



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture



Forest  
Service

Pacific  
Northwest  
Region

1996

# Eagle

## Final Environmental Impact Statement

### Record of Decision

**Mt. Hood National Forest**

**Estacada Ranger District**

**1996**

# **Record of Decision**

## **Eagle Final Environmental Impact Statement**

**USDA Forest Service  
Pacific Northwest Region  
Mt. Hood National Forest  
Estacada Ranger District**

**Clackamas County, Oregon**

**November 1996**

# Table of Contents

Introduction . . . . .	ROD - 1
Location . . . . .	ROD - 1
Background . . . . .	ROD - 1
Scope of the Decision . . . . .	ROD - 2
The Decision . . . . .	ROD - 3
Reasons for Selecting Alternative #1 . . . . .	ROD - 4
Significant Issues . . . . .	ROD - 4
Management Objectives . . . . .	ROD - 7
Public Comments . . . . .	ROD - 8
Other Alternatives Considered . . . . .	ROD - 9
Public Involvement, Scoping, and the Issues . . . . .	ROD - 11
Public Response to the SDEIS . . . . .	ROD - 14
Environmentally Preferable Alternative(s) . . . . .	ROD - 17
Mitigation Measures . . . . .	ROD - 19
Monitoring . . . . .	ROD - 21
Findings Required by Other Laws . . . . .	ROD - 21
Implementation Date . . . . .	ROD - 23
Administrative Appeal and Judicial Review Procedures . . . . .	ROD - 23
Contact Person . . . . .	ROD - 23
Signature and Date . . . . .	ROD - 23
Appendices	
Appendix A - Errata Sheet	

## **Introduction**

The Eagle Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) documents the results of the environmental analysis of four alternatives for the management of Forest Service lands in the Eagle Creek drainage administered by the Estacada Ranger District. I have read the FEIS and reviewed related documentation, including public responses to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) published in September 1993 and the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) published May 1996. My decision is based upon all of these items and this Record of Decision (ROD) documents the reasons I have decided to implement Alternative #1.

## **Location**

The Forest Service lands considered in the decision are located within the Eagle Creek and South Fork of Eagle Creek watersheds. The legal description is; Sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 T.4 S. R.6 E. and Sections 17, 18, 19, 20, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33 T.3 S. R.6 E., W.M. surveyed, Clackamas County Oregon.

The Eagle Creek and South Fork of Eagle Creek drainages are located approximately 11 air miles east of Estacada, Oregon and 32 air miles southeast of Portland, Oregon. The project area is bounded by private and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands to the west and by the Salmon-Huckleberry Wilderness to the east.

## **Background**

The development of the environmental documentation for management in the Eagle Creek/South Fork of Eagle Creek drainages began in the spring of 1991. A Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Eagle area was published in September 1993 and public responses were received. During this same time frame, the "Forest Conference" was convened in Portland, Oregon to address the human and environmental needs served by Federal forests of the Pacific Northwest and Northern California. As a result of this forest conference, a Record of Decision was published on April 13, 1994 which amended Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management planning documents within the range of the Northern Spotted owl (Northwest Forest Plan). The Mt. Hood National Forest then decided to issue a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the Eagle Creek Tim-

ber Sales. This SDEIS incorporated substantive comments received on the DEIS as well as requirements and standards and guidelines published in the Northwest Forest Plan. The SDEIS was completed, published, and made available for public comments on May 24, 1996. The comment period for this SDEIS was 45 days and ended on July 8, 1996. The *Final Environmental Impact Statement* incorporated substantive comments to the SDEIS as well as requirements and standards and guidelines listed in the ROD for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl (Northwest Forest Plan). As required in the Northwest Forest Plan, a watershed analysis was completed for the Eagle Creek watershed in 1995.

### **Scope of the Decision**

My decision provides for specific actions, guidelines, and mitigation measures for the management of National Forest lands on the Mt. Hood National Forest, Estacada Ranger District and does not apply to lands of other ownership (e.g., private land owners, BLM, etc.).

This decision does not analyze or propose management alternatives within a Late-Successional Reserve (LSR) or the Salmon-Huckleberry Wilderness. Alternative #1 does not propose management activities within riparian reserves. It does propose management activities within a portion of the inventoried Salmon-Huckleberry roadless area. This roadless area was involved in the Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE) (1979). This portion of the roadless area was considered for wilderness but subsequently dropped during the creation of the Salmon-Huckleberry Wilderness (1984). None of the alternatives in the FEIS propose road construction in the roadless area.

## The Decision

I have selected **Alternative #1** as the best management strategy for lands administered by the Forest Service within the Eagle Creek and South Fork of Eagle Creek watersheds. The selection of Alternative #1 is based on the analysis in the FEIS and consideration of public comments received and is considered one of the environmentally preferred alternatives.

Alternative #1 would:

- ✓ Silviculturally treat 1,030 acres of Matrix<sup>1</sup> land;
- ✓ Re-vegetate "bare" soil areas in three locations along roads 4614 and 4615 (Watershed Analysis, Map 3-11);
- ✓ Re-contour and resurface the running surface of road 4614180 and restructure the drainage facilities to reduce the potential for sediment delivery into streams;
- ✓ Block or obliterate access to roads through berms or gates to reduce the potential for wildlife harassment (Mt. Hood Forest Plan, page Four-72). Those roads that would be blocked are: 4614130, 4614140, 4614150, 4614160, 4614170, 4614180, 4614190, and 4615135. Those roads that are to be obliterated include: 4614167, 4615011 and two unnumbered spurs on the 4615.

Under this alternative, commercial thinning would occur on 868 acres, a shelterwood prescription would occur on 125 acres, and individual tree selection would occur on 37 acres. To accomplish this project, approximately .85 miles of new road and 0.35 miles of temporary road would need to be constructed. Following the completion of management activities, this new road and the temporary roads would be obliterated.

<sup>1</sup> "Matrix" is land identified in the Northwest Forest Plan. These are the lands where the majority of silvicultural activity would occur within the forest.

It is estimated that approximately four (4) acres of bare soil areas would be revegetated and that approximately one (1) mile of road and associated drainage facilities would be restructured. Road closures would reduce the "open" road per square mile so that it is equal to or less than the Mt. Hood Forest Plan standard of 2.0 miles of open road per square mile in winter range and 2.5 miles of open road per square mile in summer range.

*Alternative #1 would not manage timber stands within riparian reserves. This alternative would manage lands within the Salmon-Huckleberry Roadless area.*

## Reasons for Selecting Alternative #1

While making my decision, I considered several factors and weighed the merits of each alternative, including significant issues, how well each alternative addressed the objectives for management, and public comments to the SDEIS.

## Significant Issues

### Issue #1

### Water Quality and Fish Habitat

When implemented, water quality and fish habitat would essentially be unaffected by management activities under Alternative #1. Analysis indicates that:

- There would be no significant change in stream temperatures.
- Due to riparian reserves and mitigation measures, it is anticipated that soil erosion rates would remain at very low levels and state water quality standards for turbidity would be maintained.
- The Aggregate Recovery Percentage (ARP) would be well above the threshold level of concern of 75%. The following are the ARP values following implementation: Upper Mainstem, Eagle Creek — 94.9% (Existing, 94.9%), South Fork Eagle Creek — 85.4% (Existing, 87.5%), Combined — 92.3% (Existing, 94.9%), Entire Eagle Creek Watershed — 65.8% (Existing, 65.8%).

- The water available for runoff is not measurably affected and the magnitude and frequency of peak flows is not expected to be measurably affected for any of the sub-watersheds within or downstream of the project area.
- It is estimated that there would be no measurable effect to cutthroat trout habitat or populations or to other aquatic biota. This includes lower Columbia coho salmon and macroinvertebrates.
- There is a finding of “no impact” for Bull trout and Redband trout.

**Issue #2**

**Salmon-Huckleberry Roadless Area**

The Mt. Hood Forest Plan (1990) discusses inventoried roadless areas and provides an analysis on a Forest wide basis. Some of the roadless areas were recommended for preservation and others for management. The Salmon-Huckleberry roadless area was designated for management. The entire roadless area is 17,650 acres in size. Alternative #1 will manage approximately three (3) percent of these lands. Alternative #1 begins to manage lands that were in the RARE<sup>2</sup> process but were not selected as Wilderness (1984) and were designated for management in the Mt. Hood Forest Plan. Further, these lands are identified as Matrix under the Northwest Forest Plan where most of the silvicultural activity on the forest will take place. In accordance with the Northwest Forest Plan, Alternative #1 would not construct roads within the inventoried Salmon-Huckleberry Roadless Area.

<sup>2</sup> RARE is the acronym for Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (1979).



**Issue #3**

**Production of Wood Products and the Local Economy**

I have selected Alternative #1 because it does provide wood products, provides income to local residents, generates taxes for state and federal government, and provides revenue to the local counties for schools and roads. When compared to the other alternatives, Alternative #1 will provide for the second largest amount of: timber volume, jobs supported, income generated, income tax generated, and revenues provided to the counties. This project would not result in offering deficit timber sale contracts. This is evidenced by an economic analysis that indicates the benefit/cost ratio is 1.88 and has a present net value of approximately \$4.5 million.

**Issue #4**

**Ecological Diversity**

I have selected Alternative #1 because it will not cause a "take" situation for spotted owls and would not have an adverse effect on other species. The analysis used four indexes to determine environmental effects of the alternatives. These indexes were: Spotted owl habitat converted, acres of late-successional interior forest fragmented, late-successional or old growth forest converted to a grass-forb/shrub or open sapling-pole stand condition, and edge.

- There are 2,285 acres of suitable spotted owl habitat. Alternative #1 would convert 126 acres of this land from nesting, roosting, and foraging habitat to either dispersal habitat or non-habitat. Alternative #1 would not cause a loss of viability of this habitat type for dependent species.
- There are 2,100 acres of interior habitat. Alternative #1 would fragment approximately 50% of these lands. Though fragmentation would occur, approximately 10,390 acres of habitat are contained in the LSR and Wilderness. These adjacent lands would help to ensure that interior habitat is maintained at the landscape level across the watershed.
- There are 1,435 acres of mature forest. Alternative #1 would convert 8% to grass/forb.

- The total miles of edge would be increased from 26 miles to 31 miles. The edge displayed here is not necessarily the distinct line between a clearcut or shelterwood and the residual stand. This figure includes the line between a managed (thinned) stand and an unmanaged stand.

## Management Objectives

Five management objectives were established for lands administered by the Forest Service in the Eagle Creek watershed. I have determined that Alternative #1 would meet four of the five objectives. The five objectives are:

### *Objective #1*

*Maintain and enhance the long term health of the watershed for the production of high quality water.*

- Alternative #1 will begin to thin overstocked stands thus improving forest health and creating a more viable stand structure. In addition, Alternative #1 will begin watershed restoration projects. These actions will maintain or enhance water quality.

### *Objective #2*

*Enhance the long term growth potential of the project area.*

- Alternative #1 will thin stands so that the growth potential of the various sites can be realized. The resultant supply of wood products would satisfy (in part) the short-term demand for timber as well as contribute towards the potential sale quantity (PSQ) for the Mt. Hood National Forest as prescribed by the Northwest Forest Plan.

### *Objective #3*

*Enhance wildlife habitat diversity.*

- Alternative #1 will improve structural diversity, promote the development of more complex canopies, and develop large snags and logs outside of riparian areas. In addition, small openings will be created to provide habitat for early seral dependent species and forage for deer and elk.

**Objective #4**

*Maintain or improve the riparian conditions for the benefit of fish, wildlife, and plants.*

- Alternative #1 will not affect riparian conditions because riparian areas would not be managed. Riparian areas will remain in their present condition. However, the long term health of the timber stands will decline over time. In addition, structural diversity will not be improved and complex canopies and large snags and logs would not be developed.

**Objective #5**

*Begin restoration activities where there are known resource concerns.*

- Alternative #1 will encourage the growth of large trees for wildlife benefits and it will revegetate areas along roads. It will recontour and/or reshape drainage facilities and obliterate roads to prevent sediment transport.

**Public Comments**

In the Eagle Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS), I had identified Alternative #3 which would treat timber stands in 125 acres of riparian reserves as the agency preferred alternative. Comments received on this SDEIS indicated that the public had a concern over maintaining water quality and riparian dependent habitat. Due to these concerns, the respondents opposed any type of management in riparian reserves.

## Other Alternatives Considered

After considering these comments and contemplating the economic viability of thinning riparian reserves, I identified Alternative #1 as the agency preferred alternative in the Eagle Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and I have selected Alternative #1 as the best management strategy for this area.

Four alternatives were fully developed for my consideration. These alternatives were formulated by an interdisciplinary team using an issue-driven process that addressed concerns raised by employees, other agencies, American Indians, and the public. The four alternatives were presented in the SDEIS (May 1996) and with slight modifications, were carried through to the FEIS. One other alternative was considered but was not developed in the analysis process; a discussion of these alternatives is included in Chapter II of the FEIS.

### *Alternative #2*

This alternative would have accomplished the following:

- Silviculturally treat 562 acres of Matrix land;
- Re-vegetate "bare" soil areas in two locations along roads 4614 and 4615 (Watershed Analysis, Map 3-11);
- Re-contour and resurface the running surface of road 4614180 and restructure the drainage facilities to reduce the potential for sediment delivery into streams;
- Block or obliterate access to roads through berms or gates to reduce the potential for wildlife harassment (Mt. Hood Forest Plan, page Four-72). There is one road that would be blocked and it is 4614180. Those roads that are to be obliterated are: 4615011 and two unnumbered spurs on the 4615.

*Alternative #2 would not manage timber stands within riparian reserves nor would this alternative manage lands within the Salmon-Huckleberry Roadless area.*

I did not select Alternative #2 because analysis indicates that stand management should occur across the watershed and Alternative #2 only treated a small portion of these lands. With the treatment prescribed in this alternative, the established objectives would not be met as well as in other alternatives across the landscape

These objectives are:

- > Maintain and enhance the long term health of the watershed for the production of high quality water;
- > Enhance the long term growth potential of the project area;
- > Enhance wildlife habitat diversity; and
- > Maintain or improve the riparian conditions for the benefit of fish, wildlife, and plants.

**Alternative #3**

This alternative would have accomplished the following:

- Silviculturally treat 1,229 acres of both Matrix and riparian lands;
- Re-vegetate "bare" soil areas in three locations along roads 4614 and 4615 (Watershed Analysis, Map 3-11);
- Recontour and resurface the running surface of road 4614180 and restructure the drainage facilities to reduce the potential for sediment delivery into streams;
- Block access to roads through berms or gates to reduce the potential for wildlife harassment (Mt. Hood Forest Plan, page Four-72). Those roads that would be blocked are: 4614130, 4614140, 4614150, 4614160, 4614170, 4614180, 4614190, and 4615135. Those roads to be obliterated include: 4614167, 4615011 and two unnumbered spurs on the 4615.

*Alternative #3 would manage timber stands within 125 acres of riparian reserves and would manage timber stands within the Salmon-Huckleberry Roadless area.*

I did not select Alternative #3 because of my reevaluation of the proposal to treat riparian areas. I found that treating these areas would only marginally improve riparian habitat and that removing small numbers of trees may not be economically viable.

**Alternative #4  
(No Action)**

This is the no action alternative. With this alternative, no projects would occur as a result of this document.

*With Alternative #4, no management activities would occur and the land, roads, and streams would remain in their existing condition in the short term. In the long-term, stand vigor would continue to decline which would increase the possibility of mortality through damaging agents such as insects, disease, fire, or windthrow.*

I did not select Alternative #4 because it would not:

- > Manage timber stands to maintain or enhance the long-term health of the watershed for the production of high quality water;
- > Enhance the long term growth potential of the project area;
- > Begin restoration projects as described in the Eagle Watershed Analysis (i.e., revegetating bare soil areas, recontouring and resurfacing road 4614180 and restructuring drainage facilities, and blocking or obliterating roads); and
- > The Northwest Forest Plan would not be implemented.

**Public  
Involvement,  
Scoping, and  
the Issues**

At the beginning of the environmental impact analysis, a "Notice of Intent" was published in the Federal Register on April 15, 1991 that described the intentions of the Forest Service to produce an EIS for the Eagle area. A second notice of intent was published in the Federal Register that revised the original proposal based on a preliminary study of the area and a change in management strategies. This second notice was published on July 22, 1992.

Following the publication of the April 15, 1991 notice of intent, newspaper articles appeared in the Oregonian and in local newspapers. Regular informational articles and time-line updates have been published in Mt. Hood National Forest newsletter called *Sprouts*. This newsletter is regularly mailed to over 3,000 individuals and organizations.

Two public meetings were held on November 18th and November 21st, 1991 in Estacada, Oregon. A total of 41 people attended these two meetings. In addition, the Estacada Ranger District received 39 letters dealing with the proposal.

A representative from the Eagle Creek National Fish Hatchery (administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), regularly attended Steering Committee meetings. Additionally, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, the Yakima Indian Nation, and the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde have been contacted concerning this project.

As a result of the scoping process, four (4) "Significant" issues emerged that could suggest alternate methods of management to the proposed action. These four issues were addressed in the Eagle SDEIS and carried forward to the FEIS.

The four significant issues were:

**Issue #1**

**Water Quality and Fish Habitat**

**Issue Statement:** Activities that disturb soil and manipulate vegetation may increase stream sediment loading, stream temperatures, and alter the timing and size of peak flows. These occurrences may have effects to the resident fish populations and the national fish hatchery and may have an affect on stream bank stability.

**Issue #2**

**Salmon-Huckleberry Roadless Area**

**Issue Statement:** Silvicultural activities could reduce, alter or eliminate some existing roadless area characteristics in the Eagle area. These roadless area characteristics are:

- Natural Integrity;
- Apparent Naturalness;
- Remoteness;
- Solitude/primitive recreation opportunities;
- Unique features; and

- Manageability and boundaries.

**Issue #3**

**Production of Wood Products and the Local Economy**

**Issue Statement:** The Eagle Creek planning area has the potential to supply wood products as well as employment opportunities to the local economy. Receipts from timber harvest would fund local schools and return revenues to the U.S. Treasury.

**Issue #4**

**Ecological Diversity**

**Issue Statement:** Silvicultural activities could reduce, alter, or eliminate the ability for treated stands to provide habitat for a variety of organisms. In addition, ecosystem productivity could be reduced and connectivity could be disrupted between the late successional stands of timber.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Eagle Creek Timber Sales was released for public review on July 9, 1993. Originally, the public comment period for the draft document was 45 days and would have been completed on August 23, 1993. However, due to telephone conversations with interested readers, the comment period was extended for an additional 15 days. The end of the comment period then became September 7, 1993.

Following the release of the DEIS, three public meetings were held. These meetings were held in: The city of Mollala on July 26, 1993, the city of Gresham on July 27, 1993, and the city of Estacada on July 29, 1993. During these public meetings, participants were invited to a public field trip to view the Eagle Creek area. This field review was held on August 11, 1993. During the public comment period (July 9 through September 7) several newspaper articles dealing with the draft document were published in the Oregonian and in the Clackamas County News.



Once the decision was made to produce a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS), a notice of intent was published on October 18, 1995 informing the public of the decision. Regular informational articles and time-line updates have been published in the Mt. Hood National Forest newsletter, *Sprouts*. A notice of availability was published the Federal Register for the SDEIS on May 24, 1996 and the public comment period ended on July 8, 1996. Comments were received on the SDEIS and responses to substantive comments from these letters and other public involvement documentation can be found in the appendix of the FEIS.

The comment period for the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) was 45 days in length. During this comment period, no responses were made or comments received that suggested other significant issues.

## Public Response to the SDEIS

Eighteen individual letters were received by the end of the 45 day comment period. In addition, 97 "form" letters/post cards that were all worded exactly the same were also received. The following are subject areas that received the most comment during the public comment phase of the SDEIS. These comments were also weighed in my decision for selecting Alternative #1 as the best management strategy for Forest Service lands in the Eagle and South Fork of Eagle drainages. The subject area is in italics followed by a response to the concern.

*Windthrow: Concern over blowdown after cutting especially in riparian areas, spotted owl habitat, and interior habitat.*

A comprehensive blowdown analysis was completed and included in the SDEIS. Blowdown is not anticipated because of cutting prescriptions and unit placement on the landscape. Prescriptions would vary thinning intensity as the project units approached riparian areas or other blowdown potential sites. This variation would help to ensure that heavy winds would not drop below the canopy layers thus increasing the chances of windthrow. Those units with heavier cutting prescriptions (shelterwood) are placed on the landscape where the blowdown potential is moderate or light.

***Cutting In and Around Riparian Areas: Concern over sediment loading, blowdown, fish habitat, and overall water quality.***

Analysis under significant issue #1 indicates that water quality would not be significantly affected under any of the alternatives. However, due to the economic feasibility of logging selected riparian areas and public comments, I selected Alternative #1 for implementation because it does not manage riparian areas.

***Water Quality: Concern over the chances of increased erosion, landslides, and siltation through cutting on steeper slopes and new road construction.***

Analysis indicates that water quality would not be significantly affected under any of the alternatives. With Alternative #1, cutting area boundaries would be placed at least 208 feet from any non-fish bearing stream, wet areas greater than one (1) acres in size, or seeps. On fish bearing streams, unit boundaries would be a minimum of 416 feet. All units and road locations are located on geologically stable slopes. There would be no road construction adjacent to or crossing over riparian areas.

***Wildlife Habitat: Concern in the decrease of acres of interior habitat and fragmentation. Concern over Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive species. Concern over miles of existing and newly created "edge" along cutting areas.***

Alternative #1 would fragment approximately one-half (1/2) of the interior habitat in the matrix land. However, this alternative would not affect habitat in the adjacent LSR or adjacent wilderness. These adjacent lands would provide for interior habitat at the landscape level for the Eagle watershed. In addition, travel corridors (riparian areas) would remain intact and connectivity throughout the area would be maintained. Alternative #1 would convert approximately 126 acres of suitable spotted owl habitat to dispersal habitat or non-habitat. This is approximately a 5% reduction of the total 2,285 acres of existing habitat. This reduction of suitable habitat would not cause a loss of viability of this habitat type.

Although spotted owl habitat exists in the watershed, there are no pairs, singles, or activity centers in the area. Through consultation, the USDI, Fish and Wildlife Service returned a biological opinion that stated management activities on the district are not likely to adversely affect the spotted owl or its designated critical habitat (May 24, 1996).

**Silviculture:** *Concern over the need to do any management in the area. Concern over the percent of trees removed in various prescriptions.*

Alternative #1 would begin to manage timber stands that are homogenous and overstocked. The prescriptions that are to be employed would maintain or enhance long term health, enhance growth potential, and enhance wildlife diversity while protecting water quality and related habitats.

**Flooding:** *Concern that very little if any analysis was included relating to the floods in the winter of 1995/1996.*

Little information was included in the SDEIS about the effects of flooding during the winter of 1995/1996 in the Eagle area however, information was included in the FEIS. Surveys have been completed and there has been no damage to the transportation facilities in the area. Additionally, although high water was evident in the stream channels throughout Eagle/South Fork of Eagle drainages, there is no indication that there were any torrents or debris slides in the creeks that caused scouring of the channels. The surveys also show that there were no landslides, debris slides, or slope failures in existing clearcut areas. The one exception to this is on road 4615011. Indications are that water flowed down this road rutting the running surface and depositing gravels and soils into Fall creek (a tributary to the North fork). This road was identified as a problem area in the SDEIS and was/is scheduled for obliteration.

**Procedures:** *Confusion existed because the proposed action and the preferred alternative were not the same. Concern over the timing of analysis and how the watershed analysis was followed in the SDEIS analysis and recommendations.*

As required in the regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), the SDEIS identified a proposed action and then analyzed alternatives including the proposed action. The deciding officer selects an alternative based on the analysis, how well it meets objectives, and after considering public comment. The proposed action need not be the preferred alternative.

The following are examples of recommendations from the watershed analysis that were followed:

- The site potential tree height from non-fish bearing streams would be 208 feet and 416 feet on fish bearing streams.
- The closure of roads and forage seeding projects.
- Increase vegetation species diversity.
- Revegetate road cuts where there is a potential for sediment transport.

**Environmentally  
Preferable  
Alternative(s)**

I have considered all alternatives in this analysis and have determined that two of the alternatives would be environmentally preferred. An environmentally preferred alternative is one that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment and best protects, preserves, and enhances historical, cultural, and natural resources.

Factors that I used in this determination include:

- The analysis in the Eagle FEIS indicates that all alternatives would maintain or enhance water quality in this watershed.
- The Salmon-Huckleberry Roadless Area was analyzed in the Mt. Hood National Forest Land Management Plan and it determined that these lands would revert to the surrounding land allocation (B6-Special Emphasis Watershed) and that management of the individual resources could occur.
- All action alternatives (Alternatives #1, 2, and 3) would contribute towards the production of wood products and contribute revenues to the local economy and to state and Federal governments.
- The action alternatives would provide for ecological diversity which varies in intensity depending on the selected alternative.
- The three action alternatives would provide for completing restoration projects that would aid in reducing the potential for sediments to enter stream courses.

- Implementing recommendations from the watershed analysis for landscape analysis and design.

The two environmentally preferred alternatives are:

***Alternative #1***

This is an environmentally preferred alternative because it provides for management in matrix and roadless lands so that the long term health of the watershed for the production of high quality water could be maintained. In addition, Alternative #1 would enhance the long term growth potential of the project area, enhance wildlife habitat diversity, and begin watershed restoration activities.

***Alternative #2***

This is an environmentally preferred alternative because it provides for management in matrix lands but would not provide for management in the roadless area. Thus, the long term health of the watershed for the production of high quality water could be maintained on the matrix lands. In addition, Alternative #2 would enhance the long term growth potential on a portion of the project area, enhance wildlife habitat diversity on some of the matrix lands, and begin a few restoration projects.

***Alternative Comparison:***

- Both of the preferable alternatives would maintain or enhance water quality.
- Alternative #1 would enhance the long term growth potential on both matrix and roadless lands while Alternative #2 would enhance the long term growth potential on matrix lands only.
- Alternative #1 would enhance wildlife habitat diversity on both matrix and roadless lands while Alternative #2 would enhance wildlife habitat diversity on matrix lands only.
- Both Alternatives #1 and 2 would begin restoration projects but Alternative #2 would provide for fewer projects than Alternative #1.

Alternative #1 would meet, at least in part, four of the five objectives displayed in Chapter I of the FEIS.

Alternative #2 would meet, at least in part, four of the five objectives displayed in Chapter I of the FEIS but not as well as Alternative #1. Alternative #2 would have fewer effects on the landscape because the intensity of management would be less and the Salmon-Huckleberry Roadless Area would remain in its existing condition with no effect to the six roadless characteristics used in the analysis.

## Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures are defined as actions taken to avoid, minimize, reduce, or eliminate impacts as a result of implementing an alternative. The SDEIS and FEIS were prepared under the guidance of the Mt. Hood National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan and the Northwest Forest Plan. Standards and Guidelines as described in the Forest Plan and in the Northwest Forest plan (as mitigations) are incorporated into the design of the alternatives in this document. The publication, *General Water Quality Best Management Practices* (USFS, 1988) has been utilized as a guide in developing mitigation measures and site specific Best Management Practices.

The following mitigation measures are specific to the Eagle area and will be implemented when appropriate. For a complete list of mitigation measures, refer to the Eagle Final Environmental Impact Statement. All of the measures listed with this decision are considered to be easily implementable with minimal cost.

- Meet the standards and guidelines of Retention or Partial Retention along hiking trail 502A.
- Keep trails open on weekends and holidays.
- Flush cut stumps within view of trails.
- No tractor skidding of logs across hiking trails.
- Selectively place slash after harvest to visually screen yarding corridors within sight distance of trails and roads.
- Reconstruct hiking trail tread.

- Limited operating season required during peak sap flows and to protect soil and water resources; operations would be limited from 6/1 to 10/31. To minimize the potential for surface erosion, road and landing construction and log haul would not occur during periods of prolonged rain fall. Sale administrators and watershed personnel should evaluate such operations to see if they are appropriate during these times.
- Seed, fertilize and mulch all bare soil areas that were disturbed as a result of management activities (e.g., corridors, skid roads, landings and cut and fill slopes). Erosion control materials should be consist of ; annual rye grass applied at 30 lb. / acre, 16-20-0 fertilizer applied at a rate of 200 lb. / acres, and rye grass mulch applied at a rate of 3,000 lb. / acre. Straw applied at this rate should provide 100% cover of exposed soil to a depth of at least 1 inch.
- Limited operating period for completion of new road construction, road obliteration, and road cut and fill repairs is from 7/1 to 9/30 to protect soil and water resources. No work should take place between 10/1 and June 30.
- Stabilize (rock) road surfaces to minimize surface erosion; utilize special design considerations.
- Designate specific Riparian Reserve areas. Prescriptions would be developed for each unit, identifying size, width, harvest, and yarding prescriptions, and limitations.
- Directionally fall all timber away from riparian reserves, streams and hiking trails.
- Retain a buffer of trees and snags around rock outcrops or talus slopes.

## Monitoring

Standard monitoring practices have been developed in the Mt. Hood National Forest, Forest Plan. The Mt. Hood Forest produces an annual monitoring report on compliance, progress, and accomplishments. The FEIS lists site specific items that are to be monitored during and after implementation.

Site specific monitoring would include:

- Compliance with Best Management Practices;
- Monitoring stream temperatures;
- Stream surveys; and
- windthrow.

Monitoring is covered in Appendix J of the FEIS.

## Findings Required by Other Laws

**National Forest Management Act (NFMA):** This decision is consistent with the Mt. Hood National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (1990) and the Northwest Forest Plan<sup>3</sup> which incorporates requirements and standards and guidelines identified in the respective documents.

Consistency was determined by the following factors:

- The desired future conditions for each land allocation were identified and management objectives and the proposed action and alternatives to the proposed action were designed to move this area towards these desired conditions.
- The Salmon-Huckleberry Roadless Area has been evaluated in the Forest Plan and released for management.
- Inventoried deer and elk winter and summer range were considered in the analysis of the alternatives and projects were developed to enhance these habitats.

<sup>3</sup> This refers to the Record of Decision for Amendments to the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl.



- This decision complies with various requirements and standards and guidelines as stated in the Forest Plan (e.g., management of trails for visual standards, closing roads to reduce wildlife harassment, incorporation through mitigation measures, and others).
- All lands proposed for harvest are considered suitable acres.
- A consistency review has been completed for the Northwest Forest Plan and this review indicates that this decision is consistent with all requirements and standards and guidelines.

***National Historic Preservation Act:*** Concurrence was received from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and I find we are consistent with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended.

***Endangered Species Act:*** Formal consultation was instigated with the USDI Fish and Wildlife Service in regards to the spotted owl. The biological opinion of the USDI Fish and Wildlife Service is that the actions of the Forest Service are not likely to adversely affect the spotted owl or its designated critical habitat.

On August 9, 1996 the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) proposed that steelhead trout within certain areas of the lower Columbia River be listed as "Threatened" under the Endangered Species Act. The Clackamas River watershed is included in their proposal. Through a biological evaluation it has been determined that the actions proposed in this Record of Decision may effect, but are not likely to adversely effect steelhead trout. This determination has been reviewed by NMFS through conferencing on October 2, 1996.

Based on the biological evaluations and consultations with USFWS and NMFS I find that the proposed actions will not jeopardize or threaten the viability of any listed or proposed species and are therefore consistent with the Endangered Species Act.

***Vegetation Management:*** I find we are consistent with the terms of the May 5, 1989 Mediated Agreement for Managing Competing and Unwanted Vegetation.

***Recission Bill, Public Law 104-19:*** This decision does not contain a salvage component as described under Section 2001 (b) but does fall under Section 2001 (d) *Direction to Complete Timber Sales on Lands Covered by Option 9.*

**Implemen-  
tation Date**

A notice of availability for the Eagle Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was published in the Federal Register on (October 4, 1996) and was available to the public for 30 days prior to the publishing of this Record of Decision. This decision may be implemented immediately.

**Administrative  
Appeal and  
Judicial Review  
Procedures**

This decision is not subject to appeal under Public Law 104-19, Section 2001 (d) and (e). However, any resultant timber sales from this decision can be subject to judicial review (Section 2001 (f)). Judicial review would occur only in the United States district court for the district on which the affected Federal lands are located. Any challenge to such sale must be filed in such district court within 15 days after the date of initial advertisement of the challenged sale.

**Contact Person**

For more information contact:

John Berry  
District Ranger  
Estacada Ranger District  
595 NW Industrial Way  
Estacada, Oregon 97023

**Signature  
and Date**

*Roberta A. Moltzen*

Roberta Moltzen  
Forest Supervisor  
Mt. Hood National Forest  
USDA Forest Service

Nov. 8, 1996

Date

**Appendix A - Errata Sheet**

## Appendix A

### Errata

In the summary of the FEIS, there is a section *Alternatives Considered* that begins on page six and continues onto page seven under the description of Alternative #3 is in error.

Currently, item number one states: "Silviculturally treat 1,229 acres of land. All of this land would be in the Matrix allocation."

This statement should read: "Silviculturally treat 1,229 acres of land. Of these 1,229 acres, 1,104 acres are in the Matrix allocation and 125 acres are in the Riparian land allocation."