Appendix F: Responses to Substantive Comments

Changes between Draft and Final EIS:

- This entire appendix has been added

Response to Comments

The public comment period for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Tamarack Quarry Expansion Project began on July 23, 2004 and ended on September 7, 2004. Individuals, interest groups, organizations, businesses, elected officials, state, local, and other federal agencies, and Tribes were invited to comment on the DEIS. Three letters and one electronic mail were received during the 45-day comment period.

All of the letters received during the public comment period were processed and the substantive comments were compiled into "comment statements." All comments were reviewed and the information provided in the letters was used during the preparation of the Final EIS. This appendix contains the comment statements and responses. The responses are intended to be explanatory in nature; if there are any inadvertent contradictions between this appendix and the text of the Final EIS, the Final EIS prevails.

The following comments were received from David Butt.

Comment A1: *Since day one this project seems to have been planned with the purpose of seeking the LEAST amount of public comment possible.*

Response: There has been no attempt to limit public comment on the proposed action. On January 15, 2002, and May 2, 2002, notices were published in the Federal Register seeking public comment on the project. The project was also listed in the Mt. Hood National Forest's quarterly publication that announces proposed actions in autumn 2002 thru summer 2005. This quarterly announcement is mailed to approximately 300 groups and individuals and is also available online. The proposed project was also posted on the Mt. Hood National Forest website. In addition, two open houses were held, offering the public opportunities to review and comment on the proposal. A notice of availability of the Draft DEIS was published in the Federal Register, and in The Oregonian. The DEIS was also mailed to all parties who provided comment on the proposal, listed in Chapter 10 of the DEIS.

Comment A2: *The historic name of this rock quarry (Mud Creek, after the creek that drained from Mud Lake, now Trillium Lake) changed during the initial stages of this project. It is highly possible that the thousands of year round recreation users of the immediate area, would not have a clue that as a result of this project they may be meeting 20 yard loaded trucks once every 2 minutes along the first 2 miles of FS Rd 2656. If folks (many in large RVs or hauling trailers) drive 30 mph, they could meet up to 3 trucks between turning off the highway and the Mud Creek Loop.*

Response: For years the rock quarry has been known informally as the Mud Creek Pit. When the initial proposal to expand the quarry was being considered, there was concern that there may be a public misconception about the appropriateness of expanding a quarry site in a place called "Mud Creek." The quarry is actually more than a mile away from the creek known as Mud Creek. To avoid misconception that the quarry might be within or near the creek, the name was changed to

Tamarack Quarry. The name change was described in a notice in the Federal Register and was also documented in the DEIS. The location of the quarry was also described in the public notices.

The average recreation visitor to the project vicinity is frequenting the recreation facilities around Trillium Lake and is likely not aware of the existence, location, or name of the quarry, which is about 2 miles farther down the road (FS Road 2656). However, we agree that the average recreation user would be concerned about increases in truck traffic on the road. This was one of the public issues addressed in the DEIS. The analysis in the DEIS recognizes that there may be impacts to recreation users and for that reason rock haul would not be allowed from Friday at noon to Monday at 7 am. Other mitigation measures, such as signing and traffic controllers, have also been developed to address concerns related to truck traffic and recreation use. Traffic of one truck every two minutes is a theoretical maximum (a worst case scenario) that would be expected to occur only rarely, if ever. A typical day of operation is expected to generate one truck about every 12 minutes (FEIS Section 3.4).

Comment A3: *It seems obvious that if some of those recreationalists who met the very few log trucks hauling this route this summer were asked about the potential of the MAXIMUM amount of rock haul over the next 20 years, you would hear some very strong concerns.*

Response: Early on in the planning process, the FS recognized that one of the main concerns about the proposal would be the potential impacts to recreation users. This was one of the main issues identified in the analysis, and mitigation measures have been developed to address such concerns. The potential conflicts between recreation and truck traffic would not be new. Although rock haul during the past summer (2004) was not heavy, there have been years in the past when large quantities of rock were removed from the quarry. Based on our past experience, the FS and ODOT have concluded that recreation impacts of rock haul can be managed with the mitigation measures that have been developed.

Comment A4: *The analysis of both the volume of rock haul and the hazards for recreational traffic has not been adequately addressed. The Trillium Lake Road from Hwy 26 to the Dam, has poor sight distance on curves, is narrow, has soft shoulders and feels like it's already a safety hazard when heavy traffic is flowing in both directions. How can such heavy truck use of this recreation road be planned WITHOUT improving the road itself, both for safe recreation travel and bicyclists? In addition to not hauling on weekends and holidays, the road and shoulder should be widened and limits imposed on haul speed and the use of exhaust brakes.*

Response: Transportation engineers from ODOT, FS, and a consulting firm conducted an on-site analysis of the roadway to determine its condition. Their opinion was that the road is adequate, with implementation of proper traffic control, to serve the proposed traffic. The road would not be widened, thus avoiding additional environmental impacts, but the road would receive maintenance including resurfacing when needed as well as traffic control measures such as signing and speed limits.

Comment A5: *To expect a new trail (from Gov Camp to Trillium) to maybe be constructed by summer 2008 (funded by ???) to reduce conflicts between vehicular and pedestrian/bicycle along the haul route (Trillium Lake to Highway 26) is wishful thinking. These unacceptable impacts need to be mitigated by the project causing them.*

Response: Several sources of funding were used for planning the trail from Government Camp to Trillium Lake. The decision for this trail was approved in January 2006. Funding from ODOT as identified in the mitigation measures will be used for the construction of this trail. Quarry operation/rock haul is not the only source of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists. Traffic conflict already occurs between recreation-related vehicular and pedestrian/bicycle traffic. Most conflict occurs and would continue to occur during weekends and holidays, when rock would not be hauled along the road.

Comment A6: *Alternative 1 fails to both consider other sources of rock for this purpose as well as to adequately contemplate sources of longer term need.*

Response: Other sources of rock were considered and are described in Section 2.3 of the DEIS (Table 2-3). Evaluating longer term sources at this time would be highly speculative and possibly unrealistic since it would be very difficult today to predict the amount of rock that may be needed 30 or 50 years from now. It is not feasible to predict the modes of transportation or alternative materials that may be available that far into the future. However, having an available source of material for at least 20 years will allow time for other sources or alternative materials to be developed.

Comment A7: *Having attended the open house in 12/02 when the initial purpose of the project appeared to be providing ROCK for CONSTRUCTION projects ON FOREST, it was frustrating that there was no specific information available about the size (volume of haul) of the project. Now the project appears to be to provide ODOT and the FS with all of the rock they could possibly need on and off forest both for construction, maintenance and SANDING of our winter highways. Tamarack would be ODOT's major source of sand (which does not require this quality of rock) for ODOT. There appears to be a choice of either providing quality rock for the forest for the next 75 years or providing adequate rock for both the forest and ODOT for the next 20 years. Where will the need for this nonrenewable resource be met after the life of this quarry?*

Response: The original purpose of the proposed action, as published in the Federal Register (January and May 2002), and as printed on materials presented at the public open houses, was to provide a long-term source of sanding rock, as well as construction rock, for both ODOT and the Forest Service, with an estimated need of approximately two million cubic yards over the next 20 years. The proposal has not changed since, and the description in the DEIS is consistent with the earlier publications. The original proposal also disclosed that Tamarack Quarry would be ODOT's major source of sanding material for highways near Mt. Hood because the previous source (White River quarry) is no longer available. Quality rock is needed for sanding roadways because softer rock would break down into small fragments too easily and not provide adequate traction in snow and ice.

Comment A8: *This DEIS considers the economic impact of this project in terms of commercial use of rock only. The economic value of the impacted recreational resource to the nearby communities is not considered. Government Camp is expanding as a visitor destination. Existing ski shops, lodging facilities and restaurants from Brightwood to Government Camp depend on a mix of winter recreation activities to draw visitors to the mountain. "Emergency" is not defined. If the last few major flooding events along Hwy 35 had constituted an "emergency" need for ODOT and plowing was allowed after the "first measurable snowfall" and before April 15 on Trillium Lake Road (Highway 26 to Mud Creek junction) winter recreation in the entire Trillium Basin would be eliminated (how can you ski or snowshoe a loop if ¼ of it is plowed to two lanes with turnouts???).*

Response: The proposed action does not include a proposal to increase or change emergency use of the quarry. Emergency use of the quarry is currently allowed under the current special use permit (i.e., under the No Action Alternative), so the project would not represent a change over the existing condition. Conversations with ODOT maintenance personnel confirmed that emergency use is expected to occur only rarely, and ODOT would likely pursue other rock sources before using Tamarack Quarry during the winter, primarily because plowing the road would be very expensive. To date, neither the FS nor ODOT have accessed the quarry during the winter, even for emergencies (Beckman, pers. comm., 2005). Prior emergencies such as White River (Hwy 35) occurred in the late fall months prior to snowfall. Should emergency use and plowing occur, it could negatively affect winter recreation in the area; however, as noted above, the Action Alternatives would have the same effect as the No Action Alternative.

Comment A9: *Since 1986, snowtrails in this area have been groomed through a unique partnership with the Forest Service, local ski shops, winter visitors and myself who volunteers to do the grooming. The Forest Service, Clackamas County Tourism Development Council and Clackamas County Department of Economic Development have recently invested funds to improve the area road system so that winter snow trails can be groomed with a minimum of snow with the goal of increasing skier and snowshoer, improving this attraction. Creative signing has been developed to encourage snow shoe and XC ski use on one route groomed for both uses, increasing the capacity while reducing conflicts. This provides a quality recreational opportunity and is generating more and more winter recreational interest and positive economic impacts to the nearby communities. It's ironic that this project isn't even mentioned in your text.*

Response: Comment noted. One of the needs for the proposal is the need for sanding material in the winter. Winter recreation is one of the primary reasons for sanding the highways around Mt. Hood. Sanding allows the public safer access to the many winter recreation opportunities in this area. Additional discussion about the importance of winter recreation has been included in the FEIS. The project would not adversely affect winter recreation in the area except during emergency use of the quarry, which is not expected to occur.

Comment A10: *No mention is made of the impact of this project on the private land owners in the Summit Meadow subdivision. Any plowing of the road or increased use of*

the gates (to keep folks out when the road is obviously plowed two lanes wide) will require a substantial investment in a gate system as well as coordination with the private land "in holders" so as not to impact their access.

Response: As noted above, the proposed action does not propose any change in the potential emergency use of the quarry. Plowing and winter rock haul on the road would occur only during emergencies and, as evidenced by the lack of such activity in the past, is not expected to occur. ODOT may request entry to the quarry as early as April. If the FS approves the request, ODOT would have to pay for plowing and traffic control. This could impact the late season use of winter recreation in the area and coordination with private land "in holders" would occur.

The following comments were received from Oregon Natural Resources Council (ONRC) and BARK.

Comment B1: *(W)e need more convincing that the expansion of the Tamarack Quarry is needed for these purposes. Is it possible that ODOT and USFS will burn through two million cubic yards of rock in just 20 years for routine sanding, maintenance and repair? The DEIS (pg. 1-4) states "ODOT and the FS estimate that more than two million cubic yards of rock would be needed over the next 20 years for highway and road maintenance, construction, and emergency repairs, as well as for road closures and stream and other site restoration projects in the Mt. Hood area." USFS has an obligation to demonstrate this need with evidence. In the final EIS, USFS must provide us with an accounting of the use of rock by ODOT and the USFS for sanding, maintenance, and repair over the last 20 years in the vicinity of the quarry to demonstrate that two million cubic yards of rock are needed for these purposes.*

Response: Additional discussion and data has been added in the FEIS. As stated in Section 1.4 of the DEIS, ODOT (Regions 4 and 6) has historically utilized and predicts to continue to need approximately 37,000 cubic yards of material each year for sanding Mt. Hood area roadways (Hays, pers. comm., 2005). Planned road improvement projects and repairs would require an additional approximate average of 32,000 cubic yards of material each year (Hays, pers. comm., 2005). The FS predicts a need of 10-15,000 cubic yards of material per year for routine maintenance of existing FS roads based on past use of the pit. Tamarack quarry is the only quarry capable of providing a100,000 cubic yards of rock per year. Additional discussion on the estimated needed quantities is included in the FEIS (Section 1.5).

Comment B2: *There are other uses for rock that are more controversial, for which use of a nationally owned resource is not appropriate and highly controversial. New road construction, reconstruction and maintenance for the purpose of logging operations as well as highway widening do not enjoy the same broad level of support as road and highway maintenance, sanding and repair. New development in and around Government Camp will spur more road construction, and we are very concerned about the development's impact on the recreational infrastructure, wildlife, water quality, and ability of the Forest*

Service and other agencies to ensure that fire plays its natural role while keeping homes and communities safe. Any project that enables these controversial projects to move forward by providing resources required for their implementation must include a full accounting of their impacts.

Response: This proposal does not include or trigger any new road construction or highway widening. If there are proposals in the future for new road construction or highway widening on public lands, those projects and their environmental impacts would be evaluated in an environmental analysis consistent with the National Environmental Policy Act, including the opportunity for public review and comment.

Comment B3: *Removing, processing, and hauling two million cubic yards of rock from a single source for 20 years creates an enormous footprint on the land. USFS has discussed and disclosed many of these impacts in the DEIS. We understand the need for local material that is not prohibitively expensive to agencies supported by taxpayer dollars in order to promote the safety and welfare of travelers in and around the Government Camp area. However, we want to ensure that this project is truly needed, its impacts fully disclosed as well as minimized, and the material taken from the quarry utilized for the best interests of the public. We need to see data that demonstrates how the 750,000 cubic yards of rock currently in the quarry area without expansion are not adequate.*

Response: Based on the estimates of rock needed by the Forest Service and ODOT, the 750,000 cubic yards of rock would supply rock for approximately the next seven years but would not meet the need over 20 years. See also response to Comment B1.

Comment B4: *USFS does not disclose that significant Wilderness suitable lands near the project area are being considered for Wilderness designation. This is the first seriously considered Wilderness proposal on the Mt. Hood National Forest since the 1984 bill. This is significant new information the USFS should consider. On page 3-43 of the DEIS, USFS only considers the visual impacts on the Sherar Burn road, stating, "the proposed expansion would create more of a visual impact to users' expected wilderness experience on the way to the actual wilderness area. However, only approximately two percent of visitors to the Salmon-Huckleberry Wilderness use Sherar Burn Road. Therefore the impact is considered to be minor." However, USFS should disclose the impacts to visual resources from proposed Wilderness areas, as well as disclose that there will likely be an increase in use of the Sherar Burn road if more wildlands are protected as Wilderness on the east side of the Salmon Huckleberry Wilderness. Several of these areas are within a mile of the proposed quarry expansion, and the impacts on solitude from blasting and crushing activities were not described or disclosed in the DEIS.*

Response: At the time the DEIS was prepared, legislation for new wilderness areas near Mt. Hood had not been proposed. The project area is not within or adjacent to the area that was proposed by Senator Wyden in 2004 as new wilderness. The quarry would be approximately a mile to the west of a portion of that area. There have been discussions about a potential proposal for a new wilderness area between members of the Oregon delegation and the public, but at the present time there are no proposals in Congress. It is

anticipated that sound from blasting would carry to the south of the quarry not to the east toward this area. Topography (ridge lines) of the areas to the east of the quarry should protect any new proposed wilderness from noise carry from the quarry. Additional discussion on this issue has been included in the FEIS (Section 3.11).

Comment B5: *Notwithstanding future Wilderness designation, there are also impacts for current levels of recreation in the area. To have as many as 285 trucks per day (table 3-1) rattling past Trillium lake in the summer will likely displace some campers, boaters, and anglers, increasing use and impacts in other lakes in the area. As USFS notes in the DEIS, there are a number of "safety issues due to lack of off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities." There is a lack of analysis in the DEIS about these impacts to Trillium Lake and discussion on how to mitigate them in the lifetime of the quarry use. While much of the use of the Trillium Lake area is on the weekends, as is most recreation on the forest, there is use during the week and USFS and ODOT should develop mitigation plans to avoid conflicts between recreaters and rock haulers.*

Response: The 285 trips per day estimated in the DEIS was a theoretical maximum that is unlikely, if ever, to occur. A typical day of operation would be closer to 50 trips. There is no indication or evidence that operation of the pit would actually displace users at Trillium Lake. The quarry has been in use for over 50 years, and there is no indication that past use, even when heavy, has resulted in displacing users. The analysis does recognize the potential impacts on recreation in this area and mitigation measures have been developed to reduce conflicts between recreation users and rock hauling.

Comment B6: *(I)s it not likely that revegetation efforts will be very slow after the quarry is "rehabilitated"? As USFS notes in the DEIS, "although the visible clearcuts were harvested 10 to 20 years ago, they have been slow to revegetate, and still present a contrast in color" (3-10). Given that the quarry site is not only going be stripped of vegetation, but stripped of soil and rock before the soil is replaced and the site replanted, won't rehabilitation be difficult? Will adequate funding over a sufficient period of time to promote successful revegetation of the site? The DEIS states "contrasts in color would likely become negligible as the reclamation plan to establish vegetation is successfully executed" (3-8). Yet given the lack of success of revegetating disturbed soil in the project area, isn't the success of this reclamation plan speculative? USFS says that when it comes to revegetating the quarry, planting methods and times would also be "in accordance with FS recommendations" (DEIS, 2-4). Weren't the unsuccessful planting efforts on the plantations in the project vicinity also planned to meet FS recommendations?*

Response: The existing clearcuts are on a ridge that faces Timberline Lodge, and are, therefore, entirely visible from the lodge. Tamarack quarry is not currently visible due to it's location behind a ridgeline. The quarry would be expanded in such a way as to preserve the ridge that currently is screening the view from the lodge. The clearcuts have been revegetated but are growing very slowly due to poor site conditions. Growing conditions at the quarry are more favorable as evidenced by two areas of revegetation adjacent to the quarry that are showing vigorous and healthy growth. The quarry, when revegetated, would likely grow slowly due to the impacts of the rock removal but the resulting contrast in

texture and color would be different than those of the clear cut and would more closely resemble a lake or meadow when viewed from Timberline Lodge.

Comment B7: *The DEIS does not spell out how reclamation would occur, only that it "would be developed" and "coordinated with USFS wildlife biologist to meet wildlife goals." USFS must disclose detailed plans available for public review. USFS must not downplay certain impacts with speculative mitigation. While USFS does say that reclaimed areas would need to have a "natural appearance" before new areas are opened and become visible form Timberline lodge (3-11). However, what is a "natural appearance"? Taken in context with the descriptions of the quarry opening looking like Trillium Lake, we are concerned that a "natural appearance" means something very different to the USFS than it means to us. But more important, the lifespan of an expanded quarry is supposed to be 20 years. Many clearcuts in the vicinity have responded poorly to revegetation efforts in this same period of time. How will one stage of the quarry be revegetated in just a fraction of the time in time to keep rock production moving? Given the consistent need for rock suggested by the DEIS, how is it possible that adequate rehabilitation will take place in time for other sections of the quarry to be expanded?*

Response: Additional information on reclamation has been added in the FEIS. A detailed reclamation plan can be found in Appendix G. As described in the plan, revegetation would occur in stages but revegetation of one stage is not required before more excavation can begin. The plan would be updated as each project entry occurs and to the extent possible revegetation of any portion of the quarry no longer needed would occur. The term" natural appearance" applies to the revegetated areas having the appearance as the surrounding landscape of trees and shrubs as seen from Timberline Lodge.

Comment B8: *In the DEIS (pages 3-35 and 3-36), USFS admits that soil conditions would be severely diminished, making the site incapable of supporting forest vegetation for many decades. Conversion of the site to a non-productive status would add 28 acres of acre (sic) currently in a non-productive condition. On page 3-39, the DEIS says that invasive weeds should be removed, not shall be removed. How will sufficient resources be available to monitor and remove invasive weeds?*

Response: Operating plans for the quarry would require ODOT to remove noxious weeds from the quarry activity areas before operations begin. Botanists from the Forest Service would monitor the areas for the presence of noxious weeds.

Comment B9: *How is it possible for the USFS to "rehabilitate" portions of the quarry in just a few years so they will not be picked out from the surrounding forest when viewed from Timberline Lodge?*

USFS suggests that the "form, line, and texture of the proposed expansion would be generally consistent with other openings in the viewshed," and the quarry openings would mimic the appearance of Trillium Lake in winter conditions" (DEIS, 3-8). A flat clearing may appear to be a lake in the distance, but it is not a lake. There can be no doubt that some the openings in the area are an embarrassment to the USFS (hence Abbot Salmon). Mimicking more of these

openings is not sound stewardship of the scenic resource from Timberline lodge and other vistas. It must be noted that the existing quarry area is not visible from Sherar Burn, Salmon River corridor, or from Trillium Lake.

Response: The appearance of the rock pit if expanded to the full extent would not mimic the older timber harvest units on the hillside as seen from Timberline Lodge. This is because of the angle of the viewer position and the location of the quarry on the landscape. As modeled in the DEIS the quarry would have the appearance of a lake or meadow. The DEIS notes that the existing quarry is visible from Sherar Burn, but not from the Salmon River corridor or Trillium Lake (Section 3.3).

Comment B10: *A project that removes two million cubic yards of rock is bound to have some consequences to water resources. The DEIS does describe some of these impacts, but fails to put their impact in a broader context. For example, on page 3-43, USFS describes how channels may form due to increased surface flow, altering the water storage capacity of a swale, which in turn could eliminate seeps and vernal pools in the area and the sediment storage capacity of the swale. How will this impact the sediment regimes in the downstream channels? What impacts on local aquatic and terrestrial organisms will this have? Are there aquifers that would not get recharged? What will be the impacts to different plant communities in the area? How will these impacts be mitigated during operations and reversed following operations?*

Response: The project is not expected to impact downstream channels, aquatic habitat, or aquifers due to the distance from these features and the erosion control methods that would be in place during and after operations. The reclamation plan has detailed erosion control standards which would be updated at each stage of entry. Some impacts are unavoidable and not reversible and a discussion of those impacts is in Chapters 5 and 7.

Comment B11: *The proposed quarry expansion is designated as B-2. The LRMP, section B-2-008 states, "No more than 5% of an activity area should be in a detrimental soil condition from the combined impact of compaction, puddling and displacement." We do not see how it is possible for the USFS to meet this standard and the DEIS section 3.13.2.1.2 on the Mt. Hood National Forest LRMP fails to discuss this standard.*

Response: Mt. Hood National Forest LRMP Standard and Guideline B-2-008 pertains specifically to "recreational livestock" activities and not quarry development (Forest Plan page Four-221). The DEIS recognizes that development of the quarry impacts soil resources over the entire activity area since removing the soil is necessary to access and remove the rock.

Comment B12: *The USFS has not given any indication that it has conducted its required population monitoring of MIS. The DEIS states only that deer and elk rearing areas are over a mile away from the quarry and are not expected impacted by project activities, (3-22) some summer thermal cover and foraging habitat for deer and elk will be impacted (3-20), that some of the large diameter snags that are to be felled and removed would provide habitat for the marten and the pileated woodpecker (3-20), and that the forest in Community E is old*

and diverse (Table 3-3). There is no analysis about the current condition of the populations of these species.

Response: Monitoring requirements for management indicator species are contained in the Mt. Hood National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (pages five-49 thru five-56). This project is consistent with those requirements. The Forest meets regularly with the ODFW to discuss deer and elk herd management goals. Deer and elk populations are regulated and managed by ODFW. The project area is within the Santiam Unit and according to their website population levels are stable to increasing for both species within the Santiam management unit. The migration and feeding movements of both species are to the south of the project area and the project area does not appear to be utilized to any large extent as cover or forage. The Forest Plan requires monitoring of B5 management areas for pileated woodpeckers and pine martens but the quarry is not within or adjacent to B5 management areas. Recent annual monitoring reports for the Forest indicate that remote camera and tracking surveys have shown strong presence of both pileated woodpeckers and pine martens and that their populations appear viable (FY02 report page 76, FY03 report page 67). Additional discussion of management indicator species has been included in the FEIS (Section 3.6).

Comment B13: *We are also concerned about the impacts on this project on Northern Spotted Owls. There is no indication in the DEIS that the Forest Service has considered any of the new information about northern spotted owls, which is clearly significant. These studies include the April 30, 2004, the Regional Interagency Ecosystem Committee commissioned Northern Spotted Owl Status Review team submitted a draft of their report (Anthony et al., "Status and Trends of Demography of Northern Spotted Owls") to the Interagency Regional Monitoring Program (available at http://www.reo.gov/monitoring/trends/NSO Demo Report 2004.pdf); the April 21, 2004 the Haig, Mullins and Forsman's paper, "Subspecies relationships and genetic structure in the Spotted Owl"; and the FWS recognition of the importance of interspecies competition with spotted owl in A Range Wide Baseline Summary and Evaluation of* ***Data Collected through Section 7 Consultation for the Northern Spotted Owl and its*** *Critical Habitat: 1994-2001. These studies provide significant new information about the status of Northern spotted owls. More information and implication for forest management will become available when the status review is complete later this year.*

Response: The final demographic report and the status review on the Northern spotted owl were not released until after the DEIS was published. Neither the demographic report nor the status review contain any new information specific to the Tamarack Quarry project or the project area, but they do suggest that owl populations within this region are close to modeling estimates in the NWFP. This project is not expected to impact owl populations because the project is not within suitable owl habitat. Additional discussion about the 2004 report has been included in the FEIS (Section 3.6).

The following comment was received from Bill Fujii, natural resource specialist with the Oregon Water Resources Department.

Comment C1: *(A) legal source of water for the road watering listed on page 3-60 is required under state law.*

Response: Comment noted. A legal source from a municipal water system would be obtained prior to project construction. No water would be taken from any streams on National Forest system lands or Trillium Lake. This clarification has been included in the FEIS (Section 3.14.3).

The following comment was received from the US Environmental Protection Agency.

Comment D1: *We are concerned that the draft EIS does not provide a clear description of the mitigation measures that would be used to reduce impacts to water quality and other hydrologic effects in the vicinity of the project site. Our concerns stem primarily from the reliance on the yet-to-be developed excavation, reclamation, and spill plans to identify measures that would be used to avoid, reduce, or minimized these effects. While we believe that the development and implementation of these plans is necessary, we are concerned that the information they would generate is necessary to define project-specific effects and identify measures needed to mitigate identified impacts.*

Response: A reclamation plan has been developed and is included in Appendix G of the Final EIS. It is to be updated as expansion occurs. A quarry development plan and a spill response plan are included along with several erosion control measures and other mitigation measures that have been designed to avoid, reduce or minimize the effects of the project. Additional discussion of these measures has been included in the FEIS.