or 23,375 acres) of the Washita-Estep Creek – Mulberry River is administered by the Forest Service. This leaves a

sizable area of the land within the watersheds as privately owned, roughly 24% or 3,200 acres(111102010603), 29% or 5,398 acres (111102010604), and 21% or 6,031 acres (111102010605). Land uses within the watersheds is predominantly forest, with 97% of Panther Creek, 96% of the Upper Mulberry, and 94% of the Washita-Estep-Mulberry watershed are forested. The balance of the watershed land uses are mainly agricultural type land uses.

Forested land uses indicate a stable landscape that results in minimal amounts of natural or background erosion, especially for Arkansas (Miller and Liechty, 2001). For many parts of the Ozark-St. Francis NF, the prevalent soil cover contains many rocks and rock fragments which ultimately limit the erosive susceptibility of the soils. Measured erosion for minimally-disturbed forest lands rarely exceed 0.25 tons per acre where soil erosion from cropland has been estimated at 3.8 tons per acre (Patric, et al., 1984; USDA SCS, 1989). Using soil information compiled for use across the Forest, ~70% of the project area soils have been given a slight to moderate rating for woodland erosion and woodland management equipment use; the remainder is classified as a severe risk (Various County Soil Surveys). Woodland erosion risk ratings indicate the probability of damage and erosion of soils as a result of timber harvest and site preparation where soils become exposed. Woodland equipment ratings indicate that year round equipment use on these soils is appropriate.

Within the analysis area, roads are found both within the forest boundaries and outside the forest boundaries. There are approximately 66 miles of roads within the Panther Creek, 90 miles within the Upper Mulberry, and 150 miles within the Washita-Estep Creek – Mulberry watershed. This translates into a road density of 3.2 miles per square mile in Panther Creek, 3.1 in the Upper Mulberry, and 3.3 in the Washita-Estep Creek – Mulberry watershed and includes all roads as determined from forest wide information and 2004 census tiger data. On the forest there are 43 miles of roads in Panther Creek, 57 miles in the Upper Mulberry, and 113 miles in the Washita-Estep Creek-Mulberry watershed that are Forest Service jurisdiction. Within the project area there are approximately two perennial stream crossings where the current road system crosses or intersects a stream.

There are wetland inclusions and floodplains within the project area. This identification was made by comparing the project area to numerous data sources of wetland location information including: National Wetland Inventory database, FEMA flood maps, STATSGO soil use database, the USGS wetlands, swamps, and marsh DLG coverage, detailed forest level soil survey information, and field observation. Floodplains were identified on the forest in the vicinity of the project area by comparing the project area with information from the STATSGO soil database and the detailed forest level soil survey. The larger floodplains were found to occur where Ceda cobbly loam soils are present along the banks of Panther Creek and narrow floodplains occur along the smaller tributaries. The wetlands are associated with small areas of hydric soil inclusions found in depressions in Ceda cobbly loam soil map units on the floodplain.

The proposed project is located in the Boston Mountain ecoregion as identified by the EPA (2003) as a revision of work produced by Omernick (1987). These are the same ecoregion divisions recognized by the state for use in defining water quality standards. Thus, water quality standards for the project area, and the sub-watershed analysis areas for this project, are determined by the Arkansas Pollution Control and Ecology Commission Regulation 2 –

Water Quality Standards for Surface Water (2004). The designated uses assigned to the surface waters in the project area are as follows: for all waters, secondary contact recreation, domestic, industrial and agricultural water supply, seasonal Boston Mountain stream fishery. For surface water where the watershed is greater than 10 mi^2, and all lakes and reservoirs, the designated uses are the same as above but include primary contact recreation and the perennial Boston Mountain fishery. There are no 303d listed streams (impaired water bodies) within these watershed analysis area boundaries.

Existing land uses in the region, and their impacts on water quality have been studied by the US Geological Survey's Ozark Plateaus National Water Quality Assessment Program. Trends that show increased nitrogen, phosphorus and coliform bacteria concentrations occur with increases in agricultural and urban land uses (Davis and Bell, 1998). Forested land uses have a much lower concentration of these constituents. This data does not isolate the direct or transient effects of timber harvest on nutrients, but it does illustrate the water quality impacts of alternative land uses in the Ozarks and surrounding Arkansas landscapes. Within the project area there are no other potential sources of degradation, other than land uses that would impact the current condition of water quality.

The effects of vegetation management practices in the Boston Mountains are similar to other areas of Arkansas, including those of the Ozark Highlands and the Ouachita Mountains.

Direct and Indirect Effects

Alternative 1

There will be no direct effects from this alternative because no activities will result from the selection of this alternative. The current trends and conditions are expected to continue. Indirect effects will continue to result from the existing conditions of the project area. The effects of vegetation on water yield within the watershed will continue through evapotranspiration processes. Roads that do not receive necessary maintenance will continue to pose a chronic threat to water quality as problem erosion areas will continue to exist, or worsen.

Roads are the most common source of accelerated erosion on National Forest lands. Roads generate sediment from the erosion of excavated surfaces, ditches, and road maintenance operations. Raw ditch lines and roadbeds would be a continual source of sediment, usually due to lack of maintenance, inadequate maintenance, excessive ditch line disturbance, or poorly timed maintenance. As a result of alternative 1, roads in need of maintenance and reconstruction will not receive the necessary upgrades to minimize resource conditions. Unpaved roads paralleling and crossing streams will continue to pose specific risks to water quality as they often maintain linkages with the stream channel. Roads have three primary effects on the hydrologic cycle; they intercept rainfall, concentrate flow, and divert water from traditional hydrologic pathways. Through these actions, road systems mimic the stream channel network, effectively increasing the drainage density of streams in the landscape.

Activities that are associated with the Lewis Prong Project which is also in the Panther Creek Watershed and the Bonanza Project in the Washita-Estep Creek – Mulberry watershed will

continue. The impacts from the Lewis Prong and Bonanza Projects are included in the cumulative effects analysis for the watersheds.

Alternatives 2&3

The main issue with respect to forest management activities and water quality is effects to water quality that may result from the proposed project; changes to water quality should not exceed the standards determined for the identified designated uses. The activities which may elicit direct and indirect effects are those of vegetation management, silvicultural site preparation, road construction, and prescribed burning.

In a summary of silviculture activity effects in the Ozark-Ouachita Highlands, Lawson (1986) documented the amount of sediment produced from small watersheds in the undisturbed state and that produced as a result of vegetation management practices. The undisturbed sites produced about 13.8 lbs/acre of sediment with 70% of this amount attributed to large precipitation events. A seed tree harvest produced more than twice as much sediment, 31.3 lbs/acre during the first year after harvest. Three years after the treatment the erosion rates were similar to those of the undisturbed state. This is roughly equivalent to a 5 gallon bucket of soil. Another study by Lawson and Hileman (1982) investigated the effects of the seed tree removal and site preparation burning. The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in stream turbidity between seed tree removal sites and undisturbed control sites. Thus, seed tree silvicultural practices in Arkansas will result in the production of sediment, but at levels below those found on typically managed forest lands of the eastern US. Therefore, the vegetation management practices proposed for this project will result in temporary increases of sediment but at relatively low levels for a short duration.

A water monitoring study conducted on a timber sale on the Pleasant Hill Ranger District between the years of 1971 and 1974 investigated flow data and water quality before, during, and after a timber sale (unpublished, SO report). The area of investigation included 198 acres feeding an intermittent stream channel. Within the study area 59 acres were clearcut and 25 acres were thinned. Water samples were collected after storm events and crest stage gauges were read at the time of water collection. The samples were analyzed for turbidity and suspended sediment among other variables. There were a limited number of samples (16-total) which revealed no apparent changes to water quality throughout the study period. One observation from the study was that an obvious sediment source within the watershed occurred where a temporary haul road crossed the stream above the sample location. This highlights the need for adequately constructed stream crossings and disconnection of the road drainage from the stream channels for addressing water quality concerns.

Using paired watershed studies for regions of the United States, effects of silviculture practices on annual average stream discharge was depicted by Stednick (1996). In this study, the actions necessary for producing measurable increases in water yield from forests in Arkansas was determined to be a 50% reduction in basal area across an entire watershed. This level of vegetation harvest would result in an increase of roughly 6 inches above normal runoff values for the first year. The recovery period for water yield to return to pretreatment level was found to be a function of vegetation re-growth. For Arkansas, this means that water yields should return to pretreatment level quite rapidly; however, changes to peak flow and storm flow timing may continue if drainage patterns are altered by activities such as road

construction. Any changes to runoff timing should not result in impacts to current water uses or quality. Additional studies in the Missouri Ozarks by Stettergren and Krstansky (1987) indicate that for small watersheds where a regeneration treatment has occurred, slightly higher storm flows and peak discharges have been noticed; however, the absolute amounts of increased yield are insignificant. This study also noted that the time to peak and total flow duration was unchanged.

The Panther Creek watershed is 97% forested and 18% of it is proposed for harvest (including the acres that will be treated as part of the Lewis Prong Project) which will reduce the basal area less than 50%, so the proposed harvest is not expected to significantly affect water yield. The Upper Mulberry watershed is 96% forested and 3% of it is proposed for harvest that will reduce the basal area less than 50%; so the proposed harvest is not expected to significantly affect water yield. The Washita-Estep Creek – Mulberry watershed is 94% forested and 3% of it is proposed for harvesting (including the acres that will be treated as part of the Bonanza Project) which will reduce the basal area less than 50%, so the proposed harvest is not expected to significantly affect water yield.

Long term implications of nutrient loading after timber harvest for streams in the south were described in a study by Lynch and Edwards (1991). In this study, best management practices were used that include 100-foot wide perennial buffers, logging slash removed from streams, sale units monitored by a responsible party, operations ceased during wet weather, roads laid out by a professional, roads did not exceed 10% grade, culverts were used to cross perennial streams and removed when done, water bars utilized, roads gated, and filtration strips maintained. The results indicated that nutrients will not exceed water quality standards and that only during the treatment year would nutrients show a significant increase. An important conclusion was the demonstration of the effectiveness of BMP's for controlling nutrient export.

Forest management options typically include the use of chemical pesticides in the form of herbicides to control unwanted on inappropriate vegetation growth. The use of chemicals may affect stream habitats directly (through acute or chronic toxic effects) or indirectly (as a result of changes to the composition of plant communities). Direct effects depend on two factors, the toxicity of the herbicide and the level of exposure. Toxicity varies among the products used, where common chemicals such as glyphosate (Roundup) are only slightly to non-toxic to aquatic organisms to chemicals such as triclopyr ester (Garlon 4) which pose a greater risk to fish and invertebrate toxicity.

Exposure is determined by such things as application rate, chemical behavior in the environment and biological factors. Herbicides for forestry applications occur annually in amounts roughly equivalent to one tenth of one percent of their use in agriculture settings. Additionally many chemicals used in forestry applications break down fairly rapidly under normal conditions, usually within several weeks. Chemicals can enter streams through a variety of mechanisms, by direct application, drift, mobilization of residues in water, overland flow and leaching. The most significant transport pathway would be direct application, drift, and mobilization during periods of heavy precipitation and overland flow. The most effective means for reducing this likelihood is to maintain a buffer between the area for use and waterbodies, and to plan appropriately for application time frames.

Herbicide applications to control competing vegetation do not disturb the nutrient rich topsoil layer, does not create additional bare soil, and does not adversely affect watershed condition when used responsibly (Neary and Michael, 1996). By utilizing herbicides, the organic matter is left in place and off-site soil movement does not increase the loss of nutrients following harvest activities compared to the other types of management practices. Maxwell and Neary (1991) concluded in a review that the impact of vegetation management techniques on erosion and sedimentation of water resources occurs in this order, herbicides < fire < mechanical. They also concluded that sediment losses during inter-rotation vegetation management could be sharply reduced by using herbicides and moderate burning instead of mechanical methods and heavy burning.

When herbicide fate is measured in runoff water, two common outcomes are apparent. First, measured peak concentrations are of short duration. Second, the highest concentrations occur when buffer strips are not used on streams or where the streams were accidentally over flown during aerial application (Neary and Michael, 1996). Glyphosate has been frequently used in forest ecosystems because of its low mobility. It is readily immobilized by organic matter in the forest floor. Most studies have measured peak glyphosate concentrations in stream flow at or below 10 mg/m^3 (an order of magnitude below EPA established HAL). As seen with other herbicide data, the highest glyphosate peak concentrations occur when buffer strips are not used as a best management practice (Neary and Michael, 1996). Picloram and Triclopyr are also common herbicides used in forestry applications. In a review of studies looking at stream flow fate of these herbicides, a similar pattern is noted as with other herbicides, that the highest peak concentrations are found when buffer strips are not utilized as BMP's. When buffer strips are employed as a mitigation measure, peak concentrations of these chemicals have not been found to exceed 40 mg/m^3, below the RfD of both Triclopyr and Picloram. Some agricultural crops can be affected by Picloram levels < 50 mg/m^3 (Neary and Michael, 1996). Where buffer strips are used or other mitigation techniques are employed, forestry herbicides generally do not pose a threat to water quality. Peak concentrations are usually low (< 100 mg/m^3) and do not persist for long periods of time (<6 mos.) (Neary and Michael, 1996).

Forestry use of herbicides poses a low pollution risk to groundwater because of its use pattern. Herbicide use in forestry is only one tenth of 1% of agricultural usage and likely to occur only once or twice over rotations of 25 and 75 years. The greatest potential hazard to groundwater comes from stored concentrates, not operational application of diluted mixtures (Neary and Michael, 1996). Regional, confined, groundwater aquifers are not likely to be affected by silviculture herbicides (Neary, 1985). Surface unconfined aquifers in the immediate vicinity of herbicide application zones have the most potential for contamination. It is these aquifers which are directly exposed to leaching of residues from the root zone. The only known groundwater contamination incidents of an importance (contamination of bedrock aquifers, persisting > 6 mos., concentrations in excess of the water quality standard, etc.) in the southeastern United States, where significant amounts of forestry herbicides are used, involved extremely high rates of application, or spills of concentrates. In these situations, herbicide residue was detected in ground water 4 to 5 years after the contamination. These situations are definitely not typical of operational use of forestry herbicides. Proper handling precautions during herbicide transport, storage, mixing-loading, and clean-up are extremely important for preventing groundwater contamination (Neary and Michael, 1996).

Pesticides are common chemicals used in a variety of applications and have been found in surface water, ground water, and in wells. Often these residue concentrations are far below levels harmful to human health and the occurrence is infrequent (Larson et al. 1997). Reports of pesticide contamination of water are usually from agricultural uses or urban applications, but the potential for contamination from forest vegetation management programs exists (Kolpin et al. 1997; Koterba et al. 1993; Michael et al., 2000).

Although short term, low-level stream contamination has been observed for ephemeral to first-order streams draining studied sites, levels of herbicides in these streams has been neither of sufficient concentration nor of sufficient residence time to cause observable impacts on aquatic ecosystems (Michael, et al., 2000). These studies have, with a few exceptions, confirmed the absence of significant contamination of surface water. Thus, herbicides used properly can help protect water quality in the reduction of sediment in streams while accomplishing forest management goals. It is imperative that pesticides, unless clearly labeled for aquatic uses, must not be applied directly to water, and that pesticides should be used around water resources which are particularly sensitive only after careful considerations of the ramifications (Michael, et al., 2000).

From a review of literature surrounding herbicide application and use on forest lands, and monitoring conducted on the Ozark-St. Francis NF, it has been determined that the selection of this alternative could potentially result in low levels of herbicide residues entering waterbodies within the project area (SO unpublished reports). However, the levels found in the past and those anticipated for the future, are expected to be very small, and not in excess of the levels of concern established by the EPA. The OSFNF utilizes standards for herbicide application which requires buffers between treated vegetation and waterbodies, as well as standards to ensure that drift and direct application to waterbodies does not occur. This alternative includes the use of BMP practices and monitoring to ensure environmental quality is maintained.

When used for site preparation, herbicides are not broadcasted but applied by direct injection, or foliar spray. For these purposes, herbicide use is infrequent (1-2 times per 100 yrs.) and direct application methods would minimize off-site movement. Forest wide standards for herbicide application will be followed as well as appropriate BMP's designed to limit risk to water quality. Monitoring for herbicides used on the forest has been a continuous policy on OSFNF for the last 10 years. Results from this monitoring have not documented any significant concentrations of herbicides off-site from their application (unpublished reports). Other monitoring suggests that subsequent to runoff producing precipitation events, concentrations of herbicide (triclopyr) in ephemeral streams with BMP protections were very small and well below any significant risk concentration (unpublished report).

Roads are the most common source of accelerated erosion on National Forest lands. Road-generated sediment may result from the erosion of cut and fill slopes, ditches, road surfaces, and road maintenance operations. Unpaved roads paralleling and crossing streams pose specific risks to water quality as they often maintain direct linkages with the stream channel. Roads result in three primary effects on forested lands. They can intercept rainfall directly, concentrate flow, and divert or reroute water from traditional hydrologic pathways. Through these actions, road systems mimic the stream channel network, effectively increasing the drainage density of streams in the landscape. This may result in modifications to the timing of water delivery to stream systems; however, this is not expected to be a significant nor

measurable difference from current conditions. The activities of the proposed action will work toward 'disconnecting' the road system from the stream network.

Thirty-five hundredths (0.35) of a mile of road construction and 5.6 miles of temporary road construction are proposed for this project, along with 0.3 mile of temporary road construction for the Lewis Prong Project and 0.3 mile of temporary road construction that will be done as part of the Bonanza Project in the analysis area. Road construction in areas near streams could be responsible for large sediment delivery rates to the streams if proper BMPs are not followed and heavy rainfall events occur during construction. Guidance provided in the Forest Land Management Plan and the Arkansas Forestry Silviculture BMP manual outline the mitigation measures necessary to conduct these activities while controlling contributions to non-point source pollution. The remainder of the road work is maintenance, which when properly conducted, should result in a net decrease in sediment production, thus a benefit. Also approximately 2.7 miles of road are proposed for decommissioning as part of this project

Based on a review of past research on the effects of prescribed fire on water quality in the Ouachita Mountains, most research focuses on the effects of prescribed fire in combination with other vegetation treatments (personal communication, Marion 2004). For small watersheds where this research has been conducted, the combined treatments (including harvesting, site-prep, and burning) result in increased sediment yields, compared to a control site, for up to three years following application. Because of the design of these experiments, the effects of prescribed burning alone cannot be determined but are expected to be less than the combinations identified above; however, other work has identified the effects of burning to be a function of fire severity where less intense fires result in far fewer effects than moderate to severe fire intensity (DEIS Veg. Management in the Ozark and Ouachita Mountains Appendices, vol II). Prescribed fire alone is not expected to increase nutrient content within downstream water bodies, and the expected effects from prescribed fire will be a function of ground cover removal (Marion, 2004).

The direct and indirect impacts from this project are not expected to contribute to degradation of the current water quality. Implementation of the activities associated with these alternatives will result in some of the above mentioned effects to water quantity and quality; these effects have been shown from past research to be minimal and short-lived in this part of Arkansas. The most likely effects from these alternatives, beyond current conditions, are a short term increase in sediment resulting mainly from road activities and minimal increases in water production. With the application of the Arkansas Forestry Commission's Best Management Practices for Silviculture, current Forest Plan standards, and any other mitigation measures noted in this EA, the activities of this alternative should not result in significant effects to the water resources. Road stabilization through maintenance and construction, erosion control through revegetation of disturbed ground, and streamside management zones around surface water features are typical measures used to ensure the mitigation of adverse effects which may occur.

To further differentiate between Alternative 2 and 3 requires a look at the potential impacts that may result from their differences. Alternative 2 has the potential to result in negative effects as a result of the use of herbicides. Alternative 3 has no potential for herbicide to result in any impacts.

Cumulative Effects

For this analysis, the cumulative effects to water resources will be bound by the 6th level watersheds in which the project is located (see current conditions). Cumulative effects result from practices which occur throughout the watershed, on both private and public lands. Activities and land uses identified for areas not administered by the Forest Service were determined from publicly available data. The major non-point source pollution concern that arises from Forest Service activities is that of soil erosion which can potentially result in increased sedimentation of aquatic habitats or threaten water quality as turbidity.

The cumulative effects analysis estimates sediment yield from both public and private lands, the existing road network, and from expected current and future activities. Current and future sediment yield is compared to estimates of an undisturbed landscape (or past condition). An undisturbed landscape is described as an entirely forested watershed without roads. Sediment increases are then calculated as a percent above the undisturbed amount. This value is compared to potential risk values for identifying levels of concern for watershed conditions. These risk indicator values were empirically determined using a relationship between sediment values and the condition of the fisheries from select locations across the area.

The cumulative effects analysis assumes that particular activities occur on public and private lands. The assumption is made that all the activities on public lands as described under each alternative, will occur during a one year time frame, or as an instantaneous event. In practice these activities are usually spread over a number of years, thus amortizing the potential effects over the life of any resulting projects. Assumptions are included in the determination of the potential risk indicator values; these values were determined on a smaller-scale, ecoregion basis, using community-based fish information. Different guilds within the fish communities were analyzed for predictive patterns of response to sediment loading. The most responsive patterns were used to set the risk level values. This allows for a determination of the 'worst case' scenario, providing a conservative understanding of effects to the water resources and designated use fisheries.

There are two risk values for every sixth-level watershed; the first separates the low and moderate concern level and the second separates the moderate and high concern level. A low concern indicates a minimal risk to water quality, or no expected adverse effects to water resources or the designated uses. A moderate concern indicates that care should be taken designing and implementing the project to avoid adverse effects and that additional aquatic monitoring should occur prior to project implementation. Proper application of all forest plan standards and Arkansas BMPs should be verified for implementation. Assuming these guidelines are correctly applied, this project would result in minimal risks to water quality; if these standards are not applied then a greater risk to water quality results. A high concern signals that the water resources may be threatened by the current or future state of the watershed. Proposed activities should only be conducted with the application of appropriate forest plan standards and BMP's. Short term adverse effects to water resources may result from activities captured in the effects analysis, both on public as well as private lands. Additional monitoring is necessary to determine that no adverse effects to the water resources are the result of Forest Service activities; this includes monitoring for adequate BMP compliance.

The water resource cumulative effects analysis was completed based on the activities described in this document. All supporting material for this model has been included in the project planning files. The results of this analysis are displayed in Table 5. This analysis indicates that all watershed analysis areas are currently found to have a low concern level. As a result of the No Action alternative the concern level will remain Low, and under any of the Proposed Alternatives the concern level remains Low.

Table 5. Results of the Water Resources Cumulative effects analysis

Percent increase of sediment above undisturbed conditions								
	Current		**Future**					
			No Action		Alt. 2		Alt. 3	
6th level Watershed Analysis Area	% increase	Concern Level	% increase	Concern Level	% increase	Concern Level	% increase	Concern Level
111102010603	153	Low	154	Low	175	Low	175	Low
111102010604	152	Low	154	Low	162	Low	162	Low
111102010605	203	Low	204	Low	208	Low	208	Low

The cumulative effects analysis indicates minimal risks to the water resource's current condition. A number of factors contribute to this outcome. No Forest Service activities, other than existing roads, contribute to the current conditions; these are mainly the result of off-forest activities and land uses. One of the initial contributing conditions is the land use patterns of public lands. Pastures, agriculture and cultivated field type land uses pose greater risks to water resources through non-point source pollution as they traditionally require a more intensive management regime than forested landscapes.

The activities proposed by the Forest Service for the proposed action will result in additional sediment production from the landscape, but from a watershed perspective, contribute only a small (if any) increase to the overall estimated sediment yield. The Proposed Alternatives result in a slight increase in the percentage of possible sediment contributions but result in no change in the concern level. Additionally, it should be possible to schedule these activities over time instead of instantaneously as predicted by the analysis, thus reducing the possibility of acute effects. Through the use of forest plan standards and the use of Arkansas Silviculture BMPs, the activities scheduled for implementation should not pose additional risks to water quality or designated uses. Monitoring in the form of subsequent fisheries evaluation and BMP compliance checks should be adequate to discern any adverse effects which may result from the implementation of the proposed action.

2. Soil Resources

Significant Issues Related to the Resource

Issue #1

The cumulative effects of past activities on private lands, together with past and proposed activities on public land, and their impacts on soil erosion, water quality and wildlife habitat.

Much of the information in this section relies on the Soil Survey of Johnson County, Arkansas, and an article entitled, "The Effects of Forest Management Practices on Soil Nutrient Status," by Drs. Wheeler and Eichmann, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

Existing Condition

The analysis area for soils will be Compartments 307, 329, 331, 332 335, 336, and 675 for soils. The Project Area is located on the southern side of the Ozark Plateau in a heavily dissected section called the Boston Mountains. Project Area elevation varies from about 1120 feet on the southern edge of the project area on Panther Creek to 2400 feet on Garland's Knob in the northeastern corner of the project area. Several types of topography exist in this Boston Mountain section. Most of the timber harvest will occur on a common Stair-Stepped landform, called "Bluff-Bench" topography, that developed from the long term weathering/erosion of sedimentary layers of different hardness, mainly shales and sandstones. The remainder of the topography varies from nearly level to rolling mountain tops that developed from weathering of level-bedded sandstones to narrow to very narrow alluvial areas along Panther Creek. Most of the mountain tops and creek bottoms and some wider benches now or have been under cultivation or in pastures, and some are still under private ownership. Project area topography varies from 0-3% slope on mountain tops, benches, and creek bottoms, to fairly steep 40-60% on the 200 to 300 foot slopes between the benches and just above the stream bottoms in Panther Creek.

The soils in the project area are mostly stable. Soils are mostly well-drained and range from shallow to deep. There are some small areas of poorly-drained hydric soils in depressions included in the Ceda cobbly loam and Spadra fine sandy loam soil map units on the floodplain along Panther Creek.

There are some stumps in previously harvested stands, but there is no evidence of detrimental soil disturbance. Most of the soils have 100% cover consisting of leaf litter, twigs, limbs, logs, gravel, stones, and have an intact root mat. Forest Development Road (FDR) 1417 is suffering from surface erosion, and runoff water from lead-off ditches is eroding soils on the slopes below the road. A Panther Creek tributary and a smaller stream are flowing down the roadbed causing surface erosion on a portion of FDR 1417. There is a section of roadbed approximately 200 feet long that has eroded to varying degrees. Approximately 125 feet is eroded from six to twelve inches deep across the roadbed and a 75-foot long section is eroded to a depth ranging from eight inches to three feet deep and eight feet wide. Upland portions of the road have runoff flowing down them and the broad based dips are worn down. FDR 1418 along Panther Creek has some nearly vertical, bare cut-banks on the west side of the road and sections of the road run parallel to the creek with very little vegetative buffer between the road and the creek. On the northern portion that runs through private land, there are numerous stream crossings and the stream is flowing down the road in places. On the

upland portions of the road, there is some surface erosion and the ditches are eroding. On Johnson County Road 6295, there are places where small streams are flowing down the road and eroding the surface. Along Johnson County Road 5261, some of the culvert outlets are too high above the surface and are causing soil erosion on the slopes. Ditches are eroding along portions of road 5261, but lead-off ditches are located properly and are functioning well. Along FDR 1419, there are several small-dispersed campsites with bare, compacted soils; but the sites are small, on flat ground and are not causing a problem. FDR 94336E is eroding in places and the road crosses a small stream that flows into a larger one down slope.

Direct and Indirect Effects

Alternative 1

The roads proposed for reconstruction, maintenance, and decommissioning will continue to erode.

Alternative 2

Approximately six percent (211 acres) of the harvested area would sustain a temporary reduction in soil productivity due to harvesting operations. An additional 13 acres (<1% of the harvest area) would sustain a temporary reduction in soil productivity due to temporary road construction. Soil productivity would be lost on approximately one acre due to road construction. Soil productivity would be lost on approximately 0.4 acre due to road reconstruction. Approximately 29 acres of the harvested area would sustain a temporary reduction in soil productivity due to fireline construction. Two and nine tenths miles of road are proposed for decommissioning which will return approximately five acres of soil to a productive state.

Total expected temporary reduction of soil productivity would be 254 acres (8% of the harvested area), including skidding, temporary road construction, road construction and reconstruction, and fireline construction. Road decommissioning would reduce the net acreage of soil disturbance to 249 acres, but would not reduce the overall percentage. Temporary roads, primary skid trails, and landings would be disked, seeded and closed following harvesting to speed the recovery of the soil productivity. Firelines would be bladed and seeded when prescribed burning is completed to speed recovery of soil productivity and to prevent erosion. Road reconstruction will stabilize roads and prevent loss of productivity on soils adjacent to these roads and will reduce erosion and sedimentation. Road maintenance will also prevent the loss of productivity on soils adjacent to the roads by helping to control runoff. Less than 15% of an activity area can sustain a reduction in soil productivity, according to the LRMP standard. If more than 15% of the activity area sustains a reduction in soil productivity, mitigation measures must be installed. The documentation for temporary reduction in soil productivity can be found in the analysis file.

The use of herbicides would have no impact on soil disturbance because stems and roots of treated plants would remain in place until they decay. Soil microbes will break down any herbicide residue that reaches the soil.

Alternative 3

The effects are expected to be the same as those in Alternative 2. Hand tools would be used instead of herbicides. The use of hand tools would not result in any additional detrimental soil disturbance because stumps and rootstock of the treated plants would be left intact

Cumulative Effects

There is a potential for additional temporary loss in soil productivity in the stands that are proposed for shelterwood harvest and follow-up seed tree removal harvests that are planned a few years into the future. One hundred ten acres of these units are estimated to sustain a temporary loss in soil productivity due to the initial harvest. The existing and estimated additional temporary loss in soil productivity equals 110 acres, which is 9 percent of the shelterwood harvested area. The cumulative effects are not significant because the existing and estimated temporary loss in soil productivity is expected to be within the LRMP standard. Erosion control will be done on skid trails in the harvested areas to speed the recovery of soil productivity.

There was no evidence of detrimental soil disturbance in the previously harvested units that are proposed for treatment in the project area, so no cumulative effects are expected to result from the proposed treatments. .

3. Climate Change

Existing Condition

Research and analysis of evidence dating many years ago show intervals of warming and cooling on earth. The current warming trend is particularly important because it is proceeding at an unusual rate. Assessments by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) suggest that the Earth's climate has warmed between 0.6 and 0.9 degree Celsius over the past century and that human activity affecting the atmosphere is "very likely" an important driving factor. (USDOE, Energy Information Administration, 2008)

The following information is from the National Climatic Data Center website (http://lwf.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/gases.html): Many chemical compounds present in Earth's atmosphere behave as greenhouse gases. These are gases which allow direct sunlight (relative shortwave energy) to reach the Earth's surface unimpeded. As the shortwave energy (that in the visible and ultraviolet portion of the spectra) heats the surface, longer-wave energy (heat) is reflected to the atmosphere. Greenhouse gases absorb this energy, thereby allowing less heat to escape back to space, and 'trapping' it in the lower atmosphere. Many greenhouse gases occur naturally in the atmosphere, such as carbon dioxide, methane, water vapor, and, nitrous oxide, while others are synthetic. Those that are man-made include the chlorofluorocarbons, hydrofluorocarbons and perfluorocarbons, as well as sulfur hexafluoride. Atmospheric concentrations of both the natural and man-made gases have been rising over the last few centuries. As global population increases and reliance on fossil fuels (such as coal, oil and natural gas) is firmly solidified, emissions of these gases continue torise. While gases such as carbon dioxide occur naturally in the atmosphere,

through our interference with the carbon cycle, we artificially move carbon from solid storage to its gaseous state, thereby increasing atmospheric concentrations (NCDC, 2009).

The principal greenhouse gases that enter the atmosphere because of human activities are carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and fluorinated gases (USEPA, 2009). Atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration is now higher than at any time in the past 10 million years (Kennedy and Hanson 2006). Humankind has altered the natural carbon cycle by burning coal, oil, natural gas and wood and since the industrial revolution began in the mid 1700s, each of these activities has increased in scale and distribution. Prior to the industrial revolution, concentrations were fairly stable at 280 ppm. Today, they are around 370 ppm, an increase of well over 30 percent (NCDC, 2009). In 2006, carbon dioxide emissions from the United States accounted for about 20 percent of the amount added to the atmosphere globally. Fuel combustion accounted for 94.0 percent of U.S. carbon dioxide emissions in 2007; this figure represents approximately 85.4 percent of the nation's total greenhouse gas emissions that year. Changes in land use and forestry practices can also emit carbon dioxide through conversion of forest land to agricultural or urban use or can act as a sink for carbon dioxide (USEPA, 2009).

Numerous processes collectively known as the "carbon cycle" naturally regulate concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. Natural processes, such as plant photosynthesis, dominate the movement ("flux") of carbon between the atmosphere and the land and oceans. Carbon sequestration is the process by which atmospheric carbon dioxide is taken up by trees, grasses, and other plants through photosynthesis and stored as carbon in biomass (trunks, branches, foliage and roots) and soils. The sink of carbon sequestration in forests and wood products helps to offset sources of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere, such as deforestation, forest fires and fossil fuel emissions. Carbon accumulation in forests and soils, however, eventually reaches a saturation point, beyond which additional sequestration is no longer possible. This happens, for example, when trees reach maturity, or when the organic matter in soils builds back up to original levels before losses occurred (USEPA, 2009). While natural processes can absorb some of the net 6.2 billion metric tons (7.2 billion metric tons less 1 billion metric tons of sinks) of anthropogenic (human-caused) carbon dioxide emissions produced each year (measured in carbon equivalent terms), an estimated 4.1 billion metric tons are added to the atmosphere annually. This positive imbalance between greenhouse gas emissions and absorption results in the continuing increase in atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases. (USDOE, Energy Information Administration, 2008)

In computer-based models, rising concentrations of greenhouse gases produce an increase in the average surface temperature of the Earth over time. Rising temperatures may, in turn, produce changes in precipitation patterns, storm severity, and sea level commonly referred to as "climate change" (USDOE, Energy Information Administration, 2008). Projected climate change impacts include air temperature increases, sea level rise, changes in timing, location and quantity of precipitation and increased frequency of extreme weather events such as heat waves, droughts, and floods. These changes will vary regionally and affect renewable resources, aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems, and agriculture. Changes in temperature and precipitation will alter the growth patterns and distribution of plant and animal species. There are uncertainties regarding the timing and extent magnitude of climate change impacts, but continued increases in human greenhouse gas emissions will likely lead to increased climate change.

Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Effects

Alternative 1

It is currently not possible to predict the actual effects of a project on global climate change, so a baseline comparison cannot be made using the no action alternative relative to climate change.

Much of the project area is currently susceptible to climate change events such as prolonged drought due to the stressed conditions of individual trees. Tree crowns and roots have little or no room to expand and stems in crowded stands compete for water and nutrients. Under these conditions, trees are much more likely to die due to added stress from climate change events. If overstory trees die, sustainability of overstory tree species would be in question due to the lack of advanced oak and pine regeneration in the understory.

Because fuel loads within the proposed project area will not be reduced, the potential for an uncharacteristically severe wildfire will persist and increase as fuels are added to the forest floor through natural processes. In such an event, the quantities of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions released into the atmosphere would be expected to be greater than those that would have been released under the controlled conditions of a prescribed burn or in an area where fuel reduction treatments had been conducted. The actual quantity of emissions released would depend on the acreage burned, tons of fuel consumed and the amount of time required to suppress the wildfire.

Harvest of trees that have reached or passed maturity will not occur. The ability of those trees to sequester additional carbon from the atmosphere will continue to be less than that of younger stands of trees. No wood products such as wood flooring, furniture and lumber that would store carbon will be obtained from the proposed project area.

Alternatives 2 & 3

Forests and soils have a large influence on atmospheric levels of carbon dioxide. The carbon stored in live biomass, dead plant material and soil represents the balance between carbon dioxide absorbed from the atmosphere and its release through plant respiration as well as decomposition and burning.

With these alternatives, some of the carbon currently sequestered in vegetation and soils will be released back to the atmosphere. In the short-term, greenhouse gas emissions and alteration to the carbon cycle will be caused by hazardous fuel reduction activities, harvests and thinning overstocked stands. In the long term, however, these actions will also increase the forest's ability to sequester additional carbon, improve the forest's resilience to the potential impacts of climate change and decrease the potential for uncharacteristically severe wildfires. Harvest will remove some of the mature stems with diminished ability to sequester additional carbon; some of the carbon sequestered in harvested stems will continue to be stored in manufactured wood products. Residual stems and regeneration in the proposed project area will continue to sequester and store carbon.

Wildfires may still occur in the proposed project area; however, because fuel loads will have been reduced with this alternative, there will be a lower risk of uncharacteristically severe wildfire for the treated acres than the current condition poses. The reduced risk has a two-fold effect on greenhouse gas emissions or the carbon cycle:

- There is a direct beneficial effect on climate change of decreased greenhouse gas emissions from the treated acres, because the risk of acres being burned by uncharacteristically severe wildfires will be reduced.
- There is an indirect beneficial effect because live stands of trees will retain higher capacity to sequester carbon dioxide compared to stands killed by uncharacteristically severe wildfires, especially if not immediately reforested.

Although it is possible to estimate the quantity of greenhouse gas emissions prescribed burns associated with this project may release, there is no certainty about the actual intensity of the project's individual effects on global climate change. As greenhouse gas emissions are integrated across the global atmosphere, it is not currently possible to ascertain the degree of indirect effects or cumulative impacts this project will have on global climate.

4. Air Resources

Significant Issues Related to the Resource

Issue #1

The cumulative effects of past activities on private lands, together with past and proposed activities on public land, and their impacts on soil erosion, water quality and wildlife habitat.

Existing Condition

The entire project area lies within lands designated as a Class II area with respect to the air resource. The Clean Air Act defines a Class II area as "a geographic area designated for a moderate degree of protection from future degradation of the air quality."

Existing emission sources occurring within the project area consist mainly of mobile sources. These include, but are not limited to, combustion engines, dust from unpaved surfaces, and smoke from prescribed (federal, local, county) burning.

The Clean Air Act requires the EPA to establish National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for six pollutants considered harmful to public health and the environment: carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, particulate matter, and sulfur dioxide. The standards were set at the level required to provide an ample margin of safety to protect the public health. An attainment area is a geographic area in which levels of a criteria air pollutant meet NAAQS for the pollutant. Under the CAA, any area that violates national ambient air quality standards for any of the six criteria pollutants as few times as once per year and as often as four times over a three year period is classified as a "nonattainment" area. The proposed project area lies within Johnson and Newton Counties in Arkansas. Currently, the levels of all six criteria pollutants are at or below the NAAQS (attainment) in Johnson and Newton Counties.

Direct and Indirect Effects

Alternative 1

There would be no significant changes to present air quality. Exhaust emissions and dust from vehicles passing through the project area would continue. Occasionally, local residents will burn trash and small brush piles which will generate smoke.

Alternatives 2 & 3

Prescribed burning proposed in this Alternative will have the potential to impact local and regional air quality. The area immediately downwind will have the greatest chances for impacts. Risks include respiratory damage and temporary impairment of visibility. The (FEISp. 3-62) indicates particulate matter may exceed the EPA 24-hour standard for short periods of time. The management guidelines within the site-specific burning plan will mitigate this effect in the immediate vicinity and downwind from it.

With respect to air quality in the proposed project area, the greatest potential for effect will be caused by prescribed burning. Short-term changes to the current air quality condition, including contributions to the greenhouse concentration of gases in the atmosphere will result from the prescribed burning in the project. The burning will be conducted in accordance with a prescribed burn plan when conditions are favorable for rapid smoke dispersal. Arkansas Smoke Management Guidelines will be observed. Because residual smoke flows and settles in low areas during the night and early morning and may contribute to heavy fog formation which creates hazardous road conditions, the proposed burn activities will generally be completed by mid-afternoon so that most smoke is dispersed by nightfall. Individual ignitions would be small in size and would typically not exceed 3,000 acres daily. Ignition of the project area would be spread over multiple years – therefore reducing potential for smoke impacts. Use of aerial ignition would serve to reduce burn-out time and associated duration of smoke impacts. Aerial ignition would also help develop smoke column lifting and reduction of smoke impacts.

The direct effects of prescribed burning on air quality will include temporary increases in particulate matter and carbon monoxide concentrations, eye, nose and throat irritations, decreased visibility along travel ways, and odor/nuisance of smoke. Smoke consists of small particles (particulate) of ash, partly consumed fuel, and liquid droplets. Other combustion products include invisible gases such as small quantities of nitrogen oxides. Oxides of nitrogen are usually produced at temperatures only reached in piled or windrowed slash or in very intense wildfires. In general, prescribed fires produce inconsequential amounts of these gases. Except for organic soils (which are not typically consumed in prescribed burns), forests fuels contain very little sulfur, so oxides of sulfur are not a problem (USDA Technical Publication R8-TP11). Persons near the actual burn area might receive some respiratory discomfort; however, it is expected that most impacts will be in the form of nuisance smoke and/or smell. Smoke from the proposed burning and the associated emissions would reside in the local area a relatively short time depending on the weather. Some signing may be

needed along public roads to warn the public of smoky conditions. Smoke trapped in low-lying areas would be expected to dissipate once morning temperatures rise and the nighttime inversion lifts.

Other primary products of combustion are water vapor, particulate matter, hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, polyaromatic hydrocarbons, and trace minerals. Carbon monoxide and particulate matter are EPA criteria pollutants. Polyaromatic hydrocarbons are listed as toxic substances. Strict adherence to LMRP guidelines and a site-specific burning plan will limit the area where EPA standards are exceeded to a location very close in proximity to the flaming front. The burning plan will ensure that smoke or other combustion products do not reach smoke sensitive areas. Monitoring during and after the burns for adherence to guidelines and/or any potential problem areas will be conducted. These actions will ensure that the requirements of the Clean Air Act, EPA air standards, and state requirements will be met and there should be no long-term cumulative effects from these burns.

Table 6 lists the estimated amounts of CO_2 resulting from the prescribed burning proposed by this Alternative. The organic matter consumed will be replaced by new vegetation so that there should be little net increase in the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere (Dipert 1992:2 draft/unpublished).

Table 6. Cumulative total emissions released during Alt. 2 & 3 site prep, WL, TSI, and hazardous fuel reduction prescribed burning.

Compound Emitted	Estimated Release (U.S. Tons)*
	Alternative 2
Carbon Dioxide (CO_2)	**39,537**
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	**4,112**
Water Vapor	**15,629**
Particulate Matter	**1,581**
Hydrocarbons	**395**
Nitrogen Oxides	**73**
TOTAL	**61,327**

*Estimates of coefficients used for calculations: a) 2.25 tons/ac actually consumed in hazardous fuel reduction burns; 4.5t/ac burned in thinning areas; 5.0t/ac burned in shelterwood areas; (Representative of fuel models in the Prescribed Fire Guide for the Southern Region). b) 2,000-3,000 lbs of CO_2/ton of fuel burned (Dipert, 1992).

Cumulative Effects

For air quality, cumulative effects include all reasonable and foreseeable activities that produce pollutants. Emissions from prescribed burning and from vehicles and machinery during management activities will contribute greenhouse gases and pollutants to the atmosphere, but the volume of these emissions will be inconsequential and are not expected to have a cumulative impact on current air quality.

The global effects of prescribed burning are discussed in the VMEIS. The effect of prescribed burning on global warming is dependent on a pool of knowledge yet to be formulated.

Air quality from implementation of the prescribed burning will not be affected by any past burns in the area or by any proposed future burns on the District because once the smoke has dispersed, the emissions are diluted and removed from local airsheds.

An indirect effect of implementing the burning is a reduction in the emissions that would be released from potential wildfires in the area. By removing the small diameter surface fuels with controlled low intensity prescribed fire, the potential of a high intensity catastrophic fire developing within the stands would be reduced significantly. If a crown fire were to occur, the amount of live fuel that could burn would tend to release high amounts of particulate matter.

5. Forest Improvements (Road Access):

Existing Condition

This project area is located in Johnson and Newton Counties. There are a total of roughly 72 miles of roads within and around the project area; county roads comprise about 21 miles. These roads are regularly maintained by the County and Forest Service. Existing road locations shown on Figure 2 (Current Conditions map) have been identified using GPS (Global Positioning System) equipment.

Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Effects

Alternative 1

Primary arterial roads would be maintained at their current level. However, revenues from timber sales would not be generated to aid in road maintenance.

Several of the roads which are currently open would remain so, and would continue to be maintained on a regular basis with implementation of the "no action" alternative. These roads are currently classed as maintenance level 2 or 3 and are maintained for the public to reach private residences or allow for administrative access. However, forest interior roads in need of maintenance or rehabilitation would continue to erode and contribute to sedimentation of creeks and streams.

Alternatives 2&3

A Roads Analysis Process (RAP) was completed for this project to inform this environmental assessment. It identified and considered values associated with or impacted by the existing road system and all proposed roadwork. Consideration was given to long-term road funding opportunities and obligations.

Proposed timber harvesting activities will require reconstruction and maintenance of open and closed roads. Descriptive statements of the roadwork to be conducted are given on page 21 of this EA. Specific roadwork for Alternative 2 is given in Table 3 and locations shown on the map. Specific locations for the construction work were determined using GPS equipment. The effects of roadwork on soil erosion and water quality are considered in the Soil and Water sections and other effects in the Wildlife and Social Sections of this EA.

Additional information regarding roads is contained in the project specific RAP which is filed at the Pleasant Hill Ranger District Office in Clarksville, Arkansas.

All roads proposed for this project will average less than ten percent slope, with some short sections slightly greater than 10 percent.

Maintenance on approximately 46 miles of open and closed roads will be performed in this project to get the roads in a suitable condition for hauling timber across them. County roads that will be used are regularly maintained by their respective counties. Special coop agreements are in place to assist in any required maintenance resulting from logging operations. There are approximately 21 miles of these roads surrounding the project area. Several maintenance level 1 and 2 roads that were previously closed will be re-closed with gates/berms to reduce erosion and protect resources. The Forest Service Manual states that level 1 roads are to be closed to motorized traffic when management activities are complete.

Approximately 2.6 miles of existing roads no longer needed for management or access are proposed for decommissioning. Decommissioning roads involves restoring roads to a more natural state. Activities used to decommission a road include, but are not limited to, the following: reestablishing former drainage patterns, stabilizing slopes, restoring vegetation, blocking the entrance to the road, installing water bars (earthen mounds), and removing culverts. These activities are designed to completely eliminate the roadbed by restoring natural conditions. Unnamed and illegally accessed OHV trails that are present in the project area may be closed using debris, rocks, earthen mounds, or gates.

Through the Roads Analysis Process, an inventory of all existing roads was completed and locations were obtained using Global Positioning System (GPS) equipment. Several "outlaw" trails were identified as well as old road templates not presently being used for administration purposes. Some of these have been decommissioned and/or closed in the past, but are still being used as renegade OHV trails.

Several special use permits exist on Forest roads in the project area. A review of private in-holdings within the project area shows it to be fairly likely that the Forest Service will receive additional special-use proposals in the future to access private forest stands for commercial timber removal. Proper procedures for gaining access will be followed.

Gates will be installed that close the following numbered roads: 94331F, 94675C, 94335D, E, F, 94675B, G, D, and 94336E. Additionally, two gates are proposed on two separate unnumbered roads. Three newly proposed access roads to wildlife openings will also be gated. Foot travel will still be invited on all roads in the project area.

The density of open roads will decrease under both Alternatives as all presently closed roads will be re-closed upon completion of the project. In addition to the decommissioned miles, approximately 25 miles of roads would be closed on Forest Service land within the project area under alternative 2. The auditory and visibility impacts of road-using equipment should be relatively short-lived with very little effect on the environment. Re-closure and decommissioning of roads would reduce erosion and improve water quality in the analysis area.

6. Heritage Resources

Existing Condition

Information concerning possible heritage resources within the project area was obtained from the Master Site and Project Tracking Atlas, field-going personnel, historical maps, aerial photographs, land acquisition files, local historical and genealogical societies, descendant family members, and project and site records at the Pleasant Hill Ranger District office and Supervisor's Office.

The Master Site and Project Tracking Atlas indicates that there have been archeological projects conducted within or near the proposed project area. These include:

Project No.	Name
90-10-04-02	1990 Prescribed Burns
90-10-08-01	Rockslide Timber Sale
91-10-04-15	Garland's Knob Timber Sale
91-10-08-07	Uneven-Aged Timber Management Study
92-10-04-05	Cougar Timber Sale
93-10-04-01	Old Deer Road Wildlife Burn
93-10-04-04	Caesar Timber Sale
93-10-04-08	Pleasant Hill Wildlife Project
95-10-04-02	Sherman Timber Sale
02-10-04-04	Red Oak Decline
Spears 213 (*)	Chesapeake Gas Well Pad, Access Road, and Pipeline

(*) Survey conducted by Spears Inc. for Chesapeake Energy Company. All others are US Forest Service projects.

The Catalpa EA project area includes 8,553 acres of federal lands that were included in cultural resource survey for the Upper Mulberry Watershed conducted in 2008 and 2009. The results of this fieldwork were reported to the Arkansas State Historic Preservation Office and affiliated federally recognized Tribes in April 2010 (Upper Mulberry Watershed Assessment, Project Report No. 10-04-04-01). Prior to the start of fieldwork in 2008 and 2009, twenty sites had been located and recorded within the Catalpa project area. Two sites were located and recorded by Spears Inc. in their 2009 fieldwork for a Chesapeake gas well project. Another six sites were located and recorded in the 2008-2009 fieldwork for the Upper Mulberry watershed assessment.

A total of 28 archeological sites are located within or near the Catalpa EA project area. These include four sites located on private inholdings within the project area and 24 sites located on federal lands. Sites located on private inholdings will not be impacted by any activities associated with this project. The 24 sites located on federal lands include two prehistoric lithic scatters and 22 historic sites, predominately farmsteads. Three sites are recommended not eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places and warrant no further protection. The remaining 21 sites have undetermined eligibilities and will be protected from ground-disturbing activities associated with this project by painting and flagging site boundaries and by avoidance.

Site No.	Site Type	National Register Eligibility
Sites located on private inholdings		
3JO137	Prehistoric	Undetermined
3JO145	Prehistoric/Historic	Undetermined
3JO178	Historic	Undetermined
3JO197	Historic	Undetermined
Sites located on federal lands		
3JO310	Historic	Undetermined
3JO311	Historic	Undetermined
3JO312	Historic	Undetermined
3JO313	Prehistoric	Not Eligible
3JO315	Historic	Undetermined
3JO356	Historic	Undetermined
3JO357	Historic	Undetermined
3JO358	Historic	Undetermined
3JO359	Historic	Undetermined
3JO360	Prehistoric	Undetermined
3JO361	Historic	Undetermined
3JO411	Historic	Undetermined
3JO412	Historic	Undetermined
3JO414	Historic	Undetermined
3JO415	Historic	Undetermined
3JO416	Historic	Undetermined
3JO667	Historic	Undetermined
3JO668	Historic	Undetermined
3JO709	Historic	Undetermined
3JO710	Historic	Undetermined
3JO711	Historic	Undetermined
3JO712	Historic	Undetermined
3JO713	Historic	Not Eligible
3JO714	Historic	Not Eligible

Direct, Indirect and Cumulative Effects

Alternative 1

This alternative would have no effect on heritage resources. No additional surveys will be conducted. No sites will be addressed for their National Register of Historic Places eligibility.

Alternatives 2& 3

The project has been designed so that all sites that may be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, or that are of undetermined eligibility, lie outside any of the project's areas of planned ground-disturbing activity. Rock alignments associated with historical farmstead sites and the extensive cleared and plowed fields surrounding them will be avoided by ground-disturbing activities. Historic site areas which contain no organic cultural material

will undergo prescribed burning. Past research has shown that sites such as these will not be affected by a low-intensity prescribed burn.

Should any additional sites be found during project implementation, they will be examined by a professional archeologist (mitigation measure 3), who will prescribe necessary mitigation measures.

Based on these findings, all sites will be preserved intact and no significant effects will be produced upon significant historical or prehistoric sites that may be eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places.

7. Vegetation Resources and Vegetation Diversity

Significant Issues Related to the Resource

Issue #2

Forest health and sustainable ecosystems.

Existing Condition

The Catalpa project area is situated within the Boston Mountain eco-region located in the central part of the Ozark National Forest. Historically, the lands that are now the Ozark National Forest consisted of fire-dependent woodland and forest ecosystems with well-developed herbaceous understories. There was a more frequent regime of vegetation disturbance from anthropogenic fire than what has been common since the early 1900's. Early travelers in the Ozarks reported that Native Americans burned the woods on a regular basis. Frequent fire in forest/woodland ecosystems would invariably have produced open, less dense stands with a higher proportion of vegetation adapted to fire. Mean fire return interval from 1680-1820 ranged from 4.6 to 16 years, from 1821-1880 mean fire return interval ranged from 2 to 3.1 years and for the period of 1881-1920 it ranged from 1.4 to 5 years. From 1921-2000 mean fire return interval for these area ranged from 62-80 years (Guyette and Spetich, 2003).

Natural and Native-American fires more than likely occurred periodically, long before European settlement and, along with other factors, greatly influenced the development and structure of the pine and hardwood forests that existed when the first settlers arrived in the Ozarks. Historian Steven Pyne (2001):

> The modification of the American continent by fire… was the result of repeated, controlled surface burns on a cycle of one to three years, broken by occasional holocausts from escaped fires and periodic conflagrations during times of drought. Even under ideal circumstances, accidents occurred: signal fires escaped and campfires spread… So extensive were the cumulative effects of these modifications that it may be said that the general consequence of the Indian occupation of the New World was to replace forested lands with grassland or savannah, or, where the forest persisted, to open it up and free it from underbrush. Most of the impenetrable woods encountered by explorers were in bogs or swamps from which fire was excluded; naturally drained landscape was nearly everywhere burned. Conversely, almost wherever the European went, forests followed. The Great American Forest may be more a product of settlement than a victim of it.

Review of historical fire records from 1930 to 1958 from the Pleasant Hill District (located in District Files) indicates that lightning had been a source of ignition and averaged around 4

fire occurrences per year. In 1936, lightning started 20 fires during the very dry summer and early fall months (rainfall less than half normal) across the District. Up until the last 10-15 years, wildfires have largely been excluded from the project area due to an aggressive fire suppression program. This has allowed stem density to increase significantly in areas previously maintained in more open stand conditions by recurring fire. In addition, this has allowed shade-tolerant and fire-intolerant tree species such as red maple and American beech to become more common in the understory. These species would likely become more dominant in future stand composition and oaks, which are shade-intolerant and fire-tolerant, would decrease.

Displacement of anthropogenic fire, creation of barriers to fire such as roads and a long standing policy of fire suppression have led to higher forest health risks and problems due to abnormally dense forest conditions and unsustainable ecosystems. Existing ecological conditions in the project area include a dense, overstocked forest; a shift from the historic plant community composition toward fire intolerant plant species; lack of herbaceous species diversity and insect epidemics.

Most of the Ozarks, prior to National Forest acquisition, was extensively harvested for lumber and pulpwood during the early 1900's. Much of the hardwood forestlands were heavily logged for railroad ties and barrels in the early part of the twentieth century. Small acreage farms were settled along flood plains and flat ridges in the late 1800's and early 1900's, many of which were abandoned and later acquired or purchased by the Forest Service. Much of these acquired lands were then planted with shortleaf pine. Chestnut blight removed Ozark chinquapin, a common midstory/overstory species, during the 1920's and 30's. Settlers periodically burned the areas to control insect pests and improve grazing. Prior to this, the vegetative changes occurred because of natural effects (herbivore grazing, wind, disease, and wildfire) and Native American fires. Heavy cutting from the late 1800's to the 1930's combined with land clearing and periodic burning by settlers and the occasional lightning and Native-American fires described above, and cattle and hog use, greatly influenced the ecological conditions that favored the development of the forests that now exist in the project area.

Forest disease has become of paramount importance on the Ozark National Forest within the past decade. A red oak borer epidemic materialized with affected acreage going from 19,000 acres in 1999 to around 300,000 acres in 2001. Preliminary field investigations indicate that the red oak component was being reduced by as much as 85% within the affected areas. Incidents of infestation leveled off in 2004-05 and have continued to decline. Vegetative management to reduce density would serve to lower the risk to possible future insect/disease outbreaks. The most effective preventive strategy is to use regeneration, thinning, and salvage harvests that would reduce inter-tree competition and relieve water stress on remaining trees. The stump sprouts from cut trees would help provide a source of young oaks for the future stand.

Another forest health issue in the project area includes non-native invasive species such as Nepalese brown top grass, Chinese lespedeza, Mimosa, and Tree-of-Heaven (Ailanthus). These forest health issues and their treatments are covered in detail in a district wide EA done in 2009 called Pleasant Hill Wildlife Habitat Improvement Projects.

Timber harvesting, land clearing, and other uses (especially hog and cattle grazing) from pioneer days to present have developed a somewhat diverse and fragmented ecosystem

across the Catalpa project vicinity. Farming continues on some private lands with the maintenance of pasture and some crop acreage on the mountaintops and along the Mulberry River. Streams and drains within the Catalpa project have riparian ecosystems of varying widths which provide additional vegetative diversity. Privately-owned land comprises significant blocks around the project area. This area accounts for about 1,787 additional acres and varies from improved pastures to heavy woods.

The compartments for which vegetation was analyzed contain a total of 8,553 acres of National Forest land, of which 7,685 acres are suitable timber-producing lands. The project area consists of pine timber types (34%), and hardwood timber types (68%). Currently, the project area does not have a balanced age-class with 83% of stands being 70 years or older (Table 7). National Forest lands in the project area exhibit the following age-class distributions:

Table 7 Current Age Class distribution in Catalpa project area on Public Land.

	0-10	11-40	41-70	70-99	100+
Pine Acres	0	619	390	1568	0
Hardwood Acres	12	268	246	5221	222
Total Acres	12	887	636	6789	222
% of total acres	0%	10%	7%	80%	3%

Current conditions and characteristics of stands proposed for timber harvesting and other silvicultural activities ar e listed in Appendix A.

The Catalpa project has approximately 868 acres (10%) that are currently designated as unsuitable for timber production that could develop old-growth characteristics and status.

Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Effects

Alternative 1

This alternative would retain 83% of the project area in older (> 70 years) age classes. The health of dense timber stands needing treatment would continue to decline and they would become more susceptible to insects and disease. Potential productivity and/or wood volume would decrease as a result of increased competition and mortality. This alternative would not meet the desired future condition as listed in the Forest Plan and would forego the opportunity to restore oak and pine forestlands. This alternative does not address any of the stated purpose and needs of this project.

There would be a cumulative effect of late-successional, shade-tolerant species (such as maple and beech) replacing the early-succession, more shade-intolerant species (such as oaks) at all canopy levels and in the understory. Intra-tree species diversity would increase as overmature stand structures break up with insect and disease mortality and the small openings created would be replaced by late-successional hardwoods. Old fields that have been planted with pine and naturally-occurring pine areas would eventually be replaced by hardwood that currently exists in the understory/midstory of these stands. Most of the timber and wildlife outputs identified in LRMP would not be gained in the Catalpa project area.

Alternative 2

The estimated hardwood volume produced by this alternative would be 4,121 CCF of sawtimber and 1,000 CCF of pulpwood. The estimated pine volume produced would be 6,709 CCF of sawtimber and 2,000 CCF of pulpwood (CCF= one hundred cubic feet).

The effects of hardwood thinning of approximately 322 acres would improve the vigor and growth of future crop trees in the stand and favor more vegetative diversity on the forest floor by permitting more sunlight. The objective of hardwood thinning would be to reduce density, increase growth of residual trees, reduce the susceptibility of the stand to insect and diseases, improve habitat for wildlife by increasing vigor of residual hard mast producing trees, and create light conditions that promote advanced oak regeneration. Trees that are suppressed or that have poor form would be targeted for removal as well as mature trees that may be lost due to mortality. Trees of good form, more desirable species, and/or trees close to the correct spacing would be favored over trees that are simply of larger size. Removing approximately 40% of stand density would allow adequate light levels to promote advanced oak regeneration and put these stands in a condition that would ensure sustainability of these forest types. Timber Stand Improvement (TSI) measures would follow thinning on stands that currently have dense midstories and understories of undesirable species. This treatment would be done to encourage oaks and other desirable species to become abundant in the mid and understories, would help perpetuate oaks on this site, and would allow a regeneration harvest to be considered next entry. Herbicide and handtool treatments would be done after thinning to remove undesirables and allow desirable species to grow free of competition.

The effects of Hardwood Shelterwood with Reserves harvests (785 acres) would be the replacement of mature even-aged stand with an immature even-aged stand containing naturally-seeded hardwood sprouts and seedlings. Artificial regeneration (planting) would occur if desired stocking levels are not met.

Treating some of the remaining non-merchantable hardwoods with herbicides in the hardwood shelterwood areas that are not needed for wildlife and other purposes, will let light reach the forest floor, and allow stump-sprouting and acorns to germinate in these areas. In the short term, the stand will be more open and early-seral vegetation will develop across the area. Within ten years, the understory will be very dense and emerging into midstory status.

The effects of TSI-Release (309 acres-pine) using handtools and/or herbicide, TSI treatments (451 acres-hardwood) using handtools and/or herbicides, and Pre-commercial Thinning (PCT-hardwood) on 171 acres using only handtools would allow favored trees to gain dominance or get a good growth jump to stay ahead of its competitors. The effects of TSI-burning on 309 acres of pine, and burning on another 105 acres of pine in combination with an herbicide treatment, would replace woody, brushy vegetation with more desirable pine regeneration that would fully occupy the sites. Inter-planting of pine seedlings by hand would occur after these practices take place on the 105 acres.

Woodland Restoration Thinning would occur on 307 acres. This treatment is generally done on lower productivity sites with the objective of reducing density of the stand to a level that

was common in oak woodlands in pre-European times. Oak woodland restoration would allow more sunlight to reach the forest floor (thereby increasing herbaceous species diversity) and promote more mast (nut and fruit) production from the remaining trees. This is not a regeneration treatment aimed at creating a new stand. These stands would have a grassy understory and the overstory would be managed to keep a 40 ft^2 basal area (until these trees have reached over 140 years old). Oak woodland restoration would benefit a variety of game and non-game wildlife species. This treatment would generally leave a lower basal area than a thinning but more than a shelterwood.

Pine Thinning would occur on 1,072 acres. Thinning would increase growth of residual trees, reduce the susceptibility of the stand to insect and disease, and improve habitat for wildlife.
The pine stands would be thinned to a target basal area of 60-70 ft^2/acre. Trees that are suppressed or that have poor form would be targeted for removal. Trees of good form and/or close to the correct spacing would be favored over trees that are simply of larger size. The target pine spacing would depend on the average DBH of the stand.

The effects of the Pine Shelterwood harvests on 497 acres will be the eventual replacement of mature even-aged stands with immature even-aged stands containing naturally-seeded pine (and some hardwood) sprouts. These harvest methods meet the guidelines and objectives set out in the LRMP. They are appropriate methods because the native shortleaf pine have reached mature age, exhibit good cone-bearing characteristics, and are located on soils suitable for natural pine regeneration.

Treating some of the remaining non-merchantable hardwoods with herbicides in the pine shelterwood areas that are not needed for wildlife and other purposes, will let light reach the forest floor and allow pine seeds to germinate in these areas. Prescribed burning for site preparation in these and other areas before a good pine seedfall will reduce the duff and litter, topkill small brush, and expose some bare soil, which will promote a successful seed catch from the overstory pine trees (good seedbed for natural seeding). These actions should ensure that areas of the present species composition can develop in the future. In the short term, the stands will be more open and early seral vegetation will develop across these areas.

The effects of Prescribed Burning on roughly 8,553 acres of federal land and 1,787 acres of private land (if consent of landowner is given) will be the replacement of brushy and woody vegetation in the understory to a more grass and forb composition, benefiting quail, deer, and neo-tropical migratory birds. Oak & Pine regeneration would be encouraged, fuel accumulations would be reduced, risk of wildfire would decrease, and an increase in favorable habitat for historical fire-tolerant vegetation species would occur.

The effects of converting Non-Native Invasive Species to natural, historically endemic vegetation would reintroduce faunal and avian species that once thrived in pre-settlement times.

The effects of creating 1 small recreational fish pond (2 acres), one new drinking pond (one-quarter acre), and a quarter-acre reconstructed pond would be negligible to non-existent from a vegetation stand point; however, they would provide useful water sources for wildlife and create recreational opportunities.

The effects of creating 22 scattered wildlife openings (44 acres) by dozer/herbicide, another four openings by handtools/herbicide, five linear openings by dozer/herbicide, and expansion of 4 existing wildlife openings (8 acres) would be the replacement of a moderately-dense overstory with a variety of grasses and forbs that would be suitable for forage by ground-dwelling animals. The linear openings will be constructed around existing roads, thereby, restoring native vegetation back to the roadbed and returning them to the general forest condition.

The cumulative effects from all actions proposed in Alternative 2 on vegetative diversity of the project area, relative to the no-action alternative, are shown below:

Table 8. Effect of vegetative diversity changes under Alt. 2 & 3 timber harvesting actions (acres).

Forest Type	Within-Stand Diversity (Thinnings)	Between-Stand Diversity (Even Aged Management)
Hardwood	322	727
Pine	1046	497

Implementation of this alternative is not expected to have a negative cumulative impact on vegetation. The forest condition would be improved and left in a more sustainable condition. Risk of insect/disease outbreaks would decrease and growth of residual trees would increase. Also, potential old-growth would not decrease in the project area.

Alternative 3

The effects of implementing Alternative 3 would be similar to the effects mentioned above for Alternative 2. Eliminating the use of herbicides and replacing it with handtools (i.e., chainsaws, machetes, etc.) would slow the process of regenerating the desirable species. When using handtools to eliminate the undesirable species within a treatment area, only those undesirables that are 24-inches or taller would be cut. Everything less than 24 inches would remain, thereby leaving the treatment area occupied with undesirable species that could out-compete the desirable species. If herbicides were used, the less than 24-inch undesirables would be treated and would more than likely die. Additionally, herbicides prevent stump-sprouting from occurring. When only using hand-tools to cut undesirables, stump-sprouting will almost always occur, thus causing the desirable species to struggle against formidable competition for sunlight.

8. Wildlife Resources

Significant Issues Related to the Resource

Issue #1

The cumulative effects of past activities on private lands, together with past and proposed activities on public land, and their impacts on soil erosion, water quality and wildlife habitat.

Issue #2 - Forest health problems in the area and sustainable ecosystems.

Existing Condition

Wildlife, fish and plant species and their habitats in the project area are managed in cooperation with the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission (AG&F), and the Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission (ARNHC). The state wildlife management agencies main responsibilities are to set policy for hunting and fishing regulations and law enforcement programs. The Natural Heritage Commission is responsible for collecting and maintaining information on rare plants, animals and natural communities in Arkansas. The Forest Service is responsible for managing fish and wildlife habitat conditions on National Forest lands. The following discussion focuses on the habitat conditions that support wildlife populations and fisheries.

The aquatic fauna in the project area is very diverse. The richness and diversity of this area is the result of several factors including long geological history of favorable climates and habitats, a lack of glaciation during the Pleistocene era, and a wide variety of aquatic habitats in the Boston Mountain eco-region. The streams within the eco-region are typically clear, extremely high gradient, and riffle and pool habitat dominated systems with gravel, cobble, boulder, and bedrock dominated substrates of sandstone, shale, and limestone. The Boston Mountain eco-region does not have as many karst features as some of the other eco-regions in this part of Arkansas, but there are still many caves, springs, and seeps within the system. Streams within the Boston Mountain eco-region are classified as nutrient poor systems with much of the energy derived from an allochthonous food chain.

The diversity of wildlife species within this project area is typical of the Boston Mountains of the Ozark Plateau (USDA, 1990).

Wildlife habitat is being altered by the oak decline phenomenon, particularly the red oak borer infestation. If this phenomenon progresses on the District, habitat changes could include a long-term reduction in hard mast production, an increase in the amount of soft mast production as non-oaks make up more of the overstory, and a short-term higher density of snags and down trees.

The Pleasant Hill District reflects conditions that are seen Forest wide in relation to age classes of forest stands. The project analysis area contains a high proportion of late seral wildlife habitat, and lacks open woodland capable of supporting diverse understory grass and herbaceous vegetation.

Under the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) regulations, adopted in 1982, selection of management indicator species (MIS) during development of forest plans is required (36 CFR 219.19 [a]). Management Indicator Species (MIS) are selected "because their population changes are believed to indicate the effects of management activities" (36 CFR 219.19 [a] [1]). They are used during planning to help compare effects of alternatives (36 CFR 219.19 [a] [2]) and as a focus for monitoring.

Table 9. MIS Species, Habitat Requirements and Population Trends

Species	MIS Type	Habitat Requirements	Population Trend
Northern bobwhite	ecological indicator	pine and oak woodland and native grasslands	decreasing
Whitetail deer	demand	mosaic of forest age classes	stable to

			increasing*
Black bear	demand	remote habitat with mature forest component with intermixed 0-5 year old regeneration	stable to increasing*
Wild turkey	demand	mature forest with open areas containing grasses/forbs/soft mast	stable to decreasing*
Prairie warbler	ecological indicator	regenerating forest communities	decreasing
Brown-headed nuthatch	ecological indicator	open pine forest and woodlands	stable to decreasing
Cerulean warbler	ecological indicator	communities associated with mature hardwood forest with complex canopy structures, and dry-mesic oak Forest communities	stable to decreasing
Northern parula	ecological indicator	communities associated with forests in riparian areas	stable
Ovenbird	ecological indicator	dry-mesic oak forests	stable to increasing
Red-headed woodpecker	ecological indicator	oak woodland overstories	stable to decreasing
Pileated woodpecker	ecological indicator	large snags	stable to increasing
Scarlet tanager	ecological indicator	mature dry-mesic oak forest communities	stable
Acadian flycatcher	ecological indicator	mature mesic hardwood forest communities	stable to increasing
Smallmouth bass	demand	cool water stream communities	increasing
Largemouth bass	demand	quality pond and lake habitat	stable

*information from AGFC harvest data

Table 9 shows Ozark National Forest MIS species pertinent to the Pleasant Hill Ranger District, the habitat type they represent and population trends (AGFC 2001, 2006 & 2007, USDA 2001, USDA 2007 and NatureServe 2010). From the Forest MIS list, 15 species have potential habitat based on occurrence records and/or habitat requirements within the analysis area and will be addressed.

In 1996, the Southern Region of the USDA Forest Service adopted "The Southern National Forest's Migrant and Resident Landbird Conservation Strategy" (Gaines and Morris 1996) to improve monitoring, research, and management programs affecting forest birds and their habitats. A region wide program of monitoring avian populations based on point-counts was initiated as part of this strategy. The results of this monitoring effort are reported in General Technical Report – NRS-9 (USDA, 2007), and summarized for MIS avian species on the Ozark National Forest in supporting documentation (Taylor, 2010). Data collected from 1992 to 2004 is utilized. Sampling strategy and point-count methodology is described in detail in Gaines and Morris (1996).

The project area is a mature forest matrix generally composed of an oak-hickory sub-matrix and a shortleaf pine sub-matrix. Currently on federal lands, approximately 67% of the project area woodland is composed of hardwood/hardwood-pine forest types which are capable of producing abundant hard mast for wildlife. Pine/pine-hardwood and cedar/hardwood forest types comprise approximately 33% of the analysis area. Grassland areas in the analysis area comprise less than 0.5% of the project area and are often characterized by non-native noxious weeds and introduced grasses providing poor wildlife

habitat. Grass/forb habitat on federal lands is found only in old wildlife openings, utility rights-of-way, and roadsides.

Hard mast capability is well distributed across the landscape. The majority of the project area's hardwood forest types is currently of mast-producing age. These age classes are those which are 41+ years of age. These stands are found within stream corridors and on all aspects with the best representation found on the north and east slopes. Mast-producing trees are also represented within the shortleaf pine sub-matrix, but to a lesser degree.

The mast needs of many forest animals are met when at least 20 percent of 640 acres (one square mile) is occupied by well-distributed mast-producing hardwood trees (Wildlife Habitat Management Handbook, 204.1).

The majority of pine forest types in the project area are currently in age classes >61 years of age (68%). These stands are represented on all aspects, ridgetops and bottomland areas.

At present, less than 1% of the public lands in the project area (forest and woodlands) is in an early seral condition (0-10 years of age). Most of this representation of the 0-10 year age classes is the result of silvicultural treatments.

The project area reflects conditions that are seen Forest wide in relation to age classes of forest stands. The project area contains a high proportion of late-seral wildlife habitat, and lacks open woodland capable of supporting diverse understory grass and herbaceous vegetation.

Table 10. Forest Age Class Distribution by Alternative (public lands)

Age Classes (years)	Alternative 1 (acres/% total)	Alternative 2 (acres/% total)
grass/forb*	approx. 50/<0.5%	approx. 125/1.5%
0-10	12/<1%	1224/14%
11-20	131/1.5%	131/1.5%
21-40	756/9%	756/9%
41-60	302/3.5%	302/3.5%
61-80	2518/29.5%	2480/29%
81-100+	4802/56%	3541/41.5%

* grass/forb acres are represented by existing road and utility right of ways, and existing and proposed wildlife openings

With implementation of Alternative 2, approximately 1,224 acres would be converted, through harvest and subsequent regeneration, from the 81-100 year age classes to the 0-10 year age class. Browse and early-successional forest habitat would be provided in these regeneration areas for a variety of wildlife species. Viability of disturbance-dependent avian species would be enhanced. Avian species requiring both large and small areas of early successional vegetation and forest edge would benefit. Implementation of shelterwood harvest would result in 14% of the public land-base within the project area compartments in early successional forest habitat, as opposed to 1% under current conditions. In addition, approximately 38 acres in the 61-80 year age class and 37 acres in the 81-100 year age class would be converted to grass/forb habitat (wildlife openings). This would result in 1.5% of the public land-base within the project area being in grass/forb habitat, as opposed to <0.5% under current conditions.

Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in a 14% reduction of forest habitat that is greater than 81 years old (within project area compartments). Following implementation of

this alternative, 41.5% of the forested (both pine and hardwood) public land base within the project area compartments would remain in the 81-100+ year age classes. When considering recruitment of stands from the 61+ year age classes (approximately 2,480 acres or 29% of project area land base) in the next 1-20 years, and examination of distribution of stand age classes, fragmentation of interior forest habitat is not anticipated.

Direct, Indirect and Cumulative Effects

Alternative 1

Currently approved management actions would be maintained under this alternative.

Effects to wildlife and MIS from implementation of the no action alternative are analyzed in detail in a reference paper compiled by the Pleasant Hill Ranger District (Taylor, 2010). This paper is part of the project analysis file.

Timber Harvest and Wildlife Habitat Improvement.
Effects of implementation of the no action alternative are described in Taylor (2010), in relation to the subsections Early Successional Habitat, Soft Mast Production, and Hard Mast Production. Indirect beneficial effects to wildlife species dependent upon older seral stages, and habitat requirements associated with closed-canopy conditions would occur. Thinning to help restore woodland conditions and creation of wildlife openings to improve herbaceous diversity would not occur. Short term early successional habitat in regenerated forest stands would not occur, thereby causing negative indirect effects to disturbance-dependent and early successional obligate wildlife species. Lack of use of thinning and regeneration harvest would not allow for improved production of soft mast. Increases in abundance of soft mast, utilized by a variety of wildlife species as a reliable seasonal food source would not occur. Regeneration silvicultural treatments would not be implemented to provide age class diversity and maintain oak in the ecosystem as a source of hard mast for wildlife species. Oak species would be expected to become a minor component of the forest ecosystem in the long term without significant forest stand disturbance or treatments that favor oak regeneration. This alternative would cause negative indirect impacts to wildlife species. Forest Plan (USDA, 2005) recommendations of diverse, high quality habitats supporting well-distributed and viable populations of all native and desired non-native plants and animals would not be met. Natural disturbance regimes within terrestrial habitats providing a stable and sustained flow of both early- and late-successional habitats over time would not meet desired conditions for fish and wildlife habitat.

Timber Stand Improvement Practices
Timber stand improvement practices, silvicultural release and precommercial thinning practices, and planting of hardwoods in oak-poor areas would not occur. Lack of improvement of stands containing beneficial tree species for wildlife would not occur, thereby causing indirect adverse impacts.

Prescribed Fire
Prescribed fire would not be implemented in the project analysis area with adoption of this alternative. Benefits to wildlife from: sustaining oak in the ecosystem for hard mast production; restoring woodlands for increased herbaceous diversity and density; maintaining pine as a significant component in the ecosystem; maintaining other fire-dependent or adapted species and habitats; and abatement of non-native invasive plant species would not

occur. Lack of use of prescribed fire would not allow for improved production of soft mast. Increases in abundance of soft mast utilized by a variety of wildlife species as a reliable seasonal food source would not occur. This would cause negative indirect impacts to wildlife species. Forest Plan (USDA, 2005) recommendations of diverse, high quality habitats supporting well-distributed and viable populations of all native and desired non-native plants and animals would not be met. Natural disturbance regimes within terrestrial habitats providing a stable and sustained flow of both early- and late-successional habitats over time would not meet desired conditions for fish and wildlife habitat.

Herbicide Use

Herbicide use is also an important tool for benefiting oak/pine regeneration, by reducing interspecies competition and providing for these species presence in the ecosystem in the long term. Without use of this tool, benefits to oak/pine regeneration would not occur.

Aquatic Species/Habitat

Aquatic habitat for fish would not be improved because placement of large woody debris (LWD) in creeks, removal and remediation of fish passage barriers, and streambank stabilization would not occur. In most cases, Forest Plan desired conditions would not be met for fish and wildlife regarding LWD in streams. This would cause indirect adverse effects to aquatic species which may be currently limited through lack of habitat, barriers to fish passage, and water quality. Improved distribution of water sources for wildlife through construction of ponds would not occur. This would cause indirect adverse impacts to amphibians, bats, migratory and resident birds and game species.

Road Work

Road maintenance, road decommissioning and closure of roads to administrative use only would not occur. The "No Action" alternative would not serve to disconnect the road system from the stream network. Road maintenance at levels expected to occur with the action alternatives would not occur, thereby allowing entrainment of sedimentation to continue in creeks from poor quality roads. This would cause adverse indirect impacts to water quality and aquatic species. Open road density in the project area would remain status quo, thereby allowing potential erosion to cause adverse indirect impacts to water quality and aquatic species.

There would be no change short term in the amount of closed-canopy forest habitat from current levels under the No Action Alternative. Species requiring interior/closed canopy forest habitat would be expected to remain stable or increase within the project analysis area. Species requiring forest openings, edges between different successional stages, and herbaceous/shrub browse would be expected to remain stable or decrease long term within the project analysis area.

Habitat components would continue to be less than specified in the Forest Plan within the project analysis area. Objectives as described in the Forest Plan (USDA, 2005) for bobwhite quail, whitetail deer, eastern wild turkey, black bear and largemouth/smallmouth bass (OBJ.10, OBJ.11, OBJ. 12, OBJ. 13, and OBJ. 15 respectively) would not be met in the project analysis area with implementation of the no action alternative. The objective for non-native invasive species treatment (OBJ. 9) would not be met in the project analysis area. The objective for insect and disease management through thinning and regeneration of oak and pine (OBJ. 8) would not be met in the project analysis area.

Alternatives 2&3

Effects to wildlife and MIS from implementation of the action alternative are analyzed in detail in a reference paper compiled by the Pleasant Hill Ranger District (Taylor, 2007). This paper is part of the project analysis file.

Timber Harvest and Wildlife Habitat Improvement.

Effects of implementation of the action alternative are described in Taylor (2010), in relation to the subsections Early Successional Habitat, Soft Mast Production, and Hard Mast Production. Indirect negative effects to wildlife species dependent upon older seral stages and habitat requirements associated with closed canopy conditions would occur. Thinning to help restore woodland conditions and creation of wildlife openings to improve herbaceous diversity would cause positive indirect impacts to wildlife. Short term early-successional habitat in regenerated forest stands would occur, thereby causing positive indirect effects to disturbance-dependent and early successional obligate wildlife species. Use of thinning and regeneration harvest would improve production of soft mast. Increases in abundance of soft mast utilized by a variety of wildlife species as a reliable seasonal food source would occur. Regeneration silvicultural treatments would provide age class diversity and maintain oak in the ecosystem as a source of hard mast for wildlife species. Oak species would be expected to be maintained as a component of the forest ecosystem in the long term. This alternative would cause positive indirect impacts to wildlife species. Diverse and high quality habitats supporting well-distributed and viable populations of all native and desired non-native plants and animals would meet desired conditions for fish and wildlife as specified in the Forest Plan (USDA, 2005). Disturbance regimes within terrestrial habitats providing a stable and sustained flow of both early and late-successional habitats over time would meet desired conditions for fish and wildlife habitat as specified in the Forest Plan (USDA, 2005). Implementation of Alternative 3 (no herbicide use) would not be as beneficial to wildlife species as implementation of Alternative 2. Herbicide use (as proposed with Alternative 2) is an important tool often used in woodland restoration thinning and wildlife opening construction and maintenance to prevent sprouting of woody species and therefore allowing for greater understory herbaceous vegetation abundance and diversity. Woodland restoration thinning and wildlife opening construction would be more effective and produce greater vegetation diversity with implementation of Alternative 2.

Timber Stand Improvement Practices

These practices, which include release, precommercial thinning and planting of hardwoods in oak decline areas, are beneficial to wildlife in the long term. These practices provide indirect beneficial effects to wildlife by insuring long term perpetuation of hard mast-producing trees and shortleaf pine in the ecosystem.

Prescribed Fire

Implementation of prescribed fire may cause some direct mortality to small mammals and herpetofauna in the short-term. However, Kirkland et al. (1997) found that fire effects upon small mammals in oak-dominated forests are transitory. Quantitative differences between burned and unburned habitats were found to disappear within 8 months following the burn. Rapid recovery of populations of small mammals in burned forests may be due to the rapid regrowth of ground cover from surviving rootstocks. Research found there were few discernible differences in small mammal and herpetofauna populations between burned and

control areas, supporting the contention that prescribed fire in the project area had little overall impact on the terrestrial vertebrate fauna. In addition, immediate impacts of the burn on small mammals are slight as many species exhibit varying degrees of fossorial habits (Ford et al., 1999). In a study within the upper piedmont of South Carolina, Kilpatrick (et. al. 2004) found that prescribed burning and thinning for fuel reduction had minimal effects on herpetofauna in upland pine plantations. Prescribed burning has been found to change the composition of woody species seedlings. Due to reduction in the number of shade-tolerant species from prescribed burning, greater equitability among tolerant and intolerant species seedlings occurred. Mechanical removal of understory vegetation followed by prescribed fire provided both greater equitability among species and higher levels of photosynthetically active radiation reaching the forest floor (Dolan, 2004). Prescribed burning and sub-canopy removal are important tools in improving conditions for oak seedling establishment while reducing competition from shade-tolerant species. Shelterwood/Oak-Restoration harvest followed by prescribed fire simulates the combined events of overstory disturbance followed by fire; these are related events that have shaped the composition of oak ecosystems for millennia (Van Lear, 2000).

Herbicide Use

Herbicide use is also an important tool for benefiting oak/pine regeneration by providing for these species presence in the ecosystem in the long term. Effects of herbicide toxicity data and dosage estimates for triclopyr, imazapic, imazapyr, glyphosate and hexazinone proposed for use in this action alternative indicate that there is only a very low risk to wildlife, both from realistic and extreme exposures. Monitoring for herbicide concentrations following use has been a continuous policy of the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests. Results have not documented any significant concentrations of herbicides or off-site movement. In a study regarding the use of herbicides in forestry applications (Michael, 2001), the author found that maximum pesticide concentrations observed in water have been much lower than the maximum levels which the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) considers safe for consumption on a daily basis over a lifetime (HAL). In some studies the author reviewed maximum herbicide concentrations observed in ephemeral to first-order streams exceeded the lifetime HAL, but found that they last only a few hours and the highest concentrations did not exceed EPA's 1-day HAL. Even with the widespread use of pesticides in North America, those typically used in forestry vegetation management programs have not been identified in surface or ground water at sufficiently high concentrations to impair drinking water quality. Their rapid break-down by physical, chemical, and biological routes coupled with current use patterns precludes the development of significant water contamination problems unless they are applied directly to water. Additionally, mitigation measures normally employed through State Best Management Practices (BMP's) further restrict herbicide's effects outside the boundaries of its application. On February 23 and 24, 2009 analysis of risk was performed for the chemicals glyphosate, hexazinone, imazapic, imazapyr, triclopyr amine, and triclopyr ester at the proposed rate of application in SERA risk assessments prepared for the USDA Forest Service (USDA 2006). In a variety of human health and environmental health scenarios (including a variety of wildlife scenarios) most Hazard Quotients were projected to be below the Forest's maximum acceptable standard of 1.0. Application of mitigation measures shown previously in this document and adherence to Forest Standards for herbicide use and chemical labels for application will negate hazard quotients > 1.0 related to drift, accidental spills and run-off. Parameters and output from these analyses are available as part of the process record at the Pleasant Hill Ranger District Office, 2591 Highway 21, Clarksville, Arkansas 72830.

Glyphosate is not soil active and has low toxicity to animals. Lab studies conducted specifically on bobwhite quail also demonstrate extremely low toxicity. Typical hazard quotients for foliar and cut surface application for glyphosate to wildlife are less than 1.0.

Hexazinone causes no irritation with repeated contact with skin and no systemic activity. Repeated dosing by ingestion of excessive dietary levels of this chemical result in animal weight loss, alteration in liver weights, alteration in blood chemical measurements, and alteration in enzyme activities (MSDS for Velpar L dated 2/22/2006). Typical hazard quotients associated with soil application of hexazinone for wildlife are less than 1.0, with the exception of the longer-term (90 days) exposure of a large mammal to contaminated vegetation on site (see process record for specific numbers). These upper bound HQ's are not a concern because:

- The scenario assumes a diet composed of 100% contaminated vegetation or insects from the site which is highly unlikely. The long-term HQ assumes that vegetation is consumed on the same site for 90 days which is also unlikely.
- The HQ's deal with individuals, not populations.

Imazapic is weakly absorbed in basic soils, but absorption increases in acidic soils. This herbicide has low toxicity to animals. Hazard quotients calculated for risk to terrestrial wildlife are all less than 1.0 (see process record for specific numbers).

Imazapyr has very low toxicity to mammals or other animals, however it can be soil active particularly during spring leaf expansion. Application after mid-September may yield soil activity the following spring. All HQ's are well under 1.0, (see process record for specific numbers) with the exception of effects to aquatic plants. Any non-target plants if occurring in proximity to treated plants, could be killed and this could indirectly affect habitat for MIS on a very small scale.

Triclopyr Amine and Triclopyr Ester have low bioconcentration potential and single dose toxicity to mammals is low although prolonged or repeated exposure may cause skin irritation in mammals (MSDS dated 1/17/2001). Typical hazard quotients associated with both foliar and cut surface application of triclopyr for wildlife are less than 1.0, with the exception of the longer-term (90 days) exposure of a large mammal to contaminated vegetation on site (see process record for specific numbers). These upper bound HQ's are not a concern because:

- The scenario assumes a diet composed of 100% contaminated vegetation or insects from the site which is highly unlikely. The long-term HQ assumes that vegetation is consumed on the same site for 90 days which is also unlikely.
- The HQ's deal with individuals, not populations.
- The amount of non-target vegetation subject to spray deposition is very small and animals are unlikely to be eating vegetation treated with cut surface application of chemical in woodland restoration and TSI areas.

Direct effects, occurring at time of application, to birds or large mammals are unlikely, since these species are likely to move from the area when project activities are implemented. Although direct effects to amphibians are more likely since contact with herbicide could be

absorbed through the skin and effect metabolic activity, amphibians are likely to be under logs, rocks or leaves, making direct contact with chemicals less likely. Direct effects to other non-target plants occurring in these habitats could occur. Application methods, including direct application to target foliage or to freshly cut stumps, would minimize the possibility for spills and/or direct contamination to non-target species.

Indirect effects to MIS birds or mammals could occur if these species were to ingest foliage or seeds contaminated with any of the chemicals proposed in alternative 2, however, none of the chemicals would bioaccumulate in organisms. Indirect effects to MIS and habitats treated with all chemicals are likely to be negligible given that applicators treat target organisms only and that mitigation measures and forest-wide standards will be used.

There are likely to be few negative cumulative effects to MIS species over time as a result of implementing Alternative 2. None of the herbicides proposed for use will bioaccumulate or have lengthy half lives in the environment. Related to cumulative impacts, the Pleasant Hill District is authorized under a previous NEPA analysis to apply herbicide districtwide on up to 500 acres annually to treat non native invasive species (NNIS). Realistically, for the reasonably foreseeable future this may amount to 200 acres of herbicide treatment in the analysis area for NNIS over the next five years. In addition, no other herbicide projects are known from the Ozark National Forest or the vicinity at present, though some herbicide use is likely to occur on private lands particularly in association with agricultural production. Efforts to maintain early seral habitat and restore herbaceous species biodiversity in woodlands, and TSI treatments to benefit hard mast producing species are also likely to cumulatively benefit associated MIS species.

The past and proposed use of herbicides would have no negative direct, indirect or cumulative effects on water quality or wildlife with adherence to Forest Wide Standards FW19 - FW 32 (USDA, 2005). Proposed herbicide use would have beneficial effects on species using early-successional habitat by allowing creation and maintenance of wildlife openings, reduction of overstory and midstory canopy in WSI areas, and promoting oak and pine regeneration through TSI cultural practices.

Implementation of Alternative 3 (no herbicide use) would not provide the level of indirect benefits to wildlife as would be expected with implementation of Alternative 2. Lack of herbicide use would reduce the levels of early successional habitat, reduce diversity of herbaceous species in woodland restoration areas and reduce the promotion of oak/pine regeneration – below levels which would be expected with implementation of Alternative 2.

Aquatic Species/Habitat

Implementation of the action alternative would benefit native fish populations by providing additional quality habitat through introduction of large woody debris (LWD) for cover. LWD placed in streams would meet desired conditions for fish and wildlife as specified in the Forest Plan (USDA, 2005). Introduction of LWD into streams would provide direct beneficial impacts to aquatic species. Improved distribution of water sources for wildlife through construction of ponds would occur with this proposal. This would cause indirect positive impacts to amphibians, bats, migratory and resident birds and game species.

Road Work

No negative long term impacts to wildlife would occur through proposed road construction, road reconstruction, road maintenance or temporary roading. Closure of roads following use with gates/mounds would reduce disturbance to wildlife. Reconstruction and maintenance of roads would lead to improved water quality by reducing existing erosion, through use of improved road design features. Application of BMP's and forest-wide standards (FW-72 – FW-76, FW-78, FW-79, FW-81, FW-82, and FW-87 – FW-90) will be utilized for all road related work (USDA, 2005). Un-maintained and unauthorized non-system roads are one of the most common sources of accelerated erosion on National Forest lands. The proposed action would serve to assist in "disconnecting" the road system from the stream network. Road maintenance would help preclude entrainment of sedimentation in creeks from poor quality roads. This would cause positive indirect impacts to water quality and aquatic species. Open road density in the project area would in most cases be reduced by road decommissioning and closure of roads with gates – allowing administrative access only. This would serve to reduce potential erosion, providing positive indirect impacts to water quality and aquatic species. Gating areas, including some large blocks, would provide habitats for species sensitive to human disturbance and provide opportunity for more remote wildlife-related recreation opportunities.

In summary, the action alternative is predicted to have negative short term impacts on 9 of 15 management indicator species analyzed. Negative impacts would be primarily short term disturbance of individual animals and potential loss of nests. Viability of populations as a whole would not be reduced (Taylor, 2010).

The use of proposed management actions as described in this Environmental Assessment would be of long term benefit to MIS that rely upon forest ecosystems, particularly oak/pine ecosystems, for habitat. In summary, alternative 2 is predicted to have positive long term effects on 20 of 20 management indicator species analyzed. Although some individual negative long term effects are predicted, populations of all MIS would be expected to remain viable in the Ozark Highlands and on the National Forest (Taylor, 2010).

9. Threatened, Endangered, Sensitive (TES) Species

Existing Condition

Forest Service Manual (FSM) Section 2672.41 requires a biological evaluation (BE) and/or biological assessment (BA) for all Forest Service planned, funded, executed, or permitted programs and activities. The objectives of this BE/BA are to: 1) ensure that Forest Service actions do not contribute to loss of viability of any native or desired non-native species or contribute to trends toward federal listing, 2) comply with the requirements of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) so that federal agencies do not jeopardize or adversely modify critical habitat (as defined in ESA) of federally listed species, and 3) provide a process and standard to ensure that threatened, endangered, proposed, and sensitive species receive full consideration in the decision-making process.

Federally listed threatened and endangered species, species proposed for federal listing, and Southern Region sensitive species that may potentially be affected by this project were examined using the following existing available information:

1. Reviewing the list of TES plant and animal species known or likely to occur on the Ozark – St. Francis National Forest, and their habitat preferences. This review included the U.S.

Fish and Wildlife Service current list of endangered, threatened, and proposed species for Arkansas dated Feb. 28, 2005 (USDI 2005), the forestwide list dated Dec. 21, 2001 and the current Southern Region Sensitive Species list for the Forest, dated August 7, 2001 (list attached as Appendix A in Biological Evaluation).

2. Consulting element occurrence records (EOR's) for TES species as maintained by the Arkansas Natural Heritage Program (ARNHP).

3. Consulting with individuals in the private and public sector who are knowledgeable about the area and its flora and/or fauna.

4. Reviewing sources listed in the reference portion of this report.

5. Reviewing the results of field surveys that have been conducted in the area.

Most TES species known to occur on the Forest have unique habitat requirements, such as glades, barrens, rock outcrops, bogs, caves, and natural ponds. Appendix A of the BE/BA lists all 63 TES species currently known or expected to occur on or near the Ozark – St. Francis National Forest. All species on the list were considered during the analysis for this project.

A "step down" process was followed to eliminate species from further analysis and focus on those species that may be affected by proposed project activities. Species not eliminated are then analyzed in greater detail. Results of this "step down" analysis process are displayed in the Occurrence Analysis Results (OAR) column of the table in Appendix A. First, the range of a species was considered. Species' ranges on the Forest are based on county records contained in such documents as An Atlas and Annotated List of the Vascular Plants of Arkansas, and NatureServe Explorer, but are refined further when additional information is available, such as more recent occurrences documented in scientific literature or in Natural Heritage databases. Many times, historic range information clearly indicates a species will not occur in the analysis area due to the restricted geographic distribution of most TES species. When the analysis area is outside a known species range, that species is eliminated from further consideration by being coded as OAR code "1" in the Appendix A table. For the remaining species, after this first step, results from past surveys, knowledge of the analysis area and potential for suitable habitat were considered.

These resources and information were synthesized to produce a site-specific biological evaluation for this project (Taylor, 2010).

Species Identified as Being in the Action Area or Potentially Affected by the Action

From past field surveys and knowledge of the area, and given the proposed action, those species which are analyzed and discussed further in this document are those that: a) are found to be located in the activity area (OAR code "5"), and b) were not seen during the survey(s), but possibly occur in the activity area based on habitat observed during the survey(s) or field survey was not conducted when species is recognizable (OAR code "6"), and c) aquatic species known or suspected downstream of the project/activity area, but where project effects will be immeasurable or insignificant (OAR code "7").

As a result of this process, the following species occur as documented by field surveys or may potentially occur in the activity area based on habitat observations:

OAR Code	Scientific Name	Common Name	Taxa	Status

OAR Code	Scientific Name	Common Name	Taxa	Status
7	*Percina Nasuta*	Longnose darter	Fish	Sensitive
6	*Aimophila aestivalis*	Bachman's sparrow	Bird	Sensitive
5	*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*	Bald eagle	Bird	Sensitive
5	*Corynorhinus townsendii ingens*	Ozark big-eared bat	Mammal	Endangered
6	*Myotis grisescens*	Gray bat	Mammal	Endangered
6	*Myotis leibii*	Eastern small- footed bat	Mammal	Sensitive
6	*Myotis sodalis*	Indiana bat	Mammal	Endangered
6	*Lirceus bicuspicatus*	An isopod	Isopod	Sensitive
7	*Paduniella nearctica*	Nearctic paduneillan caddisfly	Insect	Sensitive
6	*Amorpha Ouachitensis*	Ouachita leadplant	Plant	Sensitive
6	*Callirhoe bushii*	Bush's poppymallow	Plant	Sensitive
5	*Castanea pumila var. ozarkensis*	Ozark chinquapin	Plant	Sensitive
6	*Cypripedium kentuckiense*	Southern lady's slipper	Plant	Sensitive
6	*Delphinium newtonianum*	Moore's larkspur	Plant	Sensitive
5	*Dodecatheon frenchii*	French's shooting star	Plant	Sensitive
6	*Silene ovata*	Ovate-leaf catchfly	Plant	Sensitive
5	*Tradescantia ozarkana*	Ozark Spiderwort	Plant	Sensitive
6	*Valerianella nuttallii*	Nutall's cornsalad	Plant	Sensitive
6	*Valerianella ozarkana*	Ozark cornsalad	Plant	Sensitive

The occurrence analysis results table shows one bird species (bald eagle), one mammal species (Ozark big-eared bat), and three plant species (Ozark chinquapin, French's shooting star, and Ozark spiderwort) were identified within the analysis area (OAR code "5").

Twelve species were not seen during field surveys, but possibly occur in the analysis area based on habitat observed or the field surveys were conducted when the species is not recognizable (OAR code"6"); 1 bird species (Bachman's sparrow), 3 mammal species (gray bat, Indiana bat and Eastern small-footed bat), 1 isopod species (lirceus isopod), and 7 plant species (Ouachita leadplant, Bush's poppymallow, Southern lady's slipper, Moore's larkspur, Ovate-leaf catchfly, Nuttall's cornsalad, and Ozark cornsalad).

Two aquatic species are known to occur downstream of the project area, but outside identified geographic bounds of water resource cumulative effects analysis area (defined as a point below which sediment amounts are immeasurable and insignificant). Species with OAR code "7" include one fish species (longnose darter) and one insect species (Nearctic paduniellan caddisfly).

Direct, Indirect & Cumulative Effects of Proposed Management Action on Each Identified Species

The analysis of possible effects to species identified as known or expected to occur in the vicinity of the proposed project, or likely to be affected by the action, includes the following existing information:

1. Data on species/habitat relationships.
2. Species range distribution.

3. Occurrences developed from past field surveys or field observations.
4. The amount, condition, and distribution of suitable habitat.

Effects to species include anticipated effects from implementation of the proposed action. Predicted effects to species shown in the table above are described in the Biological Evaluation for the Catalpa Projects (Taylor, 2010).

Determination of Effects – "No Action" Alternative (TES species)

No negative adverse effects would occur to federally listed (T & E) species populations (Ozark big-eared bat, gray bat and Indiana bat). Potential positive effects to these species through habitat improvement would not occur.

No negative adverse effects would occur to Region 8 sensitive species (longnose darter, Bachman's sparrow, bald eagle, Eastern small-footed bat, lirceus isopod, Ouachita leadplant, Bush's poppymallow, Ozark chinquapin, Southern lady's slipper, Moore's larkspur, French's shooting star, ovate-leaf catchfly, Ozark spiderwort, Nuttall's cornsalad and Ozark cornsalad). Potential positive effects to species which require open (unshaded) and/or fire-dependent habitats would not occur. These sensitive species include Bachman's sparrow, Ouachita leadplant, Bush's poppymallow, Moore's larkspur, ovate-leaf catchfly, Ozark spiderwort, Nuttall's cornsalad and Ozark cornsalad.

Determination of Effects – "Proposed Action" Alternatives 2 and 3(TES species)

Ozark big-eared bat

The proposed action was designed to totally incorporate all Forest-wide standards, and direction provided by the USFWS related to the conservation of all listed bat species.

There are no foreseeable, additional activities in the area (not associated with this project) that would directly or indirectly affect the Ozark big-eared bat population as a whole, or cause additive or synergistic adverse cumulative impacts in conjunction with the proposed action.

With implementation of Forest-wide standards from the Revised LRMP which were developed in coordination with the USFWS during the revision process, the determination of effect for the Ozark big-eared bat related to this proposed project is: "may affect – not likely to adversely affect."

Gray bat

There are no foreseeable, additional activities in the area (not associated with this project) that would directly or indirectly affect the gray bat population as a whole, or cause additive or synergistic adverse cumulative impacts in conjunction with the proposed action.

With implementation of Forest-wide standards from the Revised LRMP which were developed in coordination with the USFWS during the revision process, the determination of

effect for the Gray bat related to this proposed project is: "may affect – not likely to adversely affect."

Indiana bat

There are no foreseeable, additional activities in the area (not associated with this project) that would directly or indirectly affect the Indiana bat population as a whole, or cause additive or synergistic adverse cumulative impacts in conjunction with the proposed action.

With implementation of Forest-wide standards from the Revised LRMP which were developed in coordination with the USFWS during the revision process, the determination of effect for the Indiana bat related to this proposed project is: "may affect – not likely to adversely affect."

Implementation of this proposed project may benefit Ozark big-eared bat, gray bat and Indiana bat by providing habitat improvement. Implementation of Alternative 2 would be of more benefit to TES bat species than would be implementation of Alternative 3, due to increased vegetation effects/responses as well as prey increases with the use herbicides. Because there are no other threatened or endangered species or associated habitat present the proposed project will have no effect on any other listed or proposed species (Taylor, 2009).

Sensitive Species

For sensitive species, longnose darter, Bachman's sparrow, bald eagle, Eastern small-footed bat, lirceus isopod, Ouachita leadplant, Bush's poppymallow, Ozark chinquapin, Southern lady's slipper, Moore's larkspur, French's shooting star, ovate-leaf catchfly, Ozark spiderwort, Nuttall's cornsalad and Ozark cornsalad, direct negative impacts to individuals of these species may occur through implementation of the project. However, the project is not likely to cause a trend to the federal listing of these species under the Endangered Species Act. Furthermore, there will be no loss of population viability for these species due to implementation of this project.

Implementation of this proposed project would benefit sensitive species which require open (unshaded) and/or fire-dependent habitats. These sensitive species include Bachman's sparrow, Ouachita leadplant, Bush's poppymallow, Moore's larkspur, ovate-leaf catchfly, Ozark spiderwort, Nuttall's cornsalad and Ozark cornsalad. Because there were no other sensitive species or habitat for such species present, the project will have no impact on any other Southern Region sensitive species (Taylor, 2010).

10. Human Health Factors

Significant Issues Related to the Resource

Issue #1 – The cumulative effects of past activities on private lands, together with past and proposed activities on public land, and their impacts on soil erosion, water quality and wildlife habitat.

Existing Condition

At the present time, on National Forest Land, there are no risks to human health from the use of herbicides or cutting tools in the project area. There are other human health risks for

forest workers and visitors: dead and dying trees that are aging. Falling trees and limbs in recreation areas can cause injury to forest visitors and can cause damage to personal property. Furthermore, the Catalpa area in Newton County has a small concentration of ice storm damage. There are areas along travelways and in dispersed camping/hunting sites where trees are dead or dying from old age. Forest fuel accumulations and the interspersion of private lands/property within the analysis area, in combination, lead to potential for negative effects to human health and property.

Direct, Indirect and Cumulative Effects

Alternative 1

There would be no change from the existing condition regarding risks to human health from the use of herbicides, controlled burning, or cutting tools. Risks to human health and safety from falling limbs and trees associated with oak decline would increase due to rot, decay, and wind-throw.

Alternative 2

There is a perception by the public that any use of herbicides in the forest is unsafe. The more recent Syracuse Environmental Research Associates, Inc. (SERA) Risk Assessments for herbicides (USDA, 1999 and 2003) evaluate imazapyr, triclopyr, imazapic, hexazinone, and glyphosate from a human safety viewpoint, evaluating risks, short term effects and cumulative effects. All information contained in these Herbicide Risk Assessments (RA's) is incorporated by reference into this analysis. Risk assessments for these chemicals are documented in the project analysis file.

Site parameters were adequately (even conservatively) considered in these analyses. Analyses included risk assessment of human health and safety of workers, and of the general (visiting or off-site) public, analyses of risk to wildlife (terrestrial and aquatic) and plants both on and off site, and clear evaluations of the risk posed by potential off-site movement either in water (runoff, leaching, or other lateral transport in water through the soil) or via volatility and subsequent off-site vapor transport. Based on these analyses, there are no unintended direct or indirect negative effects projected as resulting from the proposed use of herbicide in this project. Cumulative effects from using herbicides as proposed also pose no significant risk of causing unintended negative cumulative effects due to their short half-lives and the selectivity of the proposed treatment methods.

According to SERA RA's, a hazard quotient of 1 or less is considered as low-risk. A hazard quotient of 2-10 requires extended mitigation measures. Herbicide use proposed within all watersheds will be well-buffered from streams. All mitigation measures (pp. 25-26) will be applied. These mitigation measures will greatly reduce the chance of workers being exposed and very slight risk for any public exposure to these compounds.

Applicators have the greatest risk of exposure and the chance of adverse health risk from herbicides. Glyphosate and Imazapyr have hazard quotients of less than 1. Hexazinone and Triclopyr have hazard quotients of 3 and 1.6, respectively.

Removal of dead and dying trees through harvest and thinning operations will make the forest safer for forest visitors.

Since 1986, eight injuries including 3 deaths have occurred on the Ozark-St. Francis National Forest while doing manual vegetation control. None have occurred in the last 15 years. Vegetation management activities with the greatest risks to the average worker in a 25-year career are those connected with manual site preparation. This is evidenced by high workers' compensation insurance rates for this type of work. There is a risk of worker injury doing manual tree and brush cut-down work. There should be no risk to the public from manual work.

Through prescribed burning, potential wildland fire occurrence will be greatly lessened. Effects to water quality and risk to flooding are addressed in the water section of this EA (pp. 29-40).

Strict adherence to FEIS and LMRP guidelines and a site-specific burning plan will limit the area where EPA standards are exceeded to a location very close in proximity to the flaming front. The burning plan will ensure that smoke or other combustion products do not reach, or significantly affect, smoke sensitive areas. Monitoring during and after the burn for adherence to guidelines and/or any potential problem areas will be conducted. These actions will ensure that the requirements of the Clean Air Act, EPA air standards, and state requirements will be met and there should be no long-term cumulative effects from these burns.

Downwind effects of reduced air quality would be short-term in nature. Impacting large population centers would be avoided. The acres burned under the action alternative would occur over several days. Individual ignitions would generally be limited to 500 to 2,000 acres daily. Ignition of the project area would be spread over several days, and probably over multiple years – thereby reducing potential for smoke impacts. Use of aerial ignition would serve to reduce burn-out time and associated duration of smoke impacts. Aerial ignition would also help develop smoke column lifting and reduce smoke impacts.

Smoke concentrations from prescribed burning can be a very serious matter, particularly near homes of people with respiratory illnesses, or near health-care facilities, or on roadways. Human health effects related to particulate matter in smoke include aggravation of respiratory or cardiovascular illnesses and changes in lung function, structure, and natural defense. Prescribed burn plans are required for each burn. Such plans provide burn unit locations, smoke sensitive targets, and mitigation required to limit negative effects of burning on human health and safety to the extent possible. The Forest Service complies with all applicable Federal and State regulations governing open burning. Additionally, private landowners are notified before the burn. If concerns related to human health exist, the USFS will accommodate that citizen in an effort to provide a safe and healthy environment during the burn. (e.g., citizens will be given the option to stay in a hotel room provided by the USFS)

Without fuels reduction burning, the chances of a wildfire will increase over time, and if a wildfire were to occur, and the fuel load within the forest was heavy, it is more likely that the wildfire would result in severe burn intensity, thus eliciting more adverse effects than the slight to moderate intensity fire associated with intentional fuel reduction burning.

All precautions will be taken to avoid any kind of property damage and risk to human health as per site specific burn plans, burn prescriptions and job hazard analysis.

Based upon the analysis, there should be no significant long-term cumulative effects on Human Health from implementation of vegetation management associated with Alternative 2. In addition, there should be no significant long-term cumulative effects on Human Health from implementation of prescribed fire associated with Alternative 2 (see "Air Resources" section of EA).

Alternative 3

The effects to human health from implementing timber and wildlife habitat improvement projects would be the same as the effects mentioned above for Alternative 2. Because no herbicides are proposed for this alternative, there would not be a potential risk to human health associated with herbicide use.

11. Social and Economic Factors

Existing Condition

The project is located in rural northwest Arkansas. The income levels are primarily moderate to low, and many local residents derive their income from harvesting timber and/or processing timber products. Local communities benefit from the taxes generated by timber activities. These benefits include social services such as law enforcement activities, safe drinking water, road maintenance/construction/reconstruction, and public school systems. These services contribute to an enhanced standard of living to the public within the area.

On October 30, 2000, congress signed into law the "Secure Rural School and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000" commonly known as Payments to States (Public Law 106-393). The Act addressed the decline in revenue from timber harvest in recent years received on Federal land, which have historically been shared with counties. These funds have been used by counties for schools, roads, and emergency activities.

On October 3, 2008, the Secure Rural Schools and community Self Determination Act of 2000 was reauthorized as part of Public Law 110-343. This allows counties to choose either 25% of the state's 7 year rolling average, or to receive a share of the state payment using a "formula" that uses several factors such as acres of Federal Land, previous payments, and per capita personal income. Johnson and Newton counties have elected to receive payments using the "formula" method. In 2008 the state of Arkansas received $9,392,420 from this act, Johnson County received $635,394 and Newton County received $797,304 (http://www.fs.fed.us/srs/).

Direct and Indirect Effects

Alternative 1

This alternative proposes no timber management activities. Therefore, there would be no economic benefits to the local communities resulting from jobs created by timber sales or money to be used for wildlife habitat needs (KV money).

Alternatives 2 &3

Activities proposed would affect the local economy by supplying timber for local mills, employing loggers to harvest timber, employing people to do site preparation, release, and wildlife habitat improvement work.

The revenues derived from the selling price of timber would contribute to school and road funds in Johnson and Newton counties, in accordance with the PL 110-343. At the time of the Catalpa project economic analysis, hardwood sawtimber sold for $60/CCF, hardwood pulpwood sold for $1.00/CCF, pine sawtimber sold for $70/CCF, and pine pulpwood sold for $1/CCF. These figures reflect an average from several timber sales recently sold on the Ozark National Forest. Table 3.11.2 lists the Present Net Value and Benefit/Cost Ratio of implementing each alternative.

Table 12. Economic Report on the forest product revenues generated by alternatives

	No Action	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Timber Volume (CCF)	0	13,830	13,830
PV Timber Revenue	$0.00	$719,890.00	$719,890.00
PV Road Costs	$0.00	$42,455.20	$42,455.20
PV Cultural Trtmts Costs	$0.00	$323,976.38	$434,089.87
PV Sale Prep & Admin Costs	$0.00	$347,961.00	$347,961.00
PV of All Costs	$0.00	$714,392.58	$824,506.07
Present Net Value	$0.00	$5,497.42	-$104,616.07
Revenue/Cost Ratio	$0.00	1.01	0.87

Alternative 3, which would not include herbicide applications, would cost more to implement than Alternative 2 since two or more applications of manual cutting of vegetation would be needed for TSI, release and woodland restoration thinning Wildlife opening maintenance would be costlier in the long term without herbicide use. Implementation of this alternative would necessitate brush-hogging on a more frequent basis. While supply costs are much lower, the costs associated with manual felling as opposed to herbicide application for site preparation can be higher because multiple treatments are necessary. Of course, if these two alternatives are compared in a strict efficiency analysis, the revenue of the timber for both alternatives would more than offset the costs of sale preparation, administration, and road expenditures. For instance, cultural treatments (manual or herbicide site preparation, release, TSI, PCT, etc.) are done after the timber operation to help rehabilitate the forest sites to the desired future condition.

Furthermore, this analysis does not include non-market values or non-monetary benefits. Improved wildlife habitat, decreased sedimentation from road closures, and improved hunting and recreational opportunities are hard to assign a dollar amount to and are not considered in this economic analysis. Also, costs for sale administration, silvicultural

contract administration, and sales preparation would occur regardless if this project is implemented or not. All employees will be funded with appropriated dollars each year regardless of the implementation of this particular project. Due to budget constraints and changes, and current market values, the costs associated with projects being implemented several years out may change somewhat and would always need to be reviewed and weighed accordingly. Therefore, before this project is implemented all costs for the proposed project would be re-evaluated and the project would be implemented only if the cost ratio is beneficial to the government.

Cumulative Effects

The action alternatives have a positive effect on the local economy in that it would provide revenue to the counties/schools and provide for local jobs. Economic benefits would also be realized through creation/improvement of wildlife habitat and associated improvement to the Wild & Scenic Mulberry River. Benefits to the public would be realized through reduction of fire hazard and potential loss/damage to personal property through implementation of fuels reduction burning. Reduction in fuel loading would serve to reduce potential wildfire spread and severity, thereby reducing costs associated with fire suppression which far exceeds cost per acre for prescribed burning. Decommissioning and closure of roads would create social benefits by reducing erosion and sedimentation. This would also serve to reduce the proliferation of illegal OHV use. Treatment of noxious/invasive weeds would create social benefits by reducing long-term indirect and cumulative effects to native vegetation which provides revenue to the local economy.

12. Management Areas, Scenery Management and Recreation

Existing Condition

Recreation
The 10,340-acre project area is classified as “Roaded Natural” or “Semi Primitive Motorized” in the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) designations.

ROS is a method for classifying types of recreation experiences available, or for specifying recreation experience objectives desired in certain areas. Classes are Primitive, Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, Semi-Primitive Motorized, Roaded Natural, Rural, and Urban.

Roaded Natural is defined as an area characterized by predominantly natural-appearing environments with moderate evidences of the sights and sounds of man. Such evidences usually harmonize with the natural environment. Interaction between users may be low to moderate, but with evidence of other users prevalent. Resource modification and utilization practices are evident, but harmonize with the natural environment. Conventional motorized use is provided for in construction standards and design of facilities. The recreation opportunity experience level provided would be characterized by the probability for equal experiencing of affiliation with individuals and groups and for isolation from sights and sounds of humans. Opportunities for both motorized and non-motorized forms of recreation Resource modification and utilization practices are evident, but harmonize with the natural environment. Conventional motorized use is provided for in construction standards and design of facilities...

Semi Primitive Motorized settings are characterized by naturally-appearing environment. Concentration of users is low. Resource modification and utilization practices are evident, but harmonize with the natural environment. Conventional motorized use is provided for in construction standards and design of facilities.

Recreation use in and around the analysis area is low to moderate, with highest use periods during the spring, early summer and fall seasons. Use consists of hiking fishing, camping, picnicking, sightseeing, hunting, mountain bicycling, and OHV driving. The analysis area has several scattered dispersed recreation use sites.

Recreation visitors for hunting mostly utilize the dispersed campsites within the analysis area. OHV's and pick-up trucks are driven or brought from either private lands or other forestlands outside this project area to these areas primarily to ride designated OHV roads for sightseeing and/or hunting. Dispersed camping and hunting of deer, turkey and squirrel are common in the analysis area.

Off Highway Vehicles

OHV use is now restricted to Forest designated roads and trails. High use areas are managed within capacities in order to maintain the quality of experiences. Facilities that provide access to the OHV system are created in conjunction with the development of the overall OHV system. Recreational OHV visitors are informed where designated routes are, what types of vehicles are allowed, and what seasons they are allowed.

There are currently not any designated OHV roads in the Catalpa project area. Therefore, this project will have no affect on OHV use.

Direct, Indirect and Cumulative Effects

Alternative 1

Aesthetics

There would be few short-term changes; however, as ecosystems in the analysis area progress, hardwoods would be expected to be an increasing component in the areas now dominated by pine, and hardwood stands would be expected to progress toward containing a greater component of shade-tolerant, fire-intolerant species. Visual color and pattern diversity, especially during leaf-off, would decrease with less of the contrasting green-gray patchwork patterns. Neither the ROS nor the SIO designations will be changed under this alternative.

This alternative will have little immediate effect on the visual quality of recreational and scenic driving. The near foreground on public and private lands will not change.

Recreation and OHV Use

This alternative will not change the recreation use (OHV driving, camping, hiking, mountain bicycling, or fishing) in the project vicinity.

Dispersed camping and hunting will be affected in the long term under this alternative. Alternative 1 provides no activities that maintain or increase habitat on public lands. Successful viewing of game and non-game species and hunting of deer and turkey could decrease on public lands under this alternative with possible increased use of private lands. Squirrel hunting will improve as the hardwood stands age.

Alternative 2

Aesthetics

Drivers and forest users along state highway, county and forest roads will notice more browning of vegetation from harvest, herbicide and burning activities during the initial work and for the first season.

Thinning in stands would allow views that penetrate into the stands, allowing views further than the existing near foreground, giving the stands a more park-like appearance and providing for a greater diversity of under story species. Marking should be varied in the near foreground to avoid uniform spacing and a tree-farm appearance. Slash clean-up in certain areas or prescribed fire (which would greatly reduce slash) in the first 200-300 feet in areas seen from travel ways and concentrated use areas should be completed.

Visitors to all areas of the proposed project area may also smell and see smoke during burning and blackened trees and ground for the first season until the next spring green-up, some browning of vegetation from harvest activities during the initial work and, for the first season, in stands along county and forest roads. They may also notice an increase in log truck traffic during the logging operations, but will continue to see a diverse landscape in the area. In the background, National Forest land will continue to offer viewers a variety of forest types from pines to hardwoods.

Recreation and OHV Use

Recreation users in the area may smell and see smoke during prescribed burning and browning of vegetation from harvest, herbicide and burning activities during the initial work and for the first season. During prescribed burning, area closures will be implemented to improve visitor safety. At the conclusion of the harvest activities and prescribed burning, certain roads will be closed, blocked and seeded. These activities will have no long-term negative effects on the dispersed recreation activities except with the use of closures on user-created trails.

There are currently not any designated OHV roads in the Catalpa project area. Therefore, this project will have no effect on authorized OHV use. Gate construction would reduce unauthorized OHV use in the analysis area.

Recreation users may notice signs saying, "This road is temporarily open for logging activities and will be closed to vehicle use when logging is completed." These signs will be placed on all currently closed roads, which will be reopened for this project and then reclosed after project completion by seeding the roadbed, gates and/or other closure structures. Roads

closed with gates or earthen mounds will allow foot travel for hunters to access more secluded hunting spots. Roads that are closed can be used by hikers to access the interior of the project area. Reclosing roads will reduce the number of miles of roads on which users can drive motorized vehicles. Due to the implementation of the new OHV policy, OHV users are allowed to drive only on designated routes within the project area. Forest-wide designated OHV routes will be managed to maintain a high-quality OHV experience.

The proposed timber harvests and wildlife activities will improve hunting opportunities around the dispersed hunter camps and adjacent private lands. Planned vegetation treatments would improve wildlife viewing and hunting opportunities.

Hunters are frequently drawn to logged areas because deer are attracted to them also. Early seral-stage vegetation will increase in the commercially harvested areas, areas of wildlife stand improvement and wildlife openings. The placement of the proposed ponds, wildlife openings and areas restored to woodland condition will tend to attract animals to under-utilized areas on National Forest lands and, thereby increase hunting opportunities.

One Recreational Fishing pond is proposed for placement within the project area. Two existing fishponds will be improved during the project. Pond development and improvement will provide needed habitat on forestlands for game and non-game species. It will also increase the fishing and non-motorized recreation opportunities.

Campers at dispersed sites will notice logging traffic, hear chainsaws, and will see stands as they are being logged and other timber-related and wildlife improvement activities. Campers may see some short-term effects from other activities such as brown leaves in the prescribed burned and herbicide-treated areas, and areas where release work has been conducted. After the green-up of more beneficial ground vegetation, the opportunity of successful wildlife sightings and viewing may improve.

Maintaining a system of roads in the project area will allow outdoor enthusiasts to continue to enjoy the forest on foot and allow hikers access to areas for dispersed camping and hunting. Timber harvests, silvicultural treatments, and wildlife habitat improvements proposed in the action alternative should increase numbers of both game and non-game species, so the recreational use in the forms of wildlife viewing and hunting should improve.

This alternative will not change non-consumptive recreation use (camping, hiking, and mountain bicycling,) in the project vicinity. Implementation of alternatives 2 or 3 would effect/reduce unauthorized OHV use in the area. User created OHV trails would be reduced through planned road decommissioning and closure of roads with gates.

Based on the analysis, there is nothing in Alternative 2 that would significantly affect any attributes, which might make all or part of the vicinity suitable for proposal as a special interest area for dispersed recreation or scenic quality. This alternative complies with the revised Forest Land and Resources Management Plan.

Alternative 3

The effects for Alternative 3 would be the same as the effects for Alternative 2 with the exception of herbicide application. Drivers and forest users along county and forest roads

may have more occasions to notice browning of vegetation from repeated mechanical or hand work to replace herbicide activities. Repeat hand treatments may be necessary to obtain the same effect that herbicide in combination with burning would accomplish. Additionally, there would be an increase in seeing crews and equipment to accomplish the work that is normally completed with the use of herbicide. There would be no change in log truck traffic during the logging operations without the use of herbicide. With implementation of alternative 3, opportunities for recreational hunting would be reduced. Lack of herbicide use would not allow the levels of quality wildlife habitat to be created as would be expected with implementation of alternative 2.

13. Minerals Management

All of the Federal Lands in T 12N; R 23W and T 12N; R 24W located within the project area are currently leased through the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). There are no leases currently held in T 13N; R 23W and T 13N; R 24W within the project area. The federal lands in this area have not been proven to be highly productive for minerals to date; however, with geologic formations identified such as the Fayetteville Shale, it is projected that the project area will receive some aspect of exploration during the next ten years. This is based upon recent seismic testing in the vicinity of the project area along with the increased number of gas wells being drilled on adjacent districts and on private parcels within the boundaries of the Ozark National Forest. A Surface Use Plan of Operations was recently approved for one gas well within the project area. An additional four gas wells have been proposed within the project area, however, these well locations have not been approved, because formal applications to drill have not been received.

Part 4 – Consultation and Coordination

The Forest Service consulted the following individuals, Federal, State, and local agencies, tribes and non-Forest Service persons during the development of this environmental assessment:

ID TEAM MEMBERS:

Name	Position	Office
Trevor Ozier	Forester	Pleasant Hill Ranger District
Mary Brennan	Zone Archaeologist	Pleasant Hill/Boston Mountain Ranger Districts
Mindi Lawson	NEPA Coordinator	Pleasant Hill Ranger District
Tom Cravens	Forester	Pleasant Hill Ranger District
James Bicknell	Minerals	Pleasant Hill Ranger District
Dan Martin	Fire Management Officer	Pleasant Hill Ranger District
Pat Kowalewycz	District Ranger	Pleasant Hill Ranger District
Megan Impson	Recreation Manager	Pleasant Hill Ranger District

Greg Taylor	Wildlife Biologist	Pleasant Hill Ranger District
Len Weeks	Forest Soil Scientist	Ozark-St. Francis National Forests, Supervisor's Office, Russellville, AR
Keith Whalen	Forest Fisheries Biologist	Ozark-St. Francis National Forests, Supervisor's Office, Russellville, AR
Rick Arnold	Engineering Technician	Pleasant Hill Ranger District

FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL AGENCIES:

Name	**Position**	**Office**
Leo Knoernschild	Wildlife Biologist	Arkansas Game & Fish Commission, Russellville, Arkansas
Margaret Harney	Fish & Wildlife Biologist	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Conway, Arkansas
Various Persons	Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer	Department of Arkansas Heritage
Terry Caston	Engineering Technician	Ozark-St. Francis National Forests, Supervisor's Office, Russellville, AR

NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES/NATIONS:

Name	**Location**
Caddo Indian Tribe of Oklahoma	Binger, Oklahoma
Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma	Tahlequah, Oklahoma
Osage Nation of Oklahoma	Pawhuska, Oklahoma
Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma	Quapaw, Oklahoma
Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Louisiana	Marksville, Louisiana
United Keetowah Band of Cherokee Indians	Tahlequah, Oklahoma

Part 5 – Appendices

APPENDIX A
Interested Citizens and Forest Neighbors List (Adjacent Landowners)

Chris Allen
1690 CR 4200
Clarksville, AR 72830

Jim Bensman
Heartwood
1802 Main St.
Alton, IL 62002

Frank Eichenberger
391 Parette Lake Rd.
Morrilton, AR 72110

Glen Hooks
Sierra Club
1308 W. 2nd St.
Little Rock, AR 72201

Zen and Pam Boulden
8008 Cass-Oark Rd.
Ozark, AR 72949

David and Claire Gainey
592 CR 3537
Clarksville, AR 72830

Sarah Goodman
2469 CR 3341
Clarksville, AR 72830

Leo Knoernschild
Supervisor's Office

605 W. Main St.
Russellville, AR 72801

H. Miles Lacy
Green Bay Packaging, Inc.
P.O. Box 711
Morrilton, AR 72110

Tom Post
Deltic Timber Corp.
P.O, Box 129
Ola, AR 72853

Tom McKinney
Sierra Club, Ark. Chapter
105 Southwood
West Fork, AR 72774

Richard Meers
6228 Fallstone Rd.
Fort Smith, AR 72916-8964

Mike Michelson
17504 Hwy. 21
Ozone, AR 72854

Natl Assoc. of RV Parks & Campgrounds
113 Park Ave.
Falls Church, VA 22046

Newton Co. Wildlife Association
HC 33, Box 40
Pettigrew, AR 72752

Travis Lumber Company, Inc.
Hwy. 71 South
P.O. Box 39
Mansfield, AR 72944

David Renko
14 Elk St.
Eureka Springs, AR 72632

Bob Townsell
1837 Caldwell
Conway, AR 72834

John Berry
NAGPRA Coord.
Quapaw Tribe
2475 N. Hatch Ave
Fayetteville, AR 72704

Kenn Young
P.O. Box 301
Clarksville, AR 72830

Earl J. Barbry, Sr.
Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Louisiana
P.O. Box 331
Marksville, LA 71351-0331

Richard Allen, THPO
Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 948
Tahlequah, OK 74465

Robert Cast, THPO
Caddo Indian Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 487
Binger, OK 73009

Dr. Andrea Hunter, THPO
Osage Nation
P.O. Box 779
Pawhuska, OK 74056

United Keetowah Band of Cherokee Indians
Lisa Stopp, THPO
P.O. Box 746
Tahlequah, OK 74465

Randall Bullington
AG&FC-Regional Supvr.
P.O. Box 23669
Barling, AR 72923

Daniel E. Bollich
17170 Perkins Road
Baton Rouge, LA 70810

Fran Free
Audubon Arkansas
34 East Center Street, Suite A
Fayetteville, AR 72701

Phillip Horn
1409 West Main Street
Clarksville, AR 72830

Richard Howard
3846 Cass-Oark Rd.
Ozark, AR 72949

Gene Leeds
2072 CR 2650
Lamar, AR 72846

Frank Eichenberger
391 Parette Lake Rd.
Morrilton, Ar 72110

Melissa Ruby
P.O. Box 1325
Alma, AR 72921

Lynn Cole
97-0767 Avenue 1B
Rego Park, New York 11374

Mayron Teltow
107 Cheyenne Lane
Clarksville, AR 72830

John McGraw
18451 Broussard Rd.
Perryville, LA 70769

Richard Wade
271 PR 4222
Clarksville, AR 72830

Elbert Mooney
HC 65 Box 231
Oark, AR 72552

Billy Ballis
2050 Vounty Road 2351
Ozone, AR 72854

Dale William
5146 Hwy 215
Oark, AR 72949

Lawrence Woodard
PO Box 1331
Clarksville, AR 72830

Jackie Doss
5436 County Rd. 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

Dean Case and Marylin Stewart
HC 65 Box 103
Ozone, AR 72854

WB James
HC 62 Box 204
Ozone, AR 72854

Rodger Boen
HC 62 Box 216
Ozone, AR 72854

Jerry Wood
HC 33 Box 47
Pettigrew, AR72752

Bo Mack
HC 65 Box 221
Oark, AR 72852

Troy Hill
503 SW Keystone St.
Bentonville, AR 72712

Larry Gilbert and Lori Norwood
301 N. Central Avenue
Clarksville, AR 72830

Reba Nagel
1266 CR 2031
Altus, AR 72821

Craig Tomlinson
PO Box 306
Ozone, AR 72854

Treva Hampton
HC 65 Boc 229
Oark, AR 72852

Jonathan and Seawel Eckhart
6722 Racoon Rd.
Granby, MO 64844

George and Villa Friesen
HC 62 Box 818
Deer, AR 72628-9407

Charles Hignite Jr.
PO Box 631995
Nacogdoches, TX 75963

Kenneth and Janelle Stall
912 S. Rogers St.
Clarksville, AR 72830

Harrison Webb
1958 CR 5560
Ozone, AR 72854

Billy and Mary Keith
1920 CR 5560
Ozone, AR 72854-8903

Sonny Hignite
207 Meadow Place
Clarksville, AR 72830

Brian Wynn
309 Dalewood Ct.
Russellville, AR 72801

Anna Clark
PO Box 177
Centerville, AR 72829

Charles Andrus
1506 Ridgepark RD
Harrison, AR 72601

Michael Michelson
17504 State Hwy 21
Ozone, AR 72854

Robert Cook
17541 Hwy 21
Ozone, AR 72854

Paul or Mary Lou Acord
1212 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

Sam Fields
18000 Hwy 21
Ozone, AR 72854

Johnny Criss
18040 Hwy 21
Ozone, AR 72854-0148

Kathy Germann
PO Box 83
Ozone, AR 72854

Judy Criss
18040 Hwy 21
Ozone, AR 72854

Ernest or Wanda Criss
18145 Hwy 21
Ozone, AR 72854-9402

Kenneth Melson
18210 Hwy 21
Ozone, AR 72854

Dwain Langdon
3311 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

Patricia Silvey
6886 Casual Court
San Jose, CA 95120

Donald Ray Vaught
500 CR 5500
Ozone, AR 72854

James Mitchell
3928 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

James or Charlotte Wilder
3570 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

Amy Lois Hignite
270 CR 3018
Hartman, AR 72840

Charles Heinzen
1221 Mill Creek Road
Russellville, AR 72802

Bradley Beetch
115 Aikman Pass
Conway, AR 72034

Douglas Doughty
C/O Hatley
PO Box 22
Ozark, AR 72949-0022

Dean or Brandy Edgmon
261 FS 94327B
Ozone, AR 72854

Rick and Naomi Domerese
PO Box 132
Ozone, AR 72854-0132

Aubrey Yount
288 CR 3460
Clarksville, AR 72830

Peggy and Tim Ward
PO Box 128
Clarksville, AR 72830

Anthony or Claudia Hill
251 Forest Service 94327B Rd.
Ozone, AR 72854-8879

Ricky Haston
PO Box 433
Lamar, AR 72846-9725

Gary Bocksnick
103 CR 3031
Ozark, AR 72949

Ronald Turner
777 FS 94327 B RD
Ozone, AR 72854-9083

Timothy or Robbi Mooney
PO Box 1072
Clarksville, AR 72830

Lee or Jessica Sams
257 FS 94327 B
Ozark, AR 72854

John and Sol Figueroa
13425 SW 42nd Terrace
Miami, FL 33175

Eddie Edgmon
291 CR 3299
Clarksville, AR 72830

Laretta Clayborn
PO Box 54
Deer, AR 72628

John Stepp
20271 Hwy 21
Ozone, AR 72854-9999

Mark Evans
528 Bowers Loop
Dover, AR 72835

Arvil or Paula Edgmon
1687 CR 5411
Oark, AR 72852

Daryl Pritchard
849 Pine Hill Road
Dover, AR 72837

John Turner
1652 CR 5391
Oark, AR 72852

Lonnie Meade
11304 E 26th Lane
Yuma, AZ 85367

Jayce Turner
1652 CR 5391
Oark, AR 72852

Clint or Stacy Dewberry
1516 CR 5391
Oark, AR 72852

Susan Burden
2960 CR 5351
Ozone, AR 72854-8905

Shawn or Angela Jones
486 CR 3161
Clarksville, AR 72830

Bernard Blount
PO Box 81
Judsonia, AR 72081-0081

Glenn Jr. Or Wendy Stepp
2691 CR 5570
Hagarville, AR 72839-9203

Dean Case
5436 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

Larry or Theresa Johnson
PO Box 395
Clarksville, AR 72830-0395

Robert or Clara Ritchie
392 CR 2790
Lamar, AR 72846

Villia Skaggs Ruffaner
1383 PR 6295
Oark, AR 72852

Wanda Frantz
PO Box 2012
Clarksville, AR 72830-5012

Ronald Lastoria
803N Sunset Dr.
Peoria, IL 61604-4663

Ray Mars ETAL
% Leonard Mars
22189 Rock Road
Rogers, AR 72756

David Junior Skaggs
22315 Butler Ford Road
Springdale, AR 72764

Jimmy James Skaggs
22315 Butler Ford Road
Springdale, AR 72762

Doyle Skaggs
665 W County Line Road
Springdale, AR 72764

Dallas Skaggs
PO Box 54
Oark, AR 72852-0054

Benjamin Skaggs
1246 Pioneer Lane
Gentry, AR 72734

Lonnie Madewell
2865 Leo Ammons Rd
Fayetteville, AR 72701

Sharon Skaggs Hodge
PO Box 435
Lamar, AR 72846-0435

Roderick D White III
21890 War Eagle Blacktop
Springdale, AR 72764

Jimmy Dean or Marsha Parker
315 Parker Lane
Elkins, AR 72727-3304

Lloyd Skaggs
22373 Butler Ford Drive
Springdale, AR 72764-9072

Mary Z. Brennan
PO Box 23
Oark, AR 72852

Jeffery Hyde
198 FS 944580
Oark, AR 72852

Adam and Phyllis Liebling
11 Fisk PL
Cambridge, MA 02139-2701

Doy Kimbriel
405 S Skaggs Road
Clarksville, AR 72830

Joyce Reynolds
General Delivery
Oark, AR 72852-9999

Dorothy Criss ET AL
HC 65 Box 259
Oark, AR 72852

VR Kimbriel
2616 CR 5411
Oark, AR 72852

Joey and Opal Holland
3390 Memory Lane
Hopkinsville, KY 42240

Argie Harderson
1954 CR 5411
Oark, AR 72852-9705

Beverly Holt
2116 CR 5411
Oark, AR 72852

Lawrence Sr. & Verlene Carlton
1762 CR 5411
Oark, AR 72852

Barbara Fry Trust
429 Grandview
Clarksville, AR 72830

Danny or Donna Reed
100 Virginia DR
Dover, AR 72837

Gloria Guyer
17867 Bennie Roberson Rd.
Siloam Springs, AR 72761

Philip or Mary Smith
3327 Occidental St
San Diego, CA 92122

Ulie or Cynthia Jenkins
28238 Hwy 22
Ponchatoula, LA 70454

H L McKenney
4976 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

James Price
255 Blue Heron Drive
Athens, GA 30605

Ozark Highlands Trail
Association
PO Box 10979
Fayetteville, AR 72703

John Rommel
411 CR 2515
Clarksville, AR 72830-9432

Mack E Turner
5467 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

Missouri Improvement CO
1400 Douglas Stop 1640
Omaha, NE 68179-1640

James Poole
PO Box 65
Oark, AR 72852

Jimmy Dewberry
5674 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

Terry Turner
5515 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

Ronnie Stepp
5432 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

Melvin Kimbriel
5605 VR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854-9999

Imogene Arbaugh
HC 65 Box 148
Ozone, AR 72854

Evallyn Williams
641 PR 3135
Clarksville, AR 72830

Dane Arbaugh
707 PD 3135
Clarksville, AR 72830

Cathie Cook
HC 65 Box 152
Ozone, AR 72854-8906

Tim Vanderford
184 CR 5239
Oark, AR 72852

Anna Hammons
7272 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

Bert Hammons
7272 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

Donnie or Charlotte Kimbriel
1821 CR 4490
Ozone, AR 72854

Donald Langdon
7029 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

James Vaughan
9340 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854-8906

James Poole
PO Box 65
Oark, AR 72852

Wanda Tolbert
1470 Kittrell Rd
Franklin, TN 37064

Anna Baskin
1206 College Avenue
Clarksville, AR 72830

Thomas Samuel Warren
PO Box 93
Ozone, AR 72854

Roy Lee Melson
HC 65 Box 156
Ozone, AR 72854

Delmar Mark Robinson
PO Box 53
Oark, AR 72852-9999

Cathy Skaggs
169 CR 5241
Oark, AR 72852

Sharon Montgomery
297 CR 5239
Oark, AR 72852-9999

James Hickman
PO Box 1
Oark, AR 72852-9999

Verna Warren Jorns
1206 College Avenue
Clarksville, AR 72830

T&K Futures LC
PO Box 14e
Oark, AR 72852

Claude Yates
1249 CR 3360
Clarksville, AR 72830

Lucy Vanover
604 N Montgomery ST
Clarksville, AR 72830

Anita Cowan
184 CR 5239
Oark, AR 72852

Stanley or Robin Harderson
PO Box 43
Oark, AR 72852

Gary or Carolyn Yates
473 CR 5239
Oark, AR 72852

Tom or Kay Breedlove
257 CR 5239
Oark, AR 72852

Irma Hill
HC 65 Box 130
Oark, AR 72852-9999

Kevin Yates
2432 CR 4160
Oark, AR 72852

Leslie Lantz
PO Box 2
Oark, AR 72852-0002

Dale or Karma Williams
5146 Hwy 215
Ozark, AR 72949

Nanci Lewis
Gen Del
Oark, AR 7285

Bessie Abercrombie
PO Box 48
Oark, AR 72852-9999

William or Paula Killane
1107 Harmony RD
Clarksville, AR 72830

John and Laura Higgs
PO Box 309
Gurdon, AR 71743

Haskel Clitis Cowan
PO Box 45
Oark, AR 72852

Virgil Cowan
PO Box 52
Oark, AR 72852

Tom Mingo
169 CR 5241
Oark, AR 72852

Leon Hargis Estate
1820 Oliver Springs Way
Van Buren, AR 72956

Ronnie Boling
HC 62 Box 220
Ozone, AR 72854

Aileen Brown
210 Raya Rd.
Clarksville, AR 72830-9759

Virgie Robinson
1060 Hwy 215
Oark, AR 72852

Randall Warren
HC 61 Box 5
Oark, AR 72852

Ron or Janet Scroggins
PO Box 103
Oark, AR 72852

Margaret Warren Atkins
PO Box 2
Ozone, AR 72854

Raph Warren Jr.
382 CR 5211
Oark, AR 72852-0034

David Michael Willis
1301 Stoney Creek Drive
Cedar Hill, TX 75104-3405

Dennis Willis
PO Box 94
Oark, AR 72852

Betty Barrow Warren
504 S. Gibson
Benton, AR 72015

Audrey Farmer
PO Box 53
Clarksville, AR 72830

Reedy Evans
210 Ray RD
Clarksville, AR 72830

Donna Wood
PO Box 74
Oark, AR 72852

Elmer Merkling
PO Box 115
Oark, AR 72852-9999

Donna Collins
PO Box 1
Oark, AR 72852

Mineral Acquisition Partners Inc.
101 N. Robinson Ave., Suite 1000
Oklahoma City, OK 73102-5514

Terry or Gena Avaritt
401 West Cherry Street
Clarksville, AR 72830

Dora and Tilman Tabor
117 Old Depot Rd.
Farmington, AR 72730

Annie Berry
440 PR 5237
OArk, AR 72852

Rickey Wages
9622 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854-0015

Robert Parker
PO Box 165
London, AR 72847

Marsha Hampton
HC 65 Box 140
Oark, AR 72852

JL Berry
HC 65 Box 120
Oark, AR 72852

Laurie Joan Gray
700 S. Rock Cliff Road
Ponca City, OK 74604-7202

Ronald or Beverly Kalka
804 North Post Rd
Chandler, OK 74834

Claude James
612 Poplar ST
Clarksville, AR 72830

Ronnie Mentzer
PO Box 92
Oark, AR 72852

Peggy Sue Johnson
PO Box 653
Clarksville, AR 72830

Oleander Melson
2371 Cambridge ST
Sacramento, CA 95815-3117

Luther Mays
PO Box 112
Oark, AR 72852

Betty Mays
c/o Rodney Mays
1040 Harris Road
Clarksville, AR 72830

Carol Taylor Mohlman
412 Swarthmore Avenue
Pacific Palisades, CA 90272

Larry McNeese
1411 White Oak Estate
Van Buren, AR 72956

John Hodge
202 CR 5351
Ozone, AR 72854

Roger or Karen Rogers
5867 CR 4160
Ozark, AR 72949-8425

Tom Langdon
7049 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

Randy and Melissa McNeese
1549 Wood Hills Road
Van Buren, AR 72956

Donald Langdon
7029 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

Viril Coy Hammons
7272 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

Charlie and Jackie James
1934 CR 2201
Hartman, AR 72840-9738

Michael and Doris Smith
19288 Hwy 62 West
Eureka Springs, AR 72631

Terry D Stacy
16800 Oak Drive
Morris, OK 74445

Steven Stefaniak
153 CR 5351
Ozone, AR 72854

Tony Harderson
PO Box 934
Lamar, AR 72846-0934

Charlie Dewberry
c/o John Hodge
202 CR 5351
Ozone, AR 72854

James and Edna Bean
7333 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

Rosie Cummins
1200 W Sevier ST.
Clarksville, AR 72830

Stay Magby
1381 CR 3581
Lamar, AR 72846

Billy Ballis
2050 CR 5351
Ozone, AR 72854

Leonard or Gloria Baker
1924 CR 5351
Ozone, AR 72854

Paul Cummins
HC 65 Box 130
Ozone, AR 72854-8905

Ronnie Stepp
5432 CR 5440
Ozone, AR 72854

Delbert Stepp
273 FS 1416-A
Ozone, AR 72854

Robert Parker
PO Box 165
London, AR 72847

Emmer Hubbard
c/o Robert Parker
PO Box 165
London, AR 72847

Henry Hubbard
c/o Frank Hubbard
8 South 40
Van Buren, AR 72956

Edsel Farnam
1637 E HWY 393
Delaware, AR 72835-9801

Fern Tate Cowell
1463 CR 3801
Lamar, AR 72846

Mabel Tate Skaggs
PO Box 82
Farmington, AR 72730

Elbert and Ruble Tate
HC 63 Box 200
Hagarville, AR 72839

Ruble Tate
1020 CR 4730
Hagarville, AR 72839

Betty or Ernest Tate
PO Box 82
Clarksville, AR 72830

Lonnie Tate
PO Box 1474
Clarksville, AR 72830

Elsie Billingslea
PO Box 6505
Tulsa, OK 74156-0505

Elmer Tate
124 E 14th St. N
Wichita, KS 67214-1005

Aubrey Cunningham
RR 3 Box 95
Cleveland, OK 74020-9504

Leola Warren
1987 CR 4418
Clarksville, AR 72830-9802

Joanne Hawkins
1793 CR 2651
Lamar, AR 72846

Orbon and Barbara Skaggs
10140 W Yorhouse RD.
Beach Park, IL 60087-2406

Malcolm Tate
5085 CR 4160
Oark, AR 72852

Rual McGuire
454 CR 6220
Oark, AR 72852

Peggy Sue Johnson
PO Box 653
Clarksville, AR 72830-0653

Richard Brown
2604 Butler Street
Central City, AR 72941

AG Rives Jr.
PO Box 62
Oark, AR 72852

Hubert Drake
605 North 20th #93
Slaton, TX 79364

Dennis or Anita Stutzman
129 PR 1776
London, AR 72847

James Maio
41 Atlantic Street
Keyport, NJ 07735-1854

Michelle Brandenburg
PO Box 13
Oark, AR 72852

Gary McGuire
HC 65 Box 194
Oark, AR 72852

Bandera Minerals, LLC
PO Box 3326
Tulsa, OK 74101

Shawn Porter
HC 72 Box 69
Parthenon, AR 72666

Comments were received from:
1. Ronnie Terry
2. Shawn Porter
3. Rich Brown

These comments were considered in the development of the issues and concerns section, and in other sections of this EA.

APPENDIX B – Forest Type and Condition Class Codes

Forest Types (first 2 digits of the 4 digit code-- **XX**xx)
(species listed by occurrence in stand)

11 - Eastern Red Cedar and Hardwood
12 - Shortleaf Pine and Oak
13 - Loblolly Pine and Oak
25 - Yellow Pine
31 - Loblolly Pine
32 - Shortleaf Pine
35 - Eastern Red Cedar
43 - Oak and Eastern Red Cedar
44 - Southern Red Oak and Yellow Pine
47 - White Oak, Black Oak and Yellow Pine
48 - Northern Red Oak, Hickory and Yellow Pine
49 - Bear Oak, Southern Scrub Oaks and Yellow Pine
51 - Post Oak and Black Oak
53 - White Oak, Red Oak and Hickory
54 - White Oak
55 - Northern Red Oak
63 - Sugarberry, American Elm and Green Ash
68 - Sweet Bay, Swamp Tupelo, Red Maple
69 - Beech, Magnolia
72 - River Birch and Sycamore

Stand Condition Class (last 2 digits of the 4 digit code--xx**XX**)
Even-aged Management Codes:
01 - In regeneration
02 - Damaged Poletimber
03 - Damaged Sawtimber
04 - Forest Pest Infestation
05 - Sparse Poletimber
06 - Sparse Sawtimber
07 - Low Quality Poletimber
08 - Low Quality Sawtimber
09 - Mature Poletimber
10 - Mature Sawtimber
11 - Immature Poletimber
12 - Immature Sawtimber
13 - Adequately Stocked Seedlings and Saplings
14 - Inadequately Stocked Seedlings and Saplings
15 - Non-stocked
0000 - Pastures or other Special use areas
Uneven-aged Management Codes:
16 - Group Selection Management (Hardwood)
17 - Individual Tree (Single-tree) Selection Management (Pine)

APPENDIX C - References
(Environmental Assessment and Biological Evaluation)

ADEQ, 2004, Arkansas list of impaired waterbodies, 303(d) list, report available in the public domain from the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality.

ADEQ – Environmental Preservation Division, 2004, West Fork White River Watershed Data Inventory and Nonpoint Source Pollution Assessment, FY99 CWA Section 319(h) Final Report, 369 p.

ADEQ, 2004, GIS shapefiles obtained through personal contacts for state identified extraordinary resource waters and those listed on the 2002 303d list.

AHD, 2004, GIS shapefiles obtained through personal contacts for state identified water source intakes and source water protection areas.

Anderson, H.W., Hoover, M.D., and Reinhart, K.G., 1976. Forest and Water: effects of forest management on floods, sedimentation, and water supply. USDA FS GTR PSW-18. San Francisco, California

Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality. 2006. Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Database. [Online] Available: http://www.adeq.state.ar.us. (Accessed: Oct. 5, 2004 & Jan. 19, 2005).

Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality. 2006. Fish Collection and Habitat Data Files. [Online] Available: http://www.adeq.state.ar.us. (Accessed: Oct. 5, 2004).

Arkansas Game and Fish Commission (AGFC). 2001. 2000-2001 AGFC Deer Harvest Data. [Online] Available: http://www.agfc.com/data-facts-maps/reports.aspx. (Accessed: Sept. 19, 2007).

Arkansas Game and Fish Commission. 2006. 2005 Black Bear Harvest Report. [Online] Available: http://www.agfc.com/data-facts-maps/reports.aspx. (Accessed: Sept. 19, 2007).

Arkansas Game and Fish Commission. 2007. 2006-07 Deer Season Summary. [Online] Available: http://www.agfc.com/data-facts-maps/reports.aspx. (Accessed: Sept. 19, 2007).

Arkansas Game and Fish Commission. 2007. Arkansas Wild Turkey Harvest Summary – 2007 Spring Season. [Online] Available: http://www.agfc.com/data-facts-maps/reports.aspx

Arkansas Geological Commission, 1975, Flow duration and low-flow frequency determinations of selected Arkansas streams: Water Resource Circular No. 12, prepared by Hines, M.S., 75 p.

Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission (ARHNC). 2006. Resources and Publications – Rare Elements Search Engine. [Online] Available: http://www.naturalheritage.com/rare-species/federally-listed /plant-profiles (Accessed: May 2003,May 2004 & May 2006).

Arkansas Pollution Control and Ecology Commission, 2004, Regulation 2 - Regulation Establishing Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters of the State of Arkansas, obtained from www.adeq.state.ar.us/regs/files/reg02_final_040517.pdf, 7/28/2004

Askins, R.A. 2001. Sustaining biological diversity in young forests and thickets: The challenge of managing unpopular habitats. Wildlife Society Bulletin 29:407-412.

Baker, J.C. and W.C. Hunter. 2002. Effects of Forest Management on Terrestrial Ecosystems. In: Wear, D.N. and J.G. Greis, eds. Southern Forest Resource Assessment. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-53. Asheville, North Carolina: USDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 635 pp.

Bazzaz, F.A., and E.D. Faher. 1992. Plant life in a CO_2-rich world. Scientific American 266:1 p. 68-7.

Britzke, E.R., M.J. Harvey, and S.C. Loeb. 2003. Indiana Bat, *Myotis Sodalis*, Maternity Roosts in the Southern United States. Southeastern Naturalist 2(2):235-242.

Carter, G.A., Miller, J.H., Davis, D.E., Patterson, R.M., 1984, Effect of vegetative competition on the moisture and nutrient status of loblolly pine, Canadian Journal of Forest Research, vol. 14, p.1-9.

Center for Plant Conservation. 2005. St. Louis, Missouri, USA: [Online] Available: http:www.centerforplantconservation.org. (Accessed: February 2005).

Clark, B.S., D.M. Leslie, Jr., and T.S. Carter. 1993. Foraging Activity of Adult Female Ozark Big-eared Bats (Plecotus townsendii ingens) in Summer. Journal of Mammalogy 74:422-427.

Crump, M.A. 2007. Site-Specific Water Resources Analysis for the Gillian-Owens Project Area. On file – Pleasant Hill Ranger District, Clarksville, AR.

Davis, J.V., and Bell, R.W., 1998, Water quality assessment in the Ozark Plateaus, Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma – Nutrients, Bacteria, Organic Carbon, and Suspended Sediment in Surface Water, 1993-95: U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resources Investigations Report 98-4164, 56 p.

Dolan, B.J., and G.R. Parker. 2004. Understory response to disturbance: an investigation of prescribed burning and understory removal treatments. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-73. Asheville, NC. USDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station. pp. 285-291.

Dodd, L.E. 2006. Diet and Prey Abundance of the Ozark Big-eared Bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii ingens*) in Arkansas. Masters Thesis, College of Agriculture – University of Kentucky, Lexington Kentucky. 236 pp.

FGDC, 2002. Federal Standards for Delineation of Hydrologic Unit Boundaries, Federal Geographic Data Committee Proposal, Version 1.0, 52 p.

Ford, W.M., A.M. Menzel, D.W. McGill, J. Laerm, and T.S. McCay. 1999. Effects of a community restoration fire on small mammals and herpetofauna in the southern Appalachians. Forest Ecology and Management 114: 233-243.

Froese, R. and D. Pauly. Editors. 2004. FishBase. World Wide Web electronic publication. [Online] Available: www.fishbase.org, version (10/2004). Species summary for Longnose darter *(Percina nasuta).* (Accessed: Jan. 25, 2005).

Gaines, D.: Morris, E. 1996. The Southern National Forest's migratory and resident landbird conservation strategy. Atlanta, GA. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Region.

Goff, G.F., G.A. Dawson, and J.J. Rochow. 1982. Site Examination for Threatened and Endangered Plant Species. Environmental Management, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 307-316.

Guyette, R.P., and M.A. Spetich. 2003. Fire history of oak-pine forests in the Lower Boston Mountains, Arkansas, USA. Forest Ecology and Management. 6195 (2003) 1-12.

Harlow, W.M. and E.S. Harrar. 1969. Textbook of Dendrology. McGraw-Hill Book Company. New York, New York. 512 pp.

Harvey, M.J. and R.K. Redman. 2003. Endangered Bats of Arkansas – Distribution, Status, and Ecology (2002-2003). Annual report to Arkansas Game and Fish Commission. Project Number W-56-R. Tennessee Technological University. Cookeville, Tennessee. 25 pp.

Hoover, M.D. 1952, Water and Timber Management. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation 7:75-78.

Hunter, C.G. 1988. Wildflowers of Arkansas. The Ozark Society Foundation. Little Rock, AR. 296 pp.

Hunter, C.G. 1989. Trees, Shrubs, & Vines of Arkansas. The Ozark Society Foundation. Little Rock, AR. 207 pp.

Hunter, W.C., D.A. Buehler, R.A. Canterbury, J.L. Confer, and P.B. Hamel. 2001. Conservation of disturbance-dependent birds in eastern North America. Wildlife Society Bulletin 29: 440-455.

Johnson, P.E. 1992. New Perspectives and Silviculture of Oak-dominated forests in the Central and Eastern States. Draft-North Central Forest Exp. Station, Columbia, MO.

Johnson T.R. 1987. The Amphibians and Reptiles of Missouri. Jefferson City, MO. The Missouri Department of Conservation. 149 pp.

Kennedy, D.; B. Hanson. 2006. Ice and history. Science 311: 1673. http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/reprint/311/5768/1673. pdf accessed September 8, 2009.

Kilpatrick, E.S., D.B. Kubacz, D.C. Guynn, J.D. Lanham, T.A. Waldrop. 2004. The effects of prescribed burning and thinning on herpetofauna and small mammals in the Upper Piedmont of South Carolina: preliminary results of the National Fire and Fire Surrogate Study. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-71. Asheville, NC. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. pp. 18-22.

Kirkland, G.L., H.W. Snoddy, and T.L. Amsler. 1997. Impact of fire on small mammals and amphibians in a central Appalachian deciduous forest. The American Midland Naturalist 135: 253-260.

Klingenpeel, A.J. and M.A. Crump, 2005, A manual for the Water Resources Analysis for Cumulative Effects v.1 analysis Tool., Unpublished Process paper, planning files.

Klingenpeel, A.J. and M.A. Crump. 2005. Sedimentation Model for the Boston Mountains/Ozark Highlands. Unpublished. Ozark-St. Francis National Forests, Supervisors Office, Russellville, AR.

Kolpin, D.W., Kalkhoff, S.J., Goolsby, D.A., Sneck-Fahrer, D.A., Thurman, E.M., 1997. Occurrence of selected herbicides and herbicide degeneration products in Iowa's ground water, 1995. Groundwater, vol. 35, p. 679-688.

Koterba, M.T., Banks, W.S.L., Shedlock, R.J., 1993. Pesticides in shallow ground water in the Delmarva Peninsula, Journal of Environmental Quality, Vol. 22, p.500-518.

Kurz, D. 1999. Ozark Wildflowers. Falcon Publishing, Inc. Helena, Montana. 262 pp.

Larson, S.J.; Capel, P.D.; Majewski, M.S. 1997. Pesticides in surface water: Distribution, trends, and governing factors. Pesticides in the Hydrologic System series v. 3, Chelsea, MI: Ann Arbor Press. 373 pp.

Lawson, E.R., 1986. Effects of forestry practices on water quality in the Ozark-Ouachita highlands. in eds. Blackmon, B.G., Proceedings Forestry and Water Quality: A mid-south symposium, Little Rock, AR, May 1985.

Lawson E.R. and Hileman L.H., 1982. Nutrient distributions in runoff from Ouachita mountain watersheds. In proceedings: second biennial southern silviculture research conference. Jones E.P. ed., Atlanta, GA., USDA FS southeastern forest experimental station p. 477-482.

Lynch, J.A. and Edwards, S.C. 1991. Long term implications of Forest Harvesting on nutrient cycling in central hardwood forest; proceedings of the eighth central hardwoods forest conference.

Marion, D.A., 2004, Personal Communications – Effects of Prescribed Burning on water quality in the Ouachita Mountains, memo, SO, unpublished.

Marion, D.A., Ursic, S.J., 1993. Sediment production in forests of the coastal plain, piedmont, and interior highlands. P. 19-28. in Proceedings of a technical workshop on sediments, Terrene institute, Washington D.C., 141 p.

Mast, M.A., and Turk, J.T., 1999, Environmental characteristics and water quality of Hydrologic Benchmark Network stations in the West-Central United States, 1963–95: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1173–B, 130 p.

Masters, R.E., D.M. Engle, & R. Robinson. 1993. Effects of Timber Harvest and Periodic Fire on Soil Chemical Properties in the Ouachita Mountains. Southern Journal of Applied Forestry 17(3), 139-145.

Maxwell J.R. and Neary, D.G., 1991. Vegetation management effects on sediment yields. P. 12/55 – 12/63 in Shou-Shou, T., Yung-Huang, K. (Eds.) Proceedings of the 5th federal interagency sedimentation conference, volume 2, 18-2, March, Las Vegas, NV. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington D.C.

McAnally, B. 2004. Personal communication to Ozark-St. Francis National Forests, Forest Supervisior – regarding the effects of prescribed burning on nesting turkeys.

McCabe, Charles, 1994. American Burying Beetle Biological Opinion for the Ouachita & Ozark-St. Francis NFs. USDI Fish & Wildlife Service, consultation confirmation letter to Marvin Meier, Acting Regional Forester, USDA Forest Service, January 10, 1994.

McFarland, J.D., 2004 (revised). Stratigraphic Summary of Arkansas: Arkansas Geological Commission, Information Circular 36.

McMahon, Charles K., James H. Miller, David F. Thomas. 1994. The Role of Low Impact Herbicide Treatments in Ecosystem Management. Proceedings from National Silviculture Workshop, November 1993, General Technical Report SE-88. USDA Forest Service, Southern Forest Experimental Station, Auburn, AL.

Michael, J.L. 2001. Pesticides used in forestry and their impacts on water quality. In: Proceedings, 53rd annual Southern Weed Science Society meeting: 2000 January 24-26. Tulsa, OK. Champaign, IL: Southern Weed Science Society. pp. 81-91.

Miller E.L. and Liechty H.O., 2001. Forest Inventory and Analysis: What it tells us about water quality in Arkansas. In: Proceedings of the symposium on Arkansas Forests: a conference on the results of the recent forest survey of Arkansas; ed. Gouldin J.M.,1997 North Little Rock, AR. USDA GTR-SRS-41 125 p.

Mitchell, W.A. 2002. Cave and crevice-dwelling bats on USACE projects: Townsend's big-eared bat *(Corynorhinus townsendii)*. EMRRP Technical Notes Collection (ERDC TN-EMRRP-SI-27). U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS. [Online] Available: http://www.erdc.usace.mil/el/emrrp

NRCS, National Forestry Handbook, title 190, February 2004, 216 p.

NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. 2006. Version 1.6. Arlington Virginia, USA: NatureServe. [Online] Available: http:www.natureserve.org/explorer. (Accessed: May 2004, February 2005 and May 2006).

NAWQA, 1999. http://water.usgs.gov/pubs/circ/circ1225/index.html

NCDC http://lwf.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/gases.html

Neary et al., 1993. Fate, dissipation, and environmental effects of pesticides in southern forests: a review of a decade of progress. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, vol. 12, p. 411-428.

Neary, D.G., 1985. Fate of pesticides in Florida forests: an overview of potential impacts on water quality. Soil and crop science society of Florida proceedings vol. 44, p.18-23.

Neary, D.G., Jokela, E.J., Comerford, N.B., Colbert, S.R., Cooksey, T.E., 1990. Understanding competition for soil nutrients- the key to site productivity on southeastern coastal plain spodosols, p.432-450. in Gessel, S.A. (ed.) "sustained productivity of forest soils." Proceedings of the 7th North American forest soils conference, Vancouver, B.C., July 1988, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 524 p.

Neary, D.G. and Michael, J.L., 1996. Herbicides-Protecting long term sustainability and water quality in forest ecosystems, New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science, vol 26 (1/2), p. 241-264.

Newton, M., Horner, L.M., Cowell, J.E., White, D.E., Cole, E.C., 1994. Dissipation of glyphosate and aminomethylphosphatonic acid in North American forests, Journal of Agricultural Food Chemicals, vol. 42, p. 1795-1802.

NHD, 2000. U.S. Geological Survey – National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2000; Web Page: http://nhd.usgs.gov/chapter1 , accessed 03/08/2005

NRCS, 2005. U.S. Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), Vector Data titled - BASINS 12 DIGIT HYDROLOGIC UNIT 2006, accessed online @ **http://www.geostor.arkansas.gov** on 10/01/2006.

Omernik, J.M. 1987. Ecoregions of the conterminous United States. Map (scale 1:7,500,000). Annals of the Association of American Geographers 77(1): 118-125.

Patric, J.H. 1976. Soil erosion in the eastern Forest. Journal of Forestry, 74 (10): 67

Patric, J.H., Evans, I.O., and Helvey, J.D., 1984. Summary of sediment yield data from forested land in the US: Journal of Forestry, v. 82(2), p. 101-104

Prescott, S. 2004. Summary of Male Indiana Bat Roosts in Rosson Hollow, Boston Mountain Ranger District, Ozark National Forest. Preliminary Report submitted to USDA Forest Service – Boston Mountain Ranger District.

Pyne, Steve, 2001. Quoted by Keith Sutton in article: To Better Understand the Upland Oak Die-off, One must Look Deep in Arkansas History. Arkansas Wildlife, Nov.-Dec. 2001, Vol. 32, Issue 6, pp. 9-10, Arkansas Game & Fish Commission.

Radwell, A. 2000. Masters Thesis - Ecological Integrity Assessment of Ozark Rivers to Determine Suitability for Protective Status. Arkansas Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit – University of Arkansas. COOP Unit Publication No. 36. Fayetteville, Arkansas. 107 pp.

Robison, H.W. 1992. Distribution and Status of the Longnose Darter *(Percina nasuta)* in the Ozark National Forest, Arkansas. Final Report. 56pp

Robison, H.W. and R.T. Allen. 1995. Only in Arkansas – A Study of the Endemic Plants and Animals of the State. Fayetteville. The University of Arkansas Press. 112 pp.

Robison, H.W. 1998. Crayfishes of the Pleasant Hill Ranger District, Ozark National Forest, Arkansas. Final Report, 36pp.

Rudis, V.A. 1991. Fire's Importance in South Central U.S. Forests: Distribution of Fire Evidence. In: Nodvin, S.C. and Waldrop, T.A., eds. Fire and the Environment: Ecological and Cultural Perspectives; Proceedings of an International Symposium. 1990 March 20-24; Knoxville, TN. USDA, Forest Service, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station. Gen. Tech. Rep. SE-69. Asheville, North Carolina. 240-251.

Seaber, P.R., Kapinos, F.P., and Knapp, G.L., 1987. Hydrologic Unit Maps: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 2294, 63 p. (replaces the USGS 2003 reference)

Sealander, J.A. and G.A. Heidt. 1990. Arkansas Mammals – Their Natural History, Classification, and Distribution. The University of Arkansas Press, Fayetteville, AR. 308 pp.

Science and Management Collaboration-April 1995 Number 2, Hoosier National Forest, North Central Forest Experiment Station.

Scott, M.P. 1998. The Ecology and Behavior of Burying Beetles. Annu. Rev. Entomol. 1998. 43:595-618.

Sikes, D.S. and C.J. Raithel. 2002. A Review of Hypotheses of Decline of the Endangered American Burying Beetle (Silphidae: *Nicrophorus americanus* Olivier). Journal of Insect Conservation 6: 103-113, 2002.

Smethurst, P.J., Comerford, N.B., Neary, D.G., 1993. Weed effects on early K and P nutrition and growth of slash pine on a spodosol. Forest ecology and management, vol. 60, p.15-26.

Smith, E.B. 1988. An Atlas and Annotated List of the Vascular Plants of Arkansas. University of Arkansas Press, Fayetteville, Arkansas. 363 pp.

Smithsonian National Museum of History. 2004. Web search for occurrences of Longnose darter (*Percina nasuta*). [Online] Available: http://nmnhgoph.si.edu. (Accessed: Jan. 25, 2005).

Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database for *Counties corresponding with Ozark-St. Francis NF land base, AR.*. Available URL: "http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov" [Accessed *13/06/2006*].

Stednick, J.D., 1996. Monitoring the effects of timber harvest on annual water yield, Journal of Hydrology, v. 176, p.79-95

Steyermark, J. A., Flora of Missouri, The Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa. 991 pp.

Swift, L.W. Jr., 1984. Gravel and grass surfacing reduces soil loss from mountain roads. Forest Science 30(3):657-670.

Taylor, G.J. 2007. Wildlife and MIS Environmental Assessment Reference Paper. USDA Forest Service, Ozark – St. Francis National Forests, Pleasant Hill Ranger District. 35 pp. (On file – Pleasant Hill R.D. office, Clarksville, AR).

Taylor, G.J. 2010. Biological Evaluation for the Catalpa Projects. USDA Forest Service, Ozark – St. Francis National Forests, Pleasant Hill Ranger District. 33 pp. (On file – Pleasant Hill R.D. office, Clarksville, AR).

Thompson, F.R. and R.M. DeGraaf. 2001. Conservation Approaches for Woody, Early Successional Communities in the Eastern United States. Wildlife Society Bulletin 2001, 29(2): 483-494.

Trani, M.K., et al. 2001. Patterns and Trends of Early Successional Forests in the Eastern United States. Wildlife Society Bulletin 2001, 29(2) 413-424.

Trumbo, S.T., and P.L. Bloch. 2000. Habitat Fragmentation and Burying Beetle Abundance and Success. Journal of Insect Conservation 4:245-252, 2000.

University of Arkansas Herbarium. Arkansas Biodiversity – Vascular Plants [web application]. 2006. Fayetteville, Arkansas. [Online] Available: http:www.csdl.tamu.edu/FLORA/cgi. (Accessed: May 2006).

US Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration. 2008. Greenhouse Gases, Climate Change & Energy, DOE/EIA-X012 available at www.eia.doe.gov accessed September 8, 2009

USDA, Forest Service. 1989. Southern Research Station. A Guide for Prescribed Fire in Southern Forests. Technical Publication R8-TP 11.

USDA Forest Service. 1990. Environmental Impact Statement, Vegetation Management in the Ozark/Ouachita Mountains, Vol. I and II. Management Bulletin R8-MB 23.

USDA Forest Service. 1996. San Dimas Technology & Development Center. A Guide for Road Closure and Obliteration in the Forest Service. 49 pp. June 1996.

USDA Forest Service. 1996. Mulberry River Wild and Scenic River Management Plan. Ozark – St. Francis National Forests. October 1996.

USDA Forest Service. 1997. General Tech. Report NC-195. Management of Early Successional Communities in Central Hardwood Forests. 33 pp.

USDA Forest Service. 2001. Management Indicator Species Population and Habitat Trends. Ozark-St. Francis National Forests. 54 pp. (On file – Pleasant Hill R.D. office, Clarksville, AR).

USDA Forest Service. 2002. Draft-Chapter 2 - Soil Quality Monitoring. Forest Service Handbook 2509.18, Soil Management Handbook. Southern Region. Atlanta, GA, 4 pp.

USDA Forest Service. 2003. Herbicide Risk Assessments for Glyphosate. http://www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/pesticide/risk.shtml.

USDA Forest Service. 2003. Herbicide Risk Assessments for Hexazinone. http://www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/pesticide/risk.shtml.

USDA Forest Service. 2003. Herbicide Risk Assessment for Imazapyr. http://www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/pesticide/risk.shtml

USDA Forest Service. 2003. Herbicide Risk Assessments for Triclopyr. http://www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/pesticide/risk.shtml.

USDA Forest Service. 2003. Little Piney Creek Watershed Assessment, Ozark National Forest. June 2003.

USDA Forest Service. 2005. Final Environmental Impact Statement, Ozark-St. Francis National Forest. Record of Decision, 23 September 2005.

USDA Forest Service. 2005. Revised Land and Resource Management Plan, Ozark-St. Francis National Forest. Record of Decision, 23 September 2005.

USDA Forest Service. 2007. General Tech. Report NRS-9. Population Trends and Habitat Occurrence of Forest Birds on Southern National Forests, 1992-2004. 260 pp.

USDA Forest Service. 2009c. Duzan, S., Report on Climate Change. On file at the Sylamore Ranger District Office. Mountain View, AR.

USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory (2002, September). Fire Effects Information System, [Online]. Available: http://www.fs.fed.us/database/feis/. (Accessed:2004 &2005).

USDA Forest Service. Vegetative Management in the Ozark/Ouachita Mountains Environmental Impact Statement. 1989. Southern Region. Atlanta, GA.

USDA NRCS 1994, State Soil Geographic (STATSGO) Data Base data use information, USDA NRCS NSSC Misc. pub. Number 1492.

USDA NRCS National Weather and Climate Center data 2005, electronic file: ftp://ftp.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/support/climate/taps/ar/05083.txt, accessed Jan. 2005.

USDA SCS (NRCS) 1977. Soil Survey Johnson County, Arkansas.

USDA Soil Conservation Service, 1989. Summary report 1987 national resources inventory. Statistical bulletin number 790. Iowa State University Statistical Laboratory. 36 p.

USDI Fish and Wildlife Service. 1977. *Amorpha ouachitensis* – Status Report. Albuquerque, New Mexico. 20 pp.

USDI Fish and Wildlife Service. 1982. Gray Bat Recovery Plan. Denver, Colorado. 90pp.

USDI Fish and Wildlife Service. 1995. Revised Recovery Plan, Ozark Big-eared Bat *(Plecotus townsendii ingens)*, Tulsa, Oklahoma. 51 pp.

USDI Fish and Wildlife Service. 1999. Draft Revised Recovery Plan for the Indiana Bat. Fort Snelling, Minnesota. 53 pp.

USDI Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002. Amendment to Indiana Bat Biological Opinion for the Ozark-St. Francis National Forest. USFWS, Conway, AR. March 21, 2002.

USDI Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory Bird Management. Arlington, VA. 99 pp. http://www.fws.gov./migratorybirds/reports/BCC2002.pdf

USDI Fish and Wildlife Service. 2005. Concurrence letter from Arkansas Field Office, regarding determination of effect for Threatened and Endangered Species with implementation of the Revised OSF LRMP (Dated August 17, 2005).

USDI Fish and Wildlife Service. 2005. ECOS – Environmental Conservation Online System. Current list of Threatened and Endangered Species in Arkansas. [Online] Available: http://ecos.fws.gov/tess

USEPA. www.epa.gov/sequestration/faq.html accessed on September 3, 2009

USEPA, 1988, Picloram Health Advisory. Office of Drinking Water Health Advisories, Washington D.C. August, 1988.

USEPA, 1988, U.S. EPA Integrated Risk Information Systems Substance file-Ally; CASRN 74223-64-6. 30 June 1988, Washington D.C. URL: http://www.epa.gov/ngispgm3/iris/ubst/0288.htm

USEPA, 1989, Drinking water health advisory. Pesticides. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Drinking Water Health Advisories. Lewis Publisher, Inc., Chelsea, MI.

USEPA, 2003, Level III Ecoregions of the Continental United States, map, revision of Omernik, 1987.

USGS, 1999, Inventory of Dams, other available metadata available online through GeoStor at http://www.cast.uark.edu/cast/geostor

Van Lear, D.H. 2000. Recent advances in the silvicultural use of prescribed fire. In: Moser, W.K., and C.F. Moser (eds.). Fire and forest ecology; innovative silviculture and vegetation management. Tall Timbers Fire Ecology Conference Proceedings, No. 21. Tall Timbers Research Station, Tallahassee, FL. pp. 183-189.

Weeks, L., 1993-1995. Soil disturbance monitoring on the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests. Unpublished paper. USDA Forest Service. Russellville, AR.

Weeks, L., 2002. Soil disturbance monitoring on the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests 1996-2002. Monitoring Data. USDA Forest Service. Russellville, AR.

Wheeler, G.L. and Eichman, J.K. The effects of forest management practices on soil nutrient status, a final report to the U.S. Forest Service Ouachita N.F. Department of Horticulture and Forestry, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas 1991. 56pp.

Zollner, D. 2005. Informal Report – Fire Dependency of Ozark Species. The Nature Conservancy. Little Rock, Arkansas. 10 pp.

APPENDIX D- MAPS

Catalpa

Proposed Action
Alternative 2

T13N
T12N

R24W
R23W

NEWTON CO
JOHNSON CO

307
332
336
675
331
335
330
329

N

Compartment Boundary 329
Private Ownership

Roadwork
- Existing
- Construction
- Reconstruction
- Maintenance
- Decommission
- Temporary

Wildlife/Fisheries Improvements
- Opening- Construction (Chainsaw / Herbicide)
- Opening- Construction (Dozer)
- Opening- Reconstruction
- Fish Pond Maintenance
- Fish Pond New Construction
- Wildlife Pond New Construction
- Wildlife Pond Reconstruction
- Gates
- Large Woody Debris Streams
- Linear Openings
- Woodland Restoration-255 ac.
- WL Prescribed Burning-2496 ac.

Hardwood Harvest
- Shelterwood
- Shelterwood & Thinning

Hardwood Treatments
- Pre-commercial Thinning (PCT)
- Timber Stand Improvement (TSI)

Pine Harvest
- Shelterwood
- Thinning

Pine Treatments
- Burn only
- Release-herb
- Herb-burn-plant
- TSI-herb-burn

3/30/10 tc

0 0.5 1 Miles

Fayetteville
Catalpa Project
Ozark National Forest
Ft. Smith
Russellville
West Memphis
Little Rock
St. Francis National Forest