



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

May 2008



Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Sheppard Creek Post-Fire Project

Flathead National Forest
Tally Lake Ranger District
Flathead and Lincoln Counties, Montana



NOTES TO REVIEWERS:

Reviewers should provide the Forest Service with their comments during the review period of the draft environmental impact statement. This will enable the Forest Service to analyze and respond to the comments at one time and to use information acquired in the preparation of the final environmental impact statement, thus avoiding undue delay in the decision making process. Reviewers have an obligation to structure their participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process so that it is meaningful and alerts the agency to the reviewers' position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft stage may be waived if not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement. *City of Angoon v. Hodel* (9th Circuit, 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris*, 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be specific and should address the adequacy of the statement and the merits of the alternatives discussed (40 CFR 1503.3).

The Forest Service strives to use the most current and pertinent science available. **Please help us by including a complete bibliography if you choose to cite published research when responding to our requests for comments.**

DISCLAIMERS:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Data Accuracy - The Forest Service uses the most current and complete data available. GIS data and product accuracy may vary. They may be developed from sources of differing accuracy, accurate only at certain scales, based on modeling or interpretation, incomplete while being created or revised, etc. Using GIS products for purposes other than those for which they were created may yield inaccurate or misleading results. The Forest Service reserves the right to correct, update, modify, or replace GIS products without notification. For more information, contact:

Flathead National Forest
650 Wolfpack Way
Kalispell, MT 59901
(406) 758-5204

If a map contains contours, these contours were generated and filtered using the Digital Elevation Model (DEM) files. Any contours generated from DEM's using a scale of less than 1:100,000 will lead to less reliable results and should be used for display purposes only.

Sheppard Creek Post-Fire Project

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Flathead National Forest Tally Lake Ranger District Flathead and Lincoln Counties, Montana

Lead Agency:

USDA Forest Service

Responsible Official:

Cathy Barbouletos, Forest Supervisor
Flathead National Forest
650 Wolfpack Way
Kalispell, MT 59901
(406) 758-5200

**For Information and to Send
Comments, Contact:**

Bryan Donner, Planning Team Leader
Tally Lake Ranger District
650 Wolfpack Way
Kalispell, MT 59901
(406) 758-3508
comments-northern-flathead-tally-lake@fs.fed.us

Abstract: This draft environmental impact statement summarizes the analysis performed and resulting effects of the proposed implementation of timber salvage in the Sheppard Creek Post-Fire Project area. The Forest Supervisor determined the need to recover merchantable wood fiber in a timely manner to support local communities and contribute to the long term yield of forest products. A Proposed Action to meet this need was developed by an interdisciplinary team of specialists. Issues that influenced the development of alternatives to the Proposed Action were helicopter yarding, old growth and recruitment old growth habitat, Canada lynx habitat, timber salvage in reserved areas, water quality, stream channel stability, and bark beetles. In addition to a No Action Alternative (Alternative A) and the Proposed Action (Alternative B), two action alternatives were developed that respond to the stated needs and emphasize the specific issues. Alternative C emphasizes no helicopter yarding, no timber salvage in areas providing old growth and recruitment old growth habitat, reduced timber salvage in lynx habitat, a reduction in the amount of temporary road construction, and the retention of “reserve areas” for ecosystem processes. Alternative D would salvage trees in Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas for bark beetle control and reduce the amount of temporary roads constructed to access units. The Forest Service has not identified an agency preferred alternative. The environmentally preferred alternative is Alternative A.

Date Comments Must Be Received:

July 1, 2008

This page left blank intentionally.

Table of Contents

SUMMARY

CHAPTER 1 - PURPOSE AND NEED

	<i>Page</i>
I. DOCUMENT STRUCTURE AND BACKGROUND	1-1
II. PURPOSE AND NEED.....	1-5
III. PROPOSED ACTION	1-6
IV. DECISION FRAMEWORK	1-6
V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	1-7
VI. RELATIONSHIP TO THE FOREST PLAN	1-7
VII. ISSUES	1-9
VIII. SCOPE OF THE ANALYSIS	1-14
IX. APPLICABLE LAWS AND EXECUTIVE ORDERS	1-15

CHAPTER 2 - ALTERNATIVES

I. INTRODUCTION	2-1
II. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL	2-1
Features Common to All Action Alternatives	2-2
Alternative Summary and Descriptions	
<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	2-10
<i>Alternative B (Proposed Action)</i>	2-10
<i>Alternative C</i>	2-18
<i>Alternative D</i>	2-25
Monitoring	2-34
III. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED STUDY	2-35
IV. COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES	2-37

**CHAPTER 3 - AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT
and ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES**

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION	3-1
 DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT BY RESOURCE AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ALTERNATIVES	
Vegetation	3-13
Spruce and Douglas-fir Bark Beetles	3-45
Invasive Plant Species: Noxious Weeds	3-69
Threatened, Sensitive, and Rare Plants	3-87
Fire and Fuels	3-99
Air Quality and Smoke Management	3-115
Hydrology	3-123
Fisheries	3-147
Soils	3-179
Introduction to Wildlife	3-197
Snags and Downed Wood Wildlife Habitat	3-201
Old Growth Habitat and Old Growth Associated Wildlife Species	3-221
Management Indicator Species: Commonly Hunted Big Game	3-237
Neotropical Migratory Birds and Riparian Habitats	3-247
Threatened Wildlife Species	3-257
Sensitive Wildlife Species	3-273
Recreation	3-303
Scenery	3-311
Heritage Resources	3-319
Economics and Social	3-325

CHAPTER 4 - CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS	4-1
DISTRIBUTION OF THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT..	4-2

LITERATURE CITED

APPENDICES

Appendix A Glossary	A-1
Appendix B Forest Plan Management Area Descriptions, Goals, and Standards	B-1
Appendix C Best Management Practices	C-1
Appendix D Water Regulations	D-1
Appendix E Project Monitoring Plan	E-1

LIST OF FIGURES

<i>Figure</i>		<i>Page</i>
1-1	Vicinity Map	1-2
2-1	Alternative B – Proposed Salvage Treatments	2-16
2-2	Alternative C – Proposed Salvage Treatments.....	2-17
2-3	Alternative D – Proposed Salvage Treatments	2-32
3-1	Vegetation Burn Severity.....	3-16
3-2	Pre-Fire Forest Structure.....	3-21
3-3	Post-Fire Forest Structure.....	3-22
3-4	Post-Fire Volume Estimates.....	3-26
3-5	Fire History Map.....	3-102
3-6	Airshed Location Map.....	3-117
3-7	April 1 Snow Water Equivalent at the Hand Creek Snotel Site.....	3-125
3-8	Post-Fire Simulated Erosion Rates.....	3-128
3-9	High Burn Severity Site.....	3-129
3-10	Average Residual Pool Depth of Sheppard Creek	3-132
3-11	Median Sediment Size of Sheppard Creek at Three Sites	3-132
3-12	Fisheries Analysis Areas.....	3-148
3-13	Sheppard Creek Valley Segments.....	3-150
3-14	Sheppard Creek Valley Segment D.....	3-151
3-15	Sheppard Creek Valley Segment A.....	3-152
3-16	Locations of Cutthroat Trout Populations	3-154
3-17	Upper Sheppard Creek Valley Segment E.....	3-156
3-18	Total Numbers of Age 1+ Fish in Upper Sheppard Creek.....	3-157
3-19	Percent Biomass Retained.....	3-193
3-20	Status of Old Growth Habitat.....	3-227
3-21	Labor Income in Basic Industries, Flathead County.....	3-330
3-22	Trend in Timber Revenue on the Flathead National Forest.....	3-331

This page left blank intentionally.