

Appendix C
2007 Plantation Thinning Project
Fisheries Biological Evaluation

Clackamas River Ranger District
Mt. Hood National Forest
Fifth Field Watershed: Middle Clackamas River, Collawash River

Table 1. List of Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, or Sensitive (PETS) Fish and Aquatic Mollusk Species found on the Mt. Hood National Forest and addressed under this Biological Evaluation:

	Date of Listing	Suitable Habitat Present	Species Present	Effects of Actions Alternatives		
				A	B	C
<u>Endangered Species Act Listing by ESU</u>						
<i>Threatened</i>						
Lower Columbia River steelhead & CH <i>(Oncorhynchus mykiss)</i>	3/98 1/06	3/98	Yes	NE	NLAA	NLAA
Lower Columbia River chinook & CH <i>(Oncorhynchus tshawytscha)</i>	3/99 1/06	3/99	Yes	NE	NE	NE
Columbia River Bull Trout <i>(Salvelinus confluentus)</i>	6/98	6/98	Yes	NE	NE	NE
Middle Columbia River steelhead & CH <i>(Oncorhynchus mykiss)</i>	3/99 1/06	3/99	Yes	NE	NE	NE
Upper Willamette River chinook & CH <i>(Oncorhynchus tshawytscha)</i>	3/99 1/06	3/99	Yes	NE	NLAA	NLAA
Lower Columbia River coho <i>(Oncorhynchus kisutch)</i>	6/05	7/05	Yes	NE	NLAA	NLAA
<u>Regional Forester's Sensitive Species List</u>						
<u>Survey and Manage</u>						
Interior Redband Trout (*) <i>(Oncorhynchus mykiss spp.)</i>	7/04	Yes	No	NI	NI	NI
Columbia dusky snail (*,+) <i>(Lyogyrus n. sp. 1)</i>	7/04 1/01	Yes	Unk	NI	MIIH	MIIH
Basalt Juga (+) <i>(Juga oreobasis n. sp .2)</i>	01/01	Yes	Unk	NI	MIIH	MIIH

Abbreviations/ Acronyms:

Endangered Species Act Abbreviations/ Acronyms:		Essential Fish Habitat Abbreviations/ Acronyms:	
NE	No Effect	NAA	Not Adversely Affected
NLAA	May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect	AE	Adverse Effects
LAA	May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect		
Regional Forester's Sensitive Species List* and Survey and Manage + Abbreviations/ Acronyms:			
Unk	Species presence unknown but suspected		
NI	No Impact		
MIIH	May impact individuals or habitat, but will not likely contribute to a trend towards Federal listing or loss of viability to the population or species		

Written by: /s/ Robert Bergamini Date: 01/29/07
Fisheries Biologist

Reviewed by: /s/ Tom Horning Date: 01/29/07
Fisheries Biologist

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	3
PROJECT LOCATION	3
PROJECT/ACTION AREA	4
ACTIVITIES COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES.....	4
Timber Felling	4
Yarding	6
Road Construction/Reconstruction/Landing Construction	6
Road Maintenance	7
Log Haul	8
Road Decommissioning	8
Fuels Treatment	9
DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES.....	9
Alternative A - No Action.....	9
Alternative B.....	9
Alternative C.....	10
COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE	10
INTERRELATED OR INTERDEPENDENT ACTIONS.....	11
PRESENCE OF PETS FISH AND AQUATIC SPECIES WITHIN OR DOWNSTREAM OF THE ACTION AREA	11
Columbia River Bull Trout	11
Lower Columbia River Steelhead.....	11
Upper Willamette River Spring Chinook	12
Lower Columbia River Fall Chinook	12
Lower Columbia River Coho Salmon.....	12
Columbia Dusky Snail	13
Basalt Juga	13
EFFECTS DETERMINATION	14
Direct Effects and Indirect Effects.....	14
Alternative A (No Action)	15
Action Alternatives	15
Cumulative Effects.....	21
ESA Cumulative Effects	22
CONCLUSION	22
DETERMINATION OF EFFECTS – DESIGNATED CRITICAL HABITAT.....	24
DETERMINATION OF EFFECTS – ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT.....	25
DESIGN CRITERIA AND BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMPS)	25
REFERENCES	28

INTRODUCTION

Forest management activities that may alter the aquatic habitat or affect individuals or populations of PETS (Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, and Sensitive) fish and aquatic species require a Biological Evaluation to be completed (FSM 2671.44 and FSM 2670.32) as part of the National Environmental Policy Act process to determine their potential effects on sensitive, threatened or endangered species. The Biological Evaluation process (FSM 2672.43) is intended to conduct and document activities necessary to ensure proposed management actions will not likely jeopardize the continued existence or cause adverse modification of habitat for:

- A. Species listed or proposed to be listed as endangered (E) or threatened (T) by the USDI-Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries).
- B. Species listed as sensitive (S) by USDA-Forest Service Region 6.

This Biological Evaluation (BE) addresses a proposal to thin and commercially harvest wood fiber in second growth plantations on approximately 4,374 acres within the Middle Clackamas River (formally known as the Lower Clackamas River) and Collawash River fifth-field watersheds. The project area is located in the western portion of the Clackamas River Ranger District, Mount Hood National Forest. The objective of this action is to provide forest products, maintain health, vigor, and growth that results in larger wind firm trees, enhance and restore stand diversity, enhance riparian reserves by accelerating the development of mature and late-successional stand conditions, and to accelerate future large woody debris recruitment potential and snag habitat production. The project is covered by the Lower Clackamas River Watershed Analysis (1996), Collawash/Hot Springs Fork Watershed Analysis, and the Fish Creek Watershed Analysis.

This Biological Evaluation addresses all alternatives presented in the 2007 Plantation Thinning Environmental Assessment (EA).

PROJECT LOCATION

The 2007 Plantation Thinning Project is located within the Middle Clackamas River and Collawash River 5th field watersheds of the Clackamas River Basin. Portions of these watersheds are designated as Tier I key watersheds under the Northwest Forest Plan because they contain crucial refugia for at-risk fish species. The project is located in T.5S., R.5E.; T.5S., R.6E.; T.6S., R.6E.; T.7S., R.6E.; T.7S., R.5E.; Willamette Meridian, Clackamas County, Oregon.

The proposed treatment area is located within eight drainages of the Middle Clackamas River and eight drainages of the Collawash River. The total area of the sixteen drainages associated with the project is 68,778 acres. The area of the eight drainages within the Middle Clackamas watershed is 42,117 acres and includes: Lower Fish Creek, Lower Clackamas River Tributaries, Pup Creek, Sandstone Creek, Big Creek, Trout Creek,

Lower Clackamas River Timber Lake, and the Lower Clackamas River Wards drainages. The area of the eight drainages within the Collawash watershed is 26,661 acres and includes the Hot Springs Fork Tributaries, Dutch Creek, Thunder Creek, Blister Creek, Fan Creek, Farm Creek, Lower Collawash River Tributaries - North, and the Lower Collawash River Tributaries – South drainages.

PROJECT/ACTION AREA

The Action Area is defined for ESA purposes as “all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action” (50 CFR 402). For purpose of this BE, the 2007 Plantation Thinning Action Area includes the treatment areas in the Middle Clackamas River Tributaries (6th field), Lower Clackamas River Tributaries (6th field), Fish Creek (6th field), Lower Collawash River Tributaries (6th field), and the Lower Hot Springs Fork (6th field) subwatersheds. The project action area will extend downstream for a distance of approximately 2.0 river miles in the mainstem Clackamas and Collawash Rivers. Downstream of this point it is believed any potential indirect effects to PETS species from implementing this project would be immeasurable and insignificant.

ACTIVITIES COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES

The following project elements are common to all of the project action alternatives:

Timber Felling

Felling of the timber will be accomplished by hand felling or the use of mechanical harvester/processors. Harvesters will be required to work on a layer of residual slash placed in the harvester path prior to advancing the equipment. Harvester travel routes will be limited to one pass over a path whenever possible to reduce soil displacement. To reduce the risk of erosion harvesters will be restricted to operate only during the dry season (May 31 to November 1). This restriction may be waived if soils are dry or frozen.

Treatment occurring within riparian reserves is designed to meet riparian reserve objectives. This includes protecting current resources, such as maintaining stream temperatures and short-term wood recruitment needs, and long term objectives such as developing large wood for future recruitment. Riparian reserve widths for this project are 180 feet (one site potential tree height) on each side of non-fish bearing streams and 360 feet (two site potential tree heights) in width on each side of fish-bearing streams (as described in watershed analysis documents).

No-cut stream protection buffers a minimum of 100 feet wide will be maintained along streams adjacent to listed fish habitat (LFH). A minimum 50-foot wide stream protection buffer will be maintained along all other perennial stream channels within the project area. Intermittent streams within one mile of LFH will receive minimum no-cut stream protection buffers of 50 feet in width. No-cut buffers a minimum of 30 feet in width would be maintained along intermittent channels greater than one mile from LFH under alternative B. Under alternative C all intermittent streams would receive a minimum 50

foot no-cut buffer. Larger buffer widths may be needed on a site-specific basis to prevent any increase in sediment delivery rates or a decrease in stream shading. Buffer width design will take into account the stream influence zone, steepness of slope, size and location of trees, orientation of the site to the sun (aspect), slope stability, and stream bank stability.

Within 50 feet of the stream protection buffers, only hand felling or low impact harvesting equipment such as mechanical harvesters would be allowed. Mechanical harvesting equipment would be required to operate on slash-covered paths. Trees in this zone would be directionally felled away from the protection buffers to minimize the disturbance to the forest floor.

The thinning prescription within riparian reserves will maintain an average conifer relative density (RD) value of 30 between the stream protection buffer and one site potential tree height along all streams less than one mile from LFH. In stands greater than one mile upstream from LFH, an RD value of at least 30 would be maintained within 100 ft. of the stream. In order to retain shade producing vegetation, an average canopy closure of 50% will be maintained within the secondary shade zone. This design criterion is expected to maintain a canopy closure that provides adequate shade over streams, and therefore is unlikely to alter water temperatures.

Gaps (or patch cuts) from 1/10 to ¼ acre in size would be created within riparian reserves. Gaps would make up 3-10% of each unit's riparian component. The distance separating a gap or patch cut from LFH would be greater than 180 feet. The distance separating a patch cut from all other streams would be at least 100 feet.

Treatment occurring within late-successional reserves would retain trees at a relative density of 20 to 40. Where riparian reserves overlap late successional reserves, the design features for riparian reserves will take priority in the riparian reserve component. In late-successional reserves trees would not be cut if they are greater than 20 inches in diameter (at a height of 4.5 feet). Skips (untreated areas) would be created that would vary in size and would comprise a minimum of 10% of each unit. Skips would be 0.25 to 1.25 acres or larger based on site-specific features. Where riparian reserves overlap late-successional reserves, the stream protection buffers may be counted as skips. Gaps within late-successional reserves would be 1/10 to ¼ acre in size and would make up 3-10% of each unit's late-successional reserve component.

Treatment within the matrix would be designed to increase health and growth that results in larger wind firm trees. The thinning prescription would maintain a relative density value of 25 to 35. Skips would be created that would vary in size and would comprise up to 10% of each unit. Where riparian reserves cross through matrix, the protection buffers adjacent to streams would be counted as skips. Gaps would be created within matrix; they would be 1/10 to ¼ acre in size and would make up to 3% of each unit's matrix component.

Yarding

Yarding will be accomplished utilizing a combination of mechanical harvester, processor, tractor, skyline, and helicopter logging systems. The total acres of each yarding method are as follows:

All ground based tractor operations will take place on slopes averaging less than 30% to avoid the risk of damage to soil and water resources. Mechanical fellers would be permitted on slopes up to 40% if operated on a layer of slash. No operation of ground-based yarding equipment will be permitted between November 1 and May 31 to reduce the risk of soil compaction and erosion. This restriction may be waived if soils are dry or frozen or if operators switch to skyline or other non-ground based systems. Mechanical harvesters and forwarders would be required to work on a layer of residual slash placed in the harvester path prior to advancing the equipment.

Within 50 feet of the no-cut stream protection buffers, only low impact, minimal ground disturbing harvesting equipment such as mechanical harvesters or skyline systems (suspension yarding) would be allowed. Trees in this zone would be directionally felled away from the no-harvest buffer to minimize the disturbance to the forest floor.

Ground based equipment will be required to use existing skid trails whenever feasible. There may be instances where it is not desirable to use an existing skid trail (such as where an old skid trail crosses a wet area) and in such cases, if a skid trail is needed in the area, a new skid trail would be located that does not alter surface hydrology. The use of designated skid trails and/or forwarder paths will help to minimize detrimental soil compaction within the project area. Following harvest activities, effective ground cover will be provided on ground based skid roads that have a potential for erosion problems. Water bars and/or cross ditches will be installed where needed to disperse water and control surface run-off.

All skyline yarding will incorporate one end or full suspension if needed, such as when yarding over a stream channel or seep. Skyline yarding will not occur over LFH or within the buffers associated with these streams. Yarding corridors will be approximately 15 feet wide and 100 to 200 feet apart. Skyline yarding will be allowed during all seasons.

Road Construction/Reconstruction/Landing Construction

Road construction/reconstruction will involve construction of new semi-permanent roads, landing construction, and re-opening old temporary roads constructed when the area was originally logged.

Approximately 3.3 miles of new temporary (semi-permanent) road will be constructed to access units under alternative B. This road construction is comprised of 2.6 miles of new road on undisturbed surfaces and 0.7 miles of road that will be constructed on previously disturbed skid trails. Under alternative C there will be no new roads constructed.

Temporary roads would normally be constructed, used and obliterated in the same operating season. If this is not possible, due to fire season restrictions or other

unforeseen delays, the road would be winterized prior to the end of the normal operating season by out-sloping, water-barring, effectively blocking the entrance, seeding, mulching and fertilizing.

Approximately 6.8 miles of existing temporary road will be re-opened to access the stands. The majority of these roads have been closed since the original entry into the stands, except roads reopened to thin 120 acres in the Big Creek 6th field HUC in 1994. Re-opening these roads will consist of removing any gates or berms presently blocking vehicle access, brushing overgrown areas, blading, and spot rocking where needed. Most of these roads have been previously rocked. Road work will not involve any culvert installation or removal. All roads currently closed and constructed during the previous entry in proposed treatment units and that are proposed to be reopened are outside one site potential tree height (180 ft.) from streams, and no closer than 625 feet from LFH.

Road construction will be restricted to the dry season between June 1 and October 31 unless unusually dry conditions permit activities outside this window. Conversely, road construction will not occur if conditions exceed best management practice standards that protect soil and water. All roads reopened by the project will be decommissioned following harvest activities. Decommissioning will consist of storm proofing by installing water bars and barricading the roads to vehicular traffic. Some of these roads will be used during future entries into matrix lands. The estimated return into the stands is 20 to 40 years.

Existing landings will be used whenever feasible. The Forest Service will approve landing locations in areas where there are resource concerns. Landings in riparian reserves would be located on existing roadways not requiring expansion of the road prism, or on existing landings that require only minimum reconstruction (clearing vegetation generated from earlier entries, sloping for drainage, or surfacing for erosion control purposes) to be made suitable for use. The use of existing landings within 200 feet of LFH would be prohibited. The use of existing landings located within Riparian Reserves will only be used if they are greater than 100 feet from any stream. The size and number of landings will be kept to the minimum required to harvest the units. Landings planned for use outside of the normal operating season (June 1-Oct. 31) will be surfaced with aggregate material.

When helicopter yarding is incorporated, the number of landings and their size would be kept to a minimum required to reasonably harvest the units. Landings will be located by the purchaser and approved by the Forest Service.

Road Maintenance

Road maintenance will involve any work needed to renovate or upgrade road systems in order for timber transport to occur in a safe manner. Maintenance to existing system roads prior to hauling will include placement of new aggregate surfacing where necessary to upgrade the quality of the road bed and improve road drainage, reconditioning the roadbed (grading), spot patching, sealing, brushing, and ditch cleanout where needed.

Converting asphalt to aggregate surface is proposed along some areas of the haul route in order to upgrade the roadbed where costs to repave are prohibitive. Asphalt to aggregate conversion is planned for areas along a 5.3 mile section of FS road 5410. Asphalt would be retained on approaches to stream crossings less than one mile from LFH. The length of pavement to be retained would be a minimum of 100 feet on either side of the stream crossing. Asphalt to aggregate conversion is also planned along approximately 3.9 miles of FS road 4620. There are no stream crossings within one mile of LFH along the sections of road where this activity will occur.

Ditch cleanout would be the removal of any material that may have slid into the ditch line that could impede the drainage capability. Waste material from the ditch cleanout would be disposed in sites located outside of Riparian Reserves. Existing ditch line vegetation would be maintained whenever possible to reduce the risk of erosion. Where the potential exists to deliver sediment to streams, sediment traps or other appropriate methods will be utilized during ditch cleaning. Road construction or maintenance will be restricted to the dry season between June 1 and October 31 unless unusually dry conditions permit activities outside this window.

Log Haul

The haul route will be along both aggregate and paved surface roads. The major system roads that will be used to transport timber are Forest Service (FS) roads 46, 54, 63, and 70. These road systems are paved and maintained for public safety. Secondary roads to be used for haul such as 5410, 4620, and 7010 are paved along much of the haul route. The network of aggregate surfaced roads along the route are level two and level three system roads, where the ditches are maintained and vegetated. All crossings over stream channels are paved where listed fish habitat LFH for steelhead, chinook, or coho occur. Road crossings along aggregate surfaced portions of the haul route are over small first and second order perennial or intermittent channels. The nearest aggregate surfaced crossing to LFH is along a small non fish-bearing tributary stream over 1,215 feet from any occurrence of steelhead, chinook, or coho.

Haul on these roads is not seasonally restricted. The majority of timber hauling would be allowed year-round on rock-aggregate surfaced roads. On natural surfaced roads haul will be limited to the dry season normally June 1 – October 31. Aggregate surfacing will be required on native surfaced roads if they are used outside of the normal operating season. During the wet season, log haul would only be permitted on asphalt and rocked roads when conditions would prevent sediment delivery to streams. Hauling and maintenance activities would be suspended when conditions exist that may cause the generation of excessive sediment, such as intense or prolonged rainfall; or when the road surface is deteriorating due to freeze-thaw cycles or from excessive use. Haul will be stopped if there is rutting of the road surface or a noticeable increase in the turbidity of water draining to the road ditches or at stream crossings. In periods of high rain-fall, the contract administrator may restrict log hauling on all roads to minimize water quality impacts.

Road Decommissioning

All new semi-permanent roads and existing temporary roads reopened by the project will be decommissioned following harvest activities. Decommissioning will consist of ripping the road surface and storm proofing by installing water bars and barricading the roads to vehicular traffic. Road decommissioning activities would be restricted to the dry season between June 1 and October 31 unless unusually dry conditions permit activities outside this window. There are no culverts associated with the semi-permanent or existing temporary roads that will be decommissioned.

Fuels Treatment

Fuels treatment following completion of harvest activities will consist of burning landing debris where needed to reduce fire hazard. No other burning or slash treatment is planned.

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A - No Action

Under the No-action alternative, current management plans would continue to guide management of the project area. No timber harvest or other associated actions would be implemented to accomplish project goals.

Alternative B

Alternative B proposes to commercially thin plantations that are between 30 and 61 years old that occur in various land allocations as described in the Northwest Forest Plan, including matrix, late-successional reserves, and the dry upland portion of riparian reserves. Thinning will occur on approximately 2,188 acres of matrix and 1,237 acres of late-successional reserves. Approximately 1,225 acres of thinning is proposed within riparian reserves. Thinning would be designed to enhance diversity by applying variable density prescriptions that includes density management elements such as trees unevenly spaced, small gaps (openings) and small skips (clumps) within residual stands. Riparian Reserve prescriptions would encourage understory growth and development of intermediate forest layers.

All stands have been planted and pre-commercially thinned. Approximately 120 acres (units 126, 138, 150, 172 and portions of units 114, 132, and 162) in the Big Creek subwatershed were commercially thinned within the last 20 years. The understory vegetation such as conifers and some brush species are experiencing growth suppression due to a decrease in sunlight reaching the forest floor.

The average tree height within the stands proposed for treatment ranges from 85 feet to 120 feet with dbh averaging between 10 and 15 inches. The present stocking levels range from 245 trees per acre to 540 trees per acre. The current canopy cover in the stands ranges from 75 to 90%. The average post-thinning canopy cover for all stands would be between 50 and 69%, a prescription considered as a moderate thin. The timber to be harvested is primarily Douglas fir and western hemlock.

Approximately 43 million board feet of timber would be harvested with this proposal. Treatment would occur on approximately 1.5% of the total acres within the Collawash River 5th field watershed, and 2.1% of the Middle Clackamas River 5th field watershed.

Logging systems under alternative B would include: 2,312 acres of ground based systems, 1,308 acres skyline, and approximately 754 acres of helicopter logging.

Approximately 3.3 miles of new temporary road will be constructed to access units under alternative B. This road construction is comprised of 2.6 miles of new road on undisturbed surfaces and 0.7 miles of road that will be constructed on previously disturbed skid trails. The new temporary roads will be of native surface and located on relatively flat ground or along ridge tops, outside of any riparian reserve. No proposed new temporary road is closer than 900 feet from listed fish habitat. All new roads are in locations where there would not be any increase in the stream drainage network. Following harvest activities, all of these roads and newly constructed landings will be ripped and seeded.

Alternative C

Alternative C involves thinning the same units described for Alternative B. Alternative C would not construct any new temporary roads; therefore some of the logging methods for the affected units would be changed. Alternative C also includes road closures and road decommissioning. Intermittent streams farther than one mile of listed fish habitat would have the protection buffers increased from 30 feet to 50 feet. Alternative C would be similar to Alternative B in terms of variability, riparian reserve and LSR management and skips and gaps.

Logging systems under alternative C would include: 2,298 acres of ground based systems, 1,200 acres skyline, and approximately 876 acres of helicopter logging.

In addition to closing all re-opened temporary roads, approximately 4.3 miles of existing system road that will be used during haul would be decommissioned. The decommissioning of these roads would also consist of ripping the road surface, seeding, and storm proofing by installing water bars and barricading the roads to vehicular traffic. There are no culverts associated with these roads.

Alternative C includes a proposal to close roads with berms or gates. Under the proposal 45.0 miles of roads would be bermed, 11.3 miles would be closed year-round with new gates and one existing gate that is only closed seasonally would be changed to a year-round closure affecting 6.5 miles. There are no culverts that will be removed under this closure. The closed roads will be storm proofed and blocked to vehicular traffic. These roads are expected to be used in future entries into the stands.

COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE

The potential effects to water quality and fisheries for the action alternatives would be similar. Alternative C does not include any new temporary road construction; therefore

there would be no risk of erosion or sediment entering streams due to the construction of new temporary roads. Although alternative B proposes construction of new temporary roads, there is a very low probability that sediment would enter stream habitats because of the location of these roads in relation to any water source. There would be slightly less risk of erosion from harvest operations under alternative C since helicopter logging would be used instead of ground based or skyline yarding systems on parts of some units. Because of less ground disturbance, the chance of sediment reaching the stream channel is even less likely than Alternative B.

INTERRELATED OR INTERDEPENDENT ACTIONS

Secondary impacts include interrelated projects that have no independent utility apart from the proposed action, and interdependent projects that are a part of a larger action and depend on the larger action for justification.

There are no interrelated or interdependent actions for the proposed action.

PRESENCE OF PETS FISH AND AQUATIC SPECIES WITHIN OR DOWNSTREAM OF THE ACTION AREA

Columbia River Bull Trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) - (Threatened) Bull trout were once prolific in the Clackamas River system. At present, they are believed to be extinct. Adult bull trout that occurred in the Clackamas River exhibited a fluvial life history character, maintaining residence in the main river and larger tributaries. It is quite likely that adult bull trout in the Clackamas River migrated to the Willamette and Columbia Rivers prior to construction of River Mill Dam. Adult bull trout would reside in the mainstem and larger tributaries until their spawning period during mid-August through September, at which time they would migrate upstream to smaller tributaries to spawn.

U.S. Forest Service fisheries biologists conduct fisheries sampling on an annual basis on many streams throughout the Clackamas River watershed upstream of North Fork Reservoir. To date, these sampling efforts have never yielded capture of bull trout. After several years of intensive sampling, U.S. Forest Service fisheries biologists believe that bull trout in the Clackamas River are considered to be "functionally extinct."

Lower Columbia River Steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) - (Threatened) Adult steelhead migrate into the waters of the Clackamas River drainage above North Fork Dam primarily during April through June with peak migration occurring in May. Spawning occurs during the months of April through June in the Upper Clackamas River and during the months of March through June in the Oak Grove Fork. Steelhead use the majority of the mainstem Clackamas and major tributaries such as the South Fork of the Clackamas River, Fish Creek, Roaring River, Oak Grove Fork, Collawash River, and the Hot Springs Fork of the Collawash as spawning and rearing habitat. Winter steelhead fry emerge between late June and late July and rear in freshwater habitat for one to three years. Smolt emigration takes place March through June during spring freshets.

LCR steelhead and their designated critical habitat occur in the mainstem Clackamas River, Fish Creek, Collawash River, and Hot Springs Fork just downstream of the action area. LCR steelhead and designated critical habitat also occurs adjacent to the project area in Big Creek and Trout Creek, and downstream of the project area in Pup Creek, Sandstone Creek, Thunder Creek, Fan Creek, and Farm Creek.

Upper Willamette River Spring Chinook (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) - (Threatened)
Upper Willamette River spring chinook salmon occur in the Clackamas River. The ESU consists of both naturally spawning and hatchery produced fish. These spring chinook enter the Clackamas basin from April through August and spawn from September through early October with peak spawning occurring the 3rd week in September. These fish primarily spawn and rear in the mainstem Clackamas River and larger tributaries.

Adults in the lower Clackamas drainage spawn in lower Clear Creek, Deep Creek, and Eagle Creek, below River Mill Dam and between River Mill and Faraday diversion dams. Spawning in the upper Clackamas drainage has been observed in the mainstem Clackamas from the head of North Fork Reservoir upstream to Big Bottom, the Collawash River, Hot Springs Fork of the Collawash River, lower Fish Creek, Roaring River, and the first 0.4-mile of the South Fork Clackamas River.

Upper Willamette River chinook and its critical habitat occur in the mainstem Clackamas River, Fish Creek, Collawash River, and Hot Springs Fork just downstream of the action area. No UWR chinook or critical habitat for UWR chinook occurs immediately adjacent to the project area.

Lower Columbia River Fall Chinook (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) (Threatened)
The fall chinook within the Clackamas Subbasin are thought to originate from "tule" stock which was first released into the subbasin in 1952 and continued until 1981. Since 1981 no fall chinook have been released into the Clackamas River. However some adult fall chinook released as juveniles above Willamette Falls may have strayed into the Clackamas River.

Historically fall chinook spawned in the mainstem Clackamas River above the present site of the North Fork Dam before its construction. Currently the "tule" stock of fall chinook spawn in the mainstem Clackamas River below River Mill Dam and in the lower reaches of Clear Creek. Fall Chinook spawn late August through September. These fish primarily spawn and rear in the mainstem Clackamas River and larger tributaries and are not found above River Mill Dam. The nearest occurrence of LCR chinook or its critical habitat to the project area is below River Mill Dam on the mainstem Clackamas River over 15 miles downstream of any units associated with the 2007 Plantation Thinning Project.

Lower Columbia River Coho Salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) (Threatened)
The Clackamas River contains the last important run of wild late-run winter coho in the Columbia Basin. Coho salmon occupy the Clackamas River and the lower reaches of streams in the Upper Clackamas watershed including the lower two miles of the Oak Grove Fork. Adult late-run winter coho enter the Clackamas River from November

through February. Spawning occurs mid-January to the end of April with the peak in mid-February. Peak smolt migration takes place in April and May.

LCR coho salmon occur in the mainstem Clackamas River, Fish Creek, Collawash River, and Hot Springs Fork just downstream of the action area. No LCR coho occur immediately adjacent to the project area.

Columbia Dusky Snail (*Lyogyrus n. sp. 1*) C3 species *Survey and Manage* (ROD)
Lyogyrus occurs in cold, well oxygenated perennial springs and spring outflows in shallow, slow-flowing areas. Most of the Columbia duskysnails found on the forest have been found in slow, clear, cold (<14 Celsius) water of small systems, such as spring, spring outflow and headwater tributaries. The substrate of site ranges from silt to cobble, and there seems to be a strong association with aquatic moss, especially Fontinalis. Often the snails are on the “fronds” of this moss in the sample area. There doesn’t appear to be an association with other aquatic macrophytes.

This species of aquatic mollusk has been found across the Forest during surveys conducted over the past several years (Mt. Hood National Forest, unpublished data). Habitat requirements for this species are fairly specific: cold well oxygenated springs, seeps, and small streams, preferring areas without aquatic macrophytes. Individuals have not been found in larger streams and rivers, or glacial streams.

Surveys for the Columbia duskysnail have been conducted at sites across the Forest for a wide range of projects. This mollusk has been found in many areas across the Forest and is likely to be present in seeps, springs, and smaller streams near and within the proposed project area.

Basalt Juga (*Juga Oreobasis n. sp. 2*) C3 species *Survey and Manage* (ROD)
The basalt Juga occurs sporadically in small, shallow, undisturbed perennial springs and small seeps that flow into the Columbia River. It prefers gravel substrates where *Rorippa* (water cress) is usually present. Occupied springs are often surrounded by basalt talus. The species has been found on sites within the Columbia River Gorge in the Mt. Hood National Forest and Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area.

These small snails have only been found at two location within the Oregon portion of the Scenic Area: in Canyon Creek just west of the town of Hood River and in several small seeps just above (south) Interstate 84 about half-mile east of The Dalles Dam. Individuals have been found at several locations on the Washington side of the Scenic Area and east of the Scenic Area on both sides of the river. They have never been found in any survey conducted on the Forest, and they are not believed to reside in Forest streams. Their habitat requirements are similar to the Columbia Duskysnail: cold well oxygenated springs, seeps, and small streams.

The 2001 Survey and Manage Record of Decision and Standards and Guidelines (Standards and Guidelines page 22) gives flexibility to survey or not survey – “The line officer should seek specialists’ recommendations to help determine the need for a survey based on site-specific information. In making such determination, the line officer should

consider the probability of the species being present on the project site, as well as the probability that the project would cause a significant negative effect on the species habitat or the persistence of the species at the site.”

Surveys for the two survey and manage aquatic mollusks would not be conducted as part of this project, even though the Columbia dusksnail is known to occur in many streams on the district including those within the proposed project area. Instead of conducting surveys in all adjacent streams, species presence is presumed. Riparian reserve standards and guidelines and project design criteria are sufficient to provide for the habitat needs of this species. Anticipated effects of implementing the action alternatives would not significantly affect habitat or species persistence at each site.

EFFECTS DETERMINATION

The effects determination of the 2007 Plantation Thinning Project will be based on project elements of the action alternatives that could have potential direct or indirect impacts on PETS fish and aquatic species or their habitats. These project elements include:

- Timber Felling
- Road maintenance/construction
- Yarding
- Log haul
- Road decommissioning (obliteration)

The analysis of effects focused on relevant habitat indicators that potentially could be affected by these project elements. The relevant habitat indicators include:

- Sediment
- Temperature
- Peak/Base Flow

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

Potential effects associated with project elements of the 2007 Plantation Thinning Project are:

- Increased levels of fine sediment in local streams generated during road building, road obliteration, logging, and hauling.
- Increase in stream temperature caused by loss of streamside vegetative cover by thinning within Riparian Reserves.
- Increase in peak flows caused by removal of vegetative cover.

To determine potential effects to PETS species, each of the relevant habitat indicators was evaluated by proximity to the action area, probability that an effect would occur, and magnitude of the action, if needed.

Alternative A (No Action)

With Alternative A there would be no short-term effects to water quality or fisheries resources. Since there would be no ground disturbance from harvest activities such as timber falling, yarding, road construction/maintenance, road decommissioning, or log haul, there would be no potential for any increase in surface erosion or sedimentation. Since no timber harvest would occur within riparian reserves, there would be no change in streamside canopy cover that could reduce stream shade or increase solar radiation to the stream channel potentially increasing stream temperatures. Water temperatures within and downstream of the project area would remain in their present state with the no action alternative.

If no action were taken in riparian reserves, riparian stands would maintain their mid-seral structure for many decades not reaching the desired late-successional characteristics as quickly as thinned stands. There could potentially be negative long-term effects because stands would gradually become overcrowded, reducing the capability to produce the size and quantity of coarse woody debris sufficient to sustain in-stream habitat complexity, stream bank stability, and overall health of the riparian reserves. Stands under this condition would be denser, less diverse (structurally), have smaller diameter trees, and less understory development compared to the action alternatives.

Action Alternatives

Sediment

Sediment from Road Construction and Road Maintenance Activities – Road construction and road maintenance activities have the potential to indirectly introduce fine sediment into stream channels. Road maintenance prior to log haul would help maintain the design drainage of the road surface which reduces the potential for larger sediment inputs to runoff that eventually enters stream courses. The action alternatives propose to re-open old temporary roads from previous entries and to temporarily re-open system roads that have been closed with berms or other devices. Additionally, Alternative B proposes to construct approximately 2.6 miles of new temporary road to access the stands. Both action alternatives would construct 0.7 mile of temporary roads on already disturbed land.

Maintenance of the existing system roads prior to hauling would include measures to upgrade the quality of the road bed and to improve road drainage. This includes the placement of new aggregate surfacing where necessary, blading, brushing out encroaching vegetation, removing berms, and ditch cleanout where needed. Aggregate road surfacing greatly minimizes the amount of fine sediment from road surfaces entering streams following log haul, especially during and following rainfall events. Additionally, deep patch repairs to the roadbed and converting asphalt to aggregate surface is proposed along some segments of the haul route.

Road related ground disturbing activities have been designed to minimize the risk of sediment being transported to streams from erosion or surface run-off. Road work would be restricted to the dry season between November 1 and May 31. This restriction would reduce the risk of any surface erosion due to ground disturbance.

With Alternative B, the proposed temporary roads are located on dry ground, would not cross stream channels, and would have no hydrologic link to any water source. As a result, there would be a very low probability of any sediment from temporary road surfaces reaching streams. These roads would be constructed along ridgetops, benches, or gentle slopes, where they would not cause an increase in the stream drainage network. Because of the distance of any proposed new or existing temporary roads to any water source, and the fact that these roads do not cross any perennial or intermittent streams, vegetative buffers would act as an effective barrier to any sediment being transported into stream channels by surface erosion or runoff.

All new temporary roads and reopened temporary roads would be obliterated and revegetated directly following completion of harvest operations to help reduce compaction, increase infiltration rates, and minimize surface erosion.

Road maintenance prior to log hauling also increases the risk of road related sediment entering streams near road crossing during rainfall events. This increase is associated primarily with aggregate and native surface roads although ditch cleaning associated with paved roads is a potential sediment source. Any fine sediment created by road maintenance activities would most likely be washed from the road surface in the first few precipitation events of the fall that are sufficient to cause runoff from the road surface. Although there is a possibility of increased sediment entering streams due to these activities, most road related sediment would be trapped and stored in the ditches or on the forest floor below cross drains. In the event that sediment was to reach stream channels within the project area, most fine particles would likely be trapped and stored in the small tributary streams before they are able to reach any habitat where ESA listed fish species are found. Any impacts from the minimal amount of sediment generated during these activities would be for a short-term duration, and undetectable at a subwatershed (6th field) or watershed (5th field) scale. The probability of any impacts to water quality or fisheries resources caused by sedimentation due to road construction, reconstruction, maintenance, or road obliteration, is extremely low.

Although there is no new temporary road construction proposed under Alternative C, this alternative proposes the decommissioning of existing roads. Decompacting the road surface during obliteration loosens the soil, thus making it more likely to be mobilized during the first significant run-off period unless the road is on relatively flat terrain, not near streams, or sufficient ground cover is provided. Project design criteria and associated BMPs for road decommissioning would reduce the risk of sediment entering any stream course. The roads proposed to be decommissioned are on relatively flat terrain and have no direct hydrological connection to any stream source. The impacts to water quality or fisheries resources caused by sedimentation due to road construction, reconstruction, maintenance, or road obliteration, if any, would be short-term and

undetectable at the watershed or subwatershed scale. The risk of road related sediment input to streams would be comparable for both action alternatives.

Sediment from harvest activities – Thinning, particularly within riparian reserves, is a potentially ground disturbing activity that has the potential to cause a temporary reduction in water quality by allowing sediment to enter stream channels from surface erosion or run-off. Tree falling, ground-based yarding methods, and to some extent cable yarding methods (when full suspension isn't achieved) disturb soils that may result in minor sediment movement at the site level. Ground-based harvesting equipment and cable yarding does cause some direct soil displacement which would be mitigated through project design criteria. Most of the sediment produced from timber harvesting would travel short distances before being trapped by duff, woody materials, and other obstructions. The probability of overland surface runoff on uncompacted soil surfaces is also low for the soils in the project planning area.

Project design criteria would incorporate no-cut stream protection buffers a minimum of 100 ft. wide along all perennial streams that are adjacent to LFH. A minimum 50 ft. wide no-cut protection buffer would be established along all other perennial streams within the project area. Protection buffers of 50 ft. would be established along all intermittent streams within the project area that are one mile or less from LFH. Along intermittent streams greater than one mile from LFH, a 30 ft. no-cut protection buffer would be maintained with Alternative B and 50 ft. with Alternative C. Buffer width design would take into account the stream influence zone, steepness of slope, size and location of trees, orientation of the site to the sun (aspect), slope stability, and stream bank stability. No-cut areas would include any buffer of hardwood vegetation occurring along the stream bank. No-cut buffers would generally be at the top of slope breaks on steeper ground and would circumvent all wet areas to maintain canopy cover along riparian areas.

To further reduce the risk of surface erosion entering streams as fine sediment, only low impact harvesting equipment such as, mechanical harvesters or skyline systems, which have minimal ground disturbance would be allowed within 50 feet of the stream protection buffers. Mechanical harvesting equipment would be required to operate on slash-covered paths and travel routes would be limited to one pass over a path whenever possible. Trees in this zone would be directionally felled away from the protection buffers to minimize the disturbance to the forest floor. These requirements would maintain the indicators for sediment, stream temperature, stream bank condition, and large woody material indicators.

These vegetative buffers would act as an effective barrier to any sediment being transported into stream channels by surface erosion or run-off and would minimize the risk of any channel or water quality impacts. The stream protection buffers on either side of the streams would likely retain any displaced and eroded soil before it is transported to the stream channel. These buffer widths would allow soil infiltration between the unit and any water source. Surface roughness, vegetation, and duff in untreated buffers would filter most sediment coming off surfaces before reaching streams. The use of skyline or helicopter yarding systems on steeper ground within riparian reserves would minimize ground disturbance. Seasonal restrictions on ground-based operations would further

reduce the risk of soil disturbance and run-off. Even if some soil movement occurred, the vegetated buffer strips along every perennial or intermittent channel would act as an effective barrier. The probability that measurable amounts of fine sediment would enter any stream within the project area as a direct result of logging activity is low. The difference in width of the no-cut protection buffers on intermittent streams (30 feet with Alternative B and 50 feet with Alternative C) would not result in any difference in sediment risk between the action alternatives.

Of the action alternatives, the risk of sediment from logging system sources would be slightly less with Alternative C, since helicopter logging would be used instead of ground based or skyline yarding systems on parts of some units. Skyline yarding has the potential to cause some soil displacement and compaction because it is sometimes difficult to get full suspension of logs. Helicopter yarding rarely results in soil displacement because full suspension is achieved. Because of less ground disturbance, the chance of sediment reaching the stream channel is less likely. The probability that measurable amounts of fine sediment would enter any stream within the project area as a direct result of logging activity is low under all the proposed action alternatives. With both action alternatives, helicopters would be able to use existing landings.

Sediment from log haul – (same effect for all action alternatives). Log hauling along aggregate surface or native surfaced roads has the potential to introduce sediment in small quantities to streams. Traffic breaks down surfacing material resulting in finer surface gradation and increased sediment transport from the road surface. Any fine sediment created by hauling traffic would more than likely be washed from the road surface in the first precipitation event that is sufficient to cause runoff from the road surface. Any input of sediment is expected to be minimal as the roads where there is a potential for surface run-off are asphalt or durable crushed rock. All native surfaced roads along the haul route are outside of riparian reserves, along ridge tops or gentle terrain, and have no hydrological connection to any streams. Road use however would be restricted to periods when road related runoff is not present and as such, little sediment is expected to leave the road bed while haul is occurring.

During the wet season, log haul would only be permitted on asphalt and rocked roads when conditions would prevent sediment delivery to streams. In periods of high rain-fall, the contract administrator would restrict log hauling when necessary to minimize water quality impacts. Haul would be stopped if there is rutting of the road surface or a noticeable increase in the turbidity of water draining to the road ditches or at stream crossings.

Log hauling would not measurably increase the amount of fine sediment in streams. The roads along the haul route are rocked or paved at stream crossings, and road ditches are well vegetated. Road maintenance prior to log haul would help maintain the design drainage of the road surface which reduces the potential for sediment to runoff into stream courses. The potential for sediment input into streams along the haul routes would further be minimized by permitting haul only when conditions would prevent sediment delivery to streams. Any sediment that could enter a stream during haul activities would be at crossings along aggregate surfaced roads. The majority of these

crossings are at intermittent or small perennial streams that would have very little flow, during the normal season of operation (June 1 to October 31). Crossings at streams where LFH occurs along the haul route are asphalt surfaced therefore the probability of sediments reaching the stream channels at these crossings is extremely rare. Any sediment that leaves the road surface due to run-off is expected to disperse over land or be stored within the smaller tributary streams along the haul route. If any sediment is transported downstream it would be during the beginning of the rainy season and would be diluted by a sufficient volume of water where it would be indistinguishable from background levels. It is very unlikely that any measurable amount of sediment produced during log haul would be transported to stream channels where listed fish species occur. There are no listed fish species that occur immediately downstream of any aggregate surfaced stream crossing along the haul route. If any sediment did enter stream courses from hauling activities, it would be in very small amounts and for a short-term duration. No adverse effect to fish or their habitat is expected to occur from log hauling activities.

Stream Temperature

Project design criteria were developed to reduce any potential for adverse impacts to stream temperature as the result of thinning within riparian reserves, and to meet guidelines in the Northwest Forest Plan Temperature TMDL Implementation Strategy (2005). The no-cut stream protection buffers along perennial and intermittent streams are designed to meet stream temperature goals by avoiding harvest in the primary shade zone and retaining shade producing vegetation. The primary shade zone consists of vegetation that intercepts solar radiation between 1000 and 1400 hours, which is critical for providing stream shade and maintaining stream temperature.

The no-cut buffers would insure that the majority of shade producing vegetation would remain and there would be no measurable increase in solar radiation. In addition to protection buffers, project design criteria would maintain a conifer relative density (RD see Stand Health and Productivity section for more on relative density) value of at least 30 in the stand area located between the protection buffer and one site potential tree height (180 ft.) from the stream within stands that are adjacent to or within one mile of LFH. In stands adjacent to stream reaches that are greater than one mile upstream from LFH, an RD value of at least 30 would be maintained within 100 ft. from the stream. The thinning prescriptions within riparian reserves would maintain an average 50% canopy closure up to one site potential tree height from all streams in order to retain shade producing vegetation within the secondary shade zone. This design criterion is expected to maintain a canopy closure that provides adequate shade over streams and therefore is unlikely to alter water temperatures.

Since many of the streams that flow within proposed units are relatively small, and provide very little or no flow during the hottest time of the year, the designated stream protection buffers would provide adequate canopy cover to maintain existing shade components thus, maintaining stream temperatures. Streams adjacent to LFH within the project area have increased no-cut protection buffers of 100 ft. that would maintain the existing shade components along these larger streams. Stream temperatures are not

expected to exceed the tolerance limits of resident or anadromous fish species or other aquatic organisms.

The difference in width of the no-cut protection buffers on intermittent streams (30 feet with Alternative B and 50 feet with Alternative C) would not result in any difference in stream temperature between the action alternatives. Protection buffers applied to the intermittent non-fish bearing streams in the project area would retain direct overhead shading. Intermittent streams within the project area only carry water during wet times of the year (winter and spring) when temperatures are cooler. Since these channels have little or no surface flow during the summer time when elevated stream temperatures are of concern no significant increase in stream temperature is expected downstream. No water quality effects are foreseen, and the low probability of effects would decrease, as the canopy and ground cover are re-established to pre-harvest conditions. Adherence to project design criteria would maintain the current canopy that provides shade over streams therefore, project implementation is unlikely to alter water temperatures. Any increase in stream temperatures would be immeasurable at the site or watershed scale. Current stream temperatures in all streams within and downstream of the project area are expected to be maintained.

Flow

For this proposal, the following actions have the potential to affect hydrologic recovery: actions that remove or kill trees to a level below 70% canopy cover are considered a watershed impact area. These actions would include thinning, landing creation, trees removed for skid trails or skyline corridors, trees removed for road construction, snag creation and felling trees for down wood. Other aspects of the proposed action such as road reconstruction or repair would not have a meaningful or measurable affect on hydrologic recovery because they do not alter canopy cover.

The action alternatives involve the creation of variability in the stands. Portions of the stands in stream protection buffers and skips would be left un-thinned. Other portions of the stands would have gaps, temporary road construction, landings, helicopter landings, skid trails and skyline corridors that would be open. The rest of each stand would have variable density thinning. The average post thinning canopy cover for all stands would be between 50 and 69 %.

Any potential increase in flow in the Project Area is not expected to be measurable at the downstream end of the Action Area due to the distance and relatively low probability of any potential flow increase. Current conditions in the project area indicate a low risk for peak flow enhancement. Since the proposed action will maintain all treated stands at no less than 50% crown closure, this proposal results in a very low probability of additional risk. The amount of the existing overstory vegetation that will be harvested within the units, will not likely cause a net reduction in the evapotranspiration rate within the affected drainages. Thus, there will be no increase in the volume of water available for transport by the stream network during early season precipitation events. There would be no increase in the drainage network due to roads as a result of the project since road segments proposed for construction have no hydrologic connection.

Cumulative Effects

Cumulative effects associated with the 2007 Plantation Thinning Project would focus around changes in the timing and/or magnitude of flow events resulting from past, present and future forest conditions. Past disturbances within the subwatersheds of the Middle Clackamas River and Collawash Rivers include fire, timber harvest and road-building activities along with recreational use such as off-road vehicle usage. The harvest levels in recent years has been well below the level projected by the Northwest Forest Plan due to appeals, litigation and areas established for survey and manage species.

The Mount Hood Forest Plan employs an analysis tool referred to aggregate recovery percentage (ARP) to assess the effect of harvested openings and roads on hydrologic recovery. An ARP value greater than 75% typically indicates hydrologic recovery based on an average tree diameter of 8 inches dbh and canopy closure of at least 70% in the stand. ARP values of less than 65% suggest a very high likelihood of increased magnitude and frequency of peakflows and subsequent channel degradation.

Analysis on past thinning projects has shown that there are little if any measurable impacts to hydrologic function at the subwatershed scale. Cumulatively, watershed conditions in the short-term may be slightly decreased by harvest activities, but would be improved in the long-term by improving the number, type and health of the trees and stands over the long-term. Negligible changes in the ARP values (<2%) will result from the implementation of this proposed action at the site scale. Implementation of the 2007 Plantation Thinning Project would maintain all riparian conditions at the 5th and 6th field watershed scales.

The Pacific Northwest has rapid hydrologic recovery in the first 10 years post-harvest, due to re-growth of vegetative cover. The ARP values in the subwatersheds associated with the 2007 Plantation Thinning Project have been steadily increasing since 1996, indicating an on-going trend in hydrologic recovery and a reduction in cumulative effects over time. The past effects on peak flows from previous overstory forest harvesting are being reduced by continuous forest stand growth. All of the subwatersheds on Forest Service lands have ARP values that fall below the threshold of concern of 35% indicated in the Mt. Hood National Forest LRMP.

The ARP analysis shows that the action alternatives would have very little estimated effect on the hydrology (peak flows, channel stability) of these drainages. The lowest drainage does not even approach the 18% threshold of concern (ARP value of 82%) that is often established for special emphasis watersheds. Comparing the action alternatives to no action also shows little difference. The ARP value for all of the alternatives will increase by 1 to 1.5% per year even after thinning because the plantations are experiencing rapid growth and therefore rapid hydrologic recovery. No effects on low summer flows is expected as a result of thinning activities since the riparian areas immediately adjacent to streams will remain largely intact, with no replacement of riparian conifers with significant numbers of deciduous trees/shrubs. No-cut stream

protection buffers along with silvicultural prescriptions that retain a 50% canopy closure within the secondary shade zone will reduce the magnitude of any changes to peak or base flows. The reduction in canopy closure is unlikely to significantly affect snow accumulation/melt in the proposed harvest units, or result in significantly lower soil moisture levels that result in small peak flow increases in the fall.

The ARP values calculated for the 2007 Thinning Project indicate that after thinning, trees would grow rapidly and canopy cover would be at an average of 70% after five years. Thinning would result in healthy stands with good root strength and broad crowns that would contribute to hydrologically stable drainages. Any affect to a change in the timing or magnitude of flow events will be immeasurable at the site or the 5th field watershed scale.

ESA Cumulative Effects

ESA cumulative effects are those effects of future State or private activities, not involving Federal activities that are reasonably certain to occur within the action area of the Federal action subject to consultation [50 CFR section 402.02]. The project area is located completely within federal lands. There are private lands located within the Middle Clackamas River and Collawash River watersheds. It is probable that there will be non-federal projects planned and implemented on these lands in the future. The private land in the Middle Clackamas River 5th field watershed is located downstream from the Action Area. Project effects could combine cumulatively (beneficially or detrimentally) downstream of the federal Action Area. It is expected that intensive timber management in privately owned portions of the Middle Clackamas River HUC 5th field watershed will continue in the future. It is also expected that activities on these lands will comply with county, state, and federal laws and regulations.

CONCLUSION

Under the No-action alternative (Alternative A), current management plans would continue to guide management of the project area. No timber harvest or other associated actions would be implemented. There would be **No Effect (NE)** to PETS species.

The implementation of the action alternatives proposed for the 2007 Plantation Thinning Project warrants a **“May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect” (NLAA)** determination for Lower Columbia River steelhead, Upper Willamette River chinook, and Lower Columbia River coho salmon. The proposed project will have a **“No Effect” (NE)** determination for Lower Columbia River chinook, Upper Willamette River steelhead, Middle Columbia River steelhead, and Lower Columbia River Bull Trout as these species do not occur within the project action area. A **“May impact individuals or habitat but will not likely contribute to a trend towards federal listing” (MIIH)** determination is warranted for the action alternatives to Interior Redband trout, the Columbian Dusky Snail, and the basalt Juga.

These effects determinations are appropriate for all of the action alternatives because of the proximity of the proposed project area to ESA species or suitable habitat, the

relatively minor magnitude of effects in the Project Area, and of the low potential for impacts generated at the project area to be transported to downstream reaches. There is a low probability of any direct or indirect effects to any listed or proposed fish or aquatic species or their habitat within or outside of the designated action area.

Project design criteria was developed in the planning process to minimize or eliminate any adverse impacts the action alternatives might have on water quality, fisheries, and aquatic resources. The analysis of potential effects has determined that the probability of any impact to fish species of concern or other PETS would be very low, of a short-term duration, and of a magnitude that would be immeasurable at the site-specific and watershed scale. There would be no measurable long-term effect to any habitat or watershed indicator where listed fish or PETS species occur.

This project was designed from its inception to avoid potential water quality related impacts by adhering to the following project design criteria:

1. No-cut buffers along streams, seeps, and springs.
2. Seasonal restrictions for ground-based operations.
3. Any new temporary roads needed to access the stands will be on relatively flat ground or along ridge tops with no hydrological link to any water source.
4. All new temporary roads would be closed and revegetated upon completion of the project.
5. Logging systems appropriate to the specific terrain of each unit were designed to avoid water quality impacts.
6. During unit and road placement, certain areas were avoided such as sensitive soil types and landforms. Harvest areas were dispersed across the landscape.
7. Road reconstruction along haul routes is designed to reduce erosion and repair damaged sections.
8. The use of cable yarding and/or helicopters on steeper ground, within Riparian Reserves.
9. Potential sediment delivery to streams during log transport will be minimized by restricting log haul to times when road related run-off is not present.

The use of project design criteria and adherence to General Best Management Practices (BMP's) will allow for very little, if any, erosion or sediment transport into the stream course, substantially reducing the impacts of soil disturbance and run-off on water quality.

DETERMINATION OF EFFECTS – DESIGNATED CRITICAL HABITAT

Critical habitat for twelve ESUs of West Coast salmon and steelhead listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 was designated on September 2, 2005. Critical habitat includes the stream channels within the designated stream reaches, and includes a lateral extent as defined by the ordinary high-water line or bankfull elevation. Within these areas, the primary constituent elements essential for the conservation of these ESUs are those sites and habitat components that support one or more life stages, including: freshwater spawning sites, freshwater rearing sites, freshwater migration corridors, estuarine areas, near-shore marine areas, and off-shore marine areas that support growth and maturation.

Primary constituent elements listed below, refer to freshwater habitat components. Nothing proposed in any alternative would have any affect on estuarine or marine habitat components, thus they are not discussed.

1. Freshwater spawning sites with water quantity and quality conditions and substrate supporting spawning, incubation and larval development.
2. Freshwater rearing sites with:
 - a. Water quantity and floodplain connectivity to form and maintain physical habitat conditions and support juvenile growth and mobility;
 - b. Water quality and forage supporting juvenile development; and
 - c. Natural cover such as shade, submerged and overhanging large wood, log jams and beaver dams, aquatic vegetation, large rocks and boulders, side channels, and undercut banks.
3. Freshwater migration corridors free of obstruction and excessive predation with water quantity and quality conditions, and natural cover, such as submerged and overhanging large wood, aquatic vegetation, large rocks and boulders, side channels, and undercut banks supporting juvenile and adult mobility and survival.

Designated critical habitat for Upper Willamette River chinook occurs within or downstream of the proposed project area in the mainstem Clackamas River, Collawash River, Hot Springs Fork, and Lower Fish Creek. Designated critical habitat for LCR steelhead occurs within or downstream of the proposed project area in the mainstem Clackamas River, Collawash River, Hot Springs Fork, Lower Fish Creek, Pup Creek, Big Creek, Trout Creek, Fan Creek, and the Farm Creek. As of this time, critical habitat for LCR coho has yet to be designated but will likely correspond with the critical habitat designation UWR chinook since they utilize the same habitat within the Clackamas River Basin.

Project design criteria was developed to minimize or eliminate any potential affect that project elements of the action alternatives might have on have on water quality, fisheries,

and aquatic resources. The analysis of effects has determined that the probability of any potential effect to designated critical habitat would be very low, of a short-term duration, and of a magnitude that would be immeasurable. There would be no measurable long-term effect to any habitat or baseline habitat indicators where ESA listed fish species occur. The implementation of this project would not have any long-term adverse effect to designated critical habitat. Therefore, an effects determination of **May Affect, not Likely to Adversely Affect (NLAA)** is warranted for designated critical habitat that occurs within or downstream of the project area.

DETERMINATION OF EFFECTS – ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT

Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) established under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) includes those waters and substrate necessary to ensure the production needed to support a long-term sustainable fishery (i.e., properly functioning habitat conditions necessary for the long-term survival of the species through the full range of environmental variation). EFH includes all streams, lakes, ponds, wetlands, and other water bodies currently, or historically, accessible to salmon in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and California. Three salmonid species are identified under the MSA, chinook salmon, coho salmon and Puget Sound pink salmon. Chinook and coho salmon occur on the Mt. Hood National Forest in the Clackamas River, Hood River, and Sandy River basins. Chinook and coho salmon utilize the mainstem Clackamas River, Collawash River, Hot Springs Fork, and Lower Fish Creek for migration, rearing, and spawning habitat. The proposed project would not have any adverse effect on water or substrate essential to the life history of coho, chinook, or chum salmon that occur within any basin on the Mt. Hood National Forest.

Implementation of the 2007 Plantation Thinning project would **Not Adversely Affect** essential fish habitat for chinook or coho salmon. This activity would not jeopardize the existence of any of the species of concern or adversely modify critical habitat and would not adversely affect Essential Fish Habitat as designated under the 1996 Amendment to the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

DESIGN CRITERIA AND BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMPS)

An interdisciplinary team from the Clackamas River Ranger District has developed project design criteria for commercial thinning projects. These criteria were used to develop the proposed actions.

Soils: No operation of off-road ground-based equipment would be permitted between November 1 and May 31. This restriction applies to the ground-based portions of harvest units. It also applies to ground-based equipment such as harvesters or equipment used for fuels treatment, road construction, road reconstruction or landing construction. This restriction may be waived if soils are dry or frozen or if operators switch to skyline or other non-ground based systems.

Erosion: To reduce erosion from timber sale activities, bare soils would be revegetated. Grass seed and fertilizer would be evenly distributed at appropriate rates to ensure

successful establishment. Mulch may be used on slopes greater than 20%. Effective ground cover would be installed prior to October 1 of each year.

Thinning in Riparian Reserves: Thinning in riparian reserves will emphasize the development of vegetative and structural diversity associated with mature old growth stand conditions. While thinning in the riparian reserve may have short-term effects, the thinning would contribute to maintaining or restoring the fifth-field watershed over the long term. Thinning in riparian reserves would increase tree size, adequately protect the zone of shade influence along streams, and minimize the potential for sediment delivery to streams. This prescription would maintain water temperature, large woody debris, disturbance regime, and riparian reserve indicators.

- **Perennial streams** – Establish a minimum 100 ft. no-cut buffer along the active channel of all streams that are adjacent to listed fish habitat (LFH) and a minimum 50 ft. no-cut buffer along the active channel of all other perennial streams. Larger buffer widths may be needed on a site-specific basis to prevent any increase in sediment delivery rates or a decrease in stream shading. Buffer width design would take into account the stream influence zone, steepness of slope, size and location of trees, orientation of the site to the sun (aspect), slope stability, and stream bank stability. Falling trees for skyline corridors would be avoided, but where necessary the material would be left as woody debris. Falling any trees within the no-harvest buffer would only be allowed if it would cause no increase to sediment or decrease in stream shading.
- **Intermittent streams** (as defined in NWP) – Establish a minimum 50 ft. no-cut buffer along the active channel of all intermittent streams within one mile of LFH. On intermittent channels greater than one mile from LFH, establish a minimum 30 ft. no-cut buffer. Buffer width design would take into account the stream influence zone, steepness of slope, size and location of trees, orientation of the site to the sun (aspect), slope stability, and stream bank stability. Falling trees or any equipment use within the no-harvest buffer would only be allowed if it would cause no increase to sediment or decrease in stream shading.

Within 50 feet of perennial or intermittent stream no-harvest buffers, only low impact harvesting equipment such as, but not limited to, mechanical harvesters or skyline systems, which have minimal ground disturbance would be allowed. Mechanical harvesting equipment would be required to operate on slash-covered paths. Trees in this zone would be directionally felled away from the no-harvest buffer to minimize the disturbance to the forest floor. These requirements would maintain the indicators for sediment, stream temperature, stream bank condition, and large woody material indicators.

Logging Systems

1. Avoid the use of ground based tractors or skidders on slopes generally greater than 30% and mechanical harvesters on slopes greater than 40% because of the risk of damage to soil and water resources.

2. Mechanical harvesters and forwarders would be required to work on a layer of residual slash and the operator would place slash in the harvester path prior to advancing the equipment.
3. In some units, ground-based logging is proposed for areas that have been previously harvested with ground-based systems. Existing temporary roads, landings and skid trails would generally be reused where feasible. There may be instances where it is not desirable to use an existing skid trail and in such cases, if a skid trail is needed in the area, a new skid trail would be located that minimizes the alteration of surface hydrology.
4. In some units, ground-based logging at the time of the original harvest has resulted in detrimental soil conditions that exceed Forest Plan standards. In these areas there is a greater urgency to reuse existing temporary roads, landings and skid trails. Some new skid trails might be needed as described above, but where detrimental soil conditions exceed 20%, only existing skid trails would be used and only those existing skid trails that do not alter surface hydrology.
5. Where existing detrimental soil conditions exceed Forest Plan standards, existing temporary roads and landings that are reused, would be obliterated and revegetated.

Roads

1. During the wet season, log haul would only be permitted on asphalt and rocked roads when conditions would prevent sediment delivery to streams.
2. If landings are needed in riparian reserves, they would be located on existing roadways that do not require expansion of the road prism or on existing landings that may require only minimum reconstruction (clearing vegetation, sloping for drainage, or surfacing for erosion control purposes) to be made suitable for use.
3. The re-opening of old temporary roads is encouraged over the construction of new roads if they are located in areas that would prevent sediment delivery to streams.
4. Newly constructed roads would not cross or be constructed parallel to stream channels. They would be built on ridge tops, benches, or gentle slopes and only where conditions would prevent sediment delivery to streams.
5. No road construction is proposed within riparian reserves.
6. Temporary roads would normally be constructed, used and obliterated in the same operating season. If this is not possible, due to fire season restrictions or other unforeseen delays, the road would be winterized prior to the end of the normal operating season by out-sloping, water-barring, effectively blocking the entrance, seeding, mulching and fertilizing.

REFERENCES

- Christensen, R. and Serres, K. 2002. *The 2002 Dutch Creek Stream Survey Report*. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Mt. Hood National Forest
- Christensen, R. and Taylor, S. 1999. *The 1999 Fan Creek Survey Report*. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Mt. Hood National Forest
- Cramer, D. and Cramer, S.P. 1994. Status and Population Dynamics of Coho Salmon in the Clackamas River. Technical Report, Portland General Electric Company.
- Cramer, D. and Merritt, 1992. Distribution of spawning late-run wild coho salmon in the upper Clackamas River, 1988-1991. USDA Forest Service and Portland General Electric.
- Kent, F. Dore, J. 1994. *The 1994 Rod Creek Stream Survey*. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Mt. Hood National Forest
- Kent, F. Dore, J. 1994. *The 1994 Dugan Creek Stream Survey*. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Mt. Hood National Forest
- Kent, F. Dore, J. 1994. *The 1994 Trout Creek Stream Survey*. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Mt. Hood National Forest
- Loitz, D. 1994. *The 1994 Thunder Creek Stream Survey Report*. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Mt. Hood National Forest
- NMFS. 1998a Endangered and threatened species; threatened status for two ESUs of steelhead in Washington, Oregon, and California. Federal register 63: 13347-13371.
- NMFS, 1998b. Endangered and threatened species: proposed endangered status for two chinook salmon ESUs and proposed threatened status for five chinook ESUs; proposed redefinition, threatened status, and revision of critical habitat for one chinook salmon ESU; proposed designation of chinook critical habitat in California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho. Federal Register 63: 11481-11519.
- NMFS 2005b. Endangered and threatened species; final listing determinations for 16 ESUs of West Coast salmon, and final 4(d) protective regulations for threatened salmonid ESUs. Federal register 70: 37160-37204.
- Raugust, M. and Wagner, J. 1998. *The 1998 Pup Creek Stream Survey Report*. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Mt. Hood National Forest
- Rife, D. and Milazzo, R. *Farm Creek Stream Survey*. 1984. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Mt. Hood National Forest
- Rosgen, D. 1999. *Applied River Morphology*.

Strobel, B. and Loitz, D. 1996. *The 1996 Big Creek Stream Survey Report*. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Mt. Hood National Forest

USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Mt. Hood National Forest. 1995. *Collawash/Hot Springs Watershed Analysis*.

USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Mt. Hood National Forest. 1996. *Lower Clackamas River Watershed Analysis*.

USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Mt. Hood National Forest. 1994 *Fish Creek Watershed Analysis*.

USDA Forest Service and USDI BLM, 2005. Northwest Forest Plan Temperature TMDL Implementation Strategies. *Evaluation of the Northwest Forest Plan Aquatic Conservation Strategy and Associated Tools to achieve and maintain stream temperature water quality standards*.

USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Bureau of Land Management, 1998. North Willamette LSR Assessment.

USDA Forest Service and USDI Bureau of Land Management. 1994b. *Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl*; Standards and Guidelines for Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forest related Species within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl (Northwest Forest Plan). Portland, Oregon.

Figure 1. 2007 Plantation Thinning Project Map Key








Figure 2. Map 1



Legend

- Steelhead Critical Habitat
- ▨ Isr
- Existing Temp
- Proposed Semi permanent
- Proposed Decommission
- Paved Road Surface
- Aggregate


Figure 3. Map 2



Legend

- Steelhead Critical Habitat
- ▨ Isr
- Existing Temp
- Proposed Semi permanent
- Proposed Decommission
- Paved Road Surface
- Aggregate

Figure 4. Map 3



- Legend**
- Steelhead Critical Habitat
 - Isr
 - Existing Temp
 - Proposed Semi permanent
 - Proposed Decommission
 - Paved Road Surface
 - Aggregate

Figure 5. Map 4





Figure 6. Map 5



- Legend**
- Steelhead Critical Habitat
 - ▨ Isr
 - Existing Temp
 - Proposed Semi permanent
 - Proposed Decommission
 - Paved Road Surface
 - Aggregate

0 0.25 0.5 1 Miles

