



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service

Pacific
Northwest
Region

2011



Clackamas Road Decommissioning for Habitat Restoration, Increment 2

Environmental Assessment

Clackamas River Ranger District, Mt. Hood National Forest
Clackamas County, Oregon



The photo shows one example of a newly decommissioned Forest Service road on the Mt. Hood National Forest.

For information contact:
Michelle Lombardo
16400 Champion Way
Sandy, OR 97055
(503) 668-1796
mlombardo@fs.fed.us

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (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 to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Table of Contents

1.0. Purpose of and Need for Action

1.1. Introduction	3
1.2. Document Structure	5
1.3. Background	6
1.4. Desired Conditions	7
1.5. Purpose and Need	7
1.6. Proposed Action	8
1.7. Adaptive Management	14
1.8. Decision Framework	15
1.9. Management Direction	15
1.10. Public Involvement	17
1.11. Issues	18

2.0. Alternatives, including the Proposed Action

2.1. Introduction	19
2.2. Alternatives Considered but Eliminated From Detailed Study	19
2.3. Alternatives Considered in Detail	20
2.4. Project Design Criteria	23
2.5. Comparison of Alternatives	29

3.0. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

3.1. Introduction	30
3.2. Geology	30
3.3. Hydrology	35
3.4. Climate Change	63
3.5. Fisheries	65
3.6. Wildlife	77
3.7. Botany	97
3.8. Vegetation	104
3.9. Recreation	110
3.10. Law Enforcement	115
3.11. Heritage Resources	116
3.12. Transportation	119
3.13. Other Required Disclosures	126

4.0. References

Appendix A: Maps of Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

Appendix B: Strategy for Road-related Activities to Restore Hydrologic Function

Appendix C: List of Roads included in Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

Appendix D: Maps of Alternative 3

Appendix E: Maps of Alternative 4

Appendix F: List of Roads by Alternative

Appendix G: Section 7 Consistency Determination

Appendix H: Response to Comments

1.0. Purpose of and Need for Action

1.1 Introduction

In an effort to aid the recovery of fish habitat, riparian habitat and water quality, the Mt. Hood National Forest (Forest) has accomplished numerous restoration projects over the past decade. The focus of several of these watershed restoration projects has included decommissioning over a hundred miles of road. As recognized by the Northwest Forest Plan, “the most important components of a watershed restoration program are control and prevention of road-related runoff and sediment production” (NWFP p. B-31). Also, the Forestwide *Roads Analysis* recommended decommissioning roads that have low access needs and considerable environmental risk (USDA Forest Service 2003). Therefore, in order to continue the Forest’s long-standing efforts to improve watershed health, this Environmental Assessment (EA) focuses on road decommissioning – the stabilization and restoration of unneeded roads to a more natural state.

- How are “unneeded” roads identified?

The term **unneeded** in this document does not imply that there are no potential administrative uses for a road, or that no one uses it for recreation. An unneeded road is one that is not currently vital to forest management operations and that does not access primary recreational destinations. Thus, the Forest must review the road system within its jurisdiction and identify roads that are no longer needed to meet forest resource management objectives. Roads identified as unneeded should then be decommissioned or considered for other uses, such as for trails (36 CFR 212.5(b)(2)).

This EA analyzes the environmental effects for decommissioning approximately 255 miles of road on the Clackamas River Ranger District. All of the road decommissioning activities would improve hydrologic function and aquatic and terrestrial habitat in the following eight, sixth-field subwatersheds: Pot Creek – Clackamas River, Farm Creek – Collawash River, Lower Hot Springs Fork Collawash River, Nohorn Creek, Upper Hot Springs Fork Collawash River, Elk Lake Creek, Happy Creek – Collawash River, and East Fork Collawash River. The figures on the following pages show the project area; maps of each subwatershed and the respective transportation system can be found in Appendix A. This EA analyzes four alternatives, including the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives; and the results of the analysis are captured in this document.

Figure 1.1. Vicinity map of project area.





Figure 1.2. The eight emphasis subwatersheds within the project area.



1.2 Document Structure

This Environmental Assessment is written to fulfill the purposes and requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as well as to meet policy and procedural requirements of the USDA Forest Service. The intent of NEPA, its implementing regulations, and Forest Service policy is to evaluate and disclose the effects of proposed actions on the quality of the human environment. The document is organized into three parts:

- *Purpose of and Need for Action:* The section includes information on the history of the project proposal, the purpose and need for action, and the agency's proposal for achieving that purpose and need. This section also details how the Forest Service informed the public of the proposal and how the public responded.
- *Alternatives, including the Proposed Action:* This section provides a more detailed description of the Proposed Action as well as the No Action Alternative and two other

action alternatives. This discussion also includes design criteria and project development.

- *Environmental Consequences:* This section describes the environmental effects of no action as well as the trade-offs and effects of implementing the Proposed Action and the other action alternatives. This analysis is organized by resource area. Within each section, the existing environment is described first, followed by the estimated effects of no action that provides a baseline for evaluation, and finally the estimated effects of the Proposed Action and action alternatives.

Additional documentation, including more detailed analyses of project-area resources, may be found in the project planning record located at the Mt. Hood National Forest Supervisor's Office in Sandy, Oregon.

1.3 Background

In order to better manage the Forest's transportation system, the Forest has embarked on several planning processes that address travel and access management. This project – aimed specifically at managing roads posing an aquatic risk on the Clackamas River Ranger District – is just one of these planning efforts. This project is part of a larger aquatic restoration planning process¹ that plans to review approximately 15 percent of the existing Forestwide road system each year to identify roads to decommission, close, convert to non-motorized trail, or improve. As part of this planning process, in 2009, the Forest completed its first² planning effort on the District, as documented in the Clackamas Road Decommissioning for Habitat Restoration Environmental Assessment, which focused on decommissioning roads within the Upper Clackamas River drainage. The Forest is committed to examining all of its watersheds for restoration opportunities, and this project would complete the current road decommissioning efforts in both the Collawash and Clackamas River drainages.

The Forest's decision to examine the transportation system and the risk it poses to downstream aquatic habitat was reinforced with the information found in the Forestwide *Roads Analysis* (2003)³. The *Roads Analysis*, which addressed both the access benefits and ecological impacts of road-associated effects, highlighted the fact that Forest Service budgets have not kept pace with what it costs to maintain all roads so they are functioning properly. If the Forest is not able to adequately keep up with road maintenance needs, then the Forest's backlog of roads needing maintenance could impact hydrologic function. In response, the *Roads Analysis* recommends decommissioning road segments having environmental risk factors coupled with low access needs. In the end, these efforts, along with future efforts, will systematically lead us to achieving a minimum road system needed for safe and efficient travel and for managing the Forest lands (FSH 7709.55, Chpt 20 (January 8, 2009)).

¹ Appendix B includes a copy of the Forest's *Strategy for Road-related Activities to Restore Hydrologic Function*.

² While the road decommissioning project in 2009 was part of the "first" effort included in the *Strategy for Road-related Activities to Restore Hydrologic Function*, there have been multiple projects on the District that included road decommissioning. In the project area, 85 miles of roads have been decommissioned under previous NEPA decisions.

³ For more information regarding the Forest's *Roads Analysis* see Section 3.10 Transportation of this document. Also, the *Roads Analysis* can be found on the Forest website at: <http://www.fs.usda.gov/mthood>.

1.4 Desired Conditions

The following statements represent desired conditions based on the Mt. Hood National Forest Land and Resources Management Plan, as amended.

- **Watersheds** have hydrologic and sediment regimes that function within their ranges of natural variability. They contain a network of healthy riparian areas and streams.
- **Streams** provide a diversity of aquatic habitat for fish and other stream-dwelling organisms. They offer sufficient quantities of large woody debris; they have clean and abundant spawning gravel; and they have stable banks that are well vegetated and have cool water.
- **Riparian areas** contain plant communities that are diverse in species composition and structure. They provide summer and winter thermal regulation; nutrient filtering; and have appropriate rates of surface erosion, bank erosion, and channel migration.
- **Habitats** provide for viable populations of existing native and desired non-native wildlife, fish, and plant species well distributed throughout their current geographic range within the National Forest System. Landscapes contain a diversity of habitats.
- The **transportation system** allows safe access through the Forest where appropriate, and it is carefully designed and maintained to minimize impacts to aquatic resources.

1.5 Purpose of and Need for Action

The need for this project is evident when the above desired conditions are compared to existing conditions site-specifically. The purposes are bolded below followed by the description of the needs.

Reduce impacts to water quality and aquatic habitats associated with unneeded roads

If unneeded roads are not maintained or decommissioned in the near future, there is an increased risk for surface erosion, gullying, and landslides. Such potential risks may result in increased sediment delivery to streams and reservoirs. Increased sedimentation can degrade water quality, aquatic habitats, and threatened, endangered, and sensitive aquatic species. The desired transportation system on the Forest is maintained to minimize environmental damage.

Reduce road density to improve wildlife habitat utilization

High open road density can result in habitat fragmentation, poaching and wildlife harassment. Lower open road densities promote healthier deer and elk populations. Decommissioned roads can increase forage as old roadways begin to grow native grasses and shrubs. Some wildlife species tend to utilize more contiguous habitats. Decommissioned roads would have fewer barriers to animals with limited dispersal ability. For wildlife, decommissioning roads would result in greater solitude, vigor, health, and reproductive success.

Reduce the spread of non-native invasive plants associated with unneeded roads

Roads serve as potential conduits for non-native invasive plants. Invasive plants displace native

plants; reduce functionality of habitat and forage; increase potential for soil erosion; alter physical and biological properties of soil; reduce riparian area function; and degrade habitat for culturally significant plants. Invasive plants may spread, displacing native plants on adjacent lands. These factors can affect desired healthy native ecosystems.

Reduce road maintenance costs

Current and anticipated road maintenance budgets are insufficient to properly maintain Forest Service system roads for safe and efficient access. There are miles of roads on the Forest that have not been maintained or properly repaired. Many such roads are no longer drivable due to brush encroachment. If the Forest is not able to adequately keep up with road maintenance needs, then the backlog of roads needing maintenance could affect hydrologic function and safety. Routine inspection of culverts and ditches on these roads is not always possible because of lack of access, personnel and funding.

1.6 Proposed Action

In response to the needs for action discussed above, this project would decommission approximately 255 miles of unneeded roads over several years, as implementation funding becomes available. Many of the roads would not be decommissioned until plantation thinning⁴ has occurred. The Proposed Action would also convert one road (Forest Road 6340-140), about one half mile in length, into a non-motorized trail. All of the road decommissioning activities would occur in the following eight, sixth-field subwatersheds: Pot Creek – Clackamas River, Farm Creek – Collawash River, Lower Hot Springs Fork Collawash River, Nohorn Creek, Upper Hot Springs Fork Collawash River, Elk Lake Creek, Happy Creek – Collawash River, and East Fork Collawash River. Maps of each subwatershed and the respective transportation system can be found in Appendix A.

What does **road decommissioning** mean in this document?

- ✓ The beginning portion of a decommissioned road is treated in order to block vehicles from entering the decommissioned road.
- ✓ Road decommissioning includes active (i.e., mechanical) and/or passive (i.e., inactive) methods.
- ✓ If hydrologic and ecological processes are adversely impacted by the road, then the decommissioned road is stabilized and restored to a more natural state (36 CFR 212.5(b)(2)).
- ✓ A decommissioned road is removed from the Forest’s transportation system and no longer receives any maintenance.

All of the roads in the subwatersheds were considered for potential decommissioning using the “Transportation System Planning Tool” (Appendix B). This dichotomous key was developed to guide proposals for transportation system planning on the Forest. Specifically, the “Planning Tool” provides a framework for examining administrative and public access needs for a given road. Use of the “Planning Tool” results in five potential outcomes: 1) a road remains as it

⁴ Plantation thinning includes stewardship/timber sales in the implementation and planning phases. Also, plantation thinning includes those units that would be ready to thin within approximately ten years. Appendix C includes a list of each road proposed for decommissioning and any plantation thinning access needs associated with a given road.

currently is on the Forest's transportation system; 2) a road needs repairs/improvements; 3) a road will be assessed in a future (within five years) planning effort; 4) a road is proposed for stormproofing; and 5) a road is proposed for potential decommissioning. All of the roads that were identified as needing repairs/improvements are included in Appendix C, but are *not* assessed in this NEPA document. All of the roads that were identified as potential decommissioning are included in this Proposed Action.

Road decommissioning would be accomplished by both active (i.e., mechanical) and passive (i.e., inactive) methods. Decommissioned roads would no longer need maintenance of any kind, since the ground occupied by decommissioned roads would return to a more natural, forested landscape. All decommissioned roads identified in this project, including "actively" and "passively" decommissioned roads, would be removed from the Forest Service Infrastructure Database, which is the database system used for the storage and analysis of information in the transportation atlas for the agency.

As stated above, road decommissioning methods are considered either passive or active. The decision to decommission a road by either method is dependent on several factors including: the existing physical condition of the road, the risk posed by the road to terrestrial wildlife, and the risk the road presents to aquatic resources. For consistency with the *Roads Analysis*, risks to both terrestrial and aquatic resources are ranked on a 2 through 10 point scale with 10 being a high risk and 2 being a low risk. Generally, roads identified as having lower risks are considered for passive methods and roads identified as having higher risks are considered for active methods.

Passive decommissioning methods generally consist of doing minimal work to eliminate entrance opportunities by vehicles to an inactive road. These methods are typically appropriate for roads that have not been actively used for some time, vegetation has naturally overgrown the roadbed, and natural drainage patterns are functioning at a high level. Active decommissioning efforts on this type of roads are not economically justifiable and the environmental effects of the active decommissioning efforts would likely cause more impact than the long-term impacts from leaving the road as is. An example of a passively closed road where natural vegetation has re-established itself is shown in the photo below. In this case, a naturally fallen tree helps serve as a barrier to vehicles, but a more substantial vehicle barrier exists at the connection with a connector road to provide a more effective deterrence to vehicles entry. Also, in this case the road database has been updated to remove this road from our active system.

Example of a passively decommissioned road.



Active decommissioning methods generally include actions utilizing mechanized construction equipment to physically stabilize, restore and allow for revegetation of the roadbed. Mechanized construction equipment might include excavators, backhoes and truck mounted loaders. In order to re-establish roadbeds for vegetation establishment, decompaction techniques would be implemented. These decompaction efforts might include the complete disturbance of the entire width of the roadway (Full Width Decompaction) for up to 12" depth. This includes "pavement ripping" on roads where asphalt pavements exist. The purpose of pavement ripping and other decompaction efforts are: 1) to break-up of the impervious surface by physical disturbance and root action; and 2) to revegetate with native species, contributing litter, and seed to improve the site for vegetation establishment. The asphalt layer (or gravel surfacing) on Forest Roads is typically 4-6" in depth on average. The asphalt would be broken up with an excavator and spread out evenly over the road surface, being careful to keep the broken asphalt on the road surface and out of ditches, waterbars, and streams. Another type of decompaction method is partial area decompaction. This method involves removal of pavement pieces about 3'x 3' on wheel treads spaced about every 15' and replacement with nearby vegetation. Areas would be decompacted down to mineral soil and existing vegetation would be planted when available.

These active efforts also strive to re-establish natural (pre-road construction) drainage patterns by removal of culverts and other drainage devices including bridges where necessary, removal of deep fills originally needed for installation of deep-fill culverts and stabilization of resultant slopes. In some cases these efforts also include removing unstable fills and pulling back road shoulders in hill-side construction areas where cut/fill techniques were used to balance cuts and fills in the immediate area during construction. The intent in this case is not to fully restore natural (pre-road construction) contours and slopes, but rather to stabilize unstable fills. The most intensive (and expensive) active method to decommission a road is by complete elimination of the roadbed and re-establishing natural (pre-road construction) contours and slopes. This method is typically called "re-contouring" and is employed on hill-side construction areas where cut/fill techniques were used to balance cuts and fills in the immediate area during construction. But unlike efforts that just pull-back fills to stabilize unstable fills, the intent is to fully remove the entire presence of the roadbed.

Decommissioned Stream Crossing: Removal of culverts and bridges at stream crossings is meant to restore the stream channel and banks to original pre-road (natural) contours as much as possible. The removed material would be carefully placed at cut-slopes or on the road surface beyond the natural channel slope at a less than 2 to 1 slope angle. Stream channel width would be at least 110% of “bankfull” width as measured above the stream crossing. Stream banks would be constructed at a maximum of 1.5 to 1 slope angle (66% slope). All fill materials would be tamped by the bucket of the excavator to reduce settling. Woody debris (which might be removed to access the area) would be saved and scattered on the disturbed areas parallel to the slope in order to serve as: contour barriers to surface soil movement; as a source of large woody debris to help reestablish vegetation; and as a means to reduce fuels hazards. The debris would generally be one layer thick and spaced to allow foot travel along roads. *Additionally*, boulder weirs (upstream U’s) would be constructed in most perennial stream channels. The purpose of the weirs is to decrease stream bed and bank erosion by keeping the flow of the stream in the center of the channel.

Bridge Removal: Log stringer bridges on log crib abutments with wooden plank deck overtopped with asphalt pavement would be removed as part of the decommissioning associated with the proposed action. Prior to removal of the bridge, a sheet plastic cover or similar covering would be placed underneath the bridge to prevent falling debris from entering the water and streambed. Turbidity monitoring would occur before, during, and after the project at locations above and below the project. An increase of 10 NTU’s (Nephelometric Turbidity Units) below the project area would cause work to stop and the operator would need to take remedial measures to clean the stream and prevent entry of soils into the stream. Also, in the event that chemically treated wood materials are found within the bridge structure, then those materials would be removed and disposed of in accordance with state standards.

The pavement would be removed by a loader and bucket or similar equipment and end hauled to a local disposal site outside of the Riparian Reserve. The decking would be removed to a disposal site for later burning during the rainy season. The log stringers would be cut into two pieces and yarded from the each end of the bridge. The log cribs would be removed and the accompanying fills pulled back and end hauled to a disposal location where the spoils would be spread and revegetated. The exposed stream banks would be mulched with certified weed-free ryegrass or wheat straw, seeded with a native grass seed mix, and replanted with a diversity of woody species present in the immediate vicinity.

Erosion Control with Seed and Mulch: Following soil disturbing activities, the disturbed areas would be seeded with a native seed mix or annual ryegrass and mulched with a certified weed-free annual ryegrass or wheat straw. Other materials may be used for mulching if they provide equivalent or better stabilization from erosion and protection from introducing non-native species. Attempts would be made to seed disturbed areas during conditions favorable for germination. When possible, plant materials would be saved and stockpiled from the areas of excavation and replanted on the disturbed areas. Native plants may also be transplanted to openings created in the wheel tread portion of the pavement.

In summary, active decommissioning methods include ten primary forms as summarized in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1. Road decommissioning techniques.

Decommissioning Method		Descriptor	Treatment Name and Description
Passive	Active		
X		P1	Road has not been used in the recent past, vegetation has naturally overgrown the roadbed and natural drainage patterns are functioning at a high level.
	X	A1	Active Entrance Treatment – complete disturbance (de-compaction) of the entire width of the roadway for up to 12” depth by mechanical construction equipment. (This includes commonly describe techniques such as “Pavement Ripping” where asphalt pavement exists.) This de-compaction effort is generally completed on the initial 1/8 mile (660 ft.) of road from where it abuts to an open connecting road. This method would also include the removal of minor culverts within the initial 1/8 mile if they exist. See Photo below for example of de-compaction effort.
	X	A2	Full Width Decompaction – complete disturbance (de-compaction) of the entire width of the roadway for up to 12” depth by mechanical construction equipment. (This includes commonly describe techniques such as “Pavement Ripping” where asphalt pavement exists.)
	X	A3	Partial Area Decompaction (Craters) – localized, relatively small (approx 3’ x 3’ wide) patterned de-compacted zones (known as “craters”) established by mechanical construction equipment in the roadbed.
	X	A4	Minor Drainage Improvements – generally include the construction of water-bars, swales and other water conveyance techniques to minimize localized erosion potential.
	X	A5	Minor Fill Removal/Stabilization – generally involves localized removal of unstable fills and pulling back road shoulders in hill-side construction areas where cut/fill techniques were used to balance cuts and fills. The intent in this case is not to fully restore natural (pre-road construction) contours.
	X	A6	Minor Culvert Removal – for both cross-drains and stream crossings generally involves removal of smaller diameter pipes (less than 36”) and shallow fills (less than 10 ft), stabilization of adjacent slopes, re-establishment of natural drainage patterns.
	X	A7	Major Culvert Removal – for both cross-drains and stream crossings generally involves removal of large diameter pipes (greater than 36”) and deep fills (greater than 10 ft), stabilization of adjacent slopes, re-establishment of natural drainage patterns.

	X	A8	Re-Contouring – generally involves complete elimination of the roadbed and re-establishing natural (pre-road construction) contours and slopes. This method is employed on hill-side construction areas where cut/fill techniques were used to balance cuts and fills during construction. The intent is to fully remove the entire presence of the roadbed.
	X	A9	Bridge Removal – generally includes removal of all portions of a bridge structure including decking, asphalt paving, abutments and other appurtenances.
	X	A10	Other methods – generally includes other techniques than described to meet unique field conditions.

* Note that for all decommissioning techniques, after prescribed techniques have been implemented, the road would be removed from the Forest’s database.

** Note that for all decommissioning techniques that result in disturbed soil, seeding and mulching would be applied where necessary.

Entrance management techniques are common to both passive and active decommission methods. One technique that is used in order to eliminate/minimize the temptation of drivers to drive on the closed road and provide the optimum conditions for the rapid re-establishment of vegetation, is to completely decompact the entire width of the roadway for up to 12” depth by mechanical construction equipment. This decompaction is generally completed on the initial 1/8 mile (660 ft.) of road from where it abuts to an open connecting road. An example of this technique is shown in the photo below. In addition to showing the full-width decompaction efforts, the photo also shows straw mulch placed over the previously seeded areas to minimize erosion potential and provide for rapid seed germination results. Other entrance management techniques will include placement of boulders, large logs, and or gates to ensure complete closure of the road to vehicle access.

Example of “entrance treatment” method.



Prior to advertisement of a contract for decommissioning a road, the provisions of the contract and other implementation plans would be checked with this document to insure that required elements are properly accounted for. Monitoring would be conducted in conjunction with adaptive management to insure that treatments are effective. During implementation, Contract Administrators monitor compliance with the contract that contains provisions for resource protection. Monitoring of noxious weeds and invasive plants would be conducted where appropriate to track changes in populations over time and corrective action would be prescribed where needed. Effectiveness monitoring is also conducted at the Forest level (USDA Forest Service 1990, pp. 5-6 – 5-76). Additionally, all design criteria listed Section 2.4 would be included in the implementation of Alternative 2.

All of the roads proposed for decommissioning were assessed for conversion to a *non-motorized* trail. Several factors were considered for trail conversion: if there was sufficient mileage to make the converted trail worthwhile (i.e, whether the trail would provide a meaningful recreational experience); if the converted trail could connect to an existing non-motorized trail; and if there was a request from the public to consider a specific road for trail conversion. Based on these factors, only Forest Road 6340-140 in the Happy Creek – Collawash River subwatershed is proposed to convert into a non-motorized trail (see map in Appendix A).

1.7 Adaptive Management

This project will utilize the concept of adaptive management. The treatment strategy that is currently considered appropriate for each road segment was based on initial field visits and analysis. However, after monitoring, the exact treatment details and the priority for a road may be adjusted at the time of implementation based on factors such as:

- Future weather events may cause road damage.
- Unauthorized uses by off-highway vehicles or other vehicles that were not observed during initial field visits may cause a need for more entrance work.
- A landslide or earth movement may occur.
- After implementation, monitoring may indicate that additional treatment is necessary to more effectively block vehicles or to more effectively control erosion.

Before changes are made, an interdisciplinary team would be assembled to review the change and make recommendations to the Clackamas River District Ranger. The review would consider whether the change meets the purpose and need, would consider its cost effectiveness and would determine whether the scope of the change and the anticipated effects fall generally within the range of effects and benefits described in the EA. It would consider effects and benefits to threatened, endangered, sensitive or rare species of plants and animals. If necessary, a supplemental heritage resource report would be prepared. Documentation of the change would be signed by the Clackamas River District Ranger and kept in the analysis file.

For example, if after installing the entrance management structures, the closure is breached by unauthorized vehicles, a site-specific treatment would be considered such as fortifying the barriers with large boulders to block further unauthorized vehicle access.

1.8 Decision Framework

The deciding official (i.e., Responsible Official) for this project is the District Ranger for the Clackamas River Ranger District, Mt. Hood National Forest. Based on the analysis in this document, and considering the public comments received, the Responsible Official will decide:

- Whether to decommission the roads as proposed, including all associated project design criteria;
- To select and modify an alternative; or,
- To take no action at this time.

The primary factor that will influence the District Ranger's decision is based on how well the purpose and need are addressed coupled with addressing the key issues. The Decision Notice will document and describe what activities will be implemented to address the purpose and need. The decision will be consistent with the Mt. Hood Forest Plan, as amended by the Northwest Forest Plan, and will incorporate the associated project design criteria.

1.9 Management Direction

This environmental assessment is tiered to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and Record of Decision (ROD) for the Mt. Hood National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (hereafter referred to as the Forest Plan) (USDA Forest Service 1990), as amended. The Forest Plan guides all natural resource management activities and establishes management standards and guidelines for the Forest. It describes resource management practices, levels of resource production and management, and the availability and suitability of lands for resource management. Additional management direction for the area is also provided in the following Forest Plan amendments:

- The Northwest Forest Plan (NWFP) - *Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl and Standards and Guidelines for Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl* (USDA & USDI 1994);
- Survey & Manage – *Record of Decision and Standards and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measures Standards and Guidelines* (USDA Forest Service et al. 2001); and,
- Invasive Plants– *Pacific Northwest Invasive Plant Program Preventing and Managing Invasive Plants Record of Decision* (USDA Forest Service 2005); and *Site-Specific Invasive Plant Treatments for Mt. Hood National Forest and Columbia Gorge Scenic Area in Oregon* (USDA Forest Service 2008).

Land Designations

The 1994 NWFP ROD land allocations amend those allocations described in the 1990 Forest Plan. There is considerable overlap among some allocations; therefore, more than one set of standards and guidelines may apply. Where the standards and guidelines of the 1990 Forest Plan are more restrictive or provide greater benefits to late-successional forest-related species than do

those of the 1994 NWFP ROD, the existing standards and guidelines apply. The proposed road decommissioning would occur in the following Forest Plan Management Areas: Wilderness⁵ (A2), Research Natural Area (A3), Special Interest Area (A4), Special Old Growth (A7), Key Site Riparian (A9), Wild and Scenic River Corridor⁶ (B1), Scenic Viewshed (B2), Special Emphasis Watershed (B6) (Blister Creek, Upper Collawash River, Hot Springs Fork Tributaries, and Pansy Creek), Earthflow (B8), Deer and Elk Summer Range (B11), Backcountry Lake Area (B12), Timber Emphasis (C1), Riparian Reserve, Matrix, and Late Successional Reserves. More information about the goals, objectives, and desired future conditions of the management areas within the project area can be found in the project file located at the Forest Supervisor's Office in Sandy, Oregon.

Other Relevant Laws and Direction

National Environmental Policy Act

This environmental assessment has been prepared in accordance with regulations established under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

Endangered Species Act

Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, requires federal agencies to review actions authorized, funded, or carried out by them, to ensure such actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of federally listed species, or result in the destruction or adverse modification of listed critical habitat. For this project, road decommissioning activities would comply with the standards contained within the Programmatic Biological Assessment titled *Biological assessment of activities with potential to disturb northern spotted owls – FY 2010-2013*. Informal consultation for the northern spotted owl (disturbance only) has been completed and documented in a Letter of Concurrence written by U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (August 20, 2009). Also, road decommissioning activities would be implemented consistent with the species and activity category-appropriate design criteria and conservation measures in Bureau of Land Management/Forest Service Fish Habitat Restoration Activities in Oregon and Washington CY2007-2012 Biological Assessment and associated Biological Opinions: NMFS BO (P/NWR/2006/06532 [BLM]), FWS BO (13420-2007-F-0055).

Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, as amended by the Sustainable Fisheries Act of 1996, requires federal action agencies to consult with the Secretary of Commerce (NMFS) regarding certain actions. Consultation is required for any action or proposed action authorized, funded, or undertaken by the agency that *may adversely affect* essential fish habitat (EFH) for species identified by the Federal Fishery Management Plans. For this project, three salmonid species (Chinook, coho, and Puget Sound pink salmon) identified under the Act occur in the project area (Clackamas River watershed) (see Section 3.4 Fisheries); however, this project would not adversely affect EFH.

⁵ Roads that are wilderness as designated under the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 would not be decommissioned until a "Minimum Tools Analysis" has been completed.

⁶ There are several roads within the Collawash and Clackamas River Wild and Scenic River corridors. A Section 7 Consistency Determination is included Appendix G.

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, Executive Order 11593, 36 CFR 800.9 (Protection of Historic Properties)

Section 106 requires documentation of a determination of whether each undertaking would affect historic properties. The Mt. Hood National Forest operates under a programmatic agreement between the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for consultation on project determination. Consultation with SHPO was completed for this project on June 24, 2010.

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

Section 7(a) of the 1986 Wild and Scenic Rivers Act prohibits agencies of the United States from assisting in any water resources project that "...would have a direct and adverse effect on the values for which such a river was established..." Section 7 provides authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to evaluate and make a determination on water resources projects that affect wild and scenic rivers. The authority for that determination for projects on National Forest System lands is delegated to the Forest Supervisor (Forest Service Manual 2350). Appendix G includes the Forest Supervisor's determination.

Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act of 1977 (CWA) and subsequent amendments established the basic structure of regulating discharges of pollutants into waters of the United States. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has the authority to implement pollution control programs and to set water quality standards for all contaminants in surface waters. The EPA delegated implementation of the CWA to the States; the State of Oregon recognizes the Forest Service as the Designated Management Agency for meeting CWA requirements on National Forest System lands.

1.10 Public Involvement

The project was initially listed in the summer (July) 2009 Schedule of Proposed Actions, which the Forest publishes quarterly. The Forest Service began collaborating on this project with the Clackamas Stewardship Partners over several meetings and a field trip in the summer of 2009. A scoping letter requesting public input for this project was mailed to over 200 individuals and parties in December 2009. This letter was also posted on the Forest website. Over 450 respondents submitted comments via mail, email, and phone. Copies of the scoping comments received are available in the project files at the Supervisor's Office in Sandy, Oregon.

A letter and/or email announcing a 30-day comment period on the Preliminary Assessment was mailed to everyone who expressed interest in the project during the scoping period. The Preliminary Assessment was also posted on the Forest website. A legal notice for this 30-day comment period was published in *The Oregonian* on November 16, 2010. The District hosted a public open house on December 7, 2010, in which over 25 people attended. The emails and letters received during the comment period are in the analysis file; a summary of the comments and responses to them are found in Appendix H of the EA.

1.11 Issues

Public comments were reviewed by the Interdisciplinary Team to identify public concerns and issues relative to the proposed action. The Responsible Official reviewed the public comments received during scoping to determine the key issues to be addressed in this analysis.

An **issue** is a point of debate, dispute, or disagreement regarding anticipated effects of implementing the proposed action. Some issues are: 1) outside the scope of the proposed action; 2) already decided by law, regulation, Forest Plan, or other higher level decision; 3) irrelevant to the decision to be made; or 4) conjectural and not supported by scientific or factual evidence. Other issues are directly or indirectly caused by implementing the proposed action. These issues generally suggest a problem with the proposed action such that alternative actions need to be developed to solve that problem. Identifying the key issues provides focus for the analysis. Key issues are not only used to develop alternatives to the proposed action, but are also used to develop mitigation measures and track environmental effects.

The following are a description of the key issues:

Potential effects to hunting

Decommissioning roads would eliminate access to popular hunting locations on the Forest. Specifically, decommissioning the following roads would remove access to important deer and elk hunting sites: 4640, 6311, 6320-120, 6321, 6330, 6341, 6350-160, 6370 (from its junction with the 6380), 7021, 7030, and 7040.

Potential effects to vegetation management

Decommissioning roads would eliminate access needs for managing plantations on the Forest. There is concern that removing roads from the Forest would impede vegetation management activities such as tree planting, survival exams, stand exams, precommercial thinning and restoration thinning during the course of their development.

Potential effects to the management and access to a Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) powerline

Decommissioning roads would eliminate access needs for managing BPA's John Day-Marion powerline. BPA would no longer have access to managing the transmission towers of this powerline if the following roads are decommissioned: 5732-029, 5732-143, 5732-013, 5732-012, 5731, 5731-116, 5720-024, 5720-020, 5720-018, 5720-016, 5720-183, 4650-140, 4650-135, 4650-130, 4650-115, 4650-114, 4650-118, 4650-150, 4650-025, 4650-120, 4650-011, 4650-012, 6310-031, 6310-200, 6310-203, 6310-033, 6310-190, 6310-021, 6310-182, 6310-025, 6310-180, 6310-019, 6310-160, 6310-018, 6321-119, 6321-022, 6321-014, 6322-012, 6322-011, 6322-130, 6322-120, 6320-120, 6322-120, 6320-130, 6320-016, 6320-018, 6320-160, 6320-119, 7010-114, 7010-012, 7010-013, 7010-015, 7010-120, 7015-130, 7015-120, 7010-019, 7010-020, 7010-018, 7010-152, 7010-150, 7010-024, 7015-016, 7015-017, and 7010-025.

2.0. Alternatives

2.1 Introduction

This chapter includes a description of the range of reasonable alternatives developed to respond to the need for actions described in Chapter 1. First, this chapter describes the alternatives considered but eliminated from further analysis. Next, two action alternatives and the no action are described and are presented in comparative form, so that the differences among them are clear to both the decision-maker and the public. Also described in this chapter are the design criteria that would be implemented to minimize or prevent adverse effects of road decommissioning.

2.2 Alternative Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study – Increase in Converting Roads to Non-motorized Trails

Currently, there are about 1000 miles of trails on the Forest. Wilderness trails data indicates that nearly 85% of trail use is day use. Most Portland-metro users already face at least a 90 minute drive to the western Forest boundary. Trail destinations located another 90 minutes into the Forest, make for a six hour round trip commute for most to access the trail. As a result, most day users hike less than seven miles. Trails closer to the Portland-metro area, especially those that access spectacular scenery, are most popular. Also popular are mountain bike and equestrian trails closest to the Portland-metro area. About 20% of the Forest's trails receive heavy use on weekends, but have very low use on weekdays. The other 80% of trail miles receive relatively little use even on heavy weekends. Most of these trails are longer and more remote or may not access the outstanding scenery that the higher used trails have. There are more than 52 separate trails on the Clackamas River totaling over 250 miles. There are numerous non-wilderness and mountain bike trails within the District. Most of these (e.g., Rho Ridge and Lodgepole) receive relatively low use.

Public comment suggested that this project include converting more roads to non-motorized trails and constructing new trailhead parking, connector loops, and other improvements. While the IDT had examined all roads in the analysis area for road to trail conversion when developing the Proposed Action, the IDT re-examined all roads for potentially converting more roads to trails. The IDT concluded that additional roads-to-trail conversions should not be included in the analysis because most of the trails on the District receive relatively low use *and* for the following strategic reasons⁷:

- 1) Most of the roads are short spurs that are not long enough to be managed as trails without considerable new trail construction⁸. None access unique landscape features such as waterfalls or vistas.
- 2) The longer roads also do not access prime destinations or features, nor do they meet a compelling management need (i.e., complete a gap in the Forest's trail system).
- 3) Closing a road that would extend access to a trailhead was not needed or proposed to meet watershed restoration objectives and did not improve the trail or wilderness experience for recreationists.

⁷ More discussion about converting roads to trails can be found in the project record located at the Forest Supervisor's Office in Sandy, Oregon.

⁸ New trail construction does not meet the Purpose and Need for this project.

- 4) Other trails in the area already meet the recreation need.
- 5) The decommissioned road may be used by dispersed recreationists without the long-term investment of converting it to a system trail.

Several public comments on the Preliminary Assessment recommended specific road to trail conversions. The IDT considered these roads and eliminated them from further study for the reasons offered above (the numbers in parentheses correspond to the strategic reasons for not considering road-to-trail conversions described above).

- Road 6300-170 be converted to a non-motorized pathway and not a system trail. (#2)
- Road 6380 accessing the Elk Lake Trail be closed at the Collawash Bridge and converted to a trail with access for emergency vehicles. (#3)
- Road 6340 be closed and converted to trail and the trail relocated to add another two miles of access to the Bull of the Woods Trail. (#3)
- Road 6310 should be closed and converted to a ten mile trail. (#4)
- Road 6311 should be closed and converted to a trail. (#2, #4, #5)

2.3 Alternatives Considered in Detail

Alternative 1 – No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no road decommissioning would be implemented in the project area. Approximately 440 miles of roads would remain as they currently are on the landscape. Portions of the transportation system would continue to receive little or no maintenance.

Alternative 2 – Proposed Action

Alternative 2 is the Proposed Action, as described in Chapter 1. Implementing this alternative would include removing approximately 58% of the roads from the Forest's transportation system within the analysis area (see maps in Appendix A). This alternative would include decommissioning 255 miles of roads as soon as funding is available and until plantation thinning has occurred⁹. The Proposed Action would also convert one road (Forest Road 6340-140), about one half mile in length, into a non-motorized trail. This trail would connect to an existing trail (Trail #553) in the Happy Creek subwatershed. See Chapter 1 for a more detailed description of this alternative.

Alternative 3

Alternative 3 was developed in response to the key issues discussed in Section 1.11 (maps are included in Appendix D). One of the primary focuses of the development of this alternative was an assessment of plantations and when they would be ready for thinning. In terms of vegetation management, the process used for developing the Proposed Action neglects to consider longer roads that have multiple plantations with a wide range of ages and management needs. While, the "Transportation System Planning Tool" provides a reasonable foundation for initial planning, it fails to include the complexities of specific roads. For example, if a road has twenty plantations of varying ages and growth rates, a thinning could be needed in multiple plantations

⁹ Plantation thinning includes stewardship/timber sales in the implementation and planning phases. Also, plantation thinning includes those units that would be ready to thin within approximately ten years. Appendix C includes a list of each road proposed for decommissioning and any plantation thinning access needs associated with a given road.

every five years for the next 30 years. It would be difficult to assess when that road is no longer needed or when it would be prudent to decommission it.

The following is a specific example that captures the intricacies involved with access for vegetation management. The 2007 Plantation Thinning Environmental Assessment identified several stands along road 6330, which were included in the Hot Thin stewardship contract. This project is under contract, but thinning has not yet begun. It would conduct restoration thinning on 279 acres by removing trees averaging nine inches in diameter. The Hot Thin project generated \$21,925 for restoration projects, \$92,323 for road maintenance and repairs, plus \$100,672 in potential retained receipts¹⁰ to fund other important restoration projects. Also, along 6330, 43 acres of the 2007 Plantation Thinning EA remain to be offered as a helicopter operation; however, these units have been delayed due to the high cost of helicopter fuel. Currently, the Forest is planning the Jazz Thin which includes 169 acres of restoration thinning in plantations along 6330. Along this road there are also plantations that are not ready yet, but will be ready for thinning in the second decade as well as younger plantations that will be ready in the third decade. Each of these thinning contracts would contribute toward maintaining the road and providing funds through stewardship contracting to complete restoration work.

It is the premise of Alternative 3 that there would be sufficient funding generated by repeated harvest activities on certain roads to maintain the road as a system road in perpetuity and to repair or improve the road to deal with hydrologic concerns. The Forest's *Roads Analysis* (page 40) recommended some roads would be better treated by stormproofing. This recommendation was included in the development of Alternative 3 because it would retain access for future management while dramatically reducing maintenance costs and hydrologic concerns.

With these concepts and concerns in mind, Alternative 3 was developed. It would decommission shorter roads (similar to those in the Proposed Action), but would not decommission longer roads that have multiple plantations with a wide range of ages and management needs. An analysis was conducted for the longer roads that were proposed for decommissioning with the Proposed Action. The following assumptions were used in this analysis and were based on previous experience:

- Plantations would be ready for thinning at age 35 in the western hemlock zone, at age 45 in the Pacific silver fir zone, and age 55 in the mountain hemlock zone.
- Plantations were grouped in ten year increments.
- 25% of each plantation would not be thinned.
- Late Successional Reserves would be thinned once.
- 50% of plantations outside of LSRs would be thinned a second time.
- Thinning volume would be approximately 10 MBF per acre.
- Timber value available for road maintenance, repair and other stewardship projects would be approximately \$100 per MBF (with conventional logging systems).

Alternative 3 also addresses the concerns raised by the Bonneville Power Administration. This alternative would close the roads listed in Section 1.11. The roads would be closed for public

¹⁰ This retained receipt dollar amount reflects today's market value; however, it could change with market adjustments.

access, but would remain on the Forest's transportation system for administrative use. In order to deter access to these roads, an entrance barrier device (e.g., gate) may be installed. These roads would be maintained by BPA in accordance with a maintenance agreement between BPA and the Forest Service.

In regards to hunting access, Alternative 3 proposes to keep all of the roads discussed in Section 1.11 as part of the Forest's transportation system. These roads include: 4640, 6311, 6320-120, 6321, 6330, 6341, 6350-160, 6370, 7021, 7030, and 7040. However, a portion of the 7021 would also be decommissioned. The segment from Whetstone Creek to the end that is now in newly designated wilderness would be decommissioned under this alternative (see Appendix D – Maps of Alternative 3).

Implementing this alternative would include removing approximately 30% of the roads from the Forest's transportation system. This alternative would decommission about 129 miles of road. Also, this alternative would close about 17 miles of road. These roads not needed for plantation thinning would be maintained by BPA, and potentially gated. In the Happy Creek subwatershed, the trailhead for Trail #553 would be relocated off of the 6340-160 or 150 road, which would require approximately ½ mile of new trail construction to reconnect with the existing trail¹¹.

Active decommissioning methods would include ripping pavement, constructing crossdrains, removing fill at stream crossings, constructing boulder weirs in perennial channels, removing bridges and culverts, seeding or mulching disturbed areas, and planting at stream crossings (for more information on each of these methods see the Proposed Action above).

All design criteria listed Section 2.4 would be included in the implementation of Alternative 3.

Alternative 4

Similar to Alternative 3, Alternative 4 was developed based on the key issues outline in Section 1.11 (maps are included in Appendix E). This alternative was also based on similar assumptions outlined in Alternative 3. However, there was a greater emphasis in decommissioning roads with higher aquatic and landslide risks as well as roads within the Late Successional Reserves.

Alternative 4 also addresses the concerns raised by the Bonneville Power Administration. This alternative would close the roads listed in Section 1.11. The roads would be closed for public access, but would remain on the Forest's transportation system for administrative use. In order to deter access to these roads, an entrance barrier device (e.g., gate) may be installed. These roads would be maintained by BPA in accordance with a maintenance agreement between BPA and the Forest Service.

Three of the roads proposed to be closed to public access (Forest Roads 4651, 6310-130, and 6321-120) would be treated in such a way that they are stabilized to resist forces causing movement/erosion that could impede hydrologic function. This treatment is often referred to as “storm damage risk reduction.”

¹¹ New trail construction is not analyzed in this EA. A NEPA analysis for the new trail would be completed prior to implementation.

In regards to hunting access, Alternative 4 would keep segments of the roads discussed in Section 1.11 as part of the Forest's transportation system. This alternative would close the roads listed in Section 1.11 that are not needed for plantation thinning. These roads include: 4640, 6311, 6320-120, 6321, 6330, 6341, 6350-160, 6370, 7021, 7030, and 7040. However, several segments of these roads would also be decommissioned (see Appendix E – Maps of Alternative 4).

Implementing this alternative would include removing approximately 39% of the roads from the Forest's transportation system. This alternative would decommission about 170 miles of road. Also, this alternative would close about 17 miles of road. These roads not needed for plantation thinning would be maintained by BPA, and potentially gated. In the Happy Creek subwatershed, the trailhead for Trail #553 would be relocated off of the 6340-160 or 150 road, which would require approximately ½ mile of new trail construction to reconnect with the existing trail¹².

Active decommissioning methods would include ripping pavement, constructing crossdrains, removing fill at stream crossings, constructing boulder weirs in perennial channels, removing bridges and culverts, seeding or mulching disturbed areas, and planting at stream crossings (for more information on each of these methods see the Proposed Action above).

All design criteria listed in the section below would be included in the implementation of Alternative 4.

2.4 Project Design Criteria

The following design criteria and standard management practices and requirements for the protection of resources are an integral part of the action alternatives, and are considered in the effects analysis in Chapter 3.

Botany Design Criteria

B-1: In order to prevent the spread of invasive plants, all equipment would be cleaned of dirt and weeds before entering National Forest System lands. This practice would not apply to service vehicles traveling frequently in and out of the project area that would remain on the roadway.

B-2: Existing roadways would be used to minimize the impacts to riparian vegetation and function. Native vegetation in and around project activity would be retained where feasible.

B-3: Soil disturbance that promotes invasive plant germination and establishment would be minimized to the extent practical (consistent with project objectives).

Fisheries Design Criteria

F-1: An experienced fisheries biologist, hydrologist, and/or technician would participate in the design and implementation of the project.

¹² New trail construction is not analyzed in this EA. A NEPA analysis for the new trail would be completed prior to implementation.

F-2: Slide and waste material would be disposed of in stable, non-floodplain sites. However, disposal of slide and waste material within existing road prism or adjacent hillslopes would be acceptable if restoring natural or near-natural contours. For road removal projects within riparian areas, recontour the affected area to mimic natural floodplain contours and gradient to the greatest degree possible. If natural contours are greater than 2 to 1 ratio, then slopes will be shaped to a 2 to 1 ratio or less.

F-3: Disturbance of existing vegetation in ditches and at stream crossings would be minimized to the extent necessary to restore the hydrologic function of the subject road.

F-4: Soil disturbance and displacement caused by project activities would be minimized, but where sediment risks warrant, soil movement off-site into water bodies would be prevented through the use of filter materials (such as certified weed-free straw bales or silt fencing) if vegetation strips were not available.

F-5: Project activities would be implemented during dry-field conditions (also see WQ-1).

F-6: The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) Guidelines for Timing of In-Water Work would be followed. Exceptions to ODFW guidelines for timing of in-water work would be requested and granted from appropriate regulatory agencies.

F-7: Power equipment would be refueled at least 150 feet from water bodies to prevent direct delivery of contaminants into a water body. If local site conditions do not allow for a 150-foot setback, then refueling would be as far away as possible from the water body. For all immobile equipment, absorbent pads would be used (also see WQ-13).

F-8: An approved Spill Prevention Control and Containment Plan (SPCCP) would be created, which describes measures to prevent or reduce impacts from potential spills. The SPCCP would include a description of the hazardous materials that would be used; and a spill containment kit would be located on-site. Refer to WQ-16 for specific criteria when an SPCCP would be required.

F-9: Hazard trees within riparian areas needing to be felled for safety purposes would be directionally felled, if possible, towards the stream.

F-10: For culvert removal, natural drainage patterns would be restored and promote passage of all fish species and life stages present in the area. Channel incision risk would be evaluated and in-channel grade control structures would be constructed when necessary.

F-11: Drainage features should be spaced to hydrologically disconnect road surface runoff from stream channels (also see WQ-11).

F-12: When removing a culvert from a first or second order, non-fishing bearing stream, project specialists should determine if culvert removal should follow the conservation measures under activity #5 in the programmatic biological and conference (Opinion) by the National Marine Fisheries Service (April 28, 2007) and by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (June 14, 2007).

Culvert removal on fish bearing streams should adhere to the conservation measures activity #5 in the programmatic biological and conference (Opinion) by the National Marine Fisheries Service (April 28, 2007) and by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (June 14, 2007).

F-14: If other aquatic restoration activities are used as complementary actions, follow the associated design criteria and conservation measures.

Heritage Design Criteria

H-1: In the event that archaeological properties are located during implementation, all work in the vicinity of the find would cease and a District or Forest archaeologist would be contacted. Any other protection measures would be developed in consultation with the Oregon State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), appropriate Tribes, and, if necessary, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

H-2: No heavy equipment or ground disturbing activities would be allowed on Forest Roads 4600-043 and 6310-022 until site testing has been completed.

H-3: For Forest Roads 4620-340 and 4620-360, a District or Forest archaeologist would monitor the site during implementation of road decommissioning activities, or the roads should only include entrance management.

H-4: Only entrance management would occur on Forest Roads 4650-111 and 6380-125.

H-5: No heavy equipment or ground disturbing activities would be permitted beyond the lower bench area of Forest Road 6300-120.

H-6: No heavy equipment or ground disturbing activities would be permitted on the first ¼ miles of Forest Road 7020-170. Only entrance management would be permitted on this road. Also, a District or Forest archaeologist would monitor the site during implementation of road decommissioning activities.

Recreation Design Criteria

R-1: Trailhead access and parking would be maintained or closure would be minimized during implementation. If the Dickey Creek Trailhead becomes inaccessible by decommissioning activities, then the trailhead or trail would be relocated prior to initiating any decommissioning activities. NEPA analysis for any new trail construction would be completed prior to implementing road decommissioning activities.

R-2: Roads converted to trails should meet Forest Service standards for trail construction as contained in the Forest Service Manual and Handbook. A qualified trails engineer should perform trail layout and design. Drainage structures, fill and cut slopes, and future brushing needs should be within trail budgets to maintain. All trails created from decommissioned roads should meet the Forestwide Standards and Guidelines on page Four-115 and 116 for visual quality within five to ten years of conversion activities. Any relocated trails not on road beds should meet standards within one year of construction.

R-3: Roads that are decommissioned and are breached or become ineffective over time should be re-closed with more effective design measures.

Water Quality Design Criteria

WQ-1: Road decommissioning activities would be suspended if there is more than one inch of rain in a 24 hour period or more than two inches of rain for the entire storm event as defined as precipitation in the last 48 hours at the Red Box RAWs Station (<http://www.wrh.noaa.gov/mesowest/getobext.php?sid=RXFO3&table=1&banner=off>). If this site is not functioning, then use the information at the Peavine Ridge SNOTEL site (<http://www.wrh.noaa.gov/mesowest/getobext.php?wfo=&sid=PVRO3&num=168&raw=0&dbn=m&banner=off>), or as determined by the Contracting Officer (through the Contracting Officer Representative).

WQ-2: Activities shall be suspended if stream flows rise above baseflow levels (i.e.; 200 cfs in the Bull Run River, upstream of the reservoirs or equivalent site in the Clackamas River Basin). Activities for the season shall be suspended if soil moisture is recharged and stream flows rise above baseflow levels (i.e.; 200 cfs in the Bull Run River, upstream of the reservoirs or equivalent site in the Clackamas River Basin).

WQ-3: Stream channels will be excavated to pre-road channel as determined by substrate material or longitudinal profile of stream channel. Removal of the fill at stream crossings would attempt to restore the stream channel and banks to original pre-road (natural) contours as much as possible (also see F-2).

WQ-4: The removed material would be carefully placed at cutslopes or on the road surface beyond the natural channel slope at a less than 2 to 1 slope angle.

WQ-5: Stream adjacent slopes shall be excavated back to “natural” terrain features, or at no greater than 2H:1V from base of 1.3 times the bank-full channel width (measured at the upstream side of crossing), departure from 2H:1V slope conditions will be allowed if recommended by qualified hydrologist, soils scientist, geologist or fish biologist based on field conditions.

WQ-6: 50-75% of the road surface where decompaction is prescribed would be de-compacted through the sub-grade and native vegetation could be placed on road surface no more than one layer deep. The road surface will be decompacted to a minimum depth of 18 inches if native soil material is greater than 18 inches deep the road surface will be decompacted to that depth.

WQ-7: All perennial streams would be evaluated to determine if “Upstream U’s” are necessary to prevent streambed and bank erosion. The ends of structures would be keyed into the stream bank for at least ¼ of the diameter of the boulder to minimize the stream cutting into the stream bank at high flows. Structures would be installed as outlined in the following table:

Table 2.1. Pool to pool spacing.

Wetted Stream Width (feet)	Minimum Boulder Size Needed (inches)	Stream Gradient (percent)			
		0-2%	2-6%	6-15%	15-30%
0 to 5	18	42 feet	15 feet	8 feet	4 feet
5 to 10	24	63 feet	21 feet	12 feet	6 feet
10 to 15	24	105 feet	36 feet	20 feet	10 feet
15 to 25	30	167 feet	57 feet	32 feet	16 feet

WQ-8: Activities associated with culvert or bridge removal in streams with active streamflow would be suspended if there is an increase of 10 NTU's (Nephelometric Turbidity Units) below the project area. Also, activities could be suspended if turbidity criteria are exceeded as determined by appropriate Forest Service personnel.

WQ-9: Removal-Fill Permits would be obtained for project activities when appropriate.

WQ-10: A site-specific water quality control plan would be submitted and approved for each stream diversion prior to the start of excavation. Live streams would be diverted during excavation to prevent mobilization of fill material.

WQ-11: Where roads are actively decommissioned drainage structures would be installed at a maximum of every 200' or closer dependent upon road grade and associated geology, unless determined unneeded by appropriate Forest Service personnel.

WQ-12: All vehicles and machinery would be free of petroleum leaks. Any leaks that occur would be immediately repaired and the appropriate personnel would be notified.

WQ-13: Absorbent pads would be required under all stationary equipment and fuel storage containers during all servicing and refueling operations (also see F-6).

WQ-14: All trucks used for refueling should carry a hazardous material recovery kit (also see F-7). Any contaminated soil, vegetation or debris must be removed from National Forest System lands and disposed of in accordance with state laws.

WQ-15: All petroleum products being transported or stored would be in approved containers meeting Occupational Safety and Health Administration standards and Oregon Department of Transportation.

WQ-16: All vehicles hauling more than 300 gallons of fuel would have an approved communication system with which to report accidental spills. If any fuel or fluid storage container exceeds a capacity of 660 gallons, the contractor would prepare a spill prevention control countermeasures plan. Such plan would meet applicable Environmental Protection Agency requirements (40 CFR 112) including certification by a registered professional engineer.

WQ-17: The contractor would be liable for cleanup of any hazardous material or fuel spill occurring as a result of his/her work on this contract.

WQ-18: The contractor would, on a daily basis, remove all trash and refuse from the project work area.

WQ-19: In order to preclude erosion into or contamination of the stream or floodplain, staging areas (used for construction equipment storage, vehicle storage, fueling, servicing, hazardous material storage, etc.) would be located beyond the 100-year floodplain (also see F-7).

WQ-20: Following earthwork, especially near stream banks, the disturbed area would be seeded with a native seed mix if available and mulched with a certified weed-free straw, at approximately 2000 pounds per acres or so that there is completed coverage of the disturbed and the mulch is 4 inches deep. Attempts would be made to seed disturbed areas during conditions favorable for germination. Other materials may be used for mulching if they provide equivalent or better stabilization from erosion and protection from introducing non-native species.

Wildlife Design Criteria

W-1: Hazard trees outside of the riparian areas that pose a safety risk would be directionally felled, where feasible, away from the road prism and into the surrounding forestland.

W-2: No snow plowing, road decommissioning, use of motorized equipment or blasting would be permitted in severe winter range as determined by the Forest Service, or within any B10 land allocation (i.e., Deer and Elk Winter Range areas) between December 1 to March 31. No road decommissioning, use of motorized equipment or blasting would be permitted within key summer range areas as determined by the Forest Service, or within in any B11 land allocation (i.e., Deer and Elk Summer Range areas) from April 1 – July 31.

W-3: No activity shall take place within the disruption distance of a known or predicted activity center during the March 1 to July 15 critical nesting period, unless the habitat is known to be unoccupied or there is not nesting activity, as determined by survey to protocol. The distance and timing may be modified by a Forest Service wildlife biologist according to site-specific information. In the event that any new Northern Spotted owl activity center(s) is/are located, then seasonal operating restrictions would be implemented for the road affected.

W-4: Woody debris, which must be removed to access the area, would be saved and scattered on the disturbed areas. During placement they would be laid parallel to the slope to serve as contour barriers to surface soil movement. The material would serve as a source of large woody debris to help reestablish vegetation, and the scattering of material would act as a means to reduce fuel hazards.

2.5 Comparison of Alternatives

The following table displays the four alternatives by mileage proposed for decommissioning, conversion to trail, and closure. Appendix F includes a list of road numbers by alternative.

Table 2.2. Comparison of alternatives.

Proposed Treatment	Alternative 1 – No Action	Alternative 2 – Proposed Action	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Decommission	0 miles	254.6 miles	129.0 miles	169.5 miles
Convert road to trail	0 miles	0.55 miles	0 miles	0 miles
Close	0 miles	0 miles	16.8 miles	16.8 miles
Total miles of removed from transportation system	0 miles	255.2 miles	129.0 miles	169.5 miles
Total miles remaining on the transportation system	439.9 miles	184.8 miles	310.9 miles	270.4 miles

3.0. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

3.1 Introduction

This chapter includes a summary of the physical, biological, social, and economic environments of the affected project area (the baseline or existing condition) and the expected effects or changes to those environments, if any of the alternatives were to be implemented. This chapter provides the scientific and analytical basis for the comparison of alternatives, presented on the previous page. Specialist Reports (available in the project files) are incorporated by reference, and all specialists have contributed directly to the preparation of this final document.

The chapter is arranged by resource, with the affected environment discussion presented first, followed by the estimated project effects (direct and indirect), and then estimated cumulative effects. Cumulative effects are those effects on the environment resulting from the incremental effect of the proposed road decommissioning activities when added to the effects of other past projects (that still have residual or on-going effects); the estimated effects of other current projects; and the effects of reasonably foreseeable future activities (federal or non-federal) (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508). The analysis was guided by the June 24, 2005 memo Guidance on the Consideration of Past Actions in Cumulative Effects Analysis, Executive Office of the President, Council on Environmental Quality.

3.2 Geology

Existing Condition

The area covered by this project contains some of the most geologically unstable terrain on the Mt. Hood National Forest. This unstable terrain is largely a result of the type of rock units present, the age of the rock units, and the weathering history of the rock units. Most of the rock units in this area are of volcanic origin and can be divided into two groups: lava rock and pyroclastic rock. The lava rock is typically andesite that is resistant to weathering and forms steep hillslopes. The original minerals present in the pyroclastic rock have typically been altered into clay minerals, resulting in a very weak material that is unable to support even moderately steep hillslopes. Extensive glaciation in the distant past oversteepened the valley walls. Once the glaciers melted and removed lateral support from the valley walls, large portions of those valley walls collapsed as giant landslides composed mostly of the highly altered, clay-rich, pyroclastic material.

The ancient landslide deposits developed during a much wetter climate than our present climate. The wetter climate occurred thousands of years ago. During that time unstable hillslopes collapsed and formed earthflows and large debris slides that became large coalescing deposits of landslide material. These landslide deposits can be several square miles in area and may be several hundred feet deep. Slope angles are usually gentle. These landslide deposits are more stable now than they were in the past but there are still portions of them that are adjusting to their “new” slope position. These adjustments are typically expressed as small landslides (slumps or debris slides) that occur at locally steep areas of the ancient landslide deposits, for example, along creek banks. These adjustments usually occur during or immediately after major storm events, when the ground water table is high. Most of the ancient landslide deposits are dormant and would require a major change in their hydrology or slope geometry to become active again. These dormant landslide deposits have been mapped as landform type ALD.

Other ancient landslide deposits have been recognized as being recently active. Evidence for recent movement includes fresh scarps, cracks, very tilted trees, and similar clues. These recently active landslide deposits have been mapped as landform type ALA. Landform type ALA can have a variety of types of landslides, but they are usually earthflows, debris slides, or slumps.

The large, ancient, mostly-dormant, landslide deposits in this area have been classified as high risk earthflows, moderate risk earthflows, and low risk earthflows. The high-moderate-low adjectives describe the relative susceptibility of the terrain to reactivation of ground movement from any cause.

Landslides can also occur on landform types other than ancient landslide deposits. Usually these are debris slides and debris flows that originate on steep slopes. Debris slides typically occur on slopes that are greater than 60%. Debris flows typically originate in channels that have a gradient that is steeper than about 35%. In this area many of the larger creeks originate on the upper valley walls where the creek gradients are steep, and the channels are incised enough that debris flows are common. These creeks are referred to here as debris-flow-prone creeks.

Poorly located, poorly constructed, or poorly maintained roads can result in slope stability problems and can result in resource damage. Well located, well constructed, and well maintained roads will have a minimal effect on slope stability.

Most of this area was heavily roaded beginning in the late 1950's and continuing through the 1980's. Road construction practices gradually improved though the decades but there remain many roads that were poorly located and/or poorly constructed in the past. Without proper maintenance these roads can be a threat to water quality and fish habitat.

Debris flows are a natural process in this area and have the beneficial effect of delivering boulders and large woody debris to lower elevation stream segments which enhances fish habitat. Debris flows can have detrimental effects also, such as delivering excess fine sediments to fish habitat, or blocking road crossings and diverting drainages. Poorly designed or poorly located road/creek crossings can impede this natural process and have an adverse effect on fish habitat. When debris flows reach a road, they can pass through the crossing unimpeded, they can be stopped completely, or they can block the culvert, divert the water flow, and cause extensive erosion of the road fill. In a worst case scenario, a debris flow can be temporarily stopped at the crossing and allow more water and sediment to accumulate behind the crossing, until the entire crossing structure fails catastrophically. The debris flow then continues down channel, much larger and more destructive than it would have been without the interference from the road crossing.

The Forest's *Roads Analysis* (2003) collected data regarding the roads in this area. As part of that effort, road/creek crossings were categorized as high risk crossings, moderate risk crossings, and low risk crossings. A fourth category, crossings that are below (downstream) from high risk crossings was also used. The "risk" at these crossings pertains to the likelihood of the road crossing interfering with the natural passage of sediment and large woody debris to creeks and fish habitat. High risk crossings are those that are subject to frequent debris flows from debris-

flow-prone creeks and are likely to interfere with that process. Moderate risk crossings experience fewer debris flows, and low risk crossings fewer still. Crossings that are located downstream from a high risk crossing have the additional potential to be destroyed if the higher crossing fails.

Direct and Indirect Effects

Properly decommissioned roads reduce the potential for road-related landslides and the resulting adverse effects on water quality and fish habitat. In general, the more miles of road that are properly decommissioned, the greater the beneficial effects to water quality and fish habitat. Roads that are properly decommissioned require no maintenance and therefore allow the limited forest road maintenance funds to be applied more effectively to a smaller road system. Better maintained roads have less environmental impact than poorly maintained roads.

Alternative 1 – No Action

The No Action Alternative keeps the 440 miles of road that currently exist on the transportation system in the analysis area. Road maintenance would continue to be inadequate to meet the needs for this many miles of road. Poorly maintained roads would continue to develop stability problems and continue to deliver unwanted sediment to creeks. Road repair costs would increase since more untreated problem sites would likely develop into larger and more expensive problems.

Alternative 2 – Proposed Action

This alternative removes the most miles of road of any of the four alternatives. By decommissioning the most miles of road, this alternative would result in the largest reduction in road-related stability issues and result in the most improved road maintenance for the remaining miles, thereby reducing the resource impact of those roads.

Alternative 3

Fewer road miles of road decommissioning would reduce the number and extent of road-related stability issues and reduce the overall impact of the road system on other resources, although not as much as compared to Alternatives 2 or 4. Also, road maintenance would improve over current conditions for the remaining roads, although not as much as compared to Alternatives 2 or 4. The improved maintenance would allow existing and developing road-related stability problems to be better addressed than they are at present, although not as much as compared to Alternatives 2 or 4.

For closed roads, existing drainage structures would be left in place. Sections of these roads with stability or drainage problems would be repaired. Gates could allow regular inspection of the closed roads by resource specialists. Timely recognition of developing problems and rapid response of road maintenance equipment is important during storm events or other landslide inducing conditions in order to minimize damage to roads and other resources. Gates would allow regular inspection and emergency access, if necessary.

Alternative 4

Fewer road miles would reduce the number and extent of road-related stability issues and reduce the overall impact of the road system on other resources, more than Alternative 3, but not as much as Alternative 2. Road maintenance would improve over current conditions for the remaining roads, more than Alternative 3, but not as much as Alternative 2. The improved maintenance would allow existing and developing road-related stability problems to be better addressed than they are at present, more than Alternative 3, but not as much as Alternative 2.

For closed roads, existing drainage structures would be left in place. Sections of these roads with stability or drainage problems would be repaired. Gates could allow regular inspection of the closed roads by resource specialists. Timely recognition of developing problems and rapid response of road maintenance equipment is important during storm events or other landslide inducing conditions in order to minimize damage to roads and other resources. Gates would allow regular inspection and emergency access, if necessary.

Comparison of Alternatives

With the data generated by the Forest's *Roads Analysis* (2003), it is possible to more closely compare the relative effects of the four alternatives on road-related slope stability. For this analysis, six factors were selected that are related to the incidence of road-related stability problems:

1. Road segments located on active landslides.
2. Road segments located on high risk earthflows.
3. Road segments located on moderate risk earthflows.
4. Road crossings of high risk crossings.
5. Road crossings of crossings below high risk crossings.
6. Road crossings of moderate risk crossings.

In Table 3.1 the alternatives are compared using the units (miles or number) for each factor. The table displays the data for the roads that are to be ultimately decommissioned under each alternative. (Note: In the next three tables, the following abbreviations are used: "Decom" = decommissioned road, "Blw" = below, "Wght" = weight.)

Table 3.1. Comparison of alternatives using landslide-related risk factors.

Factor	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4
Decom on Active Landslides (miles)	0.0	4.5	1.4	3.3
Decom on High Risk Earthflow (miles)	0.0	17.5	5.7	13.2
Decom on Moderate Risk Earthflow (miles)	0.0	26.1	7.8	14.8
Decom at High Risk Creek Crossings (number)	0	204	51	115
Decom at Below High Risk Creek Crossings (number)	0	5	3	3
Decom at Moderate Risk Creek Crossings (number)	0	148	47	78

A slope stability specialist assigned a relative weight to each of the factors, reflecting the relative importance of each factor. Table 3.2 displays the weighted "scores" based on the landslide-related risk factors and totals the scores for each of the four alternatives. Since the data is for the roads to be decommissioned, the higher the score, the greater the benefit to the watershed.

Table 3.2. Comparison of alternatives using weighted scores based on landslide-related risk factors.

Factor	Weight	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4
Decom on Active Landslides	10	0	45	14	33
Decom on High Risk Earthflow	3	0	53	17	40
Decom on Moderate Risk Earthflow	2	0	52	15	30
Decom at High Risk Creek Crossings	5	0	1020	255	575
Decom at Below High Risk Creek Crossings	4	0	20	12	12
Decom at Moderate Risk Creek Crossings	3	0	444	141	234
Total Weighted Score by Alternative =		0	1634	454	924

Not surprisingly, the alternatives that decommission the most miles of road score the best in this analysis. The scores suggest that Alternative 2 has the greatest reduction of adverse effects of road-related landslides, followed by Alternative 4 (which is about 57% as effective), and then Alternative 3 (which is about 28% as effective).

Table 3.3 compares the alternatives after normalizing the scores to a “per mile of decommissioned road” basis. This removes the “advantage” afforded the alternative that decommissions the most miles.

Table 3.3. Comparison of alternatives using normalized weighted scores based on landslide-related risk factors.

Factor	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4
Total road miles decommissioned	0	255	146	188
Total Landslide-Related Risk Factor Score	0	1634	454	924
Landslide-Related Risk Factor Score/road mile decom	0	6.4	3.1	4.9

Even the normalized scores suggest that, for reduction of adverse effects of road-related landslides, Alternative 2 has the greatest reduction of adverse effects of road-related landslides. In this analysis, Alternative 4 is about 77% as effective, and Alternative 3 is about 48% as effective. The normalized scores suggest that, on average, Alternative 2 better targets roads for decommissioning that present a greater threat to water quality and fish habitat, followed by Alternative 4, and then Alternative 3.

Cumulative Effects

Other projects in the analysis area include thinning of second growth trees, and road repair projects. The thinning projects would result in a temporary reduction in the tree canopy, which would slightly increase peak stream flows in the project area. Stream channels would be protected with buffers that would mitigate against increases in channel bank instability. The longer-term effect would be an increase in slope stability and water quality. The road repair projects would have a beneficial effect on slope stability and water quality. This project would remove a large number of creek crossings and some road segments on potentially unstable ground and allow more road maintenance to occur on the roads that remain. These projects combined would have a net beneficial effect on slope stability and water quality regardless of the impacts of other nearby past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions.

3.3 Hydrology

In this section, the effects to water resources are addressed by three key elements:

- 1) Flow regime;
- 2) Soils and geology; and,
- 3) Sediment yield.

Affected Environment – General

The road network analyzed is on National Forest System lands within the Mt. Hood National Forest in eight emphasis subwatersheds on the Clackamas River Ranger District, which are listed in the table below. Figures 1.1 and 1.2 in Chapter 1 show the location of the subwatersheds.

Table 3.4. Emphasis subwatersheds.

Subwatershed	Total Acres
East Fork Collawash River	10,395
Elk Lake Creek	17,181
Farm Creek-Collawash River	16,326
Happy Creek-Collawash River	14,533
Lower Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	18,272
Nohorn Creek	10,568
Pot Creek-Clackamas River	22,961
Upper Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	10,218
TOTAL	120,455

Streamflow Regime (Peak Streamflows and Flood Events)

Peak streamflows have important effects on stream channel morphology, sediment transport, and bed material size. Peak streamflows can affect channel morphology through bank erosion, channel migration, riparian vegetation alteration, bank building, and deposition of material on floodplains. The vast majority of sediment transport occurs during peakflows as sediment transport capacity increases logarithmically with discharge (MacDonald 1991).

Aquatic organisms require adequate flows be maintained at critical times to satisfy requirements of various life stages. For example, fish are adapted to natural variations in flow regimes but may be adversely affected by disturbances that alter natural flow cycles. Timing, magnitude, duration, and spatial distribution of peak and low flows must be sufficient to create and sustain riparian and aquatic system habitat and to retain patterns of sediment, nutrient, and wood routing. The timing, variability, and duration of floodplain inundation and water table elevation in meadows, floodplains and wetlands affect maintenance of main channel connectivity within these areas (FEMAT V-19).

The ability of the stream to transport incoming sediment will determine whether deposition or erosion occurs within the active stream channel. The relationship between sediment load and sediment transport capacity will affect the distribution of habitat types, channel morphology, and bed material size (MacDonald 1991). Increased size of peakflows due to urbanization have been shown to cause rapid channel incision and a severe decline in fish habitat quality (MacDonald 1991).

Another important consideration is the impact of bankfull flow, often described as the high flow during two out of three years, or as a stream discharge having a recurrence interval of 1.5 years (Dunne and Leopold 1978). The shape of the channel more closely reflects the bankfull width and height than it does the less frequent floods. If the bankfull flow is raised above the range of natural conditions, excess scouring can occur. If lower, the stream may not have the power to move its natural sediment load, causing sediment deposition within the watershed.

The Aquatic Conservation Strategy (ACS) from the Northwest Forest Plan (USDA 1994) gives clear direction that “the distribution of land use activities, such as timber harvest or roads, must minimize increases in peak streamflows” (ROD B-9) to create and sustain riparian, aquatic, and wetland habitats, and to retain patterns of sediment, nutrient, and wood routing.

Peak streamflows of large magnitude in the analysis area are generated by rain-on-snow events. The transient rain-on-snow zone is normally considered to be from 2400 to 4800 feet. Record floods occur predominantly during November through January, caused by accumulated snow at lower elevations followed by a rapid rise in temperature, unusually high-elevation freezing levels, and heavy rainfall. In some instances, the ground is frozen prior to snow accumulation, producing more favorable conditions for high runoff (SCS 1976).

There is a class of changes in hydrologic processes that consists of those that control infiltration and the flow of surface and subsurface water. This class is dominated by the effects of forest roads. The relatively impermeable surfaces of roads cause surface runoff that bypasses longer, slower subsurface flow routes. Where roads are insloped to a ditch, the ditch extends the drainage network, collects surface water from the road surface and subsurface water intercepted by roadcuts, and transports this water quickly to streams. The longevity of changes in hydrologic processes resulting from forest roads is as permanent as the road. Until a road is removed and natural drainage patterns are restored, the road will likely continue to affect the routing of water through watersheds (FEMAT V-20).

The Watershed Analysis for the Collawash/Hot Springs area (USDA 1995) concluded:

The potential channel network expansion attributable to roads was calculated ... Channel networks appear to have expanded 8 percent overall, with values ranging from 1.3 percent to 22.9 percent for various subwatersheds. Road densities for the Collawash River watershed and several subwatersheds (excluding Wilderness areas) are among the highest for the Mt. Hood National Forest. Roads may also encroach on stream channels, riparian areas, and floodplains, confining and straightening channels, generally accelerating velocities and increasing the magnitude and frequency of peakflows. As an example, Collawash peakflows associated with the February 1995 rain-on-snow event, having an estimated return interval of 5 to 10 years, came within one foot of flooding the main access road, Road 63, where the road encroaches on the river.

The combination of channel network expansion due to road ditches, and created openings attributable to road surfaces and harvest areas is likely to have increased peakflows, though quantification of such changes is not possible with existing information.

Sediment Yield

Road networks are the most important sources of accelerated delivery of sediment to fish-bearing streams. Road-related landslides, surface erosion, and stream channel diversions often deliver

large quantities of sediment to streams, both catastrophically during large storms and chronically during smaller runoff events. Older roads in poor locations and with inadequate drainage systems pose high risks of future sediment production. Road surfaces and ditches can also serve as extensions of the stream network, thereby increasing flood peaks and efficiently delivering road-derived sediments to streams (FEMAT II-40).

Accelerated rates of erosion and sediment yield are a consequence of most forest management activities. Road networks in many upland areas of the Pacific Northwest are the most important source of management-accelerated delivery of sediment to anadromous fish habitats. The sediment contribution to streams from roads is often much greater than that from all other land management activities combined, including log skidding and yarding. Road related landsliding, surface erosion and stream channel diversions frequently deliver large quantities of sediment to streams, both chronically and catastrophically during large storms. Roads may have unavoidable effects on streams, no matter how well they are located, designed or maintained. Many older roads with poor locations and inadequate drainage control and maintenance pose high risks of erosion and sedimentation of stream habitats (FEMAT V-16).

Increased levels of sedimentation often have adverse effects on fish habitats and riparian ecosystems. Fine sediment deposited in spawning gravels can reduce survival of eggs and developing alevins. Primary production, benthic invertebrate abundance, and thus, food availability for fish may be reduced as sediment levels increase. Social and feeding behavior can be disrupted by increased levels of suspended sediment. Pools, an important habitat type, may be lost due to increased levels of sediment (FEMAT V-19).

The Watershed Analysis for the Collawash/Hot Springs area (USDA 1995) notes:

Existing management related sediment production and delivery in the watershed comes primarily from the road system. The dominant processes contributing to sediment production from roads are cut bank and fill slope related erosion, and erosion related to concentrated flows. Currently, there is a greater amount of sediment production and delivery sites than what existed under the reference sediment regime. Many upland forested sites that were not sediment sources in the past are now sites of chronic production; most can directly be attributed to roads. Pathways for sediment transport have been expanded by road related drainage (see hydrology section for related road effects analysis).

Dry ravel, raindrop splash, and sheetwash, widespread sediment producing mechanisms not historically significant in the watershed now occur more frequently. The quantifiable difference between the existing range of sediment production and delivery as compared to the reference range is unknown. Considering increases in: 1) sediment production sources, 2) sediment delivery sites, and 3) the timing of annual production; it is believed that qualitatively the range of existing sediment production and delivery is greater than the background range.

Affected Environment – Flow Regime

The relatively impermeable surfaces of roads cause surface runoff of rain and snowmelt water to bypasses longer, slower subsurface flow routes in soils. Where roads are in-sloped to a ditch, as most of the roads in this project are, the ditch extends the drainage network, collects surface water from the road surface and subsurface water intercepted by road cuts and transports this

water quickly to streams. This process increases flow routing efficiency and may result in increased magnitude of peak stream flows.

For this analysis peak flows are related to the increase in the channel lengths caused by road ditches connected to streams. Based on recent research on two basins in the Western Cascades of Oregon 57% of the road length is connected to the stream network by surface flowpaths including roadside ditches and gullies below road drainage culverts (Wemple 1996). It is assumed that all road ditches and culverts are properly maintained. Where roads are decommissioned, the length of expanded drainage network from roads decreases. In one recent study in the Olympic National Forest, road-stream connectivity was reduced by 70% associated with road decommissioning (Legacy Roads and Trails Monitoring Project, Road Decommissioning in the Skokomish River Watershed, Olympic National Forest). Decommissioned roads eliminate the road ditch to the first relief culvert upslope at drainage crossings, and intercepted subsurface flows from road cuts are dispersed and allowed to infiltrate. When the ditch relief culverts are removed and an earth bottomed cross drain remains with graded sideslopes, intercepted subsurface water from cut slopes and collected by ditches may infiltrate to reduce the diverted flows.

The increase in channel length due to the ditch length as just described is expressed as a percent of the stream drainage network. The Collawash/Hot Springs Watershed Analysis determined that the exact spacing of ditch relief culverts could not be determined for each road in each subwatershed, so a "best case" scenario (200 feet spacing) and a "worst case" scenario (500 feet spacing) were analyzed. The lower values appear to be realistic for most roads and watersheds, based on field observations and common construction practices. For this analysis a 350 culvert spacing was used. It was assumed that under the current condition ditchlines on all roads still have the potential to increase the stream drainage network. Likewise, all decommissioned roads would no longer have the potential to increase the stream drainage network.

Figure 3.1 and Table 3.5 show that roads currently in the project area increase the channel network length by 6.6%. Increases in stream drainage network enhancement vary from 0 to 11.5% based on analysis area.

Figure 3.1. Stream drainage network expansion.




Table 3.5. Percent stream drainage network expansion.

Subwatershed	Alternative 1 – No Action	Alternative 2 – Proposed Action	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
East Fork Collawash River	5.9	2.5	4.0	2.5
Elk Lake Creek	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Farm Creek-Collawash River	11.5	6.1	10.2	8.6
Happy Creek-Collawash River	5.0	2.6	4.5	3.6
Lower Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	7.6	3.6	6.6	5.7
Nohorn Creek	7.7	3.6	7.0	5.9
Pot Creek-Clackamas River	9.7	4.4	6.9	6.9
Upper Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	2.3	0.5	1.9	0.9
Total	6.6	3.2	5.4	4.6

Environmental Effects – Flow Regime

Alternative 2 would have the greatest reduction in the stream drainage network, followed by Alternative 4 and then Alternative 3 (see Table 3.6). The reductions associated with Alternative 2 are three times as large as those associated with Alternative 3. Reductions associated with Alternative 4 are between those associated with Alternatives 2 and 3.

Table 3.6. Project percent reduction in stream drainage network (as compared to the current condition) by alternative.

Current Condition	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
0	52	17	30

There are no expected adverse effects for peak flow increases up to 10%, given the inherent error in peak flow prediction methods and the fact that changes in peak flows of up to 10% are usually below detection limits using standard stream gauging methods. Peak flow increases greater than 10% offer the possibility for adverse effects (DNR 1993). Therefore, a 10% increase in stream drainage network enhancement is used a threshold for the potential adverse effects. Farm Creek-Collawash River is the only subwatershed currently above the 10% threshold and with implementation of Alternatives 2 and 4 this subwatershed would be below the 10% threshold; implementation of Alternative 3 would be right at the 10% threshold. These modeled reductions associated with the alternatives would occur with the implementation of road decommissioning activities and would continue because the natural drainage patterns would be re-established.

Affected Environment – Soils and Geology

During the Roads Analysis for the Mt. Hood National Forest a Forestwide map of landslide risk was compiled from the geomorphic mapping completed during watershed analysis. Each watershed, and eventually the entire Forest, had been divided into geomorphic map units, primarily based on geologic unit and slope angle. Each geomorphic map unit had then been assigned a qualitative descriptor of its propensity for landslides (high, medium, or low). The assignment of this adjective was based on landslide inventories. The map lumps all landslide types together.

Road segments located in high landslide-risk polygons tend to have many more times the frequency of landslides than do road segments located in other landforms. In the adjacent Fish Creek Watershed a landslide study conducted after the 1996 storm event (*Factors Affecting Landslide Incidence after Large Storm Events during the Winter of 1995-1996 in the Upper Clackamas River Drainages, Oregon Cascades*) found that landslide incidence on roads in Upper Clackamas River Drainage was 0.5 landslides per road mile. Active landslides were mapped by the Forest Geologist using aerial photography and associated field validation (see Figure 3.2). The incidence of landslides per road mile is expected to be lower in the project area than the adjacent Fish Creek Watershed (see Section 3.3).

Figure 3.2. Landslide hazard and active landslides in the project area.




Figure 3.3 detail miles of road in high and moderate landslide hazard areas identified in the Forest’s Roads Analysis (2003).

Figure 3.3. Miles of road in high and moderate landslide hazard areas identified in the Roads Analysis.




Table 3.7. Miles of road in high and moderate landslide hazard areas.

Subwatershed	Alternative 1 – No Action	Alternative 2 – Proposed Action	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
East Fork Collawash River	20.1	10.9	15.7	11.3
Elk Lake Creek	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Farm Creek-Collawash River	78.4	31.7	56.1	44.7
Happy Creek-Collawash River	34.0	13.4	23.9	18.3
Lower Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	73.2	25.5	54.2	42.5
Nohorn Creek	43.2	14.3	33.1	29.1
North Fork Breitenbush River	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pot Creek-Clackamas River	50.9	18.1	31.6	30.5
Upper Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	11.7	4.6	9.0	7.7
TOTAL	311.6	118.5	223.6	184.1

Figure 3.4. Miles of road in active landslide areas.




Table 3.8. Miles of road in active landslide areas.

Subwatershed	Alternative 1 – No Action	Alternative 2 – Proposed Action	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
East Fork Collawash River	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.0
Farm Creek-Collawash River	6.2	2.6	4.7	3.8
Happy Creek-Collawash River	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.3
Lower Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	2.7	2.2	2.5	2.2
Nohorn Creek	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Total	10.2	5.3	8.4	6.5

Environmental Effects – Soils and Geology

All of the alternatives reduce the potential of landslides from existing roads. The greatest reductions in road mileage in the high and moderate landslide hazard classes is seen in Alternative 2 (62% reduction), followed by Alternative 4 (41% reduction), and then Alternative 3 (28% reduction). With the exception of East Fork Collawash River and Elk Lake Creek subwatersheds, reduction rates are very similar across the subwatersheds.

The reductions in miles of road in active landslide areas are greatest in Alternative 2 (48% reduction), followed by Alternative 4 (36% reduction), and then Alternative 3 (17% reduction). Only Farm Creek-Collawash River and Lower Hot Springs Fork Collawash River have noteworthy mileages of road in active landslide areas with the greatest reduction in roads under all alternatives seen in the Farm Creek-Collawash River subwatershed.

Affected Environment – Sediment Yield

Short-term sediment yield is assessed by examining a number of factors including total number of stream crossings, number of high and moderate risk stream crossings, sediment yield associated with a properly maintained road system, and sediment yield associated with removal of structures at road stream intersections.

Road crossings of stream channels create a potential for sedimentation due to the immediate proximity of the road to the stream being crossed. Where roads are insloped to a ditch, the ditch extends the drainage network, collects surface water from the road surface and subsurface water intercepted by road cuts and transports this water quickly to streams. This more rapidly flowing water is moving across a ditch which may not be vegetated and pick up sediment as it erodes. After road construction, this impact lessens, but still persists during storms due to the risk of overtopping of the crossing structure, most commonly culverts. Plugging of the structure by large woody debris or boulders in the streambed can reduce its capacity, and if severe, cause overtopping of the structure and damage to the fill on the downstream side of the road. Just as in the Flow Regime section, considering the number of drainage crossings is useful in assessing the risk of erosion and sedimentation from roads.

The erosive power of water increases at the sixth power of its velocity. Therefore, reducing the concentration of runoff and thereby its velocity is important to preventing erosion and the risk of sedimentation to streams.

In a study completed by the U.S. Geological Survey that assessed variations in stream turbidity within the Bull Run Watershed (LaHusen 1994), it was determined that the most visible sites of erosion are stream channels, streambanks, and roadside ditches.

Figure 3.5. Stream crossings by alternative.




Table 3.9. Stream crossings by alternative.

Subwatershed	Alternative 1 – No Action	Alternative 2 – Proposed Action	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
East Fork Collawash River	74	32	51	32
Farm Creek-Collawash River	218	104	182	152
Happy Creek-Collawash River	81	42	72	59
Lower Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	132	63	115	99
Nohorn Creek	70	33	64	54
Pot Creek-Clackamas River	189	82	131	121
Upper Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	20	4	16	8
Total	784	360	631	525

High Risk Stream Crossings

There are several risk factors that could contribute to the failure of a road at a stream crossing. There is the potential for culvert blowouts, dam-break floods, debris flows, diversions and cascading failures. Contributing factors would include geologic hazards (landslides, debris flows, etc.) and hydrologic hazards (peak flow events). With the failure of a stream crossing

there is the potential for large amounts of fine sediment to be directly deposited into the stream system (based on roads decommissioned under the 1999 Bull Run Road Decommissioning EA fills associated with perennial stream crossings varied from 300 to 3000 cubic yards).

To assess the risk, intermittent and perennial stream crossings located on high landslide-risk terrain were mapped using GIS. Since some impacts to both roads and aquatic systems can occur downstream, intermittent and perennial stream crossings located downstream of stream crossings on high landslide risk-terrain were mapped manually (USDA 2003).

Figure 3.6. High and moderate risk stream crossings by alternative.




Table 3.10. High and moderate risk stream crossings by alternative.

Subwatershed	Alternative 1 – No Action	Alternative 2 – Proposed Action	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
East Fork Collawash River	45	13	30	13
Farm Creek-Collawash River	211	98	176	146
Happy Creek-Collawash River	75	40	69	56
Lower Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	128	60	107	95
Nohorn Creek	68	31	61	52
Pot Creek-Clackamas River	110	43	76	75

Subwatershed	Alternative 1 – No Action	Alternative 2 – Proposed Action	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Upper Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	19	3	15	7
Total	656	288	534	444

Modeled Sediment Yield from Road Network

Sediment yield associated with a properly maintained road network was assessed using the Washington Department of Natural Resource’s Standard Methodology for Watershed Assessment. While this method is based on the current scientific understanding of forest management and watershed processes, its predicted outputs should not be considered as exacting measures of potential sediment yield but instead provide a framework for comparing relative effects of sediment delivery between the two alternatives. It does not assess effects from unmaintained road ditches and culverts, but assumes they are functioning properly.

Figure 3.7. Modeled road related sediment delivery (tons/year).




Table 3.11. Modeled road related sediment delivery (tons/year).

Subwatershed	Alternative 1 – No Action	Alternative 2 – Proposed Action	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
East Fork Collawash River	180.0	77.8	125.8	79.4
Elk Lake Creek	1.5	0.2	0.2	0.2
Farm Creek-Collawash River	799.8	278.6	550.8	439.0
Happy Creek-Collawash River	279.3	110.9	211.0	158.3
Lower Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	501.3	165.5	362.3	288.8
Nohorn Creek	255.7	97.2	209.8	178.6
Pot Creek-Clackamas River	495.1	154.3	300.7	295.1
Upper Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	57.1	8.0	38.5	24.6
Total	2569.8	892.6	1799.2	1464.2

Environmental Effects – Sediment Yield (Short-Term)

Under the No Action Alternative, there would continue to be chronic amounts of sediment generated associated with native surface and gravel roads and ditchlines of all roads as outlined in Figure 3.7 and Figure 3.7. There are also stream crossings and high risk stream crossings with the potential for catastrophic failure with the potential to deposit large amounts of sediment into the stream system.

Short-term measurable increases in sediment transport associated with the current condition related to plugged culverts and ditch lines may not occur for a number of years depending on the storm intensities that are encountered and the number of miles of roads that have plugged drainage structures.

Stream crossings would be reduced the most under Alternative 2 (54%), followed by Alternative 4 (33%), and then Alternative 3 (20%). With Alternative 2 having over twice the level of reductions of stream crossings as compared to Alternative 3 it would have much greater reductions in chronic sediment delivery to the stream system and this is detailed in the modeled road related sediment delivery figures where Alternative 2 has a 65% reduction (1677 tons per year) and Alternative 3 has a 30% reduction (771 tons per year). Impacts associated with Alternative 4 are between those of Alternative 2 and 3 (a reduction of 1106 tons per year).

High and moderate risk stream crossings, with the associated risk of catastrophic failure, would be reduced the most under Alternative 2 (56%), followed by Alternative 4 (32%) and then Alternative 3 (19%). Alternative 2 reduces high and moderate risk stream crossings about 3 times as much as alternative 3 (369 structures removed compared to 122 structures removed). Impacts associated with Alternative 4 are between those of Alternative by removing 212 structures.

The sediment contribution to streams from roads is often much greater than that from all other land management activities combined (FEMAT V-16) so these reductions are important in reducing management related sediment delivery to the stream system.

In the short term, decommissioning of roads would produce some sediment that would escape the mitigations designed to minimize soil loss at the new stream crossings and cross drains.

In order to quantify the potential short term sediment delivery to the stream system associated with road decommissioning the Water Erosion Prediction Project (WEPP) soil erosion model was used to quantify sediment deposition to streams.

The WEPP model (<http://forest.moscowfsl.wsu.edu/fswepp/docs/distweppdoc.html>) is a physically-based soil erosion model that can provide estimates of soil erosion and sediment yield considering the specific soil, climate, ground cover, and topographic conditions. It was developed by an interagency group of scientists including the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service (ARS), Forest Service, and Natural Resources Conservation Service; and the U.S. Department of Interior's Bureau of Land Management and Geological Survey.

WEPP simulates the conditions that impact erosion--such as the amount of vegetation canopy, the surface residue, and the soil water content for every day in a multiple-year run. For each day that has a precipitation event, WEPP determines whether the event is rain or snow, and calculates the infiltration and runoff. If there is runoff, WEPP routes the runoff over the surface, calculating erosion or deposition rates for at least 100 points on the hillslope. It then calculates the average sediment yield from the hillslope. WEPP has been shown to produce results useful for decision support, but as with all models, users are urged to test the models with locally available empirical data (Renschler, 2002).

For this project erosion and associated sedimentation were calculated for each stream crossing (actual decommissioned hillslopes where culverts were removed within the Bull Run watershed were used to estimate the area associated with crossings) and aggregated up for each analysis area. Sediment yield from the removal of stream crossings was spread over 10 years due to the amount of roads to decommission and the roads that will be decommissioned with delay. The WEPP analysis was completed for 50 years of climate data.

Table 3.12. Short-term sediment yield (tons/year) based on WEPP Analysis 2.5 year return interval storm.

Subwatershed	Alternative 1 – No Action	Alternative – Proposed 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
East Fork Collawash River	0	1.1	0.5	1.1
Farm Creek-Collawash River	0	2.6	0.6	1.4
Happy Creek-Collawash River	0	1.0	0.2	0.6
Lower Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	0	1.9	0.4	0.9
Nohorn Creek	0	1.1	0.2	0.5
Pot Creek-Clackamas River	0	2.3	1.2	1.2
Upper Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	0	0.4	0.1	0.3
Total	0	10.5	3.2	6.1

Table 3.13. Short-term sediment yield (tons/year) based on WEPP Analysis average storm for 50 years of modeling.

Subwatershed	Alternative 1 – No Action	Alternative – Proposed 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
East Fork Collawash River	0	1.1	0.5	1.1
Farm Creek-Collawash River	0	2.5	0.5	1.4
Happy Creek-Collawash River	0	1.0	0.2	0.6
Lower Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	0	1.8	0.4	0.9
Nohorn Creek	0	1.0	0.2	0.5
Pot Creek-Clackamas River	0	2.2	1.1	1.1
Upper Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	0	0.4	0.1	0.3
Total	0	9.9	3.1	5.7

Table 3.14. Short-term sediment yield (tons/year) based on WEPP Analysis 50 year return interval storm.

Subwatershed	Alternative 1 – No Action	Alternative – Proposed 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
East Fork Collawash River	0	4.6	2.2	4.6
Farm Creek-Collawash River	0	10.8	2.3	5.9
Happy Creek-Collawash River	0	4.3	0.9	2.5
Lower Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	0	7.7	1.8	3.8
Nohorn Creek	0	4.4	0.8	2.0
Pot Creek-Clackamas River	0	9.5	4.8	4.9
Upper Hot Springs Fork Collawash River	0	1.8	0.4	1.3
Total	0	43.1	13.3	25.0

Environmental Effects – Water Resources Sediment Yield (WEPP Analysis)

The current condition would not yield any sediment yield under this process because there will be no stream crossings removed. Examination of the 2.5 year recurrence interval storm (estimating a bankful streamflow event) details the most sediment yield under Alternative 2 (10.5 tons per year), followed by Alternative 4 (6.1 tons per year), and then Alternative 3 (3.2 tons per year). Impacts under Alternative 2 are over 3 times that of Alternative 4. The effects associated with the average storm for the 50 years of climate data are very similar to that of the 2.5 year recurrence interval storm.

The 50 year recurrence interval storm has approximately 4 times the sediment yield as that associated with the 2.5 year recurrence interval storm. Effects between alternatives are similar to that of the 2.5 year recurrence interval storm.

In the second winter following the drainage structure removal, erosion and delivered sediment should decrease further due to settlement of loose soils, re-vegetation, and armoring of the soil

surface by an erosion pavement of gravel in the soils. Woody plants should become more significant in providing canopy cover and soil binding capability in three to five years depending on the favorability of the growing site and success in plant establishment, by planting, natural seeding, and re-sprouting.

Based on experience and monitoring results from activities associated with the 1999 Bull Run Road Decommissioning EA there are generally some short term pulses of sediment following the first large streamflow event after culvert removal activities and after that point the stream crossing is stabilized and turbidity levels (and is assumed suspended sediment levels) are the same upstream and downstream of the road crossing.

Environmental Effects – Sediment Yield (Long-Term)

To assess the long term potential risks of sediment production this assessment looked beyond the modeling of current sediment production which assumes that all roads are maintained, as the alternative analysis does. Currently, some roads have become sufficiently invaded by brush (red alder, willows, maple, scotch broom, and hemlock) that vehicle travel is no longer possible. This also means that the ditches and culvert inlets are fully occupied by woody vegetation and that these inlets likely have significantly reduced flow capacity. The potential for culvert plugging and flow overtopping the roadway is greatly increased. This directly increases the potential for fill erosion as the overflow spills down the road fill (Figure 3.8 and Figure 3.9Figure 3.). If flows are sufficiently large or continuous, a headcut scarp will develop at the toe of the fill and progress upslope. If not stopped, the entire road fill may be eroded by the new drainage location. The volume of lost fill would relate to the fill steepness, volume and duration of water discharge, and the size of the fill at the drainage structure.

Another possible scenario is the plugging of a ditch relief culvert causing increased flow to continue past the culvert inlet on the road and ditch to the next ditch relief culvert. The ditch in the second reach below the plugged culvert must now accommodate about twice its normal runoff. Since brush has reduced culvert inlet capacity and additional flow is probably eroding the ditch and moving sediment to the inlet, the likelihood of culvert plugging is increased greatly. Also, within the project area the larger storms create many, small drainages which enter the road ditches and add to ditch flow. Eventual overtopping of the culvert is possible and flow actively eroding across the road and fill occurs.

A third scenario applies to the present aging of the culverts in the project area. Most culverts are about 30 years old and are approaching their expected design life. As the bottom of culverts rust through, flow would continue underneath the culvert. This would allow erosion of the fine materials that were used to bed the culvert when it was installed. Settling would result and additional strain to the culvert structure would occur. Eventually, the culvert would collapse gradually and lose its capacity. Eventual overtopping of the culvert and road is probable and severe erosion of the fill would ensue.

To predict the potential volume of sediment produced from culvert plugging is not possible, but it is not extreme to think that it would be considerably more than the volumes predicted for a properly maintained road if considered over a ten year timeframe. Based on roads decommissioned under the 1999 Bull Run Road Decommissioning EA fills associated with

perennial stream crossings varied from 300 to 3000 cubic yards of fill (based on local site conditions including stream size, road slope position and steepness of the area). In a large storm it would not be unreasonable for 5 to 10 culverts to fail resulting in 1,500 to 30,000 tons of sediment delivered to the stream system (for this analysis and based on soil composition 1 cubic yard of soil equated to 1 ton of sediment). In the current condition there is a risk of erosion, sedimentation, and downstream effects to turbidity and suspended sediment conditions associated with catastrophic failure of culverts and/or road fill slopes. Eventually, if not maintained, nearly all of the drainage crossings would plug, and fills would be eroded and transported as sediment.

Figure 3.8. Examples of catastrophic fill and culvert failure from the Mt. Hood National Forest Roads Analysis.



Figure 3.9. Example of gully erosion.



Table 3.15. Percent reduction of all stream crossings by alternative.

Current Condition	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
0	54 (424 xings)	20 (153 xings)	33 (259 xings)

Table 3.16. Percent reduction of high and moderate risk stream crossings by alternative.

Current Condition	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
0	56 (368 xings)	19 (122 xings)	32 (212 xings)

The alternatives reduce all stream crossings by 20 to 54% and high and moderate risk stream crossings by 19 to 56%. Alternative 2 has the greatest level of reductions followed by Alternative 4 and then Alternative 3. Reductions associated with Alternative 2 are near 3 times that of Alternative 3 and almost twice that of Alternative 4. Results for high and moderate risk stream crossings are very similar. It is assumed that the decommissioned roads are no longer producing sediment, because natural drainage patterns have been restored and impervious surfaces have been removed and re-vegetated. This comparison is applicable for the long-term evaluation of impacts after the short term effects of soil disturbance and stream channel re-establishment have passed.

Decommissioning roads would restore natural drainage patterns and thereby avoid large volumes of added sediment to the stream network that would be likely to eventually occur under the current condition. In addition limited road maintenance dollars could be focused on the remaining road systems resulting in more maintenance of culverts and ditchlines resulting in less potential for catastrophic failure.

In a recent study of road decommissioning activities on the Olympic National Forest values of a stream blocking index were reduced from an average of 1.7 before treatment to zero after treatment (n=15), indicating the risk of stream crossings becoming plugged was completely eliminated by excavation and removal of culverts and associated fills; and, diversion potential was eliminated at 89% (8 of 9) of stream crossing sites (USDA 2009).

Compliance with the Clean Water Act, Forest Plan, and Aquatic Conservation Strategy Objectives

Clean Water Act

It is the responsibility of the Forest Service as a Federal land management agency, through implementation of the Clean Water Act (CWA), to protect and restore the quality of public waters under their jurisdiction. Protecting water quality is addressed in several sections of the CWA including sections 303, 313, and 319. Best Management Practices (BMPs) are used to meet water quality standards (or water quality goals and objectives) under Section 319 (Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Protocol for Addressing Clean Water Act Section 303(d) Listed Waters (<http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/water/protocol.pdf>)).

Current statewide Water Quality Standards for the State of Oregon state: “Pursuant to Memoranda of Agreement with the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, water quality standards are expected to be met through the development and implementation of water quality restoration plans, best management practices, and aquatic conservation strategies.

Where a Federal Agency is a Designated Management Agency by the Department, implementation of these plans, practices and strategies is deemed compliance with this Division” (Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Protocol for Addressing Clean Water Act Section 303(d) Listed Waters) (<http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/water/protocol.pdf>).

In addition, the Forest Plan contains the following Standards and Guidelines with respect to the implementation of BMPs.

- Compliance with State requirements shall be met through planning, application, and monitoring of Best Management Practices FEIS, Appendix H. Best Management Practices describe the process which shall be used to implement the State Water Quality Management Plan on lands administered by the Forest Service (FW-055 and FW-056).
- Individual, general Best Management Practices which may be implemented (i.e., on a project by project basis) are described in General Water Quality Best Management Practices, Pacific Northwest Region, 11/88. Evaluations of ability to implement and estimated effectiveness shall be made at the project level (FW-057 and FW-058).
- The sensitivity of the project shall determine whether the site-specific BMP prescriptions are included in the environmental analysis, the project plan or the analysis files (FW-059).

Water Quality Best Management Practices, with the express purpose of limiting non-point source water pollution, are incorporated into the proposed action and associated project design criteria.

Section 303D

Section 303(d) of the CWA requires that waterbodies violating State or tribal water quality standards be identified and placed on a 303(d) list. The Environmental Protection Agency regulations also allow States and tribes to include threatened waters (that is, waters that display a downward trend that suggests water quality standards will not be met in the near future).


For each listed waterbody, the CWA requires States to establish a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for the parameter(s) causing beneficial use impairment. A TMDL is the sum of the waste load allocation for point sources of pollution (for example, outflow from a manufacturing plant) plus the load allocation for nonpoint sources of pollution, including “natural” background levels, plus a margin of safety to allow for uncertainty.

For water quality limited streams on National Forest System lands, the USDA Forest Service provides information, analysis, and site-specific planning efforts to support state processes to protect and restore water quality. Within the analysis area the Collawash River and Nohorm Creek are on the 2004/2006 State of Oregon 303(d) list. These streams are listed for stream temperature. Road decommissioning activities associated with Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 are predicted reduce stream temperatures by restoring natural drainage patterns (more subsurface and less exposed surface water flowpaths) and increasing stream shade (by removal and revegetation of stream crossings and road prisms paralleling streams).

Table 3.17. Water quality limited (303d) streams.

Water Body (Stream/Lake)	River Miles	Parameter	Season	Criteria	Beneficial Uses
Collawash River	0 to 7.7	Temperature	September 1 - June 15	Salmon and steelhead spawning: 13.0 degrees Celsius 7-day-average maximum	Salmon and steelhead spawning
Collawash River	0 to 12.2	Temperature	Year Around (Non-spawning)	Core cold water habitat: 16.0 degrees Celsius 7-day-average maximum	Core cold water habitat
Nohorn Creek	0 to 1.8	Temperature	September 1 - June 15	Salmon and steelhead spawning: 13.0 degrees Celsius 7-day-average maximum	Salmon and steelhead spawning

Figure 3.10. Water quality limited (303d) streams.




Consistency with Mt Hood Land and Resource Management Plan Standards and Guidelines

Key Mt. Hood Land and Resource Management Plan allocations, with respect to protection of the aquatic environment, include: Key Watersheds, Special Emphasis Watershed, Riparian

Reserves and Riparian Area.

Figure 3.18. Key watersheds and special emphasis watersheds.



Key Watersheds

Key Watersheds are a system of large refugia comprising watersheds that are crucial to at-risk fish species and stocks and provide high quality water. The Aquatic Conservation Strategy includes two designations for Key Watersheds. Tier 1 (Aquatic Conservation Emphasis) Key Watersheds contribute directly to conservation of at-risk anadromous salmonids, bull trout, and resident fish species. They also have a high potential of being restored as part of a watershed restoration program. The network of 143 Tier 1 Key Watersheds ensures that refugia are widely distributed across the landscape. While 21 Tier 2 (other) Key Watersheds may not contain at-risk fish stocks, they are important sources of high quality water.

Standards and guidelines for Key Watersheds include:

- Reduce existing system and nonsystem road mileage. If funding is insufficient to implement reductions, there will be no net increase in the amount of roads in Key Watersheds.
- Key Watersheds are the highest priority for watershed restoration.

A large portion of the analysis area is in Key Watersheds either associated with the Collawash Watershed or the Clackamas River corridor. Project activities are consistent with Standards and Guidelines by reducing existing system road mileage.

Special Emphasis Watersheds

The goal of Special Emphasis Watersheds is: Maintain or improve watershed, riparian, and aquatic habitat conditions and water quality for municipal uses and/or long term fish production. Lower Hot Springs Fork Collawash River, Elk Lake Creek, East Fork Collawash River, Happy Creek-Collawash River, and Farm Creek-Collawash River subwatersheds have at least a portion of their area in this allocation. Major characteristics include that the transportation system design may be restricted to avoid sensitive watershed lands. Standards and guidelines include:

- Roads and associated facilities should be permitted, when consistent with the protection of watershed values
- Road crossings of fish-bearing streams shall be designed to provide for adult and juvenile fish passage.
- Drainage systems of roads or parking areas should incorporate practical features to minimize or eliminate sediment and/or other pollutants from discharging directly into water bodies.

The alternatives are designed to protect watershed values, provide for fish passage and minimize sediment delivery to streams from the road system so these alternatives are consistent with standards and guidelines for Special Emphasis Watersheds.

Riparian Reserves

Riparian Reserves are portions of watersheds where riparian-dependent resources receive primary emphasis and where special standards and guidelines apply. Standards and guidelines prohibit and regulate activities in Riparian Reserves that retard or prevent attainment of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives. Riparian Reserves include those portions of a watershed directly coupled to streams and rivers, that is, the portions of a watershed required for maintaining hydrologic, geomorphic, and ecologic processes that directly affect standing and flowing waterbodies such as lakes and ponds, wetlands, streams, stream processes, and fish habitats. Riparian Reserves include areas designated in current plans and draft plan preferred alternatives as riparian management areas or streamside management zones and primary source areas for wood and sediment such as unstable and potentially unstable areas in headwater areas and along streams. Riparian Reserves occur at the margins of standing and flowing water, intermittent stream channels and ephemeral ponds, and wetlands. Riparian Reserves generally parallel the stream network but also include other areas necessary for maintaining hydrologic, geomorphic, and ecologic processes.

Consistency with Riparian Reserve Standards and Guidelines for roads within the Riparian Reserves is assessed by addressing consistency with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives. However, there are Riparian Reserve Standards and Guidelines that address:

- Minimizing disruption of natural hydrologic flow paths, including diversion of streamflow and interception of surface and subsurface flow.
- Closing and stabilizing, or obliterating and stabilizing roads based on the ongoing and potential effects to Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives and considering short-term and long-term transportation needs.
- Minimizing sediment delivery to streams from roads.
- Providing and maintain fish passage at all road crossings of existing and potential fish-bearing streams.

An assessment of consistency with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives is completed later in this section. The alternatives are designed to minimize disruption of natural, hydrologic flow paths, minimize sediment delivery and provide for fish passage.

General Riparian Area

The goal of General Riparian Area is to achieve and maintain riparian and aquatic habitat conditions for the sustained, long-term production of fish, selected wildlife and plant species, and high quality water for the full spectrum of the Forest's riparian and aquatic areas. Key Standards and Guidelines include:

- Road crossings of fish-bearing streams shall be designed to provide for adult and juvenile fish passage
- Drainage systems for roads should incorporate practical features to minimize or eliminate sediment and/or other pollutants from discharging directly into streams, lakes, wetlands, springs, or seeps.
- Existing roads causing impacts to riparian values should be mitigated or relocated.
- Unneeded and/or abandoned roads should be rehabilitated.

The alternatives are designed to meet objectives for General Riparian Area including providing for fish passage and minimizing sediment delivery to streams.

Aquatic Conservation Strategy Consistency Findings

The following is a summary of the projects consistency with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives (ROD B-10).

Objective 1: Maintain and restore the distribution, diversity, and complexity of watershed and landscape-scale features to ensure protection of the aquatic systems to which species, populations and communities are uniquely adapted.

The project is designed to restore natural drainage patterns (both surface and subsurface) which will restore natural travel paths for aquatic organisms by removing barriers. Removing roads has the potential to restore floodplain connectivity, reduce aquatic habitat fragmentation, thus increasing the complexity of stream habitat. By restoring natural flowpaths for water, sediment and large woody debris channel components that contribute to channel complexity (pool quantity and quality, substrate, flows) would be enhanced.

Objective 2: Maintain and restore spatial and temporal connectivity in and between watersheds. Lateral, longitudinal, and drainage network connections include floodplains, wetlands, upslope areas, headwater tributaries, and intact refugia. These network connections must provide chemically and physically unobstructed routes to areas critical for fulfilling life history requirements of aquatic and riparian-dependent species.

Restoring natural drainage patterns would restore spatial and temporal connectivity because riparian areas associated with stream crossings would become continuous, and surface and subsurface flows would follow natural patterns.

Objective 3: Maintain and restore the physical integrity of the aquatic system, including shorelines, banks, and bottom configurations.

Removal of roads including culverts restores streambanks and bottom configurations at stream crossings. By using stream simulation methods in designing stream crossings natural streambank and streambed configurations would be established above, though and below the existing stream crossings.

Objective 4: Maintain and restore water quality necessary to support healthy riparian, aquatic, and wetland ecosystems. Water quality must remain in the range that maintains the biological, physical, and chemical integrity of the system and benefits survival, growth, reproduction, and migration of individuals composing aquatic and riparian communities.

The project has the the objective of restoring or improving water quality by reducing existing chronic sediment sources and/or by reducing the risk of catastrophic failure of stream crossings. There may be short-term impacts to water quality (increased sedimentation) when the projects are implemented (during culvert removal). However, project design criteria were developed to minimize these impacts and keep them to an acceptable level.

Objective 5: Maintain and restore the sediment regime under which aquatic ecosystems evolved. Elements of the sediment regime include the timing, volume, rate, and character of sediment input, storage, and transport.

Road decommissioning has the potential of maintaining or restoring the sediment regime, by removing obstructions or pinch points where sediment transport is impeded. In addition, chronic sediment sources associated with the road surface and ditchlines would be removed.

Objective 6: Maintain and restore in-stream flows sufficient to create and sustain riparian, aquatic, and wetland habitats and to retain patterns of sediment, nutrient, and wood routing. The timing, magnitude, duration, and spatial distribution of peak, high, and low flows must be protected.

This project is designed to restore in-stream flows and provide for natural hydrologic and sediment regimes. By reducing stream drainage network enhancement and removing impervious surfaces associated with the road thus restoring natural flowpaths stream flow routing efficiency would approximate undisturbed levels and would not result in increased magnitude of peak stream flows. Improvement of stream crossings and restoration of areas where streams have been channelized or narrowed would reduce risks of increased peak flows, which can result in bank erosion and channel bed scour. Removal of stream crossings and restoration of the crossing using stream simulation techniques would provide for sediment, nutrient, and wood routing.

Objective 7: Maintain and restore the timing, variability, and duration of floodplain inundation and water table elevation in meadows and wetlands.

Road decommissioning would restore natural hillslope flow processes, re-establishing natural drainage patterns, providing for restoration of floodplain inundation characteristics.

Objective 8: Maintain and restore the species composition and structural diversity of plant communities in riparian areas and wetlands to provide adequate summer and winter thermal regulation, nutrient filtering, appropriate rates of surface erosion, bank erosion, and channel migration and to supply amounts and distributions of coarse woody debris sufficient to sustain physical complexity and stability.

Areas impacted by the implementation this project would be planted, seeded, and/or mulched. Seed may be native plants or non-persistent non-natives. These plants would rapidly provide ground cover, thereby reducing erosion. They would be replaced by native plants in a few years. Road decommissioning and associated culvert removal should reduce surface erosion, bank erosion, and allow for natural levels of channel migration.

Objective 9: Maintain and restore habitat to support well-distributed populations of native plant, invertebrate, and vertebrate riparian-dependent species.

Road decommissioning activities restore vegetation, streamflow, and erosion patterns, enhancing terrestrial and aquatic plant and animal populations.

Cumulative Effects

A cumulative effects analysis was performed for watershed processes where adverse direct and/or indirect effects associated with the alternatives were identified. For this project these processes include short-term sediment delivery associated with streambanks and adjacent slopes where stream drainage structures, culverts, are removed

The cumulative watershed effects analysis area includes the watershed area upstream of the Clackamas River and Collawash River confluence.

Figure 3.12. Cumulative watershed effects analysis area.




Table 3.18. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects.

Project	Sediment yield tons per year
Modeled road related sediment (project area)	892.6 to 1799.2 tons per year (based on alternative implemented)
Modeled road related sediment (outside project area)	491.7 tons per year
Road decommissioning stream crossings (outside project area)	14.2 tons
Upper Clack Thinning Project	Short-term and undetectable at the watershed or subwatershed scale.
Rethin Project	Short-term and undetectable at the watershed or subwatershed scale.
2010 Clackamas Restoration Projects	Short-term and undetectable at the watershed or subwatershed scale
Cascade Crossing Transmission Project	Unknown
Planned road decommissioning activities within the project area covered under other NEPA documents	3.8 tons total yield ¹³
Palomar Gasline Transmission Project	0.5 tons total yield ¹⁴
BPA powerline and associated infrastructure maintenance	Sediment yield estimates are included in modeled road related sediment
Collawash Road Decommissioning Alternatives 2, 3 and 4	3.1 to 9.9 (tons of sediment delivered to the stream system per year based on alternative implemented, from analysis for road decommissioning project)

For this analysis the estimated sediment delivery in tons per year delivered to the stream system was used for comparison when possible. This was done in an attempt to normalize values and complete an “apples to apples” comparison.

Based on the alternative implemented the short term sediment delivery associated with project implementation is anywhere from 0.1% to 0.7% of the total short term sediment yield for the cumulative watershed effects analysis area. These results are consistent with the Collawash/Hot Springs Fork Watershed Analysis “*Existing management related sediment production and delivery in the watershed comes primarily from the road system*”; FEMAT *The sediment contribution to streams from roads is often much greater than that from all other land management activities combined (FEMAT V-16)*; and, a recent assessment on assessing cumulative watershed effects (MacDonald, 2004) “*The median sediment production rate from roads was ... nearly an order of magnitude higher than any of the other sources*”

This increase in sediment yield associated with project implementation is not anticipated to have any adverse impacts on the aquatic system.

¹³ There are 15 stream crossings associated with this project so the same methodology used to calculate the sediment yield for the alternatives was used for this project.

¹⁴ There are two stream crossings associated with this project so the same methodology used to calculate the sediment yield for the alternatives was used for this project.

Table 3.19. Comparison of alternatives.

Items of Comparison	Alternative 1 – No Action	Alternative 2 – Proposed Action	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<i>Flow Regime</i>				
Miles of road ¹⁵	476 miles	222 miles	348 miles	307 miles
Channel network expansion by roads	9.4%	4.5%	7.8%	6.6%
<i>Soils and Geology</i>				
Roads in high and moderate hazard areas for landslides	312 miles	118 miles	224 miles	184 miles
Roads in mapped active landslide areas	10.2 miles	5.3 miles	8.4 miles	6.5 miles
<i>Sediment Yield</i>				
Number of stream crossings	784	360	631	525
Number of high and moderate risk stream crossings	656	288	534	444
Road related sediment delivery (modeled tons/year) for properly maintained roads	2570	893	1799	1464
Short-term estimated road sediment production (modeled tons/year)	0	10.5	3.2	6.1
Long-term estimated road sediment production	0%	56%	19%	32%

3.4 Climate Change

Until late in the 21st century, precipitation changes for the Pacific Northwest region are projected to be relatively modest and likely to be indistinguishable from natural variability; however, some models suggest an increase in winter storm severity. Most climate models project long-term increases in winter precipitation and decreases in summer precipitation. These changes in temperature and precipitation will alter the snowpack, streamflow, and water quality, particularly in the Columbia River Basin. Warmer temperatures will result in more precipitation falling as rain rather than snow. Snowpack will diminish, winter snow lines will retreat to higher elevations, and snowmelt timing will be altered. With earlier runoff, peak river flow will occur earlier in the year, and summer water temperatures will continue to rise as water levels drop. There is a potential for increased frequency and severity of flood flows during winter (Bisson 2008).

¹⁵ The miles of road used in this analysis are different than those stated in Chapters 1 and 2 because they reflect values calculated prior to updates made in INFRA. Also, these numbers include roads that have not yet been decommissioned on the landscape but were included in previous NEPA decisions.

From a habitat resilience standpoint, maintaining as much water as possible in streams and lakes during periods of low flow will likely be the most effective way to combat the harmful effects of climate change, but other management actions could also produce long-term benefits. Maintaining key flood-plain connections will also act as a hydrologic safety valve that helps reduce the scouring effect of high flows on redds (Bisson 2008).

Another management response to climate change involves restoring longitudinal connections throughout a drainage network, i.e., removing anthropogenic blockages to fish migrations up and down the watershed. With a constricted system of perennial stream channels in summer it will be important for all potentially usable habitats to be available (Bisson 2008).

Another management safeguard involves protecting and restoring riparian forests on valley floors and on alluvial terraces adjacent to stream channels. Riparian forests play an important role in the dynamics of the water table beneath and adjacent to streams, in moderating discharge during flow extremes, in controlling the concentration of soluble nutrients, in mediating the seasonal input of organic matter and terrestrial food items to aquatic ecosystems, and in regulating microclimate (Bisson 2008).

Policies that explicitly maintain instream flows by limiting water withdrawals, enhancing flood-plain connectivity by opening historically flooded areas where possible, removing anthropogenic barriers to fish movement, and protecting riparian forests will be needed to conserve habitat resilience in the face of climate change. Without such policies in place, aquatic habitats are likely to become increasingly isolated, simplified, and less likely to recover after significant disturbance events (Bisson 2008).

Although options for forest managers to minimize the harm to aquatic resources from climate change are limited, there are several management actions that can help protect salmon and trout (Bisson 2008):

1. Minimize anthropogenic increases in water temperature by maintaining well-shaded riparian areas.
2. Maintain a forest stand structure that retains snow, reduces the "rain on snow" effect associated with forest openings, and promotes fog drip.
3. Disconnect road drainage from the stream network to soften discharge peaks during heavy rainstorms.
4. Ensure that fish have access to seasonal habitats, e.g., off-channel wintering areas or summer thermal refugia.
5. Protect springs and large groundwater seeps from development and water removal, as these subterranean water sources will become increasingly important when surface flows are altered by climate change.

This project's resiliency to climate change will be assessed by looking at both stream drainage network enhancement and created opening acreage associated with the road network. Specifically the resiliency to climate change index was calculated by subtracting the stream drainage network enhancement and the percent of watershed in created openings from the road network from 100. For example, if the stream drainage network enhancement is 7% and the

percent of cleared area in the watershed from the road prism and associated cut and fill slopes is 2%, then the resiliency to climate change index would be 91 (100-7-2). The higher the number the more resilient the watershed is for predicated changes associated with climate change with respect to the road network.

The resiliency to climate change index for the No Action Alternative (i.e., current condition) is 88.7. For the Proposed Action, the resiliency to climate change index is 94.6; for Alternative 3 it is 90.9; and for Alternative 4 it is 92.2. All of the alternatives have a higher resiliency to climate change index than the current condition; thereby indicating that the watershed would be in a better condition to minimize the harm to aquatic resources from climate change with implementation of any of the alternatives.

3.5 Fisheries

Affected Environment

Past land management activities have had impacts on watersheds throughout the basin, but natural conditions and processes also dictate current conditions. Much of the landbase included in these eight subwatersheds occur within the Western Cascades geological zone, which is characterized by rainfall-runoff dominated streamflows and a wide range between winter high flows and summer low baseflow. These older volcanic rocks of the Western Cascades often exhibit intense weathering and are often more eroded than the younger High Cascade formations to the east. Stream networks are more abundant in the steeper, more eroded Western Cascades, the geology is much more water impermeable than that found in the High Cascades (USDA Forest Service and BLM 1996). The steep terrain combines with the parent geology to produce a landscape where landslides and large earthflows are more commonplace. The Collawash watershed is the most unstable watershed on the Mt. Hood National Forest from a slope stability standpoint (USDA Forest Service 1995a).

Past management activities, have had negative impacts on fish and aquatic resources. These include extensive road building, timber harvest, stream channel cleanout and straightening for misguided flood control and salvage activities, water diversions, hydroelectric development, grazing, and recreation. These activities have resulted in some loss of connectivity, reduction of stream shading, alteration in riparian vegetation and function, increased sedimentation, reduced instream large woody debris, and loss of pools from historic reference conditions. Low level chronic sediment impacts to aquatic habitats from the road system are often exacerbated by larger climatic events like the 1996 Flood in the Pacific Northwest. Needed maintenance on the road system and the road drainage network far exceeds the appropriated funds that are available. Despite past impacts, most streams or stream segments within the Collawash and Upper Clackamas watersheds contain good quality habitat (USDA Forest Service 1995b).

Today the Clackamas River Basin supports regionally significant fish runs; however, fish populations in the basin and the lower Columbia River have declined from historic levels, with some stocks diminished to the point of being federally listed as threatened species (Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife 1992). The Collawash and Upper Clackamas River watersheds currently provide habitat for the following Evolutionarily Significant Units (ESUs): Lower Columbia River (LCR) steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), Upper Willamette River (UWR) chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), and Lower Columbia River (LCR) coho salmon

(*Oncorhynchus kisutch*). These species and their designated critical habitat are listed as Threatened and are protected under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). Other fish occupying these watersheds include mountain whitefish, large-scale suckers, sculpin species, longnose dace, and brook lamprey. All of the subwatersheds within the project area support populations of resident rainbow (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) or cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki*). Many of the high lakes have been stocked with trout via aircraft (Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife 1992).

At this time, final planning is taking place for a reintroduction of bull trout into the Upper Clackamas watershed on the Forest. Bull trout are native to the Clackamas River and are believed to have been extirpated by the mid-1970s. Bull trout released into the Upper Clackamas River would be designated a “10(j) experimental population”. The 1982 amendments to the Endangered Species Act included a section 10(j) which provided for the designation of reintroduced populations of listed species as “experimental populations”. Experimental population designation is made when it will further the conservation of that species. It is hoped that reintroduction of bull trout to the Clackamas River can begin the spring of 2011. Early bull trout rearing and adult spawning is expected to take place outside of the assessment area for this road decommissioning proposal.

Climate has always been a variable factor in the Pacific Northwest with years of drought often followed by years of abundant moisture. Worldwide, long term and recent weather data, along with climate change simulations and regional climate models point to warming trends for the Pacific Northwest, including the assessment area. Planet-wide carbon dioxide levels appear to be higher than any time in the past 23 million years. Carbon dioxide along with other gases like methane and nitrous oxide, are often a byproduct of human actions that are considered green house gases. These gases in increasing concentrations in the atmosphere can trap the heat from solar radiation that at lesser concentrations would be radiated back into space. Changes in natural systems from a warming climate are evident in Arctic sea ice area and thickness declining and longer growing seasons with the passing of each decade in the Northern Hemisphere. In the Pacific Northwest, almost every weather station shows a warming trend and cold extremes are becoming rarer (Peterson and O’Halloran 2007). Native cold water species like bull trout and Pacific salmon may be detrimentally affected if higher year-round air temperatures translate into warmer stream temperatures in the assessment area. For the affected environment of this assessment, not all climate change effects are certain. While higher temperatures are expected with earlier snowpack melting in the Pacific Northwest and in the assessment area, trends in precipitation are less clear and more complex across the Pacific Northwest (Spies et al. 2010).

In sum, the affected environment lies within some of the most naturally unstable geologic areas on the Mt. Hood National Forest (USDA Forest Service 1995). While much of the eight subwatersheds in the project area are relatively stable from year to year, the extensive road system crosses many active earthflow and unstable areas that are characteristic of the parent geology. Very low levels of road maintenance are inadequate for the integrity of the road drainage system and protection of downstream fish habitat. Within this context of unstable geology and roads with minimal maintenance, are many miles of stream habitat supporting

substantial numbers of rearing and spawning salmon and steelhead that are federally listed as Threatened (Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife 1992).

Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, Sensitive, or Special Status (PETS) Fish and/or Aquatic Species located in (or downstream) of the Project Area

The Mt. Hood National Forest uses salmonids (salmon, trout and char) as management indicator species for aquatic habitats. Due to their sensitivity to habitat changes and water quality degradation, salmonids are used to monitor trends within Forest streams and lakes. Although other fish species may be present (e.g., sculpins, lamprey, and dace), population status and trends are unknown. Since more information exists on salmonids, this group serves as a more optimum choice for monitoring aquatic environments (USDA Forest Service 1991).

PETS species were federally listed or designated as sensitive for a number of factors. Although there are different reasons for their current status, common issues include impaired fish passage at dams and other obstructions, commercial and recreational fishing, loss of habitat, habitat modification, hatchery influences, and pollution. Hydroelectric dams have disrupted migrations and eliminated historically available habitat. Commercial and recreational fishing have reduced numbers of wild fish in some populations. Habitat has been degraded, simplified, and fragmented due to a variety of land management activities. Hatchery programs have strongly influenced populations, partly by masking declines in naturally spawning fish and dilution of native gene pools due to interbreeding.

Table 3.20. Special status (threatened, endangered, or R6 sensitive) aquatic species found in Clackamas River Basin streams.

Species	DPS/ESU	Status	Where species/Critical Habitat occurs within or downstream of Action Area
Bull Trout (<i>Salvelinus confluentus</i>)	Columbia River DPS	Threatened 5/98	Extirpated from Clackamas Basin (proposed reintroduction)
Steelhead Trout (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>)	Lower Columbia River ESU	Threatened 3/98	Upper Clackamas and Collawash Rivers and tribs., below barriers
Chinook Salmon (<i>O. tshawytscha</i>)	Lower Columbia River ESU	Threatened 3/99	Off Forest below Rivermill Dam
Chinook Salmon (<i>O. tshawytscha</i>)	Upper Willamette River ESU	Threatened 3/99	Upper Clackamas and Collawash Rivers
Coho Salmon (<i>O. kisutch</i>)	Lower Columbia River ESU	Threatened 6/05	Upper Clackamas and Collawash Rivers
Interior Redband Trout (<i>O. mykiss</i>)	Not Applicable (NA)	Sensitive - 7/04	Not found in Clackamas Basin
USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Regional Foresters Special Status Species (Aquatic)			
Columbia dusksnail (<i>Colligyrus sp. nov.1</i>)	N/A	Sensitive - 7/04, and Special Status Species 1/08	Throughout Forest
Barren Juga (<i>Juga hemphilli hemphilli</i>)	N/A	Special Status Species 1/08	Throughout Forest

Purple-lipped Juga (<i>Juga hemphilli maupinensis</i>)	N/A	Special Status Species 1/08	Wasco County, Lower Deschutes, and Warm Springs Basins
Scott's Apatanian Caddisfly (<i>Allomyia scotti</i>)	N/A	Special Status Species 1/08	High timberline elevations of the White River and Salmon River watersheds

Surveys for the three special status aquatic mollusks were not conducted as part of this project, even though the Columbia dusksnail is known to occur in many streams on the Forest, including those in the proposed project area of the action alternatives. 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.

Environmental Effects

Alternative 1 – No Action

Alternative 1 would not meet the purpose of this project to reduce adverse impacts to aquatics. There would be no direct effect or impact to any listed, proposed, or special status fish or mollusk species because no federal action would take place. The No Action Alternative could have negative impacts because the transportation system that has been deteriorating in recent years would continue to deteriorate until conditions become unsafe. Roads that have been damaged by storm events could become chronic sources of sediment, potentially impacting fisheries and aquatic resources. Many of the roads in the project area would continue to deteriorate potentially introducing sediment at some future point by slope failure or surface erosion.

In stream systems that currently have partial or full passage barriers due to inadequate stream crossings, connectivity for fish and other aquatic species would continue to be compromised. These barriers result in under utilization of spawning and rearing habitats and hinder the broad exchange of genetic material throughout populations of aquatic organisms. When culverts are too small to accommodate a 100-year flood event, there is the potential for them to become plugged, possibly resulting in washouts of the road system and damage to aquatic environments (Meehan 1991). Washouts would introduce a pulse of sediment into the stream system and potentially could cause degradation of downstream aquatic habitat.

Listed fish and their critical habitat, and special status species would continue to be negatively affected by sediment and continued loss of habitat connectivity.

Alternative 1 does not take any steps in the direction of moving toward improving watershed conditions or reducing road density. Long-term beneficial effects resulting from restoration of hydrologic functions, reduced risk of washouts and landslides, and reduction of sediment delivery to streams would not be achieved. Potential local climate change buffering from forest re-growth and increased shade from decommissioned roads would also not occur under Alternative 1.

Alternative 2 – Proposed Action

This alternative includes the highest amount of road miles for decommissioning. All the action alternatives have the potential to cause short-term degradation of water quality by increasing sediment delivery to streams as roads are de-compacted by heavy equipment, culverts and cross drains are removed, and other restoration activities are implemented. This alternative because it does call for the greatest amount of roads to be decommissioned, may cause a greater amount of short-term degradation of water quality through sediment delivery to streams. Alternative 2, however, over the long term would provide the greatest benefit to watershed conditions. It improves habitat conditions over a larger watershed area for fish and other aquatic organisms because of the greater amount of roads decommissioned, which would restore more stream connectivity, improve hydrologic functions, and convert former road beds to a forested condition. Concerning local climate change buffering, Alternative 2 would create the greatest amount of future young forest vegetation and additional shading as canopies closed over what had been system roads. With more road miles decommissioned, former open areas along streams would be reduced and shaded through restored forest vegetation and some tempering of rising air temperatures could result locally. The buffering would only be detectable at localized areas and would be undetectable at a greater scale. This alternative would also store the most atmospheric carbon dioxide as forest vegetation reestablished itself on former road beds.

Alternative 3

With the exception of the No Action Alternative, Alternative 3 decommissions the fewest number of miles. Short-term impacts from sediment production entering waterways during road decommissioning from this alternative would be the least of the three action alternatives. At the same time, this alternative would provide the least amount of reduction in the long-term sediment entering stream systems from aging and deteriorating roads, roads crossing unstable landforms, and inadequate culverts. A greater number of road passage barriers would continue to block connectivity for fish and other aquatic organisms in contrast to the other action alternatives. Local climate change buffering would occur as decommissioned roads re-vegetated with young forest but over a smaller area and less road miles than Alternative 2.

Alternative 4

Impacts, as well as benefits from this alternative are intermediate compared to Alternatives 2 and 3. Short-term sediment impacts from construction activities during road decommissioning would be very similar to Alternative 3. Local climate change buffering would be intermediate between Alternatives 2 and 3.

Direct Effects

Road decommissioning projects can involve work in the existing road prism and at times in an active stream channel. One of the most important aquatic components of watershed restoration is reducing habitat fragmentation by eliminating passage barriers to aquatic species (Meehan 1991). Whenever culvert removal is associated with road decommissioning, the potential exists to deliver sediment to streams and create turbidity. Some of these projects will involve work in or adjacent to an active fish-bearing stream channel. The use of heavy mechanized equipment, could disturb the stream influence zone, disturb fish, and cause incidental mortality. This activity could also deliver sediment, create turbidity, and cause stream bank erosion. There is also the potential of an accidental fuel/oil spill.

These projects may cause a short-term degradation of water quality due to sediment input and chemical contamination. Stream bank condition and habitat substrate may also be adversely affected in the short term. However with careful project design and mitigation, these affects are expected to be of a limited extent and duration.

Direct effects to fish and aquatic species resulting from project activities include reduced feeding efficiency during times of increased turbidity and the possibility of individual mortality during construction. Fish rely on sight to feed so feeding success could be hampered during those times turbidity is increased. This would be a short-term effect since turbid conditions would dissipate soon after the in-stream work phase was completed, generally in a few hours.

Any time there is digging or equipment being used in the live stream channel there is a possibility of fish being killed or seriously injured by being crushed or run over by equipment. Based on previous experience with in-stream restoration projects, most fish vacate the area when equipment disturbs the stream channel.

Road obliterations near streams will have short-term, construction-related effects. In the long term, the proposed road activities will decrease watershed drainage networks, eliminate stream-road crossings, and reduce areas of soil compaction. Direct long-term beneficial effects to both PETS fish species and their critical habitat and to special status species would occur from the road decommissioning projects. These projects would not only benefit seasonal fish migration, but they would decrease aquatic habitat fragmentation. Removal of culverts would allow wood, water, and sediment to move more naturally through these stream and river systems (Meehan 1991).

Indirect Effects

Indirect effects are possible from increased amounts of fine sediment degrading aquatic habitat after project implementation is completed. Fine sediment sources include material mobilized from the stream channel during culvert removal activities or erosion of exposed soil following the decompaction of road surfaces or culvert removals after project implementation. This sediment can also result from precipitation on disturbed ground prior to vegetation being re-established at project sites. Potential impacts from increased amount of fine sediments are degradation of spawning habitat and a reduction in rearing habitat caused by sediments filling in pools. Changes in channel geometry as a result of culvert removal activities could cause localized areas of erosion until the channel reaches equilibrium at those sites.

The amount of sediment generated from projects in Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 is expected to be low due to the time when the projects are implemented (seasonal low flow periods) and the use of best management practices. Once exposed soil areas are re-vegetated and stabilized, erosion would be negligible. Affected areas would be localized and probably extend no further than several hundred feet downstream from the project site. The effects would be relatively short-term; as flows in the winter increase, any sediment caused by project activity would be redistributed downstream and in effect diluted as material settles in different areas.

The probability of “take” of threatened or proposed species resulting from the implementation of these types of projects is low, but present regardless, as is any long-term adverse modification of habitat. Following ODFW in-stream work guidelines, project design criteria, using aggressive erosion control measures, and adherence to applicable Best Management Practices (BMP’s) that are focused on reducing sediment production, would insure that any effects to aquatic species or their habitats would be negligible at the watershed scale (USDA Forest Service 1988).

Cumulative Effects

Generally, any cumulative effect on fishery and aquatic resources resulting from project implementation is focused around fine sediment input into streams. This sediment can result from construction activities, or occur at a later date, such as from precipitation on disturbed ground prior to vegetation being re-established. Fine sediment produced as a result of these restoration projects, both directly and indirectly, would contribute to the overall sediment load within the watersheds where activities will occur. Adherence to Best Management Practices (BMPs), mitigation measures and project design criteria would minimize any long-term adverse effects of project implementation.

The action alternatives (Alternatives 2, 3, and 4) consist of activities that reduce or eliminate negative effects from existing road systems on fish and aquatic resources. These activities are designed to restore in-stream, riparian, and upslope environments needed for the recovery of fish species and their habitat.

Road decommissioning where ground disturbance would occur will be implemented over multiple years in a number of different subwatersheds. The recovery from short-term effects from one project may be complete by the time another project in the same watershed is implemented. Cumulative effects from the proposed project are expected to be short-term and undetectable at the watershed scale.

Beneficial effects from implementation of the proposed projects include long-term improvements to fish habitat and riparian areas, restored fish passage for all life histories of threatened and proposed species, re-established connectivity of fish populations above and below man-made barriers, restoration of hydrologic function, more natural routing of wood and sediment through stream systems (Meehan 1991).

Effects Determination to ESA Listed Fish and Designated Critical Habitat

The implementation of road decommissioning and culvert removal projects in Alternatives-2, 3, and 4, which occur in a Riparian Reserve warrants a ***May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect (LAA)*** determination for threatened LCR steelhead, UWR chinook, and LCR coho salmon found in or downstream of the project area due to the probability of take, in terms of short term, unintended harassment and the potential of short-term increases of sediment into the stream channel where these species reproduce, rear or feed. An effects determination of ***No Effect (NE)*** is warranted for LCR chinook since this species is found over thirty-five miles downstream from any project activity.

These projects would be implemented consistent with the species and activity category-appropriate design criteria and conservation measures in Bureau of Land Management/Forest Service Fish Habitat Restoration Activities in Oregon and Washington CY2007-2012 Biological

Assessment and associated Biological Opinions: NMFS BO (P/NWR/2006/06532 [BLM]), FWS BO (13420-2007-F-0055).

Effects Determination to Designated Critical Habitat

Designated critical habitat for UWR chinook, and LCR chinook occurs within or downstream of the proposed project areas in the mainstem Clackamas River and a number of streams within the watersheds where project activity will occur. As of this time, critical habitat for LCR coho has yet to be designated but will likely correspond with the critical habitat designation for LCR steelhead and UWR chinook in the mainstem Clackamas and its tributaries.

Project design criteria was developed to minimize or eliminate any potential affect that project elements of the action alternatives might 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 of a short-term duration. There would be no measurable long-term effect to any habitat or baseline habitat indicator where ESA listed fish species occurs. The implementation of these projects 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.

Effects Determination to 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 throughout the Clackamas River watershed in the lower Clackamas River and within waters of Mt. Hood National Forest. Chinook and coho salmon utilize the mainstem Clackamas River for migration, rearing, and spawning habitat. The proposed project would not have any long term 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 projects proposed would have a short-term impact but would ***Not Adversely Affect (NAA)*** 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.

Regional Forester's Special Status Species

The effects determination for special status species for both Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 on the Columbia Dusksnail, Barren Juga, Purple-lipped Juga and Scott's Apatanian Caddisfly would be ***May impact individuals or habitat but will not likely contribute to a trend towards federal listing (MIIH)*** for culvert removal and decommissioning of roads within a riparian reserve due

to the potential of short-term, increases of sediment into stream channels which these species reproduce, rear or feed.. There would be no impact for road decommissioning activities outside of riparian reserves.

Redband trout do not occur within the Clackamas River basin therefore, the effects determination is *No Effect* (NE) for this species.

Salmonid Management Indicator Species

Because of their relative sensitivity to change, salmonids were selected as “an indicator species group” for aquatic habitats. This group of species is especially important for their commercial and game values and because they occupy the spectrum of aquatic habitats on the Forest. These requirements are restrictive enough that it is reasonable to assume that if the life history needs of salmonids are met, the rest of other fish species found on the Forest will be met (see FEIS, III-58). Salmonid management indicator species for the Forest and their presence in the analysis area are shown in the table below.

Table 3.21. Mt. Hood National Forest Salmonid Management Indicator Species within Clackamas Road Decommissioning Analysis Area.

MIS	Habitat Description	Habitat Present in Analysis Area	Species Present in Analysis Area
Chinook Salmon <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	Collawash River, Upper Clackamas River, and Hot Springs Fork.	Yes	Documented and/or suspected.
Coho Salmon <i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i>	Collawash River, Upper Clackamas River, and Hot Springs Fk.	Yes	Documented and/or suspected.
Steelhead <i>Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp.</i>	Collawash River, Hot Springs Fk., Upper Clackamas River, Granite Creek, Fan Creek, Elk Lake Creek, Lower Pansy Creek, and Nohorn Creek.	Yes	Documented and/or suspected.
Rainbow trout (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>)	Collawash River, East Fork Collawash, Hot Springs Fork, Pansy Creek, Elk Lake Creek, Fan Creek, Farm Creek, Nohorn Creek, Hugh Creek, Skin Creek, Upper Clackamas River, and Granite Creek.	Yes	Documented.
Coastal cutthroat trout (<i>Oncorhynchus</i>	6 th Field Watersheds: Upper Hot Springs Fk. Collawash,	Yes	Documented.

MIS	Habitat Description	Habitat Present in Analysis Area	Species Present in Analysis Area
<i>clarki clarki</i>)			

A forest-level analysis of the status of these species and their habitat was conducted in March, 2011 (project record). The state of Oregon, in concert with the regulatory agencies, manages fish populations while the Forest manages the habitat. For a population to be viable, attributes such as species abundance, productivity, spatial structure, and genetic diversity are needed for the species to maintain its capacity to adapt to various environmental conditions and allow it sustain itself in the natural environment. All of these attributes are affected by habitat and other environmental conditions that influence species behavior and survival. Maps of the distribution of fish species for the Forest are located in the project record at the Supervisor’s Office in Sandy, Oregon.

Table 3.22. Amount of habitat for salmonid species in the analysis area compared to Mt. Hood National Forest total, calculated by HUC12.

Species	Run	Total Miles on Forest	Total Miles in the Analysis Area	% Analysis Area of Total
ODFW Chinook	spring	131.3	30	22.8%
ODFW Coho	na	183.8	33	18 %
ODFW Steelhead	winter	289.2	48	17 %
MTH Trout Resident	na	1290.8	193	15 %

The 2003 Roads Analysis identified three out of eight, 6th field watersheds in the project area as being among the watersheds having the greatest road related impact for aquatic resources on the Forest. They are Farm Creek – Collawash, Nohorn Creek, and Pot Creek – Clackamas River 6th field watersheds. Because of the unstable West Cascade geology often found in these 6th field watersheds and the larger Collawash 5th field watershed, many permanent Forest-system roads laid out decades ago experience problems from slumping, sliding, and cracking (Collawash/Hot Springs Watershed Analysis 1995). Some of these roads contribute sediment to aquatic systems as a result. Also, since most of these roads are decades old, culverts at stream crossings were often built to a lower standard and would not meet current requirements to pass fish and other aquatic organisms or pass a 100 year flow event. Roads range from paved asphalt roads to aggregate gravel surfaces and native surface roads. Most of these roads were originally built as timber harvest access but are regularly used by recreationists and other users.

In the analysis area, anadromous spring Chinook salmon, coho salmon, and winter steelhead trout predominately utilize the mainstem Collawash River, Clackamas River, and Hot Springs Fork for spawning and rearing. Juvenile anadromous salmonids, especially winter steelhead, may penetrate a short distance up tributaries of the above mainstem rivers (e.g., Fan Creek). Most 6th and 7th field tributaries are small streams and mainly support resident trout species (cutthroat/rainbow trout). In many area streams, resident trout are widely distributed and are even found high into the headwaters in very small, perennial stream channels. Other area streams have natural barriers that sometimes result in fishless streams, even though an abundance of suitable habitat lies upstream of the barrier. Anadromous spawning and rearing in the analysis

area is important for all anadromous species listed above and is mostly restricted to mainstem Clackamas, Collawash, and Hot Springs Fork Rivers (Clackamas River Fisheries Working Group, 1994-2005). Although there has been some permanent loss of riparian forest, off-channel habitat, and habitat quality to roads, much of the mainstem river habitat is comparable to high-quality anadromous spawning and rearing habitat found elsewhere on the Mt. Hood National Forest. Road-related impacts to salmonids range from roads directly impinging on streams and riparian areas, to road created barriers to fish and other organism passage. In some locations within the project area, the miles of road per square mile are quite high and could be contributing higher levels of fine sediment to area streams.

Information on the above streams and fish populations came from the 1993 East Fork Collawash River, 1992 Elk Lake Creek, 2002 Dutch Creek, 1984 Farm Creek, 2003 Granite Creek, 1992 Happy Creek, 1995 Nohorn Creek, 1992 Pansy Creek, 1993 Peat creek, and 1996 Sluice Creek, Mt. Hood National Forest, Region 6 Level II Stream Surveys. Fish population data was also available via the 1993 – 2005 Fisheries Partnerships in Action, Accomplishment Reports for the Clackamas River Fisheries Working Group. Additional information came from the Mt. Hood National Forest, Upper Clackamas and Collawash Watershed Analyses and on-the-ground project inspections.

Direct and Indirect Effects

Alternative 1 – No Action

There are no short-term direct or indirect effects from the No Action Alternative to current baseline fish habitat or to native resident and anadromous fish populations in the analysis area. Current conditions would continue for the foreseeable future.

Long-term effects, direct and indirect, such as impassable road culverts, would continue to fragment fish habitat and long term, isolated populations above culvert barriers would be in greater danger of extirpation from disturbance (e.g., flood events, landslides, catastrophic fire). With no action long term, roads would not be decommissioned that impinge on riparian and stream habitat and some streams would continue in a degraded condition. Long term under no action, all 440 miles of road in the analysis area would remain as system roads with connectivity for fish and with passage of higher flows and stream bedload impaired and opportunities to restore compacted road surfaces to stable hydrologic conditions foregone. In the event of a large flood, poorly maintained roads and undersized culverts could be damaged and greatly increase harmful sediment input to occupied fish habitat. Where you have high road miles per square mile on the landscape and that are bleeding fine sediment into stream channels, these conditions would likely continue. Current habitat conditions for resident trout and anadromous fish would remain the largely the same and degraded habitat may not improve.

Alternative 2 – Proposed Action

Alternative 2 would result in the highest amount of short-term direct and indirect negative effects to resident and anadromous fish and would also result in the highest amount of long-term benefit to fish, due to this alternative decommissioning the most miles of road. All the action alternatives have the potential to cause short-term degradation of water quality for fish by increasing sediment delivery to streams as roads are de-compacted by heavy equipment in the vicinity of stream channels, during removal of stream culverts, and other restoration activities in

proximity to water. Many of these short term negative effects are mitigated (e.g., seasonal restrictions) by best management practices and Design Criteria from the NOAA/USFWS Biological Opinion for Fisheries Restoration (NMFS 2008) that would be utilized for all the action alternatives when project implementation begins. Despite potential short-term effects from decommissioning roads these same activities in the long term of de-compacting roads, removing impassable and undersized culverts, and restoring former road beds to native forest vegetation would provide long-term beneficial effects to fish, fish habitat, and watershed health.

Alternative 3

With the exception of the No Action Alternative, Alternative 3 decommissions the fewest miles of road in the analysis area. Of the action alternatives, this alternative would have the least amount of short-term direct and indirect negative effects to fish and fish habitat. It would also have the least amount of beneficial effect to watershed hydrologic recovery and fish and fish habitat of the three action alternatives. Although this alternative decommissions about half as many miles of system road as Alternative 2, it still moves watersheds and fish habitat to a position of greater long term recovery and resilience to disturbance and benefits both anadromous and resident salmonids.

Alternative 4

This alternative is intermediate between Alternative 2 and 3 with decommissioning about 170 miles of road. Short-term direct and indirect negative effects to fish are similar to the other action alternatives where heavy equipment is used to restore compacted road surfaces, restore natural drainage patterns across former road beds and remove culvert crossings at streams. Again, this alternative like the other action alternatives would provide long-term benefits to resident and anadromous fish as connectivity is restored, de-compacted roads support native forest vegetation, and hydrologic recovery and resilience to disturbance improves.

Cumulative Effects for All Action Alternatives

There have been many management actions in the past that have affected fish habitat and water quality and there are also many ongoing restoration actions designed to restore fish habitat and improve water quality including side channel enhancement, addition of large woody debris to streams, restoration thinning, and other past and current road decommissioning projects. Fish, aquatic resources, and water quality are affected by increases in peak stream flows and fine sediment input into streams. In areas where there are many created openings and roads in the transient snow zone, peak flow increases result from rapid snow melt during rain-on-snow events (Christner 1982). Peak flow increases can also result from the more efficient routing of water to streams by road drainage ditches. Sediment can result from surface erosion during a rainfall event from areas where soil has been disturbed during treatment activities prior to ground cover and vegetation being re-established. Stream temperature increases can result from the loss of stream shading following land treatment activities. Vegetation will begin to grow on decommissioned roads. When trees growing on roads become denser and larger they will intercept snow and moderate the pulses of flow that come with rain on snow events.

Adherence to best management practices, mitigation measures and project design criteria would minimize the contribution that this project would have to cumulative effects. In the long term, the action alternatives would reduce or eliminate negative effects from existing road systems on

fish, soil, and aquatic resources. These activities are designed to restore in-stream, riparian, and upslope environments needed for the recovery of fish species and their habitat.

Road decommissioning where ground disturbance would occur would be implemented over multiple years in a number of different sub-watersheds. The recovery from short-term effects from one project may be complete by the time another project in the same watershed is implemented. Cumulative effects from the proposed project are expected to be short-term and undetectable at the watershed scale. The Fisheries Programmatic Biological Opinions contain guidance for spreading out the impacts of restoration projects so that only a few of them occur cumulatively in any given year.

Beneficial effects from implementation of the proposed projects include long-term improvements to fish habitat and riparian areas, restored fish passage for all life histories of threatened and proposed species, re-established connectivity of fish populations above and below man-made barriers, restoration of hydrologic function, and more natural routing of wood and sediment through stream systems.

Conclusion

This project would not impact rainbow trout or cutthroat trout habitat or populations (management indicator species) and their viability on the Forest or within the analysis area. It would not contribute to a negative trend in viability for federally threatened winter steelhead, spring Chinook, and coho salmon (management indicator species) within the analysis area or the Forest. All of the action alternatives for this project would result in improved habitat conditions for resident rainbow and cutthroat trout and for anadromous salmon and steelhead in the analysis area.

3.6 Wildlife

Effects to Regional Forester’s Sensitive Species

The following table summarizes effects to Regional Forester’s Sensitive Species from the Biological Evaluation, which is incorporated by reference and found within the analysis file.

Table 3.23. Summary of the effects to Special Status Species for all action alternatives.

Special Status Species	Suitable Habitat Presence	Impact of Action Alternatives 2, 3, and 4
Johnson’s Hairstreak	No	No Impact
Mardon Skipper	No	No Impact
Oregon Slender Salamander	No	No Impact
Larch Mountain Salamander	No	No Impact
Cope’s Giant Salamander	Yes	MII-NLFL*
Oregon Spotted Frog	No	No Impact
Lewis’s Woodpecker	No	No Impact
White-Headed Woodpecker	No	No Impact
Bufflehead	No	No Impact
Harlequin Duck	Yes	MII-NLFL
Bald Eagle	No	No Impact
American Peregrine Falcon	Yes	MII-NLFL
Townsend’s Big-eared Bat	No	No Impact

Special Status Species	Suitable Habitat Presence	Impact of Action Alternatives 2, 3, and 4
Fringed Myotis	No	No Impact
California Wolverine	Yes	No Impact
Malone's jumping slug	Yes	MII-NLFL
Oregon Megomphix	Yes	MII-NLFL
Puget Oregonian	No	No Impact
Columbia Oregonian	No	No Impact
Evening Fieldslug	No	No Impact
Dalles Sideband	No	No Impact
Crater Lake Tightcoil	Yes	MII-NLFL
Crowned Tightcoil	Yes	MII-NLFL

*"MII-NLFL" = May Impact Individuals, but not likely to Cause a Trend to Federal Listing or Loss of Viability to the Species.

Effects to the species listed above include changes to habitat as well as potential harm to individuals caused by physical impacts of mechanical equipment, and noise. Species that are may have some effect from this project are described below.

Effects to the Peregrine Falcon

There is a peregrine falcon nest on road 6321 at the 6321-150 section of road. Currently, there is a gate at the 6321 location and at the 6321-150 section. This road is utilized to monitor the nest success of the peregrine falcons. Surveyors are instructed to park at the gate at 6321-150 and walk into the site to do monitoring.

Any road decommissioning at the location would need to be timed to avoid disruption of nesting by the falcons. This would require work be done from October 31 to January 1 within one mile of the nest. There are no other nest sites or resources that would be impacted.

Alternative 1 (No Action)

If there were no road decommissioning there would be no disturbance to the peregrines nesting at the site by the deconstruction activities used to decommission the road. Currently the road is gated at two locations to reduce the potential for harassment of the birds. Peregrine falcons can be very easily disturbed and no action would eliminate any potential disruption of nesting or feeding of the young.

Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

Alternative 2 would decommission the entire road. This would make it difficult to monitor the nest if the entire road was decommissioned. If only the portion of the road beyond the second gate just below the nest be decommissioned this would allow access to the site but still reduce the road density. This would protect the site from people driving down the portion of the road directly beneath the nest site.

The effect of decommissioning the road on the falcons would reduce harassment at the nest site in the long term. The use of heavy equipment and human presence during the road obliteration could cause the site to be abandoned and the nest to fail unless the work was timed properly.

Reducing the time that people and equipment are in the area and only doing decommissioning work on the 6321 from October 31 to January 1 would reduce harassment at the site.

Alternative 3

This alternative would only decommission the 6321-150 section that is just below the cliff where the nest. This alternative maintains a way to monitor and do nest habitat improvement at the nest.

The effect of decommissioning the road on the falcons would reduce harassment at the nest site in the long term. The use of heavy equipment and human presence during the road obliteration could cause the site to be abandoned and the nest to fail unless the work was timed properly. Reducing the time that people and equipment are in the area and only doing decommissioning work on the 6321 from October 31 to January 1 would reduce harassment at the site.

Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would decommission the entire road (which is the same as Alternative 2). This would make it difficult to monitor the nest if the entire road was decommissioned. If only the portion of the road beyond the second gate just below the nest be decommissioned this would allow access to the site but still reduce the road density. This would protect the site from people driving down the portion of the road directly beneath the nest site.

The effect of decommissioning the road on the falcons would reduce harassment at the nest site in the long term. The use of heavy equipment and human presence during the road obliteration could cause the site to be abandoned and the nest to fail unless the work was timed properly. Reducing the time that people and equipment are in the area and only doing decommissioning work on the 6321 from October 31-January 1 would reduce harassment at the site.

Harlequin Ducks

Harlequin Ducks nest along fast moving, permanent streams and spend the winter along the coast. Harlequins can be experience reproductive failures if harassed during the nesting season. There could be short term negative effects of decommissioning roads if the work is done near stream during the nesting season. But the removal of the road would have long term benefits by reducing future harassment. In either case the threat of disruption is low since the harlequin duck is very good at hiding its nest and does not flush easily.

Alternative 1 (No Action)

While no harassment would occur by the decommissioning of the roads near streams, there would be a long-term threat of people disrupting nest by accessing the stream from the road.

Alternatives 2, 3 and 4

The potential exists that when road decommissioning is occurring near a stream that harlequin ducks may experience nest disruption. This would only happen if the work occurred near a stream from March 1 to July 1. The project design criteria would eliminate the threat of nest disruption by starting work after July 15.

Cope's Giant Salamander

The Cope's Giant salamander prefers streams and seepages in moist coniferous forests. They limit their occurrence to waters with temperatures in the 8 to 14 degrees Celsius range. They will also inhabit cold clear mountain lakes and ponds. They occur in suitable areas from sea level up to 1,350 meters elevation. The Cope's salamander breed and rear its young within the cracks and crevices of the rocky substrates within the stream course. They sometimes leave streams on wet rainy nights but remain on wet rocks and vegetation near the stream. This salamander is most frequently found on pieces of wood in streams, under logs, bark, rocks or other objects near streams.

The Cope's Giant salamander has the potential to be negatively affected by increased sedimentation resulting from road decommissioning activities adjacent to or intersecting streams and water sources. Sediment deposition within the substrate could impair preferred habitat characteristics. Also, sedimentation of streams can lead to asphyxiation of embryos and larvae as well as a degradation of overwintering habitat that may result in local extinctions.

Due to the potential for ground disturbing activities associated with the road decommissioning to increase sediment into streams the project design criteria have been designed to minimize the risk of erosion. To reduce sedimentation the road decommissioning would be restricted to the dry season between July 15 and October 31. This restriction would reduce the risk of any surface erosion due to ground disturbance. The proposed road decommissioning would cross stream channels, and remove culverts and could potentially put some sediment into the stream channel. The scarification of the road bed and removal of culverts could cause sediment to be transported into stream channels by surface erosion or runoff. All decommissioned roads would be revegetated following scarification operations to help reduce compaction and increase infiltration rates. The project design criteria would help reduce the quantity of sediment generated and transported into the stream where it could impact the salamander's habitat and lifecycle.

Impacts to the habitats for the Cope's Giant Salamander caused by sedimentation from road decommissioning or obliteration, if any, would be short-term and minor. No measurable or meaningful degradation of habitat would occur with the obliteration and revegetation.

There is a low probability that implementation of the project would increase solar radiation. Current stream temperatures in all streams within the project area are expected to be maintained. Although there is the potential that very small micro-climate changes would occur with implementation of this project, the change is not predicted to be measurable or meaningful enough to affect habitation of the areas by Cope's Giant Salamander

California Wolverine (Gulo gulo)

The wolverine is a rare carnivore that may occur rarely in the Oregon Cascades. It is primarily at high elevations with very little human activity. They avoid contact with humans. They feed on a variety of prey but depend on the scavenging from dead ungulates like elk. There have been no reliable sightings on the Forest since 1990. Continued efforts to find tracks or get a photograph with remote cameras have proven unsuccessful. The northern Cascade Range in Washington represents the southernmost extent of the current range of wolverines along the Pacific coast of

North America (Aubry et al. 2007). The wolverine is considered a subarctic species and Aubry considers sightings of this species in Oregon to be rare wandering individuals.

Effects to Rare and Uncommon Species

Terrestrial Mollusks

The Malone's jumping slug, Oregon Megomphix, Puget Oregonian, Columbia Oregonian, evening fieldslug, Crater Lake tightcoil and crowned tightcoil are mollusk species with ranges that include the project area.

- The Malone's jumping slug and Oregon megomphix are found to be common on the Mt. Hood National Forest and adjacent forest and not necessarily tied to late or mature forest. Therefore, the likelihood of these species being present near the action area is high. There is no anticipated impact to these species from road decommissioning since no down wood or habitat would be modified that would harm the persistence at the site so no surveys are required per direction in the Survey and Manage 2001 ROD (Standards and Guidelines p. 22).
- The Puget Oregonian and Columbian Oregonian are found at low to mid-elevations, generally in damp mature forests with a component of down woody debris. None of the road decommissioning or associated activities would impact these mollusk species. Project implementation would have no effect to the habitat or individuals of these species. No surveys or further analysis is required for these species due to lack of impacts to habitat per the direction in the Survey and Manage 2001 ROD (Standards and Guidelines p. 22).
- The evening fieldslug is found within meadow habitats. Project implementation would have no impact on evening fieldslug habitat or individuals of the species. No surveys were conducted for this species due to lack of impacts to habitat per the direction in the Survey and Manage 2001 ROD (Standards and Guidelines p. 22).
- The Crater Lake and crowned tightcoil are found at mid to high-elevations adjacent to perennial wet areas. Some of the culvert removal projects associated with the road decommissioning contain potential habitat for these species. Riparian reserve standards and guidelines as well as the design of the projects would prevent any adverse impacts to these habitats. No surveys were conducted for these species due to lack of measurable impacts to habitat per the direction in the Survey and Manage 2001 ROD (Standards and Guidelines p. 22).

Red Tree Vole

Habitat for the red tree vole is conifer forests containing Douglas-fir, grand fir, Sitka spruce, western hemlock, and white fir. Optimal habitat for the species occurs in old-growth Douglas-fir forests. Large, live old-growth trees appear to be the most important habitat component. Project implementation would not impact any potential habitat for the red-tree vole. No surveys were conducted for this species due to lack of impacts to habitat per the direction in the Survey and Manage 2001 ROD (Standards and Guidelines p. 22).

Northwest Forest Plan Wildlife Requirements

The white-headed woodpecker, black-backed woodpecker, pigmy nuthatch, flammulated and great gray owls, Canada lynx and bats are species with standards and guidelines within the Northwest Forest Plan. These species are discussed below:

- White-headed woodpecker, pigmy nuthatch, and flammulated owl: These three species are found generally in mature ponderosa pine habitat on the eastside of the Cascades. Project activities would not impact any ponderosa pine trees. There would be no habitat alteration in the project area for these species; therefore the standards and guidelines and management recommendations for these species do not apply.
- Black-backed woodpecker: Habitat for this species is found in mixed conifer and lodgepole pine stands in the higher elevations of the Cascade Range. Although the general project area does contain habitat for this species, project implementation would not have any impacts on individuals or the habitat for this woodpecker. Therefore, the standards and guidelines and management recommendations for this species does not apply.
- Great gray owl: There may be potential habitat for this species in the general project area. However, this project would not alter any potential habitat for the species. There is no road that crosses within 100 meters of a meadow or natural open area 10 acres or greater, thus no seasonal restriction would be required to avoid potential disturbance to this species during the breeding season and no surveys are required per the direction in the 2001 ROD (pg. 22, Standards and Guidelines)
- Canada lynx: This species is federally listed as threatened, but is not known or suspected to occur on the Mt. Hood National Forest. Because there is no suitable habitat for this species within the project area, the standards and guidelines do not apply.
- Bats: The Northwest Forest Plan provides additional protection for caves, mines, abandoned wooden bridges and buildings that are being used as roost sites for bats. Before a wooden bridge is removed, the bridge would need to be assessed for bat habitat. If bats are were found to be using the bridge, then additional bat roosting habitat (e.g., bat boxes or snags) would need to be provided in the vicinity of the bridge. There is only one bridge that is being proposed for removal, which is the 4650 bridge (see photo below). Because the flat understructure of this bridge does not allow for bats to roost, no mitigation or protection is required.

Photo of the 4650 bridge.



Rare and Uncommon Species

No surveys are required for rare and uncommon species covered under the *Record of Decision and Standards and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection buffer, and other Mitigation Measures Standards and Guidelines* (2001) because road decommissioning is included in an exemption from Judge Pechman that allows removal of culverts if the road is to be decommissioned. The culvert removal is the only aspect of the project that could potentially be habitat disturbing for Survey and Manage species; therefore, no surveys are necessary.

Direct and Indirect Effects to Snags and Terrestrial Down Wood

Alternative 1 (No Action)

No effects to the snag and terrestrial down wood habitat components would occur with the No Action alternative.

Alternative 2 (Proposed Action), Alternative 3, and Alternative 4

Ground disturbance would occur primarily in the road prism. No down wood would be removed from the project sites. Some down wood might need to be moved during project implementation, but would remain in the area. No reduction in down wood would occur. Snags would only need to be removed if they posed a safety hazard to individuals at the site during project implementation. These trees would be felled and remain on site and add down wood to the area. The reduction of snags would be minimal and would have no measurable effect on the species dependent on this habitat substrate.

Cumulative Effects to Snags and Terrestrial Down Wood

Because there are no direct and indirect effects to snags and down wood, there are no anticipated cumulative effects.

Management Indicator Species

MIS for this project include northern spotted owl, pileated woodpecker, American (pine) marten, deer, elk, salmonid smolts and legal trout (Forest Plan p. four-13). A table below lists the species and their corresponding habitat types. The analysis in this section discusses the project's impacts to these species and their habitats.

Table 3.24. Management Indicator Species and habitat description for the Forest.

MIS	Habitat Description	Habitat Present in Analysis Area	Species Present in Analysis Area
Northern Spotted Owl	Old Growth	Yes	Documented
Deer	Early Forest Succession Mature/Old Growth	Yes	Documented
Elk	Early Forest Succession Mature/Old Growth	Yes	Documented
Pileated Woodpecker	Mature/Over Mature	Yes	Documented
American Marten	Mature/Over Mature	Yes	Suspected
Gray Squirrel	Old Growth Ponderosa Pine Pine/Oak	No	Not Suspected
Wild Turkey	Old Growth Ponderosa Pine Pine/Oak	No	Not Suspected
Salmonids	Aquatic	See Fisheries Section	See Fisheries Section

The direction in the Forest Plan provides for habitat to maintain viable populations of these species. Land allocations near or adjacent to the project area that provide habitat for these species include Pileated Woodpecker and Pine Marten Habitat Areas (B5); Late-successional Reserves (LSR); Riparian Reserves (RR) for pine marten, pileated woodpecker and the northern spotted owl; Winter Range (B10) and Summer Range (B11) for deer and elk; and Riparian Reserves (RR) for fish. Of these land allocations, only Summer Range (B11) overlaps the project area. There are also numerous Forestwide standards and guidelines that pertain to these species.

Spotted Owls

The spotted owl was selected as a MIS because it represents old growth habitats. Since its selection as a MIS, it has been listed by the USFWS as a threatened species. The population of the Northern spotted owls has declined over the last 15 years since the Northwest Forest Plan was signed. This was due to a reduction in old growth habitat and the expansion of the barred owl. The barred owl is a much more competitive owl with more generalized prey and habitat requirements. The Northwest Forest Plan expected a decrease in population due to the reduction in habitat, but did not foresee the impact of the barred owl competition. There may have also been some overestimation of habitat for the spotted owl since the analysis took habitat from 80-200 years old when the preferred habitat is 200 years and up. Old growth or habitat that is over 200 years of age is selected 83% of the time for nesting in spotted owls (USDA and USDI 1990 Thomas, J.W. et al). Because the overall trend for spotted owl populations continues to decline, the USFWS completed the Final Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl, *Strix occidentalis caurina*, which is currently under revision.

Currently, there are approximately 310,000 acres of old growth habitat Forestwide (Mt. Hood National Forest GIS data, Jamie Bradbury, 2/28/2011). In this project area, there are about 29,000 acres of old growth habitat. No old growth habitat is proposed to be removed by this project; therefore there are no anticipated adverse direct, indirect or cumulative effects on species habitat. Additionally, no short-term or long-term spotted owl populations would decline as a result of road decommissioning activities. This project would not contribute to a negative trend in viability on the Forest for the Northern spotted owl. A more in depth analysis for spotted owl

follows this section. Should activities occur within a certain distance of nest sites or individuals, seasonal restrictions and buffers will be enacted to prevent the adverse effects to owls due to disturbance (see section on Direct and Indirect Effects of Disturbance, following pages). Therefore, disturbance will not have any effect on viability for spotted owls.

Northern Spotted Owl (Threatened) – Habitat Characteristics & Existing Condition

Old-growth coniferous forest is the preferred habitat of spotted owls in Oregon. Old-growth habitat components that are typical for spotted owls are: multilayered canopies, closed canopies, large diameter trees, abundance of dead or defective standing trees, and abundance of dead and down woody material. The owl's main food items are flying squirrels, red tree voles, western red-backed voles, and dusky-footed woodrats.

Habitat for the owl is further defined as either nesting/roosting/foraging (suitable) or dispersal habitat. Generally this habitat is 120 years of age or older, multi-storied and has sufficient snags and down wood to provide opportunities for nesting, roosting and foraging. Dispersal habitat for the owl generally consists of mid-seral stage stands between 40 and 120 years of age with a canopy closure of 40 percent or greater and an average diameter of 11 inches.

The Northwest Forest Plan strategy designated Late Successional Reserves (LSR) as an ecological approach on the landscape level to providing habitat for spotted owls and other late successional users. These LSRs provide connectivity of habitat across the western portions of the Pacific Northwest. Within the project area there are approximately 20 to 57 miles of roads within LSR. In addition, 100 acre Late Successional Reserves (LSR 100) were designated where there were known spotted owl nest sites and resident pairs. LSR 100s were established to maintain habitat for spotted owls where they were found. In the project area nine to 13 roads occur in the LSR 100s. In 1998, the US Fish and Wildlife Service established spotted owl Critical Habitat Units (CHU) to promote the recovery of the northern spotted owl. Most of these CHUs were in a different location than the LSRs. In 2008, the US Fish and Wildlife Service published a Recovery Plan for the northern spotted owl. The Recovery Plan revised the CHUs and created a new designation called Oregon Managed Owl Conservation Areas (OMOCA). These areas most often overlapped the late successional habitat on the westside of the Cascades. Part of this project area also occurs within an OMOCA.

Direct and Indirect Effects to Habitat for the Northern Spotted Owl

Alternative 1 (No Action)

No short-term effects to the spotted owl would be predicted with this alternative. The spotted owl habitat present in the project area would continue to function as spotted owl habitat. There would be no benefits gained for the spotted owl as is described in action alternatives.

Some parts of the project area and the surrounding area are in a high fire hazard situation and are currently prone to a wildfire outbreak. Maintaining these roads would allow the roads to be used to access areas for fire suppression activities. This alternative would maintain response time to fires that could serve to reduce the size and magnitude of future fires, potentially protecting spotted owl habitat.

Alternative 2 (Proposed Action), Alternative 3, and Alternative 4

The proposed road decommissioning would not modify any spotted owl habitat. Ground disturbance and vegetation alterations would be minimal and would not alter any of the habitat components important for spotted owls. There is an indirect effect of decommissioning roads. In the long term, the decommissioned roads would grow into forested stands and begin to provide a prey base for spotted owls. These roads would likely become dispersal or maybe even suitable habitat for the spotted owl in the future. Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) has a slightly greater area that could potentially become spotted owl habitat in the future because it decommissions more miles of roads than Alternatives 3 and 4.

The affects of road decommissioning for spotted owls is minor. There is a direct minor benefit to the owls in the short term. This benefit occurs as the road has vegetation rehabilitation. As the roads are replanted in grasses there would be a small increase in small mammal habitat (for mice and voles). However, the principal prey of spotted owl on the westside of the Forest is northern flying squirrels. Northern flying squirrels would not utilize the road prism to a great degree.

The long-term indirect benefit would occur if the road is not reutilized in the future, then trees may establish and become spotted owl habitat. This would take much longer in the road bed than in a more productive soil. The benefit of the reforestation is greatest in the areas of critical habitat and LSR. The following table summarizes the amount of road decommissioning in different spotted owl habitat designations.

Table 3.25. Roads proposed for decommissioning in LSR 100s, LSRs, and OMOCA/2008 CHU.

Alternative	Number of roads proposed for decommissioning in 100 acre LSRs	Miles of roads proposed for decommissioning in LSR	Miles of roads proposed for decommissioning in OMOCA or 2008 CHU	Total miles of roads proposed for decommissioning
Alternative 2	12	56.5	45.3	255
Alternative 3	9	19.7	13.5	129
Alternative 4	13	40.7	34.2	170

A high fire hazard situation exists in some parts of the project area. By decommissioning the proposed roads in the action alternatives, there would be a reduction of roads that could be used to access areas for fire suppression activities. The potential exists in all alternatives that a wildfire would burn an unknown amount of land within current habitat for spotted owls. A wildfire has the potential to remove the nest site by consumption of the nest tree, or by removing enough of the available suitable habitat near the nest to render the site un-usable by the spotted owl pair.

Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) could reduce the response time to fires by having less open roads and subsequently serve to increase the size and magnitude of a future fire. Alternative 2 has more roads proposed for decommissioning than Alternative 3 and therefore would have an increased potential for a greater loss of spotted owl habitat due to wildfire or at least response time for suppression efforts. There would be less road decommissioning in Alternative 4 than Alternative 2, so there would be more opportunity to reduce wildfire events in Alternative 4. The reduction in habitat for the spotted owl from wildfire could have negative effects to the spotted owl population residing in the area. However, the loss of habitat from a fire is

speculative; thus, there would be no effects to spotted owl habitat from habitat alteration or removal.

Cumulative Effects to Habitat for the Northern Spotted Owl for All Action Alternatives

Cumulative effects to spotted owls and their habitat are very minor. There is no spotted owl habitat affected by the decommissioning of roads. Some reforestation would occur over a long period of time if the roads are allowed to remain dormant. There is a minor beneficial effect to changing road surfaces to vegetation where some small mammals may be found. However, since the primary prey of spotted owls in this part of Oregon is northern flying squirrels, and this habitat would benefit mice and voles not flying squirrels, the short-term effect is negligible. Cumulatively this increase in small mammal populations and increases in forest stands on these road beds is very minor.

Direct and Indirect Effects of Disturbance on the Northern Spotted Owl

Significant noise, smoke and human presence may potentially result in a disruption of breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior of the spotted owl such that it creates the potential for injury to individuals. For a significant disruption of spotted owl behavior to occur as a result of disturbance caused by road decommissioning, the disturbance and owl(s) must be in close proximity to one another. A spotted owl that may be disturbed at a roost site is presumably capable of moving away from a disturbance without a substantial disruption of its behavior. Since spotted owl forage primarily at night, projects that occur during the day are not likely to disrupt its foraging behavior. The potential for disturbance is mainly associated with breeding behavior at active nest sites.

The proposed road decommissioning would occur in proximity to several spotted owl activity centers as well as un-surveyed suitable habitat; and has the potential to disturb the normal behavior patterns of individual owls or breeding pairs potentially at the site. In the Central Cascades, 86 percent of young owls fledge by June 30th. Therefore, the spotted owl critical period in this project area is considered to be March 1st through July 15th. After July 15th, it is presumed that most fledgling spotted owls are capable of sustained flight and can move away from harmful disturbances.

All project activities would comply with the standards contained within the Programmatic Biological Assessment titled *Biological assessment of activities with potential to disturb northern spotted owls – FY 2010-2013*. Informal consultation for the northern spotted owl (disturbance only) has been completed and documented in a Letter of Concurrence written by U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (August 20, 2009). The standards and are as follows:

No activity would occur within the disruption distance of a known owl site or predicted owl site during the critical breeding period (March 1 – July 15). This standard equates to the following seasonal restrictions:

- Chainsaw use would be restricted during March 1 – July 15 if within 65 yards of a known or predicted owl site; and,
- Heavy equipment would be restricted during March 1 – July 15 if within 35 yards of a known or predicted owl site.

If the current location of the nest tree is not known, the disruption distance would be measured from the edge of a 300 meter buffer (nest patch) around the known or predicted owl site.

Alternative 1 (No Action)

There are some minor amounts of noise associated with a road (such as driving, chain saw use from cutting down hazard trees, and road maintenance) that can cause disturbance to the spotted owl. There is a tendency for spotted owls to nest at least 200 feet from a road. The reason for this is unknown (USFWS, Jim Thraikill, Personal Communication). Thus, the disturbance effects of roads on spotted owls is minor.

Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

For this alternative there are 21 known sites and one predicted site that would require a seasonal restriction due to the proximity of the heavy equipment work and the owl nest patch (see Table 3.22). Since the current location of the nest trees is not known, the 300 meter no treatment buffer would need to be used. If the location of the nest site is found prior to project implementation, the no treatment (disruption) buffers listed above may be used. The effect of Alternative 2 on disturbance to spotted owls would be *may affect but not likely to adversely affect* spotted owls since the seasonal restriction would ensure that no nest disruption would occur.

Alternative 3

For this alternative there are 13 known sites and one predicted site that would require a seasonal restriction due to the proximity of the heavy equipment work and the owl nest patch (see Table 3.22). Since the current location of the nest trees is not known, the 300 meter no treatment buffer would need to be used. If the location of the nest site is found prior to project implementation, the no treatment (disruption) buffers listed above may be used. The effect of Alternative 3 on disturbance to spotted owls would be *may affect but not likely to adversely affect* spotted owls since the seasonal restriction would ensure no nest disruption would occur.

Alternative 4

For this alternative there are 16 known sites and one predicted site that would require a seasonal restriction due to the proximity of the heavy equipment work and the owl nest patch (see Table 3.22). Since the current location of the nest trees is not known, the 300 meter no treatment buffer would need to be used. If the location of the nest site is found prior to project implementation, the no treatment (disruption) buffers listed above may be used. The effect of Alternative 4 on disturbance to spotted owls would be *may affect but not likely to adversely affect* spotted owls since the seasonal restriction would ensure no nest disruption would occur.

Summary of Effects to Northern Spotted Owl (Disturbance) for the Action Alternatives

The following table shows which roads would require seasonal restriction requirements by alternative.

Table 3.26. Seasonal restrictions by road number and alternative.

Road Number	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
7010-120	X	X	
7010-270	X		X

7020-120	X		X
7020-017	X	X	
7021-120	X		X
7015-017	X		
7015-016	X		
6330-000	X		
6330-200	X	X	X
6330-170	X		X
6300-170	X		X
6300-175	X	X	X
6300-176	X	X	X
6310-240	X	X	X
6310-210	X		
6322-150	X	X	X
6380-012	X	X	
6350-250	X	X	X
5710-029	X	X	X
4650-120	X		X
4650-170	X	X	X
4670-150	X		
4670-160	X	X	X
4661-031	X		
4640-150	X	X	X
4661-164	X	X	X
4661-120	X	X	
4660-014	X		X
4661-031	X		X
4660-120	X	X	X

With these seasonal restrictions, adverse effects would be avoided. This project would have an effects determination of *may effect, not likely to adversely affect (NLAA)*. The protection of known and predicted nest patches with the seasonal restrictions, and the low density of actively nesting spotted owls is the rationale for the effects determination. No additional restrictions are required in the 100 acre LSRs, LSR or OMOCA's.

Cumulative Effects for Disturbance to the Northern Spotted Owl for All Action Alternatives

Cumulative effects are minimal for disturbance to spotted owls. There is no evidence that roads or decommissioning of roads has any detrimental effect on the reproduction or well being of spotted owls. There are no anticipated effects from the cumulative effect of closing these roads or any new or existing road decommissioning project.

Deer and Elk

In the Forest Plan, deer and elk were selected as MIS because they are economically important game animals. Deer and elk utilize early-successional forest habitat for foraging and were originally thought to require mature and old growth forest for thermal cover. The Forest Plan standards and guidelines have minimum requirements for optimal and thermal cover habitat components, but no specific level for forage. During the 1980s and 1990s, wildlife managers

considered thermal cover to be important to elk survival and production. Over time however wildlife managers have questioned if elk required thermal cover. Currently, there is not much evidence from the elk research community in support of the necessity of thermal cover for elk. John Cook indicated at the Elk Modeling Workshop (April 2010) that telemetry data indicated that elk were negatively associated with cover. Cook indicated that openings are far more valuable for elk than cover. With the reduction in timber harvest, the Forest now far exceeds the standards for optimal and thermal cover, but openings are becoming scarce. As management has changed from widespread regeneration harvest to selective thinning, past harvest units have grown a thick stand of young trees that shade out the grasses and forbs used as forage for deer and elk.

Deer and elk habitat on the Forest has been declining slightly because of a reduced amount of early-successional habitat due to reductions in harvest, differences in harvest methods, and low amounts of wildfires due to fire suppression. Historically (prior to active fire suppression) there would have been a higher amount of wildfires and a greater amount of fire-created openings. This is the professional opinion and consensus among biologists from the Forest and Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife (ODFW), although data on this hypothesis is unavailable because as the past harvest units have grown up (i.e., become very brushy with limited sight-lines), the ability of ODFW biologists to census big game populations has made surveys too difficult to be reliable. The state considers the trend for the populations to be stable and there is no concern for viability of the species; if there were, ODFW would close the season for deer and elk on the Forest. Hunter success has been stable for the last 20 years, thus indicating a stable deer and elk population in the state, although overall populations are smaller than they were in the 1960s.

Currently, there are approximately 69,200 acres of early seral habitat on the Forest (Mt. Hood National Forest GIS data, Jamie Bradbury, 2/28/2011). In this project area, there is about 3,100 acres of early seral habitat. Because road decommissioning activities primarily would be limited to the road prism, this project would not affect seral habitat and therefore would have little effect on deer and elk habitat. Additionally, this project would not contribute to a negative trend in viability of deer and elk on the Forest. A more in depth analysis for deer and elk follows this section on MIS.

Deer and Elk (Management Indicator Species) – Habitat Characteristics & Existing Situation

Roosevelt elk herds on the Clackamas River Ranger District likely exhibit a close association with riparian habitat in areas of gentle terrain and low road density. Elk tend to frequent streams or wetlands. Clearcuts in the shrub/seedling stage historically have been an important source of forage for elk. The area also contains black-tailed deer. Elk and deer on the District browse on a wide range of native shrubs, trees, forbs and grasses.

Deer and elk range throughout the District, although there are substantially fewer elk than deer. Elk herds were greater in the past due to forage being produced within mainly the shrub/seedling stage of timber harvest units. Since timber harvest does not occur as frequently on the District as it has in the past, few elk remain today due to a lack of forage. Deer have not been studied intensively within the watershed, but are generally considered to be wider ranging, more tolerant of human disturbance, and less dependent on riparian areas.

In mountainous areas elk move seasonally. Winter snow accumulation and the reduction in forage availability makes movement to areas with less snow an important survival mechanism. These seasonal movements occur annually. When elk move down slope to the lower elevations, a biologist calls this *winter range*. In the spring when the elk move back up to higher elevations where new vegetation growth makes forage more palatable and with higher nutrition, a biologist considers this *summer range*. On the summer range calves are born in areas with flatter topographic relief. Migration away from the winter range allows for the maximum summer growth of plants that will provide for survival during the colder more snow influenced months. Management of elk during the winter has always been considered the most important time to reduce harassment when energy expenditure could exceed the ability of the elk intake enough nutrition to survive. But late summer foraging is also important to providing enough fat on cows and calves to go into the winter in sufficient condition to survive a harsh winter.

Presentations from the Elk Habitat Modeling Workshop (April 2010) indicated that elk were positively associated with openings and negatively associated with open roads. Telemetry data presented at this workshop indicated that elk avoided roads and used areas with lower road densities at a higher rate than areas with higher road densities. In other words, the lower the road density the greater the likelihood of elk use in that area. Harassed elk move more often than elk left alone and use of habitat decreases as road density increases (Witmer and deCalesta 1985). Witmer and deCalesta (1985) reported a 50% decline of elk use in a 1640-foot band around paved forest roads in Oregon. The width of the area avoided by elk has been reported as 0.25 to 1.8 miles, depending on the amount and kind of traffic, quality of the road and the density of cover adjacent to the road. (Toweill, D.E., J.W. Thomas eds. 2002). Elk within or moving through areas of high open-road density tend to move longer distances (Fiedler 1994).

The Forest Plan states that motorized vehicular traffic should be reduced to not exceed 2.0 miles per square mile within inventoried deer and elk winter range and 2.5 miles per square mile within deer and elk summer range. Table 3.28, below, shows the current condition of road density, its relationship to the Forest Plan standards, and the density for each alternative.

Area analysis for road densities was conducted by fixed analysis areas, known collectively as Range X¹⁶. The Range X analysis looked at summer and winter range and classified the areas with the flattest topography and identified those areas as “key”. The flatter or more gentle the topography the higher the value to elk both from an energy expenditure and nutrient capacity. The flatter topography captures and holds nutrients and fertile soils that deposit down slope. The flatter locations also hold more moisture making forage more palatable. There is both Key Winter Range and Key Summer Range. These areas are best suited for elk habitat for foraging and calving due to higher nutrition and less energy expenditure. The analysis areas differ from the watershed boundaries and were designed to analyze habitat components within the two ecological classifications deemed important to deer and elk – winter and summer range. Table 3.28 shows the road density analysis by elk habitat mapping unit identified in the Range X analysis.

¹⁶ This analysis was conducted during the preparation for the Forest Plan in 1990. It utilized GIS to identify areas important to elk.

Direct, Indirect and Cumulative Effects for Deer and Elk

The following table displays the amount of roads being decommissioned in summer and winter range.

Table 3.27. Proposed miles of road decommissioning in ungulate summer and winter range habitat by action alternative.

Range designation	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Summer range	51.6	18.6	29.5
Winter range	203.0	110.4	140.0

The greater the miles of road being decommissioned the greater the benefit to deer and elk by that alternative due to increased utilization of that area because of the reduction in harassment.

Alternative 1 (No Action)

Eighteen out of the 21 analysis areas currently meet or exceed road density Forest Plan standards. The remaining three analysis areas (Summer Range 19, Summer Range 27, and Winter Range 26) currently do not meet Forest Plan standards. Elk and deer populations would continue to decline as a result of fewer openings providing forage for the ungulates due to general trends in forest management in the Pacific Northwest. Following the Northwest Forest Plan there has been a tremendous reduction in clearcutting on Federal lands and this has resulted in annual reduction in openings in the Forest. This reduction in openings has produced a decrease in the amount of forage across the Cascades unless fire has created new openings and forage.

With the no action alternative, there would be no reduction in road density and the resultant improvement to habitat from reduced harassment. There would be no increased security provided to deer and elk as a result of the road decommissioning. However, there would be more opportunities for harvest in many areas that could have produced forage openings. If no road closures or decommissioning were to occur, the road densities would be greater, creating a situation where elk and deer might feel less secure. However, the roads themselves would provide openings for them to use as forage.

Alternative 2 (Proposed Action), Alternative 3, and Alternative 4

Ground disturbance would occur primarily in the road prism. There would be no impacts to optimal, thermal, and hiding cover, as well as forage habitat available to the ungulate population. Most of the roads that are decommissioned would eventually naturally revegetate and potentially provide additional forage and cover for the deer and elk residing in the area.

The action alternatives would prevent motorized traffic from traveling on the proposed decommissioned roads. The proposed road decommissioning would occur scattered throughout the subwatersheds and would reduce current open road densities of 1.8 miles per square mile (Alternative 1) to 1.17 miles per square mile in Alternative 2, 1.61 miles per square mile in Alternative 3, and 1.42 miles per square mile in Alternative 4, in both summer and winter range.

The Forest Plan states that motorized vehicular traffic should be reduced to not exceed 2.0 miles per square mile within inventoried deer and elk winter range and 2.5 miles per square mile within deer and elk summer range. The following table displays the reduction in road density

per Range X Road Density Analysis Area that would occur with implementation of each alternative. The Range X analysis labels key habitats as either “KW” for Key Winter Range or “KS” for Key Summer Range. The label “WR” indicates Winter Range; the label “SR” indicates Summer Range.

Table 3.28. Road density analysis for Key Winter Range*, Winter Range, and Summer Range.

Analysis area units	Acres in analysis area	Current open road miles	Forest Plan Goal	Road density (Alt 1)	Alt 2 Miles of decommissioning	Alt 2 Road density	Alt 3 Miles of decommissioning	Alt 3 Road density	Alt 4 Miles of decommissioning	Alt 4 Road density
KW8	3233	6.7	1.5	1.3	1.1	1.1	0.6	1.2	0.6	1.2
SR19	3656	15.7	2.5	2.7	10.2	1.0	2.0	2.4	2.0	2.4
SR20	6571	21.9	2.5	2.1	12.9	0.9	5.0	1.6	5.0	1.6
SR26	4872	14.1	2.5	1.9	3.8	1.4	3.8	1.4	3.8	1.4
SR27	5884	23.8	2.5	2.6	11.9	1.3	2.3	2.3	7.8	1.7
SR28	5043	15.0	2.5	1.9	2.8	1.6	0.9	1.8	2.8	1.6
SR39	3528	13.5	2.5	2.4	5.0	1.5	3.1	1.9	3.8	1.8
SR40	4943	15.7	2.5	2.0	5.4	1.3	1.3	1.9	1.3	1.9
SR41	6870	23.9	2.5	2.2	16.1	0.7	3.7	1.9	6.0	1.7
SR42	3128	5.7	2.5	1.2	4.8	0.2	2.3	0.7	3.7	0.4
SR43	6603	4.9	2.5	0.5	2.6	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.4
SR44	4939	13.3	2.5	1.7	8.8	0.6	3.5	1.3	6.9	0.8
SR45	5386	15.6	2.5	1.9	8.2	0.9	2.2	1.6	4.2	1.4
SR47	2718	1.9	2.5	0.4	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.9	0.0
SR6	5768	18.4	2.5	2.0	4.6	1.5	1.5	1.9	2.5	1.8
SR8	4707	16.3	2.5	2.2	3.5	1.7	2.0	1.9	2.0	1.9
WR24	1779	4.6	2.0	1.7	1.0	1.3	0.4	1.5	0.4	1.5
WR25	4904	12.4	2.0	1.6	0.6	1.5	0.4	1.6	0.5	1.6
SR45	5386	15.6	2.5	1.9	8.2	0.9	2.2	1.6	4.2	1.4
WR26	3832	13.7	2.0	2.3	2.4	1.9	0.6	2.2	0.7	2.2
WR5	4197	12.6	2.0	1.9	0.1	1.9	0.1	1.9	0.1	1.9
WR9	5322	14.4	2.0	1.7	4.3	1.2	3.0	1.4	4.3	1.2
SR45	5386	15.6	2.5	1.9	8.2	0.9	2.2	1.6	4.2	1.4
WR26	3832	13.7	2.0	2.3	2.4	1.9	0.6	2.2	0.7	2.2
WR5	4197	12.6	2.0	1.9	0.1	1.9	0.1	1.9	0.1	1.9
WR9	5322	14.4	2.0	1.7	4.3	1.2	3.0	1.4	4.3	1.2

*Note: There is no key summer range located in the project area.

The proposed decommissioning of roads would reduce the road density and improve utilization of deer and elk habitat due to the reduced harassment and increased security. Benefits to ungulates would be substantial in both summer and winter range in the project area. By reducing road densities in these areas, crucial winter habitat would be improved and summer habitat important for calf and fawn rearing would be more productive. Habitat utilization for ungulates would be slightly more improved in Alternative 2 than Alternatives 3 and 4 due to the increase in road decommissioning. However, the reverse is true of the opportunity to provide forage by created openings. The best scenarios occur when a harvest is scheduled prior to the decommissioning a road.

Deer and elk currently within the area during project implementation could be displaced for the

short-term due to the noise levels and associated activity produced by the road decommissioning activities. Due to the abundance of similar low quality habitat in the surrounding area, individuals would be able to alter their foraging and dispersal patterns to another area with equally poor forage. Generally project implementation would not occur during the winter or spring (calving season) due to the wet soil conditions. These are the periods when deer and elk are most vulnerable to disturbance. Most roads would be decommissioned in the summer or fall, a time when disturbance to ungulates would not be highly disruptive to many animals.

Although the road decommissioning would slightly improve the habitat being provided for deer and elk, a lack of good quality forage would continue to be the main limiting factor for ungulate populations in the area. Since regeneration harvest is no longer occurring on the District, openings are not being created that was the ungulates source for forage during the period of heavy timber harvest in the recent past. This continuing lack of forage would continue to suppress ungulate numbers in the project area. Although the level of road decommissioning in the watersheds would improve security for the ungulates, it would not be able to off-set the negative effects of forage reduction from lack of timber harvest. Populations would continue to decline in the future due to the decrease in forage production. However, populations are not expected to decrease to the point that deer and elk herds are not viable; populations are expected to stabilize as the population size becomes commensurate with the carrying capacity of the forage. Additionally, this project is not directly reducing the amount of habitat available to deer and elk, so the proposed decommissioning will not affect viability.

There is a potential risk of large wildfire due to the decrease in the road network. The majority of fires caused by human sources are located in the main recreation areas where dispersed camping is taking place (Personal Communication with Mike Moore, Assistant Fire Management Officer, Clackamas River Ranger District, 9/22/2010). Lightning caused fires however, are the start of most of the Forest's larger fires. A decrease in the road network and the inability to easily reconstruct the road during a fire because the culverts have been removed could slow response times for crews and fire vehicles and could result in larger fires as a result of decommissioning. This could potentially increase habitat for ungulates by creating large amounts of forage.

American Marten & Pileated Woodpecker (Management Indicator Species) – Habitat Characteristics & Existing Condition

The Forest Plan listed **American marten** (formerly Pine marten) as a MIS because of its association to mature and over mature habitat and need for large snags and large amounts of down wood. Shrinking habitat and trapping pressure led to the concern for marten populations (USDA 1990a). The Forest Plan over estimated the habitat for martens because they did not understand the preference for higher elevation habitat that martens prefer in the Cascades. Tracking records and remote camera work does not support the earlier belief that this species establishes territories in old growth forest on the westside of the Cascades as was previously thought. Earlier sight records were most likely dispersing individuals. American martens do however prefer older habitat at higher elevations and select habitat with high amounts of snags and down wood. Their preference is most tied to cavities for denning and a higher abundance of rodents, especially squirrels and chipmunks. Martens prefer sub alpine pine; older mature stands with dead trees and down wood; and stands with large snags for denning and prey habitat. There

is about 10,900 acres of habitat that has a 40% or higher probability of supporting American Marten on the Forest (R. Davis).

For this analysis of home ranges 173 acres was used in determining the number of home ranges on the Forest. For the Forest the analysis indicates there are approximately 63-125 home ranges for martens. The original analysis in the Forest Plan for marten was higher stating that there were a minimum number of home ranges at 231. However, the Forest Plan analysis would have to assume that habitat would only have a 15-20% probability to support martens to have that many home ranges. We know now that the Forest Plan analysis over estimated the number of home ranges capable on the Forest. The current analysis is probably closer in actual number of a population and is better supported by tracking information provided by Cascadia Wild for their winter tracking data and camera stations. During the spring, a home range might be occupied by a male a female and three young. So an estimate of population on the Forest would be 310-625 martens depending on prey availability.

For this project, the units are mid-seral stands and do not contain mature forest habitats, large snags or large down logs. They provide marginal foraging habitat particularly in the stands with lodgepole pine. The project impacts only about 90 acres of habitat that is considered the 30 percent and above habitat preference for martens in the analysis area. Martens may utilize habitat in the project areas for movement, but it is on the low end of the preference scale for the species.

Because the project area has less than .004% of suitable habitat compared to habitat across the Forest, the overall direct, indirect and cumulative effects would result in an extremely small negative trend of habitat. The increase in disturbance would be insignificant at the scale of the Forest. Road decommissioning is consistent with the Forest Plan, and thus continued viability of American martens is expected on the Forest.

The **pileated woodpecker** was chosen as an MIS because of its need for large snags, large amounts of down woody material for foraging, and large defective trees for nesting, roosting and foraging. They are listed as an indicator of mature and over mature habitat. The pileated woodpecker is associated with forest habitats that have large trees, especially large snags (> 20 inches diameter) for nesting and foraging. It uses both coniferous and deciduous trees, but tends to be most common in old-growth Douglas-fir forests in western Oregon. They choose foraging habitats that contain high densities of logs and snags, dense canopies, and tall shrub cover. They may forage on small snags but prefer large snags (Schroeder 1982) (Csuti 1997).

The breeding bird atlas project analyzed the breeding bird survey routes in Oregon and the result was a trend of 0.9 increase for the species with a 0.53 probability with a sample of 61 survey routes. This probability is too high to determine that the species was above 0 for the trend. However, a survey wide analysis for the species showed a 1.7 percent increase with a 0.0 probability indicating that it was statistically significant with 1890 survey routes as the sample size (<http://www.mbr-pwrc.usgs.gov/bbs/>).

Mellen et al. 1992 found that the mean home range for pileated woodpeckers is 1181 acres with approximately a 9-30% overlap (about 200 acres) between territories. Mellen et al. found that

pileated woodpeckers selected habitat that was greater than 71 years of age. Therefore, an average home range with overlap for pileated woodpeckers would be approximately 970 acres.

There are about 405,000 acres of pileated woodpecker habitat on the Forest (Mt. Hood National Forest GIS data for 80 years and older habitat on the Forest; Jamie Bradbury; 02/28/2001). By dividing the acres of pileated woodpecker habitat by the average home range with overlap of 970 acres there are 418 potential home ranges on the Forest. With an average clutch size of four (Marshall, D.B. et al. 2003), it would indicate that the summer population of pileated woodpeckers could be as high as 2508 birds including adults and fledglings.

Within the project area, there are 54,400 acres of habitat for pileated woodpeckers. It is estimated that the project area contains approximately 56 territories with a potential population of 336 pileated at the height of the breeding season including fledglings.

The current trend for habitat for pileated woodpeckers is an increase in available habitat for the last 10 years. The DecAid analysis later in this section shows the amount of down wood and snags. There would be no reduction of habitat for pileated woodpeckers in the project area, but the overall trend for older forest and increased snags and down wood has increased since the Northwest Forest Plan was implemented.

Because road decommissioning activities are expected to result in no impact or minimal effects to pileated woodpecker habitat (or risks to species), there would be no short- or long-term direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to the pileated woodpecker population.

The status and condition of management indicator species (MIS) are presumed to represent the status and condition of many other species. This project focuses on certain key species and does not specifically address common species such as bear, bobcats or squirrels except to the extent that they are represented by management indicator species.

The pileated woodpecker is associated with forest habitats that have large trees, especially snags for nesting and foraging. It will use both coniferous and deciduous trees, but tends to be most common in old-growth Douglas-fir forests in western Oregon (Csuti et al. 1997). American martens are associated with forested habitats at any elevation, but will wander through openings and even up into alpine areas. They prefer mature forests with closed canopies, but sometimes use openings in forests if there are sufficient downed logs to provide cover (Csuti et al. 1997).

Direct, Indirect and Cumulative Effects for American Marten & Pileated Woodpecker

Alternative 1 (No Action)

No direct effect to the pine marten and pileated woodpecker would occur with the no action alternative. Some parts of the project area and the surrounding area are in a high fire hazard situation and are currently prone to a wildfire outbreak. Maintaining these roads would allow the roads to be used to access areas for fire suppression activities. This alternative would maintain response time to fires that would serve to reduce the size and magnitude of future fires, potentially protecting pine marten and pileated woodpecker habitat.

Alternative 2 (Proposed Action), Alternative 3, and Alternative 4

Ground disturbance would occur primarily in the road prism. There would be no measurable impacts to pine marten and pileated woodpecker habitat. Although there is potential habitat for these species surrounding some of the proposed road decommissioning, it would not be impacted with project implementation. At the most a few snags would need to be felled for safety reasons, the amount of which would have no meaningful effects on these species or its habitat.

Many of these roads proposed for decommissioning are currently open. By blocking vehicular access to these roads, pine marten and pileated woodpecker habitat would be benefited by reducing the level of disturbance and habitat impacts that is associated with open roads (i.e., general road use, OHV use off the road prism, snag poaching, dispersed recreation, etc.)

By decommissioning these roads there would be a reduction of roads that could be used to access areas for fire suppression activities. This alternative could reduce the response time to fires by having less open roads and subsequently serve to increase the size and magnitude of a future fire. This could potentially remove pileated woodpecker and American marten habitat.

The only cumulative effects anticipated from this project would be an increase in snags and down wood that may have been taken out due to wood cutting or to reduce danger trees.

Land Birds – Habitat Conditions and Existing Condition

Approximately 170 species of birds occur on the Forest. Less than 30 of these species are likely present within the project area during the breeding season. Some species favor habitat with late-successional characteristics while others favor early-successional habitat with large trees. Birds do not use roads as habitat in general, although some species will roost on roads or will gather gravel from the road surface. The gallinaceous birds from the dove family are known to utilize roads for this purpose.

Several migratory bird species occurring on the District have significantly declined over the last two decades, based on Breeding Bird Survey data (Sharp 1992). Of these species, approximately half are snag dependent and insectivorous or birds of prey feeding on forest birds.

Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Effects for Land Birds

Alternative 1 (No Action)

There would be no change in the habitat for land birds if no roads were decommissioned. Roads are a minor effect to bird species in general. Roads act like gaps in the forest and provide some edge effect. Edge effect can be both beneficial and detrimental to birds. The edge effect can provide improved foraging opportunities and can increase species richness, but it can also introduce an increase in predation and nest parasitism.

Alternative 2 (Proposed Action), Alternative 3, and Alternative 4

Decommissioning of roads would not alter the habitat for migratory birds. There would be no negative effects to species that prefer late-seral habitats. There may be a reduction in areas for birds to gather grit from the road surface, but this is minor. This effect would mostly be to

grouse, quail, doves, and pigeons. There are many places for these species to find grit so it is not a limiting factor for these species.

Decommissioning of roads would allow for this habitat to eventually fill in the gap and decrease the edge effect. This may decrease species richness and foraging opportunities for some species, but it would reduce nest parasitism and predation that comes with the edge effect.

The cumulative effects anticipated from this project and other road decommissioning projects would be a reduction in harassment of nesting birds from vehicles and people. For every road decommissioned there would be a potential increase in nest success of those birds utilizing that habitat.

3.7 Botany

Decommissioning roads benefits native vegetation and wildlife habitat by thwarting the spread of invasive nonnative plants. People and vehicles are major vectors for the spread of weeds. Blocking vehicle access to roads or closing roads aids in the prevention and control of invasive plants. The only drawback to road decommissioning is the potential transport and spread of weeds on heavy equipment used to actively decommission a road or the potential spread of weeds to disturbed ground resulting from the mechanical deconstruction of road surfaces (breaking up and removal of pavement), creating growing space for weeds to colonize. Aside from these concerns associated with active road decommissioning, decommissioning roads can be an effective invasive plant prevention and control measure.

Active decommissioning of roads can potentially introduce invasive plants either through transport on equipment or by disturbing ground within the road prism, creating growing space opportunities for invasive plant species. Passively decommissioning roads has less potential for introducing invasive plants, but a greater length of time will be needed for native vegetation to break down and recolonize pavement, gravel surfaces, or compacted ground within road prisms.

Common and Widespread Invasive Plant Species

Many to most of the roadsides on the westside of the Forest are colonized by invasive nonnative plant species. The following (in alphabetical order by common name) are the most common and widespread invasive plant species along roadsides on the westside of the Forest:

- bitter and curly dock (*Rumex obtusifolius*, *R. crispus*)
- Canada and bull thistle (*Cirsium arvense*, *C. vulgare*)
- common and English plantain (*Plantago major*, *P. lanceolata*)
- common tansy (*Tanacetum vulgare*)
- dandelion (*Taraxacum officinale*)
- foxglove (*Digitalis purpurea*)
- hairy cat's-ear (*Hypochaeris radicata*)
- oxeye daisy (*Leucanthemum vulgare*)
- Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*)
- St. John's-wort (*Hypericum perforatum*)
- tansy ragwort (*Senecio jacobaea*)

Many ruderal species can quickly colonize disturbed ground and outcompete native species because of their ability to produce prolific seed and to reproduce asexually (vegetatively) from deep-seated root systems, rhizomes (underground stems), stolons (aboveground lateral stems), or root and stem fragments. Red and white clover (*Trifolium pretense* and *T. repens*) are nonnative plant species that are common and widespread along roads on the Forest. They were introduced intentionally in seed mixes in the past to revegetate roadsides. Some introduced species like Scotch broom are now so common, widespread, and abundant in western Washington and Oregon that they are considered *naturalized* (well-established in their introduced range but originating from a different area, region, or continent).

Uncommon Invasive Plant Species

Compared to the taxa listed above, the following invasive nonnative plant species are less common and scattered in distribution on the westside of the Forest:

Armenian (formerly Himalayan) blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*)
diffuse and spotted knapweed (*Centaurea diffusa*, *C. biebersteinii*)
common hawkweed (*Hieracium lachenalii*)
English ivy (*Hedera helix*)
herb Robert (*Geranium robertianum*)
reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*)
rush skeletonweed (*Chondrilla juncea*)
shining crane's-bill (*Geranium lucidum*)

[*Note:* This short list is not at all comprehensive and includes only some of the more prominent invasive species occurring on the westside of the Forest. Additionally, it is expected that new invaders (new species) to the Forest will arrive over time and would be added to this list.] These invasive plants are of greater concern because, unlike the species in the first group, they are less common and widespread and, therefore, still controllable and should be treated to prevent their spread when decommissioning roads.

Spotted and diffuse knapweed tend to be confined to roadsides and disturbed sites and not spread into forests on the westside of the Forest, but they produce prolific seed (as much as 1,000 or more seeds per plant) and can infest disturbed areas quickly. For example, Highway 35 and roadsides along Lake Branch Creek on the Hood River RD are infested with spotted and diffuse knapweed. On the westside of the Forest, small populations of knapweed can be found scattered along Highway 26 (from Government Camp to Zigzag) and along Highway 224 (from Estacada south).

Herb Robert and shining crane's-bill not only spread quickly along roads but invade forest edges too. Both species were recently added to the Oregon Department of Agriculture's noxious weed list for the state of Oregon. In western Washington, herb Robert occupies the edges of most highways and roads at low elevations on the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest and is out-of-control. At present, populations of herb Robert and shining crane's-bill can be found scattered at numerous locations on the westside of the Forest and are, therefore, reasonably controllable.

Reed canary grass is scattered across the district (along roadsides, rivers, streams, and wetlands) and is difficult to get rid of.

Only one population of *rush skeletonweed* is known on the west side of the Forest. Located along Highway 224 about a mile north of the Timber Lake Job Corps Center, the ¼-acre population was treated with herbicide by the Oregon Department of Agriculture in 2007.

Ecosystem-Altering Invasive Plant Species

The following are ecosystem-altering invasive plant species:

- false brome (*Brachypodium sylvaticum*)
- garlic mustard (*Alliaria petiolata*)
- Japanese, giant, Himalayan, and Bohemian knotweed (*Fallopia* spp.)
- orange, yellow, and common hawkweed (*Hieracium aurantiacum*, *H. caespitosum*, *H. lachenalii*)

No *ecosystem-altering* invasive plant species were found during surveys in the project area. These highly invasive species can displace entire native plant communities and alter ecosystem structure and functions, including plant-animal interactions, wildlife habitat, hydrology, nutrient dynamics, belowground processes (e.g., mycorrhizal associations), natural fire regimes, and many other goods and services provided by healthy functioning ecosystems.

False brome currently occupies thousands of acres (at last count some 2,500 acres) on the Willamette National Forest and is now in the Columbia River Gorge, including the National Scenic Area. It invades openings as well as forests and can spread rapidly forming monocultures on the forest floor.

Garlic mustard has spread from the town of Corbett, which appears to be its epicenter, into the Columbia River Gorge. Like false brome, it invades forest understories and, additionally, can disrupt mycorrhizal associations (fungal-plant symbioses) that benefit conifers and many other native plant species (Stinson et al. 2006). It too is capable of forming monocultures on the forest floor. Ample evidence of its ability to overwhelm forest understories exists in hardwood forests in the northeastern and midwestern United States.

For the last eight to nine years, The Nature Conservancy (TNC) has been treating hundreds of *Japanese knotweed* (*Fallopia japonica*) populations that occupy banks and gravel bars along the Sandy River. TNC has also been treating scattered knotweed populations in the Still Creek area in the summer home tracts near Zigzag-Rhododendron. The Oregon Department of Agriculture treated Japanese knotweed populations at and in the vicinity of Timber Lake Job Corps Center in 2008 and will return in 2010 to retreat these populations.

Populations of *orange and yellow hawkweed* are scattered across an estimated thousand acres along Lolo Pass Road and within the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) powerline corridor on the Zigzag and Hood River RDs, originating from a one-acre population found in the early 1990s (T. Forney, Oregon Dept. of Agriculture, pers. communication). Populations have spread into the western end of the Bull Run watershed and there is a 3-4 acre population of

orange hawkweed in the Mt. Hood Wilderness Area (Burnt Lake trail). Scattered populations of *common hawkweed* have recently been found along the 1828 road, which parallels Lolo Pass Road, and along roads in the western portion of the Bull Run watershed.

If any of these taxa are found during surveys of roads proposed for decommissioning in the Sandy and Salmon River watersheds, it is imperative to treat them during road decommissioning since they can spread from roads into upland forest, riparian areas, and meadows. Once established, they are difficult and costly to control, let alone eradicate.

Treatment Considerations

Should common and widespread invasive plant species (e.g., Canada and bull thistle, oxeye daisy, Scotch broom, St. John's-wort, tansy ragwort, etc.) found along roads proposed for decommissioning be treated (manually, mechanically, or chemically) as part of the road decommissioning project?

The answer to this central question depends largely on the availability of funding. Funding for treating invasive plants on the Forest currently is limited given the challenge at hand of treating thousands of invaded acres. Title II Payco grants, applied for annually, provide the primary source for funding invasive plant treatments. There is no internal agency funding for westside invasive plant treatments except through challenge cost-share agreements with The Nature Conservancy and Clackamas River Basin Watershed Council. An additional challenge to treating common and widespread invasive plant populations is recruiting and coordinating a work force of contractors and volunteers to conduct treatments. Current treatments on the west side of the Forest target high-priority invasive plant species. Species targeted in 2008-2009 included Armenian (Himalayan) blackberry and English ivy along Highway 224; false brome along FS Road 70 (along the Hot Springs Fork of the Collawash River); Japanese knotweed at Timber Lake Job Corps Center and in the summer home tracts near Zigzag-Rhododendron; orange and yellow hawkweed along Lolo Pass Road and in the Mt. Hood Wilderness Area; rush skeletonweed along Highway 224; and spotted and diffuse knapweed along Highways 26 and 224. Treatments were carried out by partners such as the Oregon Department of Agriculture, The Nature Conservancy, the Oregon Department of Transportation, and the Clackamas River Basin Watershed Council. Major funding and coordination would be required to treat the many populations of common and widespread invasive plant species found across the west side of the Forest, including within the road decommissioning project area.

Manual treatment of common and widespread invasive plant species is complicated by not only limited funding and coordination challenges but the ability of many of these species to reproduce from seed stored in the soil, which can remain viable for many years (up to 75 years for Scotch broom), or to reproduce asexually (vegetatively) from rhizomes, stolons, and plant fragments. Unfortunately, herbicide treatment is often the most (or only) effective way to control these and other invasive plant species. Canada thistle, for example, can reproduce from deep and extensive root systems, including rhizomes, making effective manual treatment difficult. *Solarization* (covering plants with opaque plastic or a geotextile fabric) can be an effective treatment for Canada thistle, but there are thousands of populations of Canada thistle scattered across the Forest. Manual or mechanical removal (uprooting) of Scotch broom can be an effective treatment for this species, but it can also promote sprouting from seeds buried in the soil. Small

populations of St. John's-wort and tansy ragwort can be handpulled, if done carefully, but both species are widespread along roadsides, produce abundant seeds that remain viable in the soil for many years (6-10 years for St. John's-wort and up to 15 years for tansy ragwort), and can reproduce from lateral roots (St. John's-wort) or root fragments (tansy ragwort). Therefore, manual control of many of the widespread invasive plant species can be ineffective and may require repeated treatment along hundreds of miles of road for extended years, a Herculean task even with a fully funded treatment program and a highly coordinated workforce of dedicated contractors, paid workers, and volunteers.

Given these daunting challenges, the best way to proceed at present is to target the most threatening invaders: i.e., the less common and widespread (and therefore controllable) species and those with the capacity to alter ecosystems. Once populations of these species are under control (which may take years of treatment), work can move on to other more common and widespread species based on criteria such as degree of invasiveness, number of populations, population size, location, and threat to other resources such as rare plants, wetlands, riparian vegetation, wildlife habitat, timber-production lands, etc.. Invasive plants increase in acreage at an estimated rate of roughly 10% per year on national forest system lands (USDA-Forest Service 1999). Control of invasive plants can be achieved gradually; however, it will require annual funding, a coordinated treatment plan and work force, and dogged persistence.

Special-Status Plants (Region 6 Sensitive species)

Road prisms are disturbed areas and therefore not the most likely habitat for rare botanical species, although there are plenty of exceptions to this rule of thumb: e.g., *Cimicifuga elata* (shrub), *Bridgeoporus nobilissimus* (fungus), and rare epiphytic lichens such as *Usnea longissima*, *Hypogymnia duplicata*, and *Pseudocyphellaria rainierensis*. There are two *B. nobilissimus* sites within 10-15 ft. of paved roads on the Zigzag RD. *U. longissima* is relatively common on the Clackamas River RD and occurs along major roads, including Highway 224. *H. duplicata* has been found along decommissioned roads in the Bull Run watershed on the Zigzag RD. *P. rainierensis* has been found along trails and near decommissioned roads on the Clackamas River and Zigzag RDs. *P. rainierensis* was recently found on a tree along the Hot Springs Fork of the Collawash River adjacent to the false brome site along FS Road 70.

If active road decommissioning (i.e., tearing up the paved road surface) disturbs roadside banks, shoulders, or vegetation (particularly trees), there would be concerns if any special-status species happen to be in close vicinity. If road decommissioning will not disturb roadside banks, shoulders, or vegetation, then there is no concern. Of the species listed above, *U. longissima* is the most likely to occur along roads proposed for decommissioning. This lichen species is easy to identify and can only be confused with *Alectoria sarmentosa*. Neither *U. longissima* nor other special-status plant species were found during surveys conducted for the Upper Clackamas road decommissioning project during the summer of 2008 (W. Wong, pers. communication, 2009).

Summary

The net effect of road decommissioning is a reduction in the risk of invasive plant spread. Closing roads is a good thing for invasive plant management. The subsidiary negative side effects of active road decommissioning are the potential transport of weeds on road

decommissioning equipment and the potential introduction or spread of weeds from the breaking up of paved road surfaces, releasing growing space for weeds to colonize.

Invasive (animal and plant) species management is one of the highest priorities for the U.S. Forest Service (FEIS 2005). So a reduction in invasive plant spread associated with road decommissioning is not only a benefit but an agency priority.

1. Closing/decommissioning roads benefits native plant communities and healthy ecosystems since human traffic on roads is the major vector for the spread of invasive plants, including noxious weeds. It makes sense to close/decommission roads from an invasive plant *prevention* standpoint.

2. Common and widespread invasive plant species (e.g., *Canada and bull thistle*, *oxeye daisy*, *Scotch broom*, *St. John's-wort*, *tansy ragwort*, etc.) may be treated in the future if more funding becomes available, but currently are not high-priority target species. A subset of populations of these species may be worth treating based on their size, vigor, proximity to resources we want to protect (e.g., rare plant sites, wetlands, water bodies, riparian habitat), or other considerations. *Note:* Tansy ragwort is controlled to some extent already by cinnabar moth larvae (an introduced biological control agent) that feed on the plant. But control is patchy. Manual or chemical treatment may be needed to supplement biological control.

3. *Uncommon* invasive plant species (e.g., *Armenian blackberry*, *herb Robert*, *spotted and diffuse knapweed*, etc.) should be treated. Early detection and rapid response (EDRR) is the most effective way to handle these species. A few populations of knapweed were found during surveys in the Upper Clackamas road decommissioning project (W. Wong, pers. communication) and have been included as new EDRR sites to be treated by the Oregon Department of Agriculture.

4. *Ecosystem-altering* invasive plant species (e.g., *false brome*, *garlic mustard*, *invasive hawkweeds*, and *invasive knotweeds*) should be treated to prevent/control their spread. None were found during road surveys in the Upper Clackamas road decommissioning project (W. Wong, pers. communication).

What other measures should we take to prevent the introduction or spread of invasive plant species during road decommissioning activities? (1) Educate contractors and other workers involved with road decommissioning about invasive plants and stipulate in their contracts that they must clean their vehicles and other equipment (using pressurized water) before entering the Mt. Hood National Forest in order to avoid the potential transport of weeds or weed seed. (2) Assess whether *active* or *passive* vegetation restoration is needed to prevent invasive plants from occupying released growing space resulting from active road decommissioning. Active restoration includes the planting of locally collected native grass seed, tree seedlings, shrubs, or forbs and, if needed, certified weed-free mulch. Mulch application is a good idea to prevent seed and seedlings from drying out and to prevent weed colonization. If locally collected native grass seed is not available, use non-native, non-invasive, non-persistent grasses (e.g., annual ryegrass [*Lolium multiflorum*], Madsen sterile wheat) with certified weed-free mulch. In some cases, it may be advisable to plant annual ryegrass instead of a native grass species, such as blue wildrye,

because the intent is for native plants already in the area to recolonize the disturbed ground. Annual ryegrass will occupy a disturbed site for only a few years whereas blue wildrye will occupy the site for a much longer time period, delaying passive restoration of native species. Additionally, the forest floor of closed-canopy forests tend to be occupied by shade-tolerant tree seedlings, shrubs, and forbs and less so by grasses. In many cases, invasive plants will return if disturbed ground is not *actively restored* (replanted with native species to occupy the released growing space).

Should decommissioned roads be monitored to check for weed growth following decommissioning? Yes, especially if highly invasive non-native plant species are suspected in the area or vicinity and if heavy equipment associated with active road decommissioning may have introduced invasive plants. Monitoring should continue for several years (at least 3-5 years) following road decommissioning since there may be a lag time between completion of road decommissioning activities and invasive plants appearing. Also, new plants can sprout from seed in the soil seed bank for many years, making long-term monitoring all the more important.

The recently completed *FEIS Site-Specific Invasive Plant Treatments for the Mt. Hood National Forest and Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area* (2008) is a guide to invasive plant treatments for the entire Forest, including roads proposed for decommissioning in the Sandy and Salmon River watersheds. The FEIS is available at the following website:
<http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/invasiveplant-eis/site-specific/MTH/>.

3.8 Vegetation

Most of the roads in the project area were built by timber sale operators to access harvest units. The resulting plantations need to be accessed for vegetation management activities such as tree planting, survival exams, stand exams, precommercial thinning and restoration thinning during the course of their development. Some of these actions can be accomplished by walking on closed or decommissioned roads at additional costs, but restoration thinning may or may not be feasible without reopening the roads. In addition to plantation access, roads are used today for other vegetation related activities such as gathering special forest products (firewood, mushrooms, etc.) and managing insect outbreaks. This section will focus primarily on plantation management.

The reasons for thinning vary based on site-specific conditions and land allocations. Recent thinning Environmental Assessments such as Upper Clack Thinning have described in detail the rationale for thinning. In summary:

- Plantations display uniformity of species and dense tree spacing and do not grow well on their own without density management.
- Restoration thinning is needed in plantations in both riparian reserves and late-successional reserves to accelerate the development of mature and late-successional stand conditions.
- Diversity in plantations can be enhanced by variable density thinning that includes skips and gaps.
- The health, growth and wind-firmness are improved by thinning plantations at the appropriate stage of their development.


- Plantation management is a key component of the Forest's strategy to meet the Northwest Forest Plan goal of maintaining the stability of local and regional economies. There is a need to keep forests healthy and productive to sustainably provide forest products now and in the future. Not only are forest products needed by society, but also the employment created is important to local and regional economies.
- Recent thinning projects have generated sufficient funds to cover the cost of road maintenance, road repairs and stewardship projects (fish and wildlife enhancements).

Public comments often suggest that helicopters can be used to accomplish restoration thinning and that roads are not needed. However, helicopter logging is very expensive given the high cost of jet fuel; costs become prohibitive for yarding distances greater than ½ mile. Helicopter projects may receive no bids and if they do they would not have sufficient value to cover the cost of road repairs/maintenance along haul routes or stewardship projects.

In order to facilitate access to future thinning, alternatives to helicopter use are the development of new roads and reopening of decommissioned roads. These would likely be feasible if the road is relatively short and does not require the installation of large stream-crossing culverts. Any new road construction or a future change to the status of decommissioned roads would require analysis through the NEPA process including public participation and evaluation of environmental effects.


One of the reasons often given for decommissioning roads is that there are insufficient funds available for road maintenance. In the project area, this situation is changing. Most of the roads in the project area were built by timber sale operators to access harvest units. Prior to the 1990s, timber harvest covered both the cost of constructing the current road system and regular maintenance. Since that time however, a major shift to plantation management has occurred. There has been a gap between when large scale old-growth harvesting ended and the time when large numbers of plantations grew old enough to be ready for thinning. The following analysis indicates that there is sufficient value in a sustainable restoration thinning program in the project area to cover the cost of maintaining roads to a standard that both provides safe access and protects resources. The chart below shows the volume harvested on the Mt. Hood National Forest each year (volume data separated by watershed is not available). This volume was generated primarily from clear cut harvest and the plantations that resulted are now ready for thinning or are growing steadily and will be ready for thinning in the next 10 to 30 years.

**Mt. Hood National Forest
Volume Harvested by Year (Millions of Board Feet)**



Existing Condition

The project area, excluding Wilderness, is 95,200 acres of which 35,325 acres are plantations (37% of the land base). The chart below shows plantations in the project area by their year-of-origin. The average quantity of plantations created between 1958 and 1993 is 920 acres for the project area. Recently planned restoration thinning projects covered the oldest plantations. In the future, each year, approximately 920 acres of plantations in the project area will be growing into conditions where thinning is viable. These plantations will require thinning in a timely manner to achieve the resource objectives summarized above. This will continue until at least 2040 or longer depending on the timing of a second thinning or other subsequent management.



This table is a summary of an analysis conducted to predict when plantations in the project area would be ready for thinning. These figures do not include plantations that may be thinned more than once.

Table 3.29. Timing of thinning and acres within the project area.

Timing of Thinning	Acres
First decade	7,722
Second decade	11,366
Third decade	9,581
Fourth decade	5,793
Fifth decade	825
Sixth decade	38
Total	35,325

The value of this restoration thinning would not only help maintain roads that access plantations, but would be used to maintain roads that access recreation features such as campgrounds and trailheads as well as roads that continue on to other portions of the Forest.

There are currently 85 miles of roads that have already been decommissioned in the project area within the past 20 years. Approximately 4,000 acres of plantation are no longer accessible by roads due to past decommissioning.

Virtually all of the plantations in the project area display uniformity of species and dense tree spacing and would not grow well on their own without density management. Plantations in riparian reserves and late-successional reserves would be slow to develop mature and late-

successional stand conditions. Plantation health, growth and wind-firmness would gradually deteriorate.

The project area contains a mix of land allocations identified in the Forest Plan. With the exception of Wilderness, the land allocations allow and encourage the thinning of plantations. For example, it is encouraged in viewsheds (B2-034), special emphasis watersheds (B6-018), riparian areas (B7-028), earthflows (B8-028), and timber emphasis areas (C1-016). The standards and guidelines of the Northwest Forest Plan encourage the thinning of plantations in late-successional reserves and riparian reserves. Thinning in plantations is also a primary recommendation in the Collawash Watershed Analysis (page 4-5) and the Upper Clackamas Watershed Analysis (page 61).

Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 (No Action)

Vegetation management activities would continue on 31,325 acres of plantations and other stands that remain accessible. The needs for plantation management would be achieved without having to reassess accessibility. Access for other activities such as sapling thinning and special forest product gathering would not be impeded.

Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

Approximately 22,358 acres of plantations would lose access, or 62% of the total plantations in the project area. Cumulatively, 4,000 acres of plantations in the project area have already been made inaccessible by past decommissioning. Alternative 2 would result in a landscape where only 26% of the plantations would remain accessible.

It is difficult to predict what portion of this acreage could be feasibly managed by helicopter or by reconstructing roads when stands are ready for thinning. With this alternative, many plantations would be well beyond the feasible reach of helicopter systems.

Plantations that cannot be feasibly thinned would remain at maximum density for many decades until natural processes (mortality, disturbance) opens the canopy enough to allow expansion of crowns and understory response from increased light. Failure to maintain tree spacing while they are young can have consequences lasting the life of the stand (Oliver 1996). If stands are not treated, the overstocked condition would result in trees with reduced vigor, small size, increased mortality, and increased susceptibility to stressors such as insects, diseases and weather. Recent studies have indicated that dense, closed-canopy second growth without legacy trees can result in a period of low structural diversity that can last more than 100 years and can have profound effects on the capacity of the forest to develop biocomplexity in the future (Courtney 2004).

When plantations are not thinned there would be long-term implications for climate change. A detailed discussion of thinning and climate change can be found in recent thinning Environmental Assessments such as Upper Clack Thinning. In summary: no long-lived wood products would be created, no enhanced growth of the residual stand would occur to sequester carbon, and as health declines plantations would have reduced capacity to withstand stresses such as dry summer conditions (Spies 2010).

When plantations are not thinned there would be a reduction in the amount of forest products removed making it difficult to meet the Northwest Forest Plan goal of maintaining the stability of local and regional economies. The need to keep forests healthy and productive to sustainably provide forest products now and in the future would not be met on inaccessible acres. Forest products are needed by society, and the employment created is important to local and regional economies. Alternative 2 would forgo some of the opportunities to meet these needs. It would also reduce the Forest's ability to generate funds to cover the cost of road maintenance, road repairs and stewardship projects such as fish and wildlife enhancements. Alternative 2 would also reduce access for sapling thinning and special forest product gathering. There would be reduced local employment as these activities are curtailed.

These effects are cumulative across the Forest as each increment of decommissioning planning gradually removes access in other watersheds. For example, 106 miles of roads were decommissioned in the Fish Creek watershed and 113 miles have been planned for decommissioning in the Upper Clackamas watershed.

One example of the many roads proposed for decommissioning with this alternative is Road 6330. This road and its tributaries are 11.4 miles long and it accesses 45 plantations varying in age. A total of 1,246 acres of plantation are accessed with 571 acres ready to thin now, 430 acres ready in the second decade, and 245 acres ready in the third decade. Depending on the timing of the decommissioning, there could be many acres of plantations inaccessible for their first thin and all of them would be inaccessible for a second thin. Most of these plantations would not be feasible for helicopter logging due to the extreme distance to the nearest road available for helicopter landings.

Alternative 3

Approximately 9,777 acres of plantations would lose access or 27% of the total plantations in the project area. Approximately 61% of the plantations would remain accessible. Alternative 3 would result in some of the same effects described for Alternative 2 when inaccessible plantations are not thinned. However, Alternative 3 would retain access for a much greater portion of the landscape.

With Alternative 3, Road 6330 would remain open providing access to 1,246 acres of plantations. The plantation thinning along this road would provide approximately \$400,000 per decade to maintain this and other roads.

Alternative 4

This alternative falls midway between Alternatives 2 and 3 in terms of access. Access would be lost to approximately 14,546 acres of plantations or 41% of the total plantations in the project area. Approximately 48% of the plantations would remain accessible.

Alternative 4 would result in some of the same effects described for Alternative 2 when inaccessible plantations are not thinned. However, Alternative 4 would retain access for a much greater portion of the landscape.

With Alternative 4, Road 6330 would be decommissioned at mile post 3.8 leaving access to a portion of the plantations (800 acres) along its length.

Comparison of Alternatives

This table shows the value of timber in restoration thinning available each year in the project area to pay for road maintenance and restoration projects.

Table 3.30. Value of timber in restoration thinning available each decade by alternative.

Alternative	First decade	Second decade	Third decade	Fourth decade
Alternative 2	\$579,000/year	\$422,000/year	\$565,000/year	\$521,000/year
Alternative 3	\$579,000/year	\$804,000/year	\$1,072,000/year	\$928,000/year
Alternative 4	\$579,000/year	\$753,000/year	\$937,000/year	\$850,000/year

3.9 Recreation

This section incorporates by reference the Recreation Specialist Report found in the project record at the Supervisor’s Office in Sandy, Oregon.

Affected Environment

Recreational driving is one of the primary uses of the Forest. The Forest Plan estimated over 860,000 RVDs for recreational driving on the Forest. Recreational driving can include driving for pleasure and driving to recreational destinations including trailheads, campgrounds, dispersed campsites (undeveloped campsites without facilities), fishing and hunting areas, and collection areas for mushrooms, firewood and other special forest products. There are about 3,100 total miles of roads on the Forest; and approximately 440 miles in the project area. The proposed decommissioning project primarily would affect smaller spur roads that do not access trailheads, campgrounds and other recreation destinations. Roads or portions of roads that access campgrounds, nearly all trailheads, and other major recreation destinations have not been proposed for decommissioning.

In general, short spur roads do not substantially improve the public’s access to or use of the Forest nor do they provide quality routes for recreational driving. However, closing longer roads may affect access for other dispersed recreational uses such as hunting and special forest product gathering. Some roads proposed for decommissioning may access dispersed campsites, stream fishing sites, target shooting areas and viewpoints.

The Forest has a trail maintenance staff of less than four full time employees. Most trail maintenance on the Forest is done with volunteers like the Pacific Crest Trail Association, the Oregon Equestrian Trails, the Backcountry Horsemen, and the Oregon Nordic Club, and with partners like AmeriCorps, Project YESS, and Northwest Youth Corps. This reliance on volunteers for trail maintenance has been steadily increasing for 10-15 years. The purpose and need for this project, in addition to improving aquatic habitat, is to reduce the miles of roads this Forest must maintain. Assuming the current trails maintenance budget, the Forest would have difficulty expanding trail mileage without reducing trail maintenance on some trails, or securing a corresponding long-term commitment for additional maintenance responsibilities from a partner. Most of our volunteer and partner groups are already at capacity for trail maintenance work. Wilderness trails require more than twice the time and cost to maintain because of the need to use non-motorized equipment (cross-cut saws rather than chainsaws for clearing down logs, loppers rather than brush saws for brushing). Additionally, while Forest Service direction

(FSM 2353.25) does not prohibit new trail construction, the Forest Service's capital investment project (CIP)¹⁷ emphasizes trail reconstruction, rather than construction. CIP funding is the Forest's primary source for receiving larger sums of money for maintaining and reconstructing trails.

There are more than 52 separate trails on the Clackamas District totaling over 250 miles. There are numerous non-wilderness and mountain bike trails within the District as well. In comparison to the trails Forestwide, most of these (e.g., Rho Ridge and Lodgepole) receive relatively low use. On the Clackamas District there are several trails in need of heavy maintenance and reconstruction, including sections that should be relocated to address erosion problems. The three trails in the project area that are most in need are the Lodgepole Trail, the Shellrock Trail, and sections of the Rho Ridge Trail. These trails are so remote, and have so little use that they are not likely to be competitive for CIP funds.

Hunting is a popular recreation activity throughout the Clackamas District. Several specific roads were identified by Forest users commenting on the Alternative 2 (Proposed Action). They indicated that these roads were important for keeping vehicle access to their hunting grounds. They include Forest Roads 4640, 6321, 6311, 6320-120, 6330, 6341, 6350-160, 7021, 7030, 7040, and 6370 (from its junction with the 6380 up to Ogre Creek). They also indicated that the proposal would eliminate vehicle access to some popular hunting campsites including sites along Forest Road 4640 to where it ties in with Road 5710, and along Forest Roads 6330 and 6350-160.

In August 2010, the Forest issued a Record of Decision (ROD) for the Off-Highway Vehicle Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement that designated OHV riding locations. This ROD prohibits non-street legal OHV use on all of the gravel and native surface system and user-created roads and off-road areas considered in this project area. Because OHV use is no longer permitted in the project area, it is not discussed further in this recreation section. More information regarding OHV use can be found in the following law enforcement section, as well as the project record.

General Effects to Recreation from Road Decommissioning for All Action Alternatives

Of particular concern to recreation users are roads that access trailheads. In some cases roads that provide more direct access are proposed for decommissioning and forest users would need to drive farther to access their recreation destination. One road (6340-140) that accesses a trailhead is now within designated wilderness. Roads that access more remote trailheads may be considered for decommissioning where there are concerns about the roads potential impact to water quality.

Several of the roads considered for decommissioning are used for accessing favorite hunting grounds. Many of the hunters scout along the roads, set up camps along or off the road, or access off-road hunting areas. Decommissioning roads affect these users making it more challenging to access their hunting grounds and displacing them from dispersed hunter camps. Reducing the roads may improve wildlife habitat, but make it more difficult for hunters to locate

¹⁷ No new trails have been constructed on the Forest with CIP funding in the last 20 years. The CIP funding application, including the project evaluation criteria, is contained in the project record.

and retrieve game. The impacts for hunters using roads 4640, 6321, 6311, 6320-120, 6330, 6341, 6350-160, 7021, 7030, 7040, and 6370 are discussed in more detail in the effects by alternative discussion below.

Decommissioning of the roads proposed in all these alternatives would impact dispersed campers. In most cases, these users would be able to find alternative dispersed campsites on the District or the Forest. There are numerous dispersed sites remaining throughout the District and Forest, however, many of these sites are “favorite” dispersed camping destinations by families, hunters, etc. that return to them over time. In these cases, another dispersed campsite might meet their need to find a campsite, but their loss of “sense of place” and attachment to the closed dispersed site is an impact that may not be mitigated with an alternative site.

A couple of comments on the Preliminary Assessment wanted to be able to informally use decommissioned roads without the need for formal road to trail conversion. Roads proposed for decommissioning may be used by non-motorized users for a variety of uses including special forest products collection, hiking, biking, and equestrian use. Depending on the amount of decommissioning done on the road, the closed, decommissioned road may resemble a road for decades to come (see next section on types of road decommissioning). These uses may become more difficult if the road and road bed was obliterated or overtime as the road bed became revegetated. As long as the dispersed use does not adversely impact the long-term recovery and rehabilitation of the road to meet aquatic and watershed objectives, incidental use would not be affected.

Effects to Recreation by Alternative

Alternative 1 – No Action

Because the Alternative 1 would not close or decommission any roads, there would be no adverse impacts to current Forest users accessing the Forest for recreational uses. Access to dispersed camping sites, fishing holes, wildlife hunting grounds, legitimate target shooting areas, and mushroom, firewood, and other special forest collection sites would not be affected.

Alternative 2 – Proposed Action

Alternative 2 would decommission over 250 miles of roads on the District. Most of these roads are relatively minor spur roads that were constructed for past timber sales. Some of the longer roads that have been in place for more than ten years have established recreational use areas accessed by these roads, especially where they follow streams and rivers popular for dispersed camping. Some of the roads being proposed for decommissioning access hunting grounds, fishing holes, and special forest product collection areas. Decommissioning these roads under Alternative 2 would require dispersed recreation users to either hike farther in to access these locations, or find other areas to pursue these uses. Alternative 2 would benefit recreation users seeking a larger unroaded setting adjacent to wilderness. In many drainages, nearly all the roads in a large tract would be decommissioned. While evidence of these roads would likely be visible on the landscape for decades, the lack of vehicles and fewer people would give these areas a more primitive setting over time.

Alternative 2 would help address some of the recreation management problems (such as littering) on these roads, although those problems would likely be displaced to other adjacent areas. To

the extent that Alternative 2 obliterates roads, it would also help restore larger areas of unroaded areas for hikers wanting larger unroaded areas. Because it often takes time for a decommissioned road to fully return to a more natural appearing condition, these areas would continue to have evidence of the decommissioned road and look less than “unroaded”.

Several areas with proposed road decommissioning have specific concerns associated with them, including adverse impacts to recreation users or ongoing management concerns. Following are some more site specific known recreation use patterns and management issues by area:

- **East Fork Collawash River:** Access to Round Lake, the Round Lake Trail (#656) and the Rhododendron Ridge Trail #564 would be maintained. Road 6370 would be kept open to the Round Lake Trail and closed beyond that. Road 6370 up to Ogre Creek, accesses areas used by hunters and also goes to duck boxes maintained by the Oregon Hunters Association. The decommissioning of Road 6355-120 limits a road that provides mid-trail access to the Rho Ridge Trail.
- **Elk Creek:** Alternative 2 would decommission Road 6380-125 that accesses a popular area of dispersed recreation sites in an area also known as “The Bridge to Nowhere” along the East Fork of the Collawash River near the Elk Lake Trail #559. Alternative 2 would not affect access to the trailhead for Elk Lake Trail.
- **Farm Creek Collawash River:** Road 6340 provides access to the trailhead for Bull of the Woods Trail #550. Road 4620 provides access to the Sandstone Trail # 542. Alternative 2 would not change those trailhead accesses. It would decommission spur roads around the Bull of the Woods Trailhead. Alternative 2 would decommission nearly five miles of Road 6311 and over three miles of Road 6321 which would affect hunting access in these drainages. Alternative 2 would maintain the decision made in the past Kahuna Environmental Assessment and leave Road 4620-260 road open to the 4620-180 junction and leave the 4620-280 road open for recreational hunting.
- **Happy Creek Collawash River:** The 6340-140 road provides access to the trailhead for Dickey Creek Trail #553. The last part of the road is now within Bull of the Woods Wilderness, so that section of road must be closed to vehicles. Alternative 2 would convert this road to trail. The road decommissioning in wilderness would require mechanized equipment and a minimum tool analysis would need to be completed to assess alternatives and effects to wilderness. Another short spur 6340-140-032 that is located within wilderness would also be decommissioned. Several other spur roads are adjacent to the expanded Bull of the Woods Wilderness and would be decommissioned.
- **Lower Hot Springs Collawash:** Alternative 2 would decommission nearly six miles of Road 6330 and nearly nine miles of Road 6341. Closure of these 15 miles of roads would restrict access to a large area of dispersed recreation sites and hunting grounds. This alternative would decommission all the roads in a very large part of this drainage. It would leave access to the Pansy Creek Trailhead #551 along Road 6341. The trailhead for this trail is along the road which parallels the wilderness boundary. There is additional parking for the trailhead just beyond the culvert where the road crosses Pansy Creek. The road would be

closed beyond this trailhead parking and turnaround area. This alternative would maintain access to Sandstone Trail # 543.

- **Nohorn Creek:** Alternative 2 would decommission nearly all roads in a ten square mile area around Nohorn Creek, Skin Creek and Hugh Creek including 5.5 miles of Road 7030 and nearly four miles of Road 7040 and 7040-120. These roads were identified by hunters and dispersed recreationists as important use areas.
- **Pot Creek:** Alternative 2 would close over two miles of Road 4640 as well as 4650 from its junction with Road 46 and Road 4650-120 north of the powerline. This part of the 4650 road parallels the south side of the Clackamas River and would affect access to dispersed sites and recreation uses along the river. Decommissioning Road 4650 in this section would also extend the access to the Burnt Granite Trail #595 Trailhead for those coming from Road 46 by over nine miles as they would now need to travel Road 46 to Road 4670 to Road 4650 from the south.

Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would decommission about 130 miles of roads in the Clackamas River Ranger District. Most of the long access roads would not be decommissioned under this alternative. Most of the short spur roads identified in Alternative 2 would be decommissioned in Alternative 3. The effects to recreation resources of this alternative would be fewer closures of dispersed recreation campsites, hunting areas and other vehicle based recreation. Because far fewer roads would be decommissioned in this alternative, there would be fewer large tracts of land that would have more “unroaded” recreation opportunities. Where roads are proposed for decommissioning in both Alternative 2 and 3, effects of implementing Alternative 3 would be the same as the effects described in Alternative 2. Differences in the effects in Alternative 3 are listed below by specific area:

- **Farm Creek Collawash River:** Alternative 3 would leave Roads 6311 and 6321 that were identified by hunters open for recreational use.
- **Happy Creek Collawash River:** Alternative 3 would not decommission the 6350-160 and 6380-130 roads, which are two of the longer roads closed in Alternative 2. Alternative 3 would not decommission the 6340-160 or 150 roads, which would allow for a new trail to be constructed from these spurs to access the Dickey Creek Trail. This alternative would then decommission the existing trailhead and access road (because it is in newly designated wilderness).
- **Lower Hot Springs Collawash:** Alternative 3 would leave nearly six miles of Road 6330 and nearly nine miles of Road 6341 open to the public for dispersed recreation. Alternative 3 would leave access to trails unchanged.
- **Nohorn Creek:** Alternative 3 would leave the nearly ten miles of road around Nohorn, Skin and Hugh Creeks accessible to hunters and dispersed recreationists.

Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would decommission about 170 miles of road on the Clackamas District. Most of the effects of implementing Alternative 4 are captured in the effects described in Alternatives 2 and 3 above. Alternative 4 would decommission fewer roads than Alternative 2, and decommission more roads than Alternative 3. Differences in the effects in Alternative 4 are listed below by specific area. Alternative 4 would have the same effects as Alternative 3 as far as access to the Dickey Creek Trail #553.

- **Farm Creek Collawash River:** Alternative 4 would decommission approximately the last third of Roads 6311 and 6321; therefore hunters would have access on most of these roads.
- **Lower Hot Springs Collawash:** Alternative 4 would decommission the last 2/3 of Road 6341 past the Pansy Creek Trailhead. It would decommission the last 1/3 of the 6330 road as well as both Roads 160 and 170 spurs off of that road. It would not decommission the 7010-160 spur.
- **Nohorn Creek:** Alternative 4 would decommission only the last section of the 7010 road and only the 7020-120 road along the east side of Hugh Creek. Most of the effects in Alternative 4 are more similar to Alternative 3 than Alternative 2.
- **Pot Creek:** The effects of Alternative 4 in Pot Creek drainage are more similar to Alternative 2 than Alternative 3. Most of the same roads would be decommissioned.

3.10 Law Enforcement

Affected Environment

Spur roads are occasionally popular spots to dump trash, such as broken appliances, construction materials, hazardous materials, and stripped cars. In addition to illegal dumping, some of the ends of the roads analyzed in this project are used for more dangerous uses such as manufacturing illegal substances and illegal target shooting. OHV use is not permitted in the project area; however, some of the ends of spur roads or ghost roads off of system roads may have OHV use. These unlawful uses are often difficult to prosecute or catch suspects in the act.

Effects to Law Enforcement for Alternative 1 (No Action)

There would be continued adverse impacts in some problem areas that are prone to unlawful and dangerous uses. As mentioned above, some of these roads are magnet areas for illegal dumping, target shooting of adjacent trees, illegal OHV use, and other management problems. These uses would likely continue in the same locations under this alternative; and illegal activities would continue to be difficult to prosecute.

Effects to Law Enforcement for All Action Alternatives

Decommissioning roads can help address some of these problems on a site specific basis. The reduction in road miles for law enforcement to patrol for these illegal uses makes it more efficient for them to focus their time and cover more of the remaining miles more frequently. That may or may not increase the successful apprehension and prosecution of these criminals. Unfortunately, in many cases, these inappropriate uses move or are just displaced to other open

roads rather than being eliminated all together. Because there may not be a direct correlation to decommissioning roads and illegal uses on roads (since illegal activities are most likely going to be relocated to other system roads), there may be no change in dealing with these management nuisances. However, there is the potential in all of the action alternatives for law enforcement to have their efforts more concentrated since there would be fewer roads to patrol.

3.11 Heritage Resources

The National Historic Preservation Act and the National Environmental Protection Act both require consideration be given to the potential effect of federal undertakings on historic resources, (including historic and prehistoric cultural resource sites). The guidelines for assessing effects and for consultation are provided in 36 CFR 800. To implement these guidelines, in 2004, Region 6 of the Forest Service entered a Programmatic Agreement (PA) with the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP). In accordance with this agreement, the proposed activities were considered on a case-by-case basis and separated into one of two categories: 1) Activities considered to have little or no potential to affect historic properties and are excluded from review; and 2) Activities requiring a survey or inspection.

Environmental Effects

Alternative 1 – No Action

All of the roads considered for analysis would remain in their existing condition under this alternative. Heritage resources would only be affected by decay and other natural forces that are already occurring. This alternative would have no effect on heritage resources.

Alternative 2 – Proposed Action

In accordance with the 2004 agreement between Region 6 of the Forest Service, Oregon State Historic Presentation and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the projects have limited potential to affect archaeological properties (Stipulation III.b(5); *Road decommissioning including ripping, culvert removal, out sloping, water barring, stabilization (following analysis) potentially unstable fills, and seeding and planting native vegetation, and mulching, if needed.*) and is exempt from case-by-case review in accordance with the 2004 Programmatic Agreement. However, activities occurring within native surfaced roads or outside of previously disturbed ground have some potential to affect archaeological properties and require inspection surveys.

The proposed projects were separated into activities for which no survey is required, and activities requiring surveys. If previous surveys were determined to comply with the 2004 agreement, a resurvey of the area is not required.

Actions not requiring surveys include road decommissioning activities within areas defined as having a low potential for the presence of archaeological properties, passive decommissioning consisting of barricades and natural revegetation, and activities occurring within roads with thick aggregate surfaces. Actions requiring surveys include road decommissioning activities within native surfaced roads, road decommissioning activities within or near previously documented archaeological sites, and culvert removals where heavy machinery may enter undisturbed ground. All native surfaced roads situated in areas with a high likelihood for the presence of

archaeological sites scheduled for passive decommissioning would have the first 300 feet actively disturbed and also require surveys.

Due to wilderness expansion and an active earthflow area approximately ½ mile of 6340140 was placed into wilderness status. It is proposed under Alternative 2 to construct approximately ½ mile of trail to connect 6340160 to the existing Dickey Creek Trailhead #553 at the end of the 6340140 road. A heritage survey must be completed on this new proposed section of trail before implementation.

For this particular project, it was determined that surveys or inspections were required for culvert locations situated in areas with a high likelihood for the presence of archaeological sites, and all native roads scheduled for active or passive decommissioning which are also situated in areas with a high likelihood for the presence of archaeological sites. These roads consist of Forest Roads 4600043, 4600044, 4600045, 4600046, 4600300, 4620021, 4620026, 4620038, 4620260, 4620270, 4620280, 4620290, 4620340, 4620360, 4640021, 4640025, 4640150, 4640157, 4640163, 4640170, 4640173, 4650011, 4650012, 4650013, 4650014, 4650015, 4650018, 4650021, 4650022, 4650023, 4650024, 4650025, 4650026, 4650111, 4650120, 4650150, 4651011, 4660011, 4660013, 4660014, 4660016, 4660120, 4660130, 4661011, 4661012, 4661013, 4661019, 4661020, 4661031, 4661120, 4661164, 4670014, 4670150, 4670160, 4670165, 5710020, 5710029, 5710130, 5710148, 5710160, 5710161, 5710190, 5720015, 5720016, 5720018, 5720020, 5720021, 5720023, 5720024, 5720039, 5720185, 5720188, 5720190, 5720200, 5730120, 5731013, 5731014, 5731015, 5731016, 5731116, 5731120, 5732016, 6300016, 6300120, 6300130, 6300140, 6300150, 6300173, 6300175, 6300176, 6300180, 6300190, 6310016, 6310018, 6310019, 6310020, 6310021, 6310022, 6310025, 6310028, 6310029, 6310030, 6310031, 6310037, 6310120, 6310125, 6310140, 6310150, 6310165, 6310172, 6310173, 6310178, 6310180, 6310182, 6310190, 6310200, 6310202, 6310203, 6310204, 6310206, 6310210, 6310230, 6310240, 6310248, 6310256, 6310260, 6311011, 6311150, 6320014, 6320016, 6320018, 6320023, 6320024, 6320027, 6320029, 6320123, 6321014, 6321015, 6321017, 6321150, 6322011, 6322012, 6322013, 6322014, 6322122, 633011, 6330013, 6330014, 6330017, 6330019, 6330160, 6330170, 6330195, 6330200, 6330240, 6340015, 6340017, 6340019, 6340021, 6340024, 6340026, 6340030, 6340031, 6340032, 6340033, 6340140, 6340150, 6340160, 6340164, 6340300, 6340310, 6340320, 6340330, 6340340, 6341011, 6341012, 6350029, 6350230, 6350231, 6355018, 6355019, 6370215, 6380125, 7010013, 7010014, 7010017, 7010025, 7010127, 7010134, 7010210, 7015016, 7015017, 7015018, 7020017, 7020020, 7020024, 7020170, 7021012, and 7040121. A total of 86.82 miles were surveyed (160.18 acres). All surveyed roads proved negative for the presence of archaeological properties with the exception of the following: 6300120 (site 665NA242), and 6310022 (665SN243).

However, there are three new and 13 previously documented archaeological properties on or near roads 4600043, 4600046, 4620340, 4620360, 4640157, 4650111, 6310022, 6310120, 6300140, 6340320, 6380125, and 7020170 scheduled for decommissioning, which are discussed below:

- Archaeological site 35CL210 (663NA210) was found to lie within the road prism of 4600043. This site area and road are now within the boundary of the new Wilderness and the site be affected by the decommissioning of the road. Mitigation measures are 1) Road

entrance closure only, or 2) complete site testing to determine site boundary, depth and eligibility so decommissioning can be implemented on the road south of the site boundary with an entrance closure. No heavy equipment will be allowed to utilize the road until site testing is completed.

- Archaeological isolate 663SN286 was found to lie outside of any area of potential effect on 4600046. No additional measures are required concerning this archaeological property.
- Archaeological site 665NA08 was found during the construction of 4620340. Testing of the site area in 1978 determined the site was a low density lithic scatter that was located within the road prism and within the existing clear cut to the west. Mitigation measures are 1) monitoring the project during implementation or 2) road entrance closure only.
- Archaeological site 35CL18 (665NA10) was found to be located within the clearcut harvest unit to the north and southeast of the 4620360 road. Mitigations are to 1) monitor the road decommissioning during project implementation or 2) road entrance closure only.
- Archaeological site 663NA225 was found to be located within a dispersed camping site of the east of 4640157. Decommission the road leading to the disperse camp site is outside the scope of this project and is not approved by heritage resources for any type of ground disturbance. No additional protective measures are required concerning this site.
- Archaeological site 663NA60 was found to be located near the end of the 4650111 road. Road entrance closure is recommended for this road and no additional protective measures are required concerning this site.
- Archaeological site 663EA133 was found to be located along the 6300120 road and was found to lie outside of any area of potential effect. No additional measures are required concerning this archaeological property.
- New archaeological site 665NA242 was found to lie within and near the end of road 6300120. Mitigation measures are to decommission road 6300120 to the lower bench dispersed site approximately 300 feet to the west. No ground disturbing activity is allowed beyond the lower bench area.
- Archaeological site 35CL105 (663NA74) was found to lie outside any area of potential effect on the 6300140. No additional measures are required concerning this archaeological property.
- New archaeological isolate was found to lie within the road prism of 6310022. Testing within the isolate site area must be completed to determine if it is a true isolate of a site. If testing finds the road to be a true isolate than no additional protective measures are required concerning this isolate. If testing determines the area to be a pre-contact site then additional measure will be required.
- Archaeological site 665EA07 was found to lie outside any area of potential effect on the 6340300. No additional measures are required concerning this archaeological property.

- Archaeological site 35CL21 (665NA04) was found to lie outside any area of potential effect on the 6340320. No additional measures are required concerning this archaeological property.
- Archaeological site 35CL22 (665NA11) was found to lie outside any area of potential effect on the 6340320. No additional measures are required concerning this archaeological property.
- Archaeological site 35CL263 (663NA326) was found to lie within and near road 6380125. The mitigation measure for this site area is to close the road at the entrance. No ground disturbing activities are approved for this site area.
- Archaeological site 665NA142 was found to lie within and near road 7020170. Mitigation measures consist of 1) begin road decommissioning ¼ mile east of the 7020, 2) entrance closure only, and 3) monitoring during project implementation. No ground disturbing activities are approved for the first ¼ mile of the 7020170 road.
- New archaeological site 665NA244 was found to lie outside any area of potential effect on the 7020. No additional measures are required concerning this archaeological property.

In the event that archaeological properties are located during decommissioning activities, all work in the vicinity of the find will cease and a District or Forest archaeologist will be contacted.

Therefore, the proposed project may proceed as planned with no effect to heritage resources.

Alternatives 3

The anticipated impacts to heritage resources would remain the same under this alternative as they do for Alternative 2. With the recommended mitigation measures (as stated above and in the *Project Design Criteria* section), Alternatives 3 would have no effect to heritage resources.

Alternatives 4

The anticipated impacts to heritage resources would remain the same under this alternative as they do for Alternative 2. With the recommended mitigation measures (as stated above and in the *Project Design Criteria* section of the Heritage Report), Alternatives 4 would have no effect to heritage resources.

3.12 Transportation

The road system on the Forest has been developed since before the establishment of the Forest. The system steadily grew from approximately 1,000 miles in the 1950's to its peak of approximately 3,850 miles in early 1990's. Currently, there are approximately 3,107 miles of roads on the Forest. This project analyzes approximately 440 miles of roads, which represents 14 percent of the total road system on the Forest.

A majority of the Forest's roads were constructed to support decades of timber harvesting and were paid for largely through timber sale receipts. Road maintenance was funded largely by

timber sales and congressional appropriations. However, as timber harvesting has been reduced from 370 million board feet in 1990 to about 25 million board feet today, road maintenance funding has been reduced as well. While reduced timber traffic has reduced maintenance needs, the maintenance needs associated with recreation and weather have not decreased. With the continued deterioration of the Forest's transportation system coupled with diminished finances, we have been forced to make tough administrative decisions to reduce maintenance activities.

In January 2001, the Forest Service issued interim administrative directives requiring that all road management activities, including construction, reconstruction, or obliteration, must be preceded by a roads analysis that identifies the need for a road and emphasizes a minimum road system. The Mt. Hood National Forest *Roads Analysis* (2003) addresses both the access benefits and ecological costs of road-associated effects, gives priority to reconstructing and maintaining needed roads and decommissioning unneeded roads, or, where appropriate, converting them to less costly and more environmentally beneficial other uses. This process is outlined in Forest Service Manual 7700. Responsible Officials are directed to use a Roads Analysis process to ensure that road management decisions are based on identification and consideration of social and ecological effects. The objective is to manage the Forest transportation system to provide user safety, convenience, and efficiency of operations in an environmentally responsible manner and to achieve road related ecosystem restoration within the limits of current or likely funding levels. This analysis incorporates by reference the information found in the Forest's *Roads Analysis*.

The Forest Plan Access and Travel Management Guide (Appendix C of Forest Plan) provides broad direction for travel management of the transportation system and provides general Forest guidelines for preparation and implementation of travel management plans.

Road Maintenance Methods

Road maintenance is defined as the upkeep of the entire Forest transportation facility including surface and shoulders parking and side areas, structures, and such traffic control devices as are necessary for its safe and efficient utilization. Road maintenance excludes activities that would increase its capacity or upgrading it to serve a different purpose from originally intended. Maintenance includes work needed to meet laws, regulations, codes and other legal policies as long as the original intent or purpose of the road is not changed. A road is considered to be fully maintained when the maintenance activities are completed that leaves the road in a condition that meets the criteria as stated by its Road Management Objectives (RMO).

All Forest system roads are assigned maintenance levels, which describe in general terms the type of traffic that uses each road and the level of maintenance intended for the road. Maintenance levels 1 through 5 are defined in the Forest Service Handbook 7709.59, Chapter 62 (Transportation System Maintenance) and included below.

Maintenance Levels

- Level 1: Assigned to roads of intermittent service during the period that they are closed to vehicular traffic. Roads receiving level 1 maintenance may be of any type, class, or construction standard, and may be managed at any other maintenance level during the

time they are open for traffic. However, while being maintained at level 1, they are closed to vehicular traffic, but may be open and suitable for non-motorized uses.

- Level 2: Assigned to roads open for use by high-clearance vehicles. Passenger car traffic is not considered.
- Level 3: Assigned to roads open and maintained for travel by a prudent driver in a standard passenger car. User comfort and convenience are not considered priorities.
- Level 4: Assigned to roads that provide a moderate degree of user comfort and convenience at moderate travel speeds. Most roads are double lane and dust abated or paved.
- Level 5: Assigned to roads that provide a high degree of user comfort and convenience. These roads are normally double lane, paved facilities.

A summary of the existing road system by maintenance level for both the current Forest road system and roads within the project are is shown below:

Table 3.31. Maintenance levels for the Forest and project area.

Maintenance Level	Surfacing Type	Total Miles on the Forest	Total Miles within this Project Area
1	All surface types (native, aggregate, or pavement)	446	93.9
2	All surface types (native, aggregate, or pavement)	2,296	306.1
3	All surface types (native, aggregate, or pavement)	220	16.25
4	All surface types (native, aggregate, or pavement)	82	0.00
5	All surface types (native, aggregate, or pavement)	63	23.8
TOTAL		3,107	440.1

Road Maintenance Costs

Costs associated with road maintenance are generally grouped into four cost categories:

1. Surfacing costs, which includes the costs associated with repairing the road surface;
2. Road prism costs, which includes the costs associated with repairing road damage caused by such things as minor earthen slides and earthen slumps within the roadbed;
3. Safety costs, which includes costs related to items such as sign repair/replacement, brushing, improving turnouts and road widening; and,
4. Drainage costs, which includes items such as repairing or adding culverts, cleaning plugged or partially culverts and cleaning plugged or partially plugged roadside ditches.

These four cost categories help managers identify and classify the type of maintenance needed for a specific road identified for maintenance. Depending on the particular condition of each road the required annual maintenance costs may include items in one or more categories. For annual road maintenance planning and budgeting purposes, roads are inspected and the required maintenance items identified. Annual maintenance costs can then be calculated, priority roads identified and maintenance work programmed for completion.

The Forest’s *Roads Analysis* contains a discussion of average maintenance costs for maintenance and decommissioning on pages 18-19 and 40-42. In order to be consistent with the *Roads Analysis* and previous EAs that used these costs, the average unit costs used in the *Roads Analysis* are used in this analysis. A summary of the average maintenance costs per mile and surfacing type is given in the table below. The maintenance cost can be calculated by multiplying the number of miles by the average annual maintenance cost per mile of road. For the purposes of this analysis it is assumed that the average annual maintenance costs include the costs required to meet all four cost categories as described above to meet the roads annual maintenance needs.

Table 3.32. Average maintenance costs per mile based on maintenance level.

Maintenance Level	Surfacing Type	Average annual maintenance cost per mile
1	All surface types (native, aggregate or pavement)	\$50
2	All surface types (native, aggregate or pavement)	\$410
3	All surface types (native, aggregate or pavement)	\$2,100
4	Native or Aggregate	\$3,980
5	Asphalt or other Pavement	\$3,980

With the number of road miles known by surfacing type and maintenance level, along with average annual maintenance costs, the total cost for each type of road can be estimated. A summary of these costs are contained below in the table below.

Table 3.33. Estimated annual maintenance costs by maintenance level.

Maintenance Level	Surfacing Type	Total Miles on the Forest	Average Annual Maintenance Cost per Mile	Estimated Annual Maintenance Cost
1	All surface types (Native, Aggregate or Pavement)	446	\$50	\$22,300
2	All surface types (Native, Aggregate or Pavement)	2,296	\$410	\$941,360
3	All surface types	220	\$2,100	\$462,000

Maintenance Level	Surfacing Type	Total Miles on the Forest	Average Annual Maintenance Cost per Mile	Estimated Annual Maintenance Cost
	(Native, Aggregate or Pavement)			
4	All surface types (Native, Aggregate or Pavement)	82	\$3,980	\$326,360
5	All surface types (Native, Aggregate or Pavement)	63	\$3,980	\$250,740
TOTAL		3,107	n/a	\$2,002,760

Road Maintenance Budgets

As stated earlier, the funds received and used to perform annual maintenance activities are lower than the need to fully fund the annual maintenance needs of the Forest’s road system. The table below shows a summary of the appropriated funds received to support the road management program on the Forest.

Table 3.34. Summary of appropriated funds for road management.

Fiscal Year	Annual CMRD Budget
1995	\$1,783,000
1996	\$2,350,000
1997	\$4,600,000
1998	\$2,045,000
1999	\$1,806,000
2000	\$1,891,000
2001	\$2,266,000
2002	\$1,749,000
2003	\$3,169,000
2004	\$1,456,000
2005	\$1,938,000
2006	\$613,574
2007	\$1,449,500
2008	\$1,332,036
2009	\$1,153,000
2010*	\$3,507,000

*This amount also includes one-time funding of \$2,381,000 from American Recovery and Restoration Act Funds and \$65,000 in Legacy Roads Funds in addition to CMRD Funds.

As shown in the table above, road funding generally varies from year to year. The budget is inadequate for both routine and deferred road maintenance. The result of current funding levels and the inability to perform routine annual maintenance is the slow deterioration of the road system due to the effects of deferred maintenance.

The Forest Service does, however, have cooperative road maintenance agreements with various counties and local road agencies, including the City of Portland, which has maintenance responsibility for approximately 128.7 miles of roads within the Bull Run Watershed. Under

these agreements, the Forest can do maintenance on cooperating agencies' roads and the cooperating agencies may perform maintenance on the Forest Service road system. These collaborative efforts allow the agencies to more efficiently complete their work, but they do not add miles of maintenance the way in which the volunteer trail maintenance organizations do.

Road Decommissioning Costs

Estimating costs for decommissioning roads is difficult to do because of the site specific nature of techniques employed. However, in order to gauge the magnitude of the economic impacts to the Forest's Transportation Management Program a general methodology is required. The Forest's *Roads Analysis* contains a detailed discussion and subsequent methodology to estimate these costs. For consistency with this analysis and other environmental documents prepared that used this methodology, the average costs of road decommissioning techniques developed in the *Roads Analysis* will be used in this report. The average costs are shown in the table below.

As can be seen in the table below, the cost of full obliteration with slope recontouring is very expensive and in many cases the cost is not warranted unless the resource risks involved are very high. Within this project area, the risks associated with roads proposed for decommissioning are relatively low. Based on the composite risk factor from the *Roads Analysis*, the project area has 8.2% of the roads are very low risk, 28.7% are low risk, 29.1% are moderate risk, 33.7% are high risk and less than 1% very high risk.

Table 3.35. Costs per mile by decommissioning type.

Treatment Method	Decommission Type	Cost per Mile
Passive	Entrance Treatment-Flat slope, no live stream culvert removal, no large fills (passive decommission method).	\$2,000 - \$5,000
Active	Stabilize-Removal of some small culverts, minor to moderate live stream channel restoration, some fill pullback (active decommission method).	\$5,000 - \$15,000
Active	Stabilize-Large fills, large culvert removal, sidecast pullback, major stream channel restoration (active decommission method).	\$15,000 - \$30,000

Roads Record Management

The management of electronic information related to the road system and other transportation system components is completed via a standard agency-wide database called "Infra Travel Routes". Within this database data on individual roads is maintained that includes such items as maintenance level, traffic data, traffic accident records, road logs, condition surveys, maintenance needs, and future management objectives.

Updating the database is an ongoing annual task that is performed by Forest Service personnel and if roads are decommissioned as a result of this study, they will be removed from the system and no longer tracked as a system road. Roads that are designated for decommissioning as a

result of the decision by the Responsible Official will be indicated as such within the database and the database will serve as the official tracking tool for decisions made for each road.

Effects Analysis

Each road proposed for decommissioning under this project is site specific for its aquatic restoration issues and needs. The cost to decommission the proposed roads is estimated from previous road decommissioning projects from 2009.

The alternative chosen would affect the average annual maintenance costs for the roads system within the project area. The same road under each alternative may have a different treatment associated with it.

Alternative 1 - No Action

Selecting the No Action Alternative would mean no road decommissioning activities would be completed under this road decommission project. Approximately 440 miles of roads would remain as they currently are on the landscape. The same level of access would be provided in the future and the estimated annual maintenance costs would remain the same for the road system within the area. These roads would continue to receive limited funding and therefore, maintenance needs may not be adequately met.

Alternative 2 - Proposed Action

Implementation of Alternative 2 would reduce the total road system in the project area to 185 miles of roads. This represents a reduction of about 58% of the analyzed road system within the project area. It currently costs an estimated \$259,045 to maintain the road system within the project area. Upon completion of the decommissioning efforts, it is estimated that the annual maintenance costs for the road system within the project area would be about \$177,425. This represents a reduction in estimated annual maintenance costs of approximately \$81,620.

Implementation of Alternative 2 would decommission about 81.6 miles of level 1 roads; 188.2 miles of level 2 roads; and 0.18 miles of level 3 roads¹⁸.

Alternative 3

Implementation of Alternative 3 would reduce the total road system in the project area to 311 miles of roads. This represents a reduction of 34% of the analyzed road system within the project area. It currently costs an estimated \$259,045 to maintain the road system within the project area. Upon completion of the decommissioning efforts, it is estimated that the annual maintenance costs for the road system within the project area would be \$226,096. This represents a reduction in estimated annual maintenance costs of \$32,949.

Implementation of Alternative 3 would decommission about 65.3 miles of level 1 roads and 72.4 miles of level 2 roads¹³. No level 3 roads would be decommissioned.

¹⁸ Mileage is from the INFRA database. Most of the mileage from this project is from GIS data; therefore there are some differences in the mileage amounts because INFRA and GIS data reflect slight differences due to how the information is compiled and utilized.

Alternative 4

Implementation of Alternative 4 would reduce the total road system in the project area to 270 miles of roads. This represents a reduction of 39% of the analyzed road system within the project area. It currently costs an estimated \$259,045 to maintain the road system within the project area. Upon completion of the decommissioning efforts, it is estimated that the annual maintenance costs for the system within the project area would be \$210,427. This represents a reduction in estimated annual maintenance costs of \$48,618.

Implementation of Alternative 4 would decommission about 67.9 miles of level 1 roads and 110.3 miles of level 2 roads¹³. No level 3 roads would be decommissioned.

Table 3.36. Total annual costs to maintain roads by alternative

Alternative	ML1	ML2	ML3	ML4	ML5	Remaining Mileage	Decommissioned Mileage	% of Road Mileage Reduction	Estimated Maintenance Costs*
1	93.9	306.1	16.3	0	23.8	440.1	0.00	0%	\$259,045
2	12.3	117.9	16.1	0	23.8	170.1	269.9	58%	\$177,425
3	28.6	233.7	16.3	0	23.8	302.4	137.6	34%	\$226,096
4	26	195.8	16.3	0	23.8	261.9	178.1	39%	\$210,427

*Maintenance costs are based on the average maintenance costs from Table 3.33.

3.13 Other Required Disclosures

Floodplains and Wetlands

There would be no impacts to floodplains or wetlands from this project. The Oregon Department of Lands and the US Army Corps of Engineers would be notified and provided necessary information about this project related to dredging and filling at stream crossings (Section 404, Clean Water Act).

Air Quality

No burning is planned for this project, so there would be no impacts on visibility from smoke. Any dust from proposed decommissioning activities would be short-term in duration and very site-specific for each road. There would be no effects past the decommissioning phase. No cumulative effects would be expected.

Consumers, Civil Rights, Minority Groups, Women, and Environmental Justice

Executive Order No. 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations*, directs Federal agencies to address effects accruing in a disproportionate way to minority and low income populations. No disproportionate impacts to consumers, civil rights, minority groups, and women are expected from the action alternatives. Decommissioning work would be implemented by contracts with private businesses. Project contracting for the project's activities would use approved management direction to protect the rights of these private companies.

Treaty Resources and Reserved Indian Rights

No impacts on American Indian social, economic, or subsistence rights are anticipated. No impacts are anticipated related to the American Indian Religious Freedom Act. The Confederated Tribe of Warm Springs was contacted in reference to this Proposed Action.

Prime Farmlands, Rangelands, and Forestlands

None of the alternatives would have an adverse impact to the productivity of farmland, rangeland, or forestland.

Irreversible and Irrecoverable Commitments of Resources

Irreversible commitments of resources are those that are forever lost and cannot be reversed. Irrecoverable commitments of resources are considered to be those that are lost for a period of time and, in time, can be replaced. The alternatives would not result in any irreversible or irrecoverable commitments of resources.

4.0 References

- Aumen, N.G., Grizzard, T.G., Hawkins, R.H., 1989. *Task Force Final Report – Water Quality Monitoring in the Bull Run Watershed Oregon*. Submitted to: City of Portland, Oregon Bureau of Water Works.
- Bisson, Pete. 2008. Salmon and Trout in the Pacific Northwest and Climate Change. (June 16, 2008). U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Climate Change Resource Center. <http://www.fs.fed.us/ccrc/topics/salmon-trout.shtml>.
- Department of Natural Resources. 1993. *Washington Department of Natural Resources Watershed Analysis Manual, Version 2.0*, October 1993.
- Dunne and Leopold. 1978. *Water in Environmental Planning*. W.H. Freeman and Co. San Francisco, CA.
- FEMAT 1993. *Forest Ecosystem Management: An Ecological, Economic, and Social Assessment, Report of Forest Ecosystem Management Assessment Team*, USDA Forest Service, Ogden, UT.
- La Husen, R.G. 1994. *Variations in Turbidity in Streams of the Bull Run Watershed, Oregon 1989-90*. US Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 93-4045.
- MacDonald, L.H., A.W. Smart, and R.C. Wissmar. 1991. *Monitoring guidelines to evaluate effects of forestry activities on streams in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska*. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10.
- MacDonald, L.H., 2 Drew Coe, and Sandra Litschert. 2004. *Assessing Cumulative Watershed Effects in the Central Sierra Nevada: Hillslope Measurements and Catchment-Scale Modeling*. USDA Forest Service Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-193.
- Meehan, W.R. 1991. (Editor) *Influences of Forest and Rangeland Management on Salmonid Fishes and Their Habitats*. American Fisheries Society.
- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. 1992. *Clackamas River Subbasin Fish Management Plan*.
- Peterson D.L., O'Halloran K. 2007. *Preparing for Climate Change – Olympic National Forest and Pacific Northwest*. U.S. Forest Service Powerpoint Presentation.
- Renschler, Chris S., Jon Harbor, *Soil erosion assessment tools from point to regional scales--the role of geomorphologists in land management research and implementation*, *Geomorphology*, Volume 47, Issues 2-4, 1 October 2002, Pages 189-209, ISSN 0169-555X, DOI: 10.1016/S0169-555X(02)00082-X. (<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6V93-45MDT0B-8/2/62b708eee4ec7cf0e217606dc6e36c68>).

Sandy River Basin Working Group. 2007. *Sandy River basin aquatic habitat restoration strategy: an anchor habitat-based prioritization of restoration opportunities*. Oregon Trout. Portland, OR.

SCS. 1976. *Flood Hazard Analyses, Upper Sandy River and Tributaries, Clackamas County Oregon*. USDA Soil Conservation Service, Portland OR.

Spies T.A., Giesen T.W., Swanso F.J., Franklin J.F., Lach D., Johnson K.N. 2010. *Climate Change Adaptation Strategies for Federal Forests of the Pacific Northwest, USA: Ecological, Policy, and Socio-economic Perspectives*. Landscape Ecology.

USDA Forest Service. 1988. *General Best Management Practices*. Pacific Northwest Region.

USDA Forest Service. 1991. *Mt. Hood National Forest, Land and Resource Management Plan, Final Environmental Impact Statement*. Pacific Northwest Region.

USDA Forest Service and USDI Bureau of Land Management. 1994. *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.

USDA Forest Service. 1995a. *Collawash/Hot Springs Watershed Analysis*. Mt. Hood National Forest.
(http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/mthood/documents/Watershed_Analyses/Collawash_Hot_Springs_WA.pdf)

USDA Forest Service. 1995b. *Upper Clackamas River Watershed Analysis*. Clackamas River Ranger District. Estacada, Oregon.

USDA Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management. 1996. *Lower Clackamas River Watershed Analysis*. Pacific Northwest Region. Clackamas River Ranger District, Oregon.

USDA Forest Service. 1996. *Factors Affecting Landslide Incidence after Large Storm Events during the Winter of 1995-1996 in the Upper Clackamas River Drainages, Oregon Cascades*. Mt Hood National Forest.

USDA Forest Service. 1997. *Bull Run Watershed Analysis*. Mt. Hood National Forest, Zigzag Ranger District, US Government Printing Office, 591-971. Portland, OR. 522 pp.

USDA Forest Service. 1999. *Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Protocol for Addressing Clean Water Act Section 303(d) Listed Waters*.
<http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/water/protocol.pdf>

USDA Forest Service. 2003. *Roads Analysis Mt. Hood National Forest*. Mt. Hood National Forest.

USDA Forest Service. 2006. *Bull Run Watershed Road Decommissioning Environmental Assessment* . Mt. Hood National Forest.

USDA Forest Service. 2006. *Hood River Basin Aquatic Habitat Restoration Strategy*. Mt. Hood National Forest.

USDA Forest Service. 2009. *Legacy Roads and Trails Monitoring Project Road Decommissioning in the Skokomish River Watershed Olympic National Forest*. Rocky Mountain Research Station.

http://www.fs.fed.us/GRAIP/downloads/case_studies/LegacyRoadsEffectivenessMonitoringOlympicNF2009.pdf.

Wemple, B.C., J.A. Jones, G.E. Grant. 1996. *Channel Network Extension by Logging Roads in Two Basins, Western Cascades, Oregon*. Water Resources bulletin 32(6):1195-1207.

WEPP. 2000. *Water Erosion Prediction Project soil erosion model*.

<http://forest.moscowsl.wsu.edu/fswcpp/docs/distweppdoc.html>.