INLAND NATIVE FISH STRATEGY
IMPLEMENTATION INFORMATION PACKAGE

List of Contents

IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING PLAN
FOR THE
INLAND NATIVE FISH STRATEGY

October 3, 1995

THE DECISION

The Inland Native Fish Strategy Decision Notice was signed July 28, 1995, and became effective August 30. Based on public comment and internal review, and with the support of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Regional Foresters have decided to select Alternative D as described in the Environmental Assessment for the Inland Native Fish Strategy.

Under the authority of 36 CFR 219.10(f), this decision amends Regional Guides for the Forest Service's Intermountain, Northern, and Pacific Northwest Regions and Forest Plans in the 22 affected National Forests, and replaces the interim riparian standard established May 20, 1994 by Region 6 Regional Forester John Lowe (*Decision Notice for the Continuation of Interim Management Direction Establishing Riparian, Ecosystem, and Wildlife Standards for Timber Sales*).

The Forest Service will apply management measures to all proposed or new projects and activities involving the management of timber, roads, grazing, recreation resources, riparian areas, minerals, fire and fuels, and land uses such as leases, permits, rights-of-way, and easements. These measures also apply to restoration activities for watershed, fish, and wildlife habitat within Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas or that degrade Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas.

The strategy does not attempt to develop a restoration strategy given the short time period for implementation of this interim direction. It is expected that Forests would utilize the information from watershed analysis and project development to initiate restoration projects where appropriate and funds are available. Priority watersheds would have the highest priority for restoration efforts.

We will also be testing the concepts and philosophies of Alternatives C and E as described in the Decision Notice for this project. The direction for Alternatives C and E are not included with this package; details on how and where the testing will be accomplished will be distributed when test watersheds have been identified.

RESPONSIBILITY

Responsibility for the implementation and monitoring of the standards and guidelines during the interim period rests with the line officers at Forest and District levels of the organization.

IMPLEMENTATION

New Projects or Activities

Effective August 30, 1995, this strategy will be applied to proposed or new projects or activities.

Riparian Management Objectives (RMO's) will apply to watersheds occupied by inland native fish where watershed analysis has not been completed.

Standards and Guidelines will be applied to the entire geographic area for the project. Project and site-specific standards and guidelines will apply to all Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas and to projects and activities in areas outside RHCA's that are identified through NEPA analysis as potentially degrading RHCA's.

Projects or Activities Inside of Designated Priority Watersheds

By September 30, 1995, Forest Supervisors will submit to their respective Regional Foresters an action plan describing how high- and moderate-risk projects located in designated priority inland fish watersheds will be modified to avoid unacceptable risk.

Modifications for high- and moderate-risk projects should be initiated by January 30, 1996, with high-risk projects having the highest priority.

Projects or activities inside of priority watersheds and rated as low-risk must have an action plan developed by the Forest Supervisor and submitted to the Regional Forester by March 1, 1996 to assure that there will be no adverse impact to the inland fish habitat.

FLEXIBILITY

The Inland Native Fish Strategy was designed to provide the line officer with a great deal of flexibility in implementation of the strategy. This interim direction is intended to protect future options for the protection of inland native fish habitat.

The Riparian Management Objectives and Standards and Guidelines are based upon the best information available to us at this time to protect inland fish habitats across the Columbia Basin. These Riparian Management Objectives and Standards and Guidelines are a foundation from which to measure the effects of proposed projects or activities and design their implementation so as to protect the inland fish habitat.

These objectives and guidelines can be changed to fit site-specific conditions. Changes to these objectives and guidelines can be made through site-specific, stream reach and/or watershed analysis. The degree of analysis should be commensurate with the site-specific situation. This is a decision to be made by the appropriate line officer based upon interdisciplinary input.

The watershed analysis process is significantly streamlined to allow managers to focus watershed analysis to address specific issues and management needs, and conduct analysis commensurate with the situation. The state-of-the-art for watershed analysis is continually developing, so the processes are designed to be flexible.

In all cases, the rationale supporting changes must be documented in the project NEPA document or activity file.

MONITORING

Monitoring is an important component of the proposed interim direction. The primary focus is to verify that the standards and guidelines were applied during the project implementation (implementation monitoring). The responsibility for monitoring implementation of the Inland Native Strategy rests with the Regional Foresters, Forest Supervisors, and District Rangers.

Monitoring to assess whether those protective measures are effective to attain Riparian Goals and Management Objectives (effectiveness monitoring) would be a lower priority given the short time frame for this interim direction. Complex ecological processes and long time frames are inherent in the RMOs, and it is unrealistic to expect that the planned monitoring would generate conclusive results within 18 months. Nevertheless, it is critical to begin monitoring. Forests are urged to utilize current Forest Plan monitoring efforts and activity reviews.

TESTING OF ALTERNATIVES C, D AND E

The Interim Strategy calls for a testing of the application of Alternatives C, D and E. That test will take place in one watershed in each of the three regions. The Implementation Team is in the beginning throes of designing that test. Our test effort will encourage the participation of the various states and industry and environmental publics. We hope to have this design completed and regional watersheds selected by October 1, 1995.

FOREST WORKSHOPS

The Implementation Team will hold a series of four Forest Workshops in order to answer questions and provide additional information on implementation of the Inland Native Fish Strategy. At this time, workshops are scheduled to be held in the following locations:

Friday, October 6	**Missoula, Montana**
Wednesday, October 11	**Spokane, Washington**
Thursday, October 19	**Bend, Oregon**
Friday, October 20	**Boise, Idaho**

These dates are subject to change.

Additional information on the workshops will be provided as available. A set of Questions and Answers is attached to this package (Attachment A).

For Further Information, **Contact:**

David J. Wright, Team Leader
Inland Native Fish Strategy
3815 Schreiber Avenue
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83814

Telephone (208) 765-7223
FAX (208) 765-7307

ATTACHMENT A

Inland Native Fish Strategy
Questions and Answers

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. ***What are the procedures for amending Forest Plans?***

   The INFS Decision Notice amended the Forest Plans to the extent of incorporation of INFS direction.

2. ***If an existing Forest Plan is more restrictive, does it still apply?***

   Where direction contained in existing plans is more restrictive than INFS direction, the Forest Plan direction applies. The INFS direction does replace the Eastside Screens riparian direction.

3. ***As the INFS strategy is interim in nature and will be supplanted by the Eastside Ecosystem Management Project (EEMP) and Interior Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP) EISs, what are the consequences of a delay in the completion and implementation of this plan and EISs?***

   The Inland Native Fish Strategy is in effect until the two EiS's are completed. Unlike PACFISH, a delay would have no effect on the interim direction.

4. ***How will implementation of the INFS strategy be funded?***

   In the short-term (FY95) implementation will have to be funded out of existing allocations. Over the longer-term (FY96) the Regional Fisheries Program Managers have requested additional funding for implementation.

RIPARIAN HABITAT CONSERVATION AREAS (RHCAs) & RIPARIAN MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES (RMOs;

5. ***How will RHCAs be delineated?***

   This will be appropriate to the level of implementation for which the RHCAs are being delineated. For example, at the broad planning level (forest plans) the RHCAs would be delineated on maps or GIS themes at scales appropriate to the geographic scope of the plan. However as this level of delineation can be imprecise, project-level planning and implementation would require more precise methods, ranging from delineation on smaller scale maps to actual on the ground delineation (i.e. boundary tags within timber harvest units) based on site characteristics.

6. ***What flexibility is allowed in refining and/or modifying RMOs and RHCAs? Can they be adjusted in the 18-month period of time? What is the process for making these adjustments?***

   RMOs and RHCAs **should** be adjusted to meet local conditions. When adjustments are to be made in any of these two elements, it is to be done **as a result** of either a site-specific analysis or a watershed scale-analysis (a watershed-scale analysis is required when priority watersheds could be affected). The degree of detail required for a watershed scale analysis should be commensurate with the project involved. The analysis must be documented. **The changes in RMOs require additional amendments to the Forest Plan. Documentation of changes to RMOs and RHCAs must be made in the project-level NEPA decision documents.**

7. *Who approves changes in RHCAs and RMOs, and what (if any) oversight will there be?*

The line officer responsible for the administrative area involved, typically the District Ranger, has final decision authority for changes in RHCAs or RMOs. Any changes must follow the procedures outlined in the strategy (see pages A-2 and A-5 of the attachment to the Decision Notice).

8. *How will 100-year floodplains be determined?*

The site will be evaluated by specialists to determine the area expected to be inundated with a frequency equal to or less than 100 years. Existing documentation can be used.

9. *How do you refine RMOs to incorporate natural variability such as catastrophic events?*

Extreme events usually shape habitat features described by the RMOs. However, this should be only considered when analyzing whether existing conditions are a result of human induced changes or simply long-term watershed processes. For example, if the large wood component of a watershed is outside the range specified in the INFS strategy, then one must examine how large wood is normally supplied to the system. If catastrophic events such as landslides or blowdown appear to be the major sources for large wood, then the existing conditions must be considered in the context of the timing of these events.

10. *How will the project level BE process for sensitive fish species be affected by the INFS strategy?*

The project-level Biological Evaluation (BE) process will be simplified. The purpose of the INFS conservation strategy is to provide interim direction that would reduce the risk of loss of resident native fish populations or negative impacts to their habitat on National Forest System lands within the assessment area. This interim direction will preserve management options by reducing impacts to aquatic habitats. Full compliance with INFS on any project will insure no further loss of viability and support a determination of "may affect individuals but not contribute to a tend toward federal listing," or "no effect."

11. *What level of analysis and documentation (watershed analysis versus site-specific analysis) is required to modify activities (harvest units, roads, grazing, etc.) within RHCAs?*

The six-step process in the Federal guide to watershed analysis should be used to assess the current status of a watershed, or existing watershed analysis, and to provide the content for subsequent management. This process is especially important to assess possible cumulative effects of multiple proposed projects or large projects in a watershed where site-specific or project level analysis detail is inappropriate. Comparing existing watershed analysis with the six steps will help identify additional information to be collected.

Watershed analysis provides the land manager with a base from which to assess the potential effects of site-specific activities and the limits for change to standards and guides. It will alert the land manager to what information are lacking or weak when making management decisions.

The first watershed analysis will be more time-consuming and costly than subsequent ones. Subsequent analysis, however, will become increasingly less difficult and take less time once interdisciplinary teams develop familiarity with the six-step process and a format for analysis. The cost and time needed for analyses are dependent on the size of the watershed, its complexity and issues identified.

Watershed analyses data will typically include information on the status of the soil, water, and vegetation resources; fish and wildlife populations; and past management activities, for example. Available tools should be used, such as landsat photography to identify vegetation; stream surveys; and stocking

records from state fish and game records. Use of GIS is not required to do an accurate and informative analysis.

It is critical to **stay focused** on why a watershed analysis is being done and realize that all questions need not be answered in one analysis. Subsequent analyses can deal with other issues or management needs. To attain RMO's, discuss such things as the historic condition of the forest, its current condition, and what the forest should look like in the future, without losing site of the reason for the analysis. Identify information gaps, and make decisions with an understanding that those information gaps exist. Understand and list the assumptions that are associated with management decisions being made with data available from the watershed or site-specific analyses.

Modification of RHCAs based on **site-specific analysis** should occur on projects or activities where watershed analysis is not needed. The objective of the modifications will be to meet the RMOs.

Modification in the absence of watershed analysis will occur if watershed-specific or stream-reach specific data are available to address and support the modifications to ensure attainment of RMOs.

In describing the activity and modifications, you should:

a. Identify the location of activities in relation to the stream channel and critical habitat; the magnitude of disturbance (i.e., extent of vegetative manipulation, soil and riparian disturbance, etc.); and persistence and recovery time of the disturbance (i.e., how long will the disturbance persist on the landscape?).

b. Identify the potential cumulative effects of the project in relation to other effects within the watershed. or downstream effects to critical habitat.

c. Document the process and rationale for the modification and how site-specific information was used to ensure attainment of RMOs.

d. Identify background information or monitoring results from other projects to support the modifications.

The Federal Guide for Watershed Analysis ("Ecosystem Analysis at the Watershed Scale", revised August 1995, Version 2.2) will be provided to field units as the protocol to follow for watershed analysis when a watershed analysis is required to adjust RMOs and RHCAs.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

12. ***Is a watershed analysis required prior to either salvage harvest or road construction within RHCAs?***

Standard and Guideline TM-1 requires a watershed analysis in priority watersheds. Standard and Guideline RF-2a states that no new roads (including stream crossings) will be built in RHCAs until watershed analysis is completed. Both of these provide clear and concise direction, and should not be viewed as a barrier to implementation of Forest Service activities.

13. ***How are road management projects which increase sediment delivery to stream over the short-term but are intended to correct erosion sources to reduce sediment delivery over the long-term addressed?***

When analyzing any action, not just roads, both short- and long-term effects must be considered and managed. While short-term effects must not be great enough to jeopardize the RMO's, avoidance of all short-term effects should not be allowed to preclude management changes or restoration actions necessary for the long-term recovery of habitats and/or populations.

14. *Clarify prohibition of the sidecasting of snow within or abutting RHCAs in watersheds.*

This includes the obvious, snow containing soil and road surface materials. However, it is also intended to address the creation of berms or piles of snow which in melting or acting as barriers would concentrate melt water resulting in destabilized streambanks through saturation conditions elevated above "normal" conditions or actual hydraulic damage from flowing water.

15. *Clarify FM-4 (prescribed burns).*

Any prescribed fire, including natural or accidental starts which are essentially managed as prescribed fires, either entirely within or including RHCAs must be managed under prescriptions which contribute to attainment of the RMOs of the particular RHCAs affected.

16. *Can INFS road S&Gs be implemented prior to completion of Road Management Plans?*

It is expected that implementation of standards and guidelines pertaining to roads will begin immediately. The road management plans will serve to provide a documented plan for accomplishing INFS objectives through road management and should be completed as quickly as possible but should not hold up implementation of actions designed to minimize impacts of roads on aquatic habitat.

17. *Does RF-2 c. 5. ("regulation of traffic during wet periods") require the closing of these roads?*

No, the "regulation of traffic" is expected to range from prohibiting use by certain classes of vehicles (e.g. heavy trucks), to complete closure to all traffic (including ATVs).

18. *When is reconstruction/maintenance considered as "new construction" (i.e., INFS standards and guidelines must be applied)?*

The practical test should be whether the impact from maintenance or reconstruction is similar in magnitude to those occurring from initial construction. If so, then reconstruction/maintenance should be considered to be new construction. In any event, road reconstruction and maintenance cannot retard or prevent the attainment of RMOs.

19. *Are stream fords considered stream crossings (RF-4)?*

Yes. It is expected that such things as armoring of approaches and streambed to reduce sedimentation from traffic or erosion from high flows would be addressed.

20. *Can a Forest or District elect to proceed with a timber sale without upgrading culverts to meet RF-4?*

Yes, unless upgrading culverts that pose a substantial risk to the riparian condition are a part of road reconstruction tied to the timber sale. Otherwise, requirements to meet S&Gs are not tied to any particular action. However, it would be prudent and logical to use any available opportunity that a project (such as a timber sale) might offer to upgrade culverts or comply with other S&Gs. If there is no opportunity to upgrade culverts as part of the project, then the forest would proceed to comply with INFS S&Gs based on other available opportunities and based on the degree of threat posed by the culverts. Upgrading culverts that pose a substantial risk to riparian condition should, of course, be a part of any road reconstruction or maintenance project.

21. *Will Right-of-Way applicants be required to apply INFS Standards and Guidelines before hauling over Forest Service Rights of Way?*

In general, yes, if a Forest Service permit is required, the permittee should comply with applicable INFS Standards and Guidelines. Remember, INFS does not apply to private lands.

22. *When, if ever, does an on-going project become a new project as determined by INFS?*

For the purposes of INFS implementation, any project meeting the test of an ongoing project will be considered to remain an ongoing project if it is the same as what was in place at the time of INFS signature. If this condition cannot be met, the project should be treated as a new project, i.e., INFS standards and guidelines applied.

23. *What is meant by Retard Attainment of RMOs as related to grazing Standards and Guidelines?*

The RMOs established by INFS describe habitat features which exhibit change relatively slowly, making it difficult, if not impossible, to detect change with the 18-month lifespan of the INFS. Since the condition of the riparian vegetative community directly affects these RMOs and changes in riparian vegetation are generally detectable within short time periods, the recovery of the vegetation component of the riparian system will be used to predict whether grazing will ultimately degrade or prevent the attainment of the RMOs.

It is important to understand that for changes in grazing systems to be meaningful, they must be in place over the long term. This appears to conflict with the short-term nature of INFS. However, management put into place through implementation of INFS would be expected to continue through the long term if it conforms with direction provided by the Eastside Ecosystem Management Project and Interior Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Project when these plans are completed. Based on the current state of knowledge of the effects of grazing on riparian and aquatic systems, it is expected that this would occur. Therefore, the implementation of INFS can be envisioned as the initiation of management changes over the next 18 months which will likely continue and whose benefits to aquatic habitat will become apparent through the long term.

WATERSHED ANALYSIS

24. *What is the scale of watersheds on which watershed analysis will be performed?*

The INFS strategy follows guidance developed for the Northwest Forest Plan. Generally, watershed analysis will be performed on watersheds 20 to 200 square miles in size. Projects on mainstem rivers with watersheds greatly exceeding this size criteria should be analyzed based on a subwatershed of appropriate size.

25. *When is watershed analysis required?*

Refer to the Standards and Guidelines in Appendix E of the INFS Environmental Assessment.

26. *How much specific information is needed for watershed analysis?*

Initially, use existing information but identify missing data to be gathered and used in subsequent iterations. The level of information should be commensurate with the issues being addressed. The deciding official will determine exactly what constitutes adequate information and analysis. This analysis will be documented in the project NEPA document.

TERMS

Measurable:	Can be measured (detected) using commonly accepted scientific field methods. Use INFS monitoring procedures when available.
Modify:	Make changes in project design (e.g., grazing system, road design, etc.) to ensure that the goals and objects of the INFS strategy are achieved.
Pool:	***Main Channel Pool:*** A scour or dammed pool that is a discrete fluvial (slow to directed scour thread) geomorphic (dished-out channel bed depression) channel unit that occupies the majority of the wetted channel width. Main channel pools are bounded by a head crest (upstream break in slope) and a tail crest (downstream break-in-slope). Main channel pools are used in the calculation of pool frequency, and for summaries of pool geometry, i.e. pool max-depth, wetted width and length, pool area and volume, width-to-max-depth, and residual depth.
	Pocket Pools: Small bed depressions, often <30% of wetted width, formed 3round flow obstructions (boulder, logs, irregular bank or bank vegetation, jutting peninsulas, within fast water habitat types. These do not represent main channel pools, and are not used in the calculation of pool frequency or for summaries of channel geometry.
Project:	As used in the INFS strategy, project refers to actions such as timber sales, grazing allotments, road maintenance (combined at the watershed level), or developed campground maintenance (again combined at the watershed level). Individual actions associated with these larger "projects" such as harvest units, road segments associated with timber sales, fences, reservoirs, grazing systems, or painting or repair of campground facilities would not be considered to be separate "projects".
Road:	Travelway, currently or previously, used by motorized vehicles that affect or has the potential to affect the hydrologic and/or sediment regimes within a watershed.
Salvage:	See Standard and Guideline TM-1 (INFS Environmental Assessment, Appendix E) and current agency direction. The definition of salvage used for INFS will not differ from that currently in use by the implementing agency at the time of project implementation.
Substantial Risk:	See Standard and Guideline RF-4 (INFS Environmental Assessment, Appendix E.
Unacceptable Risk:	If, as a result of an ongoing action or group of actions, environmental changes are probable or foreseeable that may cause a population to become threatened or endangered, or that decrease the estimated numbers and distribution of reproductive individuals such that the continued existence of the population within priority watersheds is at risk, that action or group of actions will be considered to pose an unacceptable risk.

INFISH ACTION PLAN
IDAHO PANHANDLE NATIONAL FOREST

Two projects were identified on the Idaho Panhandle National Forest as "High Risk" within priority bull trout watersheds; The Rocket Run Timber Sale and the Big Bird Timber Sale. The following is the action plan required by the INFISH implementation plan to mitigate any potential adverse impacts to bull trout habitat within these project areas and priority watersheds.

Alternative D in the Inland native Fish Strategy specifies that on-going or planned activities within priority watersheds that have been assessed to present moderate to high risks for adverse affects to the habitat and/or populations of inland native fish must proceed in 1 of 3 manners.

1. Cancel the action.
2. Modify the action.
3. Postpone the action until final direction is issued.

ROCKET RUN TIMBER SALE

Introduction:

An environmental assessment was conducted for this timber sale and a DN/FONSI was signed on 10/20/87. The "10-year Planning Cycle" alternative was selected as the preferred alternative. This alternative allowed for timber harvest in 14 harvest units as well as road construction/reconstruction within the Little North Fork of the Clearwater River, Rocky Run Cr. and several unnamed tributaries of Rocky Run Creek.

Prior to sale advertisement, the two harvest units and associated road construction that were located in the Little NF of the Clearwater River were dropped from implementation due to consideration of this river for "Wild and Scenic" classification, as well as watershed/fisheries resource benefit.

Sale layout, including the transportation plan, for the remaining units was completed prior to January, 1993. During sale layout, several changes to the designed stream buffers were initiated to further protect watershed and fisheries and to mitigate logging systems limitations. These buffers ranged from 30 to 200 feet depending upon the site specific conditions. They met or

exceeded those required in the environmental assessment and the Forest Plan at the time. Additionally, in compliance with the environmental assessment, constraints were incorporated into the this contract such as harvesting units 1-4 and 5a "over snow", restricting hauling of associated volume to periods when the roads are sufficiently frozen to prevent rutting and protect the road from disturbance, road closure following every logging vehicle to minimize adverse impacts to roads and other resources, strict road maintenance requirements related to the maintenance of road/ditch drainage. Specifically related to fish, a double culvert which was a barrier to fish passage was replaced with a temporary bridge to be removed after the sale is completed.

This sale was advertised and subsequently awarded on June 15, 1983. The road construction/reconstruction was completed October of 1994. During the road construction the planned new road 301D and 1/2 the volume of unit 11 associated with this road were dropped from the sale package via a contract modification to additionally protect soil, water, and fish. Road reconstruction on 787D was also stopped before it accesses Unit 2 to protect a wet seep area and minor intermittent streams. Harvest of unit is now planned via a longer skid in "over snow" conditions. No harvest has been undertaken as of this writing.

Two months following award of this sale a Biological Evaluation was completed. The finding of this BE was "likely to effect the habitat of bull trout and result in a trend toward federal listing.". During the assessment of the Inland Native Fish Strategy this timber sale contract was identified as a "High Risk" project within a priority watershed requiring an action plan to address the the compatibility of this project with Inland Native Fish RMO's and Standards and Guidelines.

Action Plan: Modify the Action

*** Evaluate watershed analysis needs for the priority watershed utilizing the Revised Federal Guide for Watershed Analysis. Completed 8/08/95. (See attached analysis)

*** Complete site specific watershed analysis of project area. Forest Supervisor, District Ranger, Forest Hydrologist, Forest Ecosystem Team Leader, District Fish Biologist, District Silviculturist. Completed 8/14/95.

*** Recommend to the Purchaser the following proposed modifications to the timber sale contract: By 9/30/95

-- The westerly boundary for units 3,4, and 5B, and the southern boundary of unit 5a need to be moved from 30 feet to 75 feet further from the streams to provide adequate stream course buffers. This adjustment will provide adequate protection to

the integrity of the stream channel and stream banks, provide increased protection for riparian vegetation, provide for adequate levels of thermal protection, maintain adequate amounts of large woody debris recruitment, and increase the filtration/deposition area thus reducing the risk of sediment delivery to the stream system.

- In order to respond to the Purchaser's predicted concerns for replacement volume, units 6,7, and 10 were reviewed as potential areas to replace lost volume. These units are in stable, less sensitive areas and are not directly associated with any major or minor streams, bogs or wet areas. Additionally, the north side of units 5A & 5B also have potential to offset volume losses. Adjustments to unit boundaries in these units would be restricted to the minimal needed and will be in full compliance with the associated silvicutural prescriptions, EA constraints, and contractual requirements.

- Additional resource protection/mitigation not directly related to the timber sale contract have been identified as a result of on site review. Now that road construction/reconstruction work is completed, a re-assessment of road management needs is planned and adjustments, if needed, will be made to the KV plan as appropriate.

BIG BIRD TIMBER SALE

Introduction:

Activity proposed by this EA is covered by existing NEPA that dates back to 1985. This activity includes 14 miles of new roads, 31 harvest units on 1550 acres producing 18.5 mmbf of saw timber. The sale was laid out in 1986 and planned to sell in 1990. Twelve miles of capital investment roads were built in 1987-88 and several failures and wash-outs occurred along this road system during a rain-on-snow event in November 1990. The decision was made in 1991 to combine the Bird Bird and Woodstock Sales (cover by the compartment EA) and drop the timber volume to 8.5 mmbf. Due to old growth concerns, this combined sale was moved from 1992 to 1993, timber volume was further reduced to 4.5 mmbf, and sale was planned for 1994.

Action Plan: Modify the action.

The Big Bird Timber sale occurs within the Bird Creek watershed which was identified as a priority watershed in the Inland Native Fish Strategy. Risks for adverse effects to the habitat and/or populations of inland native fish were assessed to be high. The District has elected to modify the proposed actions for this project area by postponing sale of this sell and redesigning the project to meet INFISH standards and guidelines.

*** Redesign timber sale package. By Sept 30, 1997.

United States Department of Agriculture | Forest Service | Colville National Forest | 765 South Main Federal Building Colville, WA 99114

File Code: 2670
Route To: 1950

Date: September 5, 1995

Subject: Inland Native Fish Strategy Action Plan

To: Regional Forester, R-6

The July 28, 1995, Inland Native Fish Strategy Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact requires that within one month of the signing of this decision notice, Forest Supervisors must submit to their respective Regional Foresters an action plan for how [ongoing] high and moderate risk projects [within priority watersheds] will be modified to avoid an unacceptable risk. The Colville National Forest's action plan is enclosed.

One change with regard to priority watersheds needs to be noted. At the time we submitted Forest Plan Bull Trout Habitat Effectiveness Monitoring forms to the Infish team, the Forest made the professional judgement that upper Sullivan Creek (above Mill Pond reservoir) contained bull trout based on a report from a fisheries biologist employed by the Pend Oreille Public Utility District (PUD) which documented that a bull trout was caught in the upper end of Mill Pond reservoir. Since that time, additional investigation by the PUD biologist has confirmed that the fish caught was actually a brown trout and not a bull trout.

Based on this new information, we have completed an action plan for only the lower portion of Sullivan Creek between Mill Pond Dam (which is an effective upstream barrier) and the confluence with the Pend Oreille River. We intend to supplement our action plan to include the upper portion of Sullivan Creek should future bull trout surveys indicate the presence of bull trout in that portion of the watershed.

We have also obtained information from the Kalispell Tribe that their fisheries survey crew has located bull trout in Mill Creek on the Newport Ranger District. Although there is no existing process for adding priority watersheds, we are informing Jeff Blackwood of this finding by copy of this letter so this information can be considered in the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project.

Please call George Buckingham, Ecosystem Planning and Monitoring Staff Officer, or Tom Shuhda, Forest Fisheries Biologist, if you have any questions.

FOR Jerry L Coleman

EDWARD L. SCHULTZ
Forest Supervisor

Enclosure

cc: Dave Wright, INFS Team
Jeff Blackwood, ICBEMP
District Ranger, Sullivan Lake RD

Inland Native Fish Strategy Action Plan
Colville National Forest

A. Objective - To modify any "unacceptable risk" activities in priority watersheds to "acceptable" by modifying, postponing, or cancelling the activity as directed by the Decision Notice for the Inland Native Fish Strategy.

B. Geographic area - The action plan outlined in this document includes the priority watersheds identified on the Colville National Forest. These watersheds, along with their corresponding watershed code(s) include:

South Salmo River (17010216-98A)
Slate Creek (17010216-04C, 04D, 04E, 040)
Lower Sullivan Creek (17010216-060)
East, West and Middle Branches of LeClerc Creek (17010216-13A & 13B)

See the attached map for watershed locations.

C. Identification of Moderate and High Risk Activities - All activities within priority watersheds were evaluated by the Forest Fisheries Biologist and the Sullivan Lake RD Resource Assistant during the spring of 1995. Activities determined to be moderate or high risk include the following:

1. Moderate Risk

a. Dispersed camping - South Salmo River, Slate Creek

2. High Risk

a. Dispersed camping - Lower Sullivan Creek; East, West and Middle Branches of LeClerc Creek

b. Grazing - East, West and Middle Branches of LeClerc Creek

D. Definitions

Priority watersheds - Watersheds having excellent habitat or strong assemblages of inland native fish, particularly bull trout, or watersheds that provide for population distribution goals, or watersheds having a high restoration potential.

Unacceptable risk - If either of the following results is probable or foreseeable as a result of an ongoing action or group of actions, that action or group of actions will be considered to pose an unacceptable risk and the interim standards and guidelines would be applied to avoid adverse impacts:

(1) Environmental changes that may cause a population to become threatened.

(2) Endangered or environmental changes that decrease the estimated numbers and distribution of reproductive individuals such that the continued existence of the population within priority watersheds is at risk.

Risk Levels - For those projects which were determined to have adverse effects, a rating of high, medium or low was assigned using professional judgement based on the relative probability of impact occurring.

If high risk bull trout populations were determined to be adversely affected by a project, the relative rating was increased one category as per direction provided for screening activities in priority bull trout watersheds (R4 Memo 2670, April 10, 1995).

II. Actions

Each moderate or high risk activity will be evaluated to determined whether the activity poses an unacceptable risk. Where no unacceptable risk is identified, generally no action will be undertaken, but continued monitoring of the activity will occur. For those activities determined to pose an unacceptable risk, a preferred course of action will be identified and implemented, assuming that the funding and workforce are available to accomplish the needed action. If these resources are not sufficient, a contingency or back-up plan will be identified which may include cancellation (cessation) of the activity. The preferred course of action for each moderate and high risk activity is described below:

A. Grazing (East, West and Middle Branches of LeClerc Creek)

1. Develop and implement a public information plan as needed.

2. Review and summarize existing utilization, channel stability, and fish survey report data to assess site specific conditions.

3. Identify any additional data needs.

4. Identify "unacceptable risk" sites and/or activities within the allotment, if any.

5. Coordinate with the allotment permittee concerning activity analysis and proposed changes.

6. Revise Allotment Management Plan, including NEPA analysis if necessary, in FY96.

7. Initiate modifications in permit/allotment management practices prior to and during the FY96 grazing season necessary to ensure that grazing uses no longer pose unacceptable risk to bull trout habitat. Implement changes resulting from the revised AMP as soon as practicable once the NEPA analysis is complete and funding is secured.

B. Dispersed Recreation (South Salmo River, Slate Creek, Lower Sullivan Creek and the East, West and Middle Branches of LeClerc Creek)

1. Develop and implement a public information plan.

2. Review dispersed campsite inventory completed by District in 1994-95.

3. Identify "unacceptable risk" sites, if any.

4. Develop site plans to modify, move, or close sites.

5. Initiate NEPA analysis (if necessary) to implement proposed changes in FY96.

6. Modify, move, or close "unacceptable risk" sites as appropriate.

III. Implementation Schedule

Action	Completion Date	Who Responsible	Cost Estimate
A. Grazing:			
1) Develop public info plan	10/15/95	D5 Res Forester (lead) D5 Resource Assistant S.O. Public Affairs	$ 1000
2) Review existing data & summarize	11/15/95	D5 Resource Assist (lead) S.O. Fisheries Biologist D5 Resource Forester SO Hydrologist	$ 2000
3) Identify additional data needs	11/15/95	Same as above	Included ab
4) Identify unacceptable risk sites/activities	11/15/95	Same as above	Included ab
5) Coordinate w/permittee	02/15/96	District Ranger (lead) D5 Resource Assistant D5 Resource Forester	Included in regular coo
6) Revise LeClerc AMP	09/01/96	D5 Resource Assist (lead) D5 Resource Forester GS-5 Temporary	$ 8000

A. Grazing (Continued):

7) Initiate AMP changes/modifications	10/01/96	D5 Resource Forester	$ 2000
B. Dispersed Recreation:			
1) Develop public info plan	10/15/95	D5 Res Forester (lead) D5 Resource Assistant SO Public Affairs	$ 1000
2) Review existing dispersed site data & summarize	11/01/95	D5 Res Forester (lead) D5 Resource Assistant	$ 1000
3) Identify unacceptable risk sites/activities	11/15/95	D5 Res Forester (lead) S.O. Fisheries Biologist D5 Resource Assistant	Included above
4) Develop plans to modify, close or move sites	02/01/95	D5 Res Forester (lead) D5 Resource Assistant SO Engineering	$ 3000
5) Initiate NEPA on proposed actions	3/01/96	D5 Res Forester	$ 3000
6) Implement NEPA decisions	6/15/96	District Ranger	unknown

Total estimated cost = $ 21,000

(The above cost estimate does not include possible modification/rehabilitati of dispersed recreation sites.)

IV. Public Involvement

The moderate and high risk activities identified on the Colville National Forest, grazing and dispersed recreation, are activities with a long tradition of use and involve a high interest level by the public. Consequently, keeping the public informed during the process of implementing INFISH activities will be essential. Coordination with the grazing permittee(s) will be important through all phases of the process. Likewise, in addition to public involvement activities associated with any needed NEPA analysis, keeping the public informed of the implementation of INFISH activities will be important for both grazing and recreation activities.

United States Department of Agriculture | Forest Service | Kootenai NF | 506 US Hwy 2 West Libby, MT 59923

REPLY TO: 1950/2670 DATE: 9/13/95

SUBJECT: INFISH Action Plan

TO: Regional Forester

In accordance with select requirements in the Inland Native Fish Strategy Environmental Assessment and Decision Notice (28 July, 1995), we submit the following Action Plan for projects that pose a moderate or high risk to native fishes. This plan outlines the actions we plan to take to resolve the identified problems.

INFISH ACTION PLAN
Kootenai National Forest

As part of the planning effort for INFISH, the Kootenai NF evaluated all ongoing and authorized activities within priority bull trout watersheds. This evaluation identified two projects that posed a moderate risk to bull trout - the NORANDA Montanore copper/silver mining project, and the Glen Lake Irrigation District (GLID) irrigation ditch. Because of marginal to non-viable fish stocks in both watersheds affected by these projects, the INFISH evaluation process results in upgrading the risk rating for both projects to "HIGH". The following is a brief on each project, and the actions we intend to take for these two ongoing or authorized activities.

GLID Irrigation Ditch

The existing special use permit (SUP) contains a requirement for fish screening, and the ditch headgate presently incorporates features that could exclude smolt-sized bull trout. However, the fish screen has not been in use since initial trials in 1986 due to sever maintenance problems from plugging by debris, and the inability of the headgate and screen to pass the permitted water appropriation of 125cfs. The headgate and canal actually appropriates approximately 90cfs from Grave Creek (HUC #1701 0101 1301/02/06), a priority bull trout watershed with a non-viable adfluvial spawning stock in residence. This water appropriation is the primary water supply for the entire agricultural community in the Tobacco Valley around Eureka, Montana, and is in operation from April through September every year. The GLID ditch is presently under a SUP that expires in December of this year. The GLID historic water rights date to 1905, and exceed the summer baseflow condition in Grave Creek.

Aside from simple occupancy of a Riparian Habitat Conservation Area, this activity is not consistent with portions of Forest Plan (INFISH) standards RA-5, LH-1 and LH-3. In cooperation with GLID and the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks, we have participated in stream, ditch, habitat and fisheries investigations over the last three years in preparation for permit renewal and modification of the headworks to minimize the threat to bull trout. The GLID commissioners have cooperated fully with the ongoing effort to revise the headgate to protect bull trout. Mitigation of this activity is needed because the irretrievable loss of bull trout smolts to the irrigation system is inhibiting the recovery of the affected fish stock in Grave Creek.

ACTIONS

* Issue an easement for the project under the authority of Public Law 99-545 (the "Colorado Ditch Bill").

* Continue cooperative participation on the team formulating plans for a modified headgate and fish excluder, and provide technical expertise as needed.

* Administer provisions of the proposed new GLID easement.

ANALYSIS

In a literal sense, issuance of an easement to replace the existing SUP for this activity will not directly mitigate the risk this ditch poses to maintenance of a viable population of bull trout (36 CFR 219.19). Issuance of an easement in this instance is non-discretionary, however, under terms of the Act (FSM 2729.16f). In a practical sense, a number of indirect benefits will accrue from the switch to an easement.

The switch from a SUP to an easement will reduce the administrative burden on the Forest Service and GLID, and negate the need for a NEPA analysis (FSM 2729.16f).

Conveyance of a greater property right (via an easement) will significantly enhance GLID's chances of financing a new, expensive headgate through commercial loans or bonds (as opposed to one time investment fees imposed on small, marginal agricultural users).

The easement package and plat will be submitted to the Regional Office and Office of General Council for approval this fall. Further, the risk to the affected bull trout will temporarily subside in early October as irrigation withdrawls are suspended for the year. Actual modifications to the headgate are not likely to occur until Spring, 1996, at the earliest, and more likely Spring, 1997, because of time needed select and design an optimum replacement structure, arrange financing, and construct. With proposed Action Plan, we can keep the mitigation effort moving forward.

NORANDA Montanore Mine

The surface occupancy by this proposed mine and powerline would be located in the Libby Creek drainage (HUC #1701 0101 1603/04/05), a priority bull trout watershed with a non-viable adfluvial spawning stock in residence. The Montanore project has yet to begin, with the exception of an exploratory adit on private land that is under an indefinite company-imposed suspension. NORANDA has all permits inhand, but is awaiting patent signing and resolution of a lawsuit, and is presently seeking partners to make this a joint venture before proceeding with development of the mine. The existing Plan of Operations, as modified through the permitting process, contains an extensive list of mitigation, rehabilitation and monitoring requirements that will mean no-net-loss of bull trout or habitat. However, the project Biological Evaluation, Record of Decision and Final EIS disclose the uncertainties behind this judgement, thus, the intensive monitoring requirement for project operations, rehabilitation and mitigation activities to ensure no adverse effects. The Moderate ("HIGH") risk rating of this project under INFISH evaluation procedures evolves from these uncertainties. It is our contention that no additional mitigation of this project is needed for bull trout, and we have verbal concurrence from the US Fish & Wildlife Service on that finding (2810 memo of 5/19/93, in project files).

Our most recent evaluation shows that, aside from encroachment on Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas (roads, powerline, some facilities), this activity is not consistent with portions of Forest Plan (INFISH) standards TM-1b, RF-2b/d and RF-4. However, in cooperation with NORANDA, the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks, the Montana departments of Natural Resources and Conservation, State Lands, and Health and Environmental Sciences Water Quality Division (collectively DEQ), the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Army Corps of Engineers, we have previously approved a comprehensi

Plan of Operations that we believe resolves uncertainties and future contingencies (incorporates INFISH standards RF-2c/3/5, RM-2, MM-1/2/3/5/6, LH-1/3, RA-1/4, WR-1 and FW-1/4).

Even though the project is approved and required permits issued, Noranda will need to come back to the Forest Service for approval of specific final designs and plans before they can begin implementation on the ground. Therefore, in light of the INFISH amendments, we propose the following.

ACTIONS

* Incorporate additional road mitigation (standards RF-2c/d) when the operator requests Forest Service reconstruction requirements per the approved Plan of Operations.

* To the extent feasible, further reduce encroachment on riparian areas, once the operator begins project construction, through voluntary facility-siting adjustments.

ANALYSIS

In reality there is no immediate action needed to further mitigate this project since no activities are underway or planned for at least the 18 months of the INFISH interim direction. More importantly, in a legal context (36 CFR 228.4 and 228.8) we find that nothing has occurred that would warrant a finding of an unforeseen significant disturbance and, thus, that the operator has a Valid Existing Right. Therefore, no additional mitigation requirements need to be requested of the operator at this time.

/s

Stephen J. Solem

STEPHEN J. SOLEM
Acting Forest Supervisor

cc J.Kollmeyer
L.Froberg
C.Brooks
L.Cron

SUMMARY OF SCREENING WITHIN PRIORITY BULL TROUT WATERSHEDS
July 12, 1995

Enclosed is a summary of the results of the screening effort plus a list of all the projects screened as high or moderate risk.

REGION 1

Forest	Risk Ratings				
	H	M	L	NE	Total
Clearwater	1	1	73	0	75
Flathead	0	4	3	28	35
Deerlodge	2	4	14	160	180
Helena	7	7	4	64	82
Lolo	3	6	19	222	250
Kootenai	2	11	0	162	175
Bitterroot	0	5	1	341	347
Idaho Panhandle	2	0	4	212	218
TOTAL	17	38	118	1,189	1,362

REGION 4

Forest	Risk Ratings				
	H	M	L	NE	TOTAL
Boise	4	11	7	57	79
Sawtooth	0	1	1	10	12
Challis	0	0	8	0	8
Humboldt	0	0	5	0	5
Payette	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	4	12	21	67	104

REGION 6

Forest	Risk Ratings				
	H	M	L	NE	TOTAL
Colville	3	0	4	0	7
Fremont	0	0	3	0	3
Ochoco	0	0	0	10	10
Wallowa Whitman	16	32	76	6	130
TOTAL	19	32	83	16	150
GRAND TOTAL	40	82	222	1,272	1,616

HIGH AND MODERATE RISK TIMBER SALES

Forest	Sale Name	Volume	Under Contract	Average Value
Idaho Panhandle	Rocket Run	5.8 MMBF	Yes	$319/MBF
Idaho Panhandle	Big Bird	2.5	No	
Kootenai	Lost Girl	2.5	Yes	$319/MBF
Wal-Whit	Snell Hollow	.6	Yes	$115/MBF
Wal-Whit	North Wind	3.4	Yes	$250/MBF
Wal-Whit	High Ham	1.5	Yes	$110/MBF
Wal-Whit	Dutch Wolf	3.5	No	
Wal-Whit	East Pine	2.5	No	

Total Volume found to be in high or moderate risk is 22.2MMBF. The volume under contract is 13.7MMBF. Bid price for volume under contract ranged from $110 to $319 per thousand board-feet.

Region 1 - 10.8 MMBF with 8.3 under contract.
Region 6 - 11.5 MMBF with 5.5 under contract.

HIGH AND MODERATE RISK RANGE ALLOTMENTS

Forest	Allotment Name	Permitted AUMS
Bitterroot	Gold Creek	29
Bitterroot	Meadow/Tolan	36
Deerlodge	Stewart/Gold	677
Deerlodge	Stony Creek	492
Deerlodge	Meadow Creek	654
Deerlodge	Sand Basin	677
Deerlodge	Middle Fork	1409
Deerlodge	Harvey/Moyie	589
Flathead	Piper Allotment	27
Lolo	S. Fork Lolo Creek	251
Boise	Tripod	1263
Boise	Ola C	2214
Boise	Payette	2831
Colville	LeClerc Creek	543
Malheur	Flag Prarie	2582
Malheur	Spring Creek	3643
Malheur	Dollar Basin	974
Malheur	Star Glade	194
Malheur	McCoy	347
Malheur	Logan Valley	2010
Malheur	Summit Prarie	1567
Malheur	North Fork	2416
Malheur	Ott	2308
Wallowa-Whitman	Pine Valley	5634
Wallowa-Whitman	Bourne	1295
Wallowa-Whitman	Boulder	607
Wallowa-Whitman	Big Creek	2893
Wallowa-Whitman	Lobo (Dutch Unit)	719
Total		38881

Region 1 - 4,841
Region 4 - 6,308
Region 6 - 27,732
Total 38,881

HIGH AND MODERATE MINING OPERATIONS

FOREST	MINING OPERATION NAME
Clearwater	Jenkins Mining Operation
Helena	Charter Oak
Helena	Unnamed near Ontario Mine
Helena	Old Telegraph Mine
Helena	Third Term Mine
Helena	Unnamed Near Kimball
Helena	Julia Mine
Helena	Monarch Mine
Helena	Negros Mine Workings
Helena	Viking Mine
Lolo	Golden Sunset Mine
Lolo	Antimony Mine
Kootenai	Montanore Mine
Kootenai	Skranak Mine
Kootenai	6 Gold Dredging Projects
Wallowa-Whitman	Mammoth Placer (NOI)
Wallowa-Whitman	PHO Placer
Wallowa-Whitman	C&K Placer
Wallowa-Whitman	Ron Calder - No BE
Wallowa-Whitman	Cable Cove Group
Wallowa-Whitman	Mandy Placer
Wallowa-Whitman	Rockwood (NOI)
Wallowa-Whitman	Lewis (OP)
Wallowa-Whitman	Jack Nelson (NOI)
Wallowa-Whitman	Nugget Placer (OP)
Wallowa-Whitman	Blue Jay (OP)
Wallowa-Whitman	Arkay Placer
Wallowa-Whitman	Norway Mine
Wallowa-Whitman	Oughta-Be Placer Mine
Wallowa-Whitman	Big Fire Trust Lode
Wallowa-Whitman	Silver Spur
Wallowa-Whitman	Campell
Wallowa-Whitman	Fruststration Lode (NOI)
Wallowa-Whitman	Fruit Creek (OP)
Wallowa-Whitman	Maiden's Dream (OP)

HIGH AND MODERATE RECREATION OPERATIONS

Boise	Dispersed Camping, Middle Fork Payette River
Clearwater	Outfitter Guides
Flathead	Upper Stillwater Campground/Boat Launch
Flathead	Holland Lake Campground/Boat Launch
Helena	Kading Campground
Helena	Forest Trail #339 (329?)
Helena	Copper Creek Campground
Colville	Dispersed Camping (2 projects)
Wallowa-Whitman	Motorized Trails in Powder River
Wallowa-Whitman	McCully Forks Campground
Wallowa-Whitman	Dispersed Recreation Sites Powder River

HIGH AND MODERATE TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS

Bitterroot	Fred Burr Access Road #773 (Special Use Permit)
Bitterroot	State HIghway #38 Reconstruction
Boise	Road Maintenance, Upper South Fork Boise River
Boise	Road Maintenance, Lower South Fork Boise River
Boise	Road Maintenance, Middle Fork Boise River
Boise	Road Maintenance, Middle Fork Payette River
Flathead	Special User Permit Roads and Easements
Helena	Forest Road #227
Helena	Forest Road #330
Kootenai	Road 150 Blading
Kootenai	Sizemore Roaduse Private Road Permit
Sawtooth	Road Maintenance
Wallowa-Whitman	General Road System - Pine Creek
Wallowa-Whitman	General Road System - Eagle Creek
Wallowa-Whitman	Road Maintenance in Upper and North Powder, Wolf Creek
Wallowa-Whitman	General Road System - Powder River
Wallowa-Whitman	Road Maintenance Pine Creek

HIGH AND MODERATE MISCELLANEOUS

Bitterroot	Fred Burr Irrigation Ditch Special Use Permit
Boise	Electrofishing, N.Fork Boise River
Boise	Fish Habitat Improvement, Spruce Creek
Boise	Electrofishing, Middle Fork Payette River
Boise	Electrofishing, Canyon Creek
Boise	Bull Trout Transplant, Crooked River
Boise	Bull Trout Transplant, North Fork Boise River
Boise	Thinning, Second Fork
Clearwater	Fire Suppression
Lolo	Dunham Ditch Irrigation Diversion
Lolo	Yellowstone Pipeline
Lolo	BPA-Dworshak Powerline
Lolo	Montana Power powerline
Lolo	Clark Fork Telecommunication buried line
Lolo	Mt. Fiber Optic Line - Prospect Creek
Kootenai	Glen Lake Irrigation Ditch
Wallowa-Whitman	Eagle Cap Wilderness Fire Plan
Wallowa-Whitman	Eagle Cap Wilderness Stewardship Plan
Wallowa-Whitman	Carnes Ditch

INLAND NATIVE FISH STRATEGY
LIST OF PRIORITY WATERSHEDS
April, 1995

STATE/NATIONAL FOREST	HYDROLOGIC UNIT CODE	STREAM NAME
IDAHO		
BOISE/SAWTOOTH		
41	1705012308 (01,02,03)	GOLD FORK PAYETTE
	1705012309 (01,02)	
42	1705012210 (02,03,04)	3RD FK SQUAW CREEK
43	1705012211 (01,02)	2ND FK SQUAW CREEK
44	170501210501	
	1705012104 (01,02)	UPPER MID FK PAYETTE
45	1705012004 (03,04)	UPPER DEADWOOD RIVER
46	1705012004 (01,02)	LOWER DEADWOOD RIVER
47	1705012005 (01,02)	CLEAR CREEK
48	1705012010	CANYON CREEK
49	17050120 (11,12)	SF PAYETTE RIVER
50	170501110601	NF BOISE RIVER
	170501110602	NF BOISE RIVER
51	170501200802	TENMILE CREEK
52	170501110401	BEAR CREEK
53	170501110202	
	170501110203	CROOKED RIVER
54	170501110902	BLACK WARRIOR
55	170501111001	
	170501111002	QUEENS RIVER
57	170501131002	FEATHER RIVER
58	1705011118 (01,02)	ROARING RIVER
59	1705011133 (01-04)	SHEEP CREEK
60	1705011411 (01-05)	RATTLESNAKE CREEK
61	170501130701	FALL CREEK
62	170501130803	WILLOW
63	1705011313 (03-07)	SF BOISE HEADWATERS
64	1705011314 (03-06)	SMOKY CREEK
65	170501131201	SKELETON CREEK
66	170501131103	BOARDMAN

STATE/NATIONAL FOREST	HYDROLOGIC UNIT CODE	STREAM NAME
IDAHO, cont'd		
CHALLIS/SALMON		
23		HORSE CREEK
24		INDIAN CREEK
25		UPPER NF SALMON COMPLEX
26		4 OF JULY CREEK
27		CARMEN
28		GARDEN AND CLEAR CREEK
29		PINE
30		MOOSE
31		NAPISA COMPLEX
32		UPPER PANTHER COMPLEX
33		YELLOW JACKET/CAMAS/SILVER
34		BRUSH AND SHEEP CREEK
35		IRON
36		TWELVE MILE CREEK
37		BEAR/HAYDEN/EF HAYDEN
38		PATTEE/AGENCY
39		UPPER LEMHI
40	1704021708	SAWMILL
CLEARWATER		
6	17060307	UPPER NF CLEARWATER RIVER
7	17060308	ISABELLA CREEK
IDAHO PANHANDLE		
1	17010215 (07,08)	UPPER PRIEST RIVER/HUGHES FK
2	17010214 (09)	TRESTLE CREEK
3	17010214 (10)	GOLD CREEK COMPLEX
4	170103041701	
	17010304 (18-22)	ST JOE
5	17060308 (08-10)	LITTLE NF CLEARWATER
22	1701010411	LONG CANYON
	170101040201	FISHER
MONTANA		
BITTERROOT		
106	170102050901	
	170102051201	BURNT FK BITTERROOT RIVER
	170102051003	FRED BURR CREEK
107	1701020515	SKALKAHO
108	1701020516	SLEEPING CHILD CREEK
109	17010205 (24 - 27)	WFK BITTERROOT RIVER
	1701020523 (02,03)	
110	170102052805	WARM SPRINGS CREEK
111	1701020530 (01,02)	
	1701020531	EFK BITTERROOT RIVER

STATE/NATIONAL FOREST	HYDROLOGIC UNIT CODE	STREAM NAME
MONTANA, cont'd		
DEERLODGE		
101	170102010303	HARVEY CREEK
102	17010201 (01-10)	ROCK CREEK
103	1701020113	BOULDER CREEK
104	1701020117	RACETRACK CREEK
105	17010201 (24,25)	WARM SPRINGS CK
FLATHEAD		
112	170102061801	FROZEN LAKE
113	1701020617	TRAIL CREEK
114	1701020615 (02-04)	WHALE CREEK
115	1701020614	RED MEADOW CREEK
116	170102061804	CYCLONE LAKE
117	1701020608	COAL CREEK
118	1701020607	BIG CREEK
119	1701021007 (02,03)	UPPER/LOWER STILLWATER LAKE
120	170102100503	WHITEFISH LAKE/UPPER W. LAKE
121	170102090104	WOUNDED BUCK LAKE
122	1701020712	BEAR CREEK
123	170102071402	GRANITE CREEK
124	1701020714 (01,02,04)	MORRISON CREEK
125	1701020716	STRAWBERRY CREEK
126	1701020711	LONG CREEK
127	170102090502	WHEELER CREEK
128	1701020906	SULLIVAN CREEK
129	1701020717	SCHAFER CREEK
130	1701020716	CLACK CREEK
131	1701020716	BOWL CREEK
132	1701020911	SPOTTED BEAR RIVER
133	170102110302	SOUTH LOST CREEK
134	170102110402	WOODWARD CREEK
135	170102110502	GOAT CREEK
136	170102110502	SQUEEZER CREEK
137	170102110602	LION CREEK
138	170102110601	PIPER CREEK
139	170102110701	JIM CREEK
140	170102110802	COLD CREEK
141	170102110803	ELK CREEK
142	1701021111	LINDBERG LAKE
143	170102111003	HOLLAND LAKE
144	1701020915	LITTLE SALMON CREEK
145	1701020916	BIG SALMON CREEK
146	1701020918	WHITE RIVER
147	1701020923	GORDON CREEK
148	17010209 (20-22)	SFK FLATHEAD RIVER
149	1701020920	DANAHER CREEK
150	1701020920	DANAHER CREEK
HELENA		
99	17010203 (28,29)	COPPER/LANDERS CREEKS
100	1701020113	LITTLE BLACKFOOT

STATE/NATIONAL FOREST	HYDROLOGIC UNIT CODE	STREAM NAME
MONTANA, cont'd		
KOOTENAI		
69	170101011303	PHILLIPS/SOPHIE
70	170101011304 (05)	WIGWAM CREEK
71	170101011301 (02,06)	GRAVE CREEK
72	170101030101	LOWER YAAK RIVER
73	170101010201 (02)	O'BRIEN CREEK
74	170101010501 (02,03)	PIPE CREEK
75	170101010301	QUARTZ CREEK
76	170101012101 (02,03)	CALLAHAN CREEK
77	170101011802	LAKE CREEK
	1701010119	
	1701010120	
78	170102130501 (02 - 05)	BULL RIVER
79	170101011603 (04,05)	LIBBY CREEK
80	170102130403 (04)	ROCK CREEK
81	170101020404 (05)	WEST FISHER CREEK
	170101020801 (03)	SILVER BUTTE CREEK
82	170102130902 (04)	VERMILLION RIVER
LOLO		
83	1701021316	FISH TRAP CREEK
84	170102131502	W. FK THOMPSON
85	170102131301 (03,04-07)	PROSPECT
86	1701020419	ST REGIS RIVER
	1701020418(20,22,23)	
87	1701020415	CEDAR CREEK
88	1701020413	TROUT CREEK
89	1701020409	FISH CREEK
	1701020410	
90	1701020405	PETTY CREEK
91	170102050302	SF LOLO CREEK
92	170102040101 (02,04)	RATTLESNAKE CREEK
93	1701020302	GOLD CREEK
94	170102030502	BELLMONT CREEK
95	17010203 (09,10)	CLEARWATER RIVER
	1701020307	
	170102030809	
96	1701020311 (02-04)	COTTONWOOD CREEK
97	1701020315	MONTURE CREEK
	1701020313(01-03)	
98	1701020317	NFK BLACKFOOT RIVER
	170102031602	
	1701020314	
	1701020330	

STATE/NATIONAL FOREST	HYDROLOGIC UNIT CODE	STREAM NAME
OREGON		
FREMONT	180102025	SPRAGUE RIVER
	180102026	SPRAGUE RIVER
	180102028	SPRAGUE RIVER
	1801020211	SPRAGUE RIVER
	1801020212	SPRAGUE RIVER
	1801020213	SPRAGUE RIVER
MALHEUR	170501162106	SWAMP/SHEEP/NFK
	170501162105	ELK
	170501162103	LITTLE CRANE
	170501162104	CRANE
	170501162102	MAIN NFK MALHEUR
	170501162001	MAIN NFK MALHEUR
	170501161601	MID FK MALHEUR
	170501161701	MID FK MALHEUR
	170501161702	BIG CREEK
	170501161704	LAKE CREEK
	170501161705	BIG CREEK
OCHOCO	17070301 (01-04)	METOLIUS
	1712000417 (01,03,04)	
WALLOWA-WHITMAN		
14	17060213 (15-19)	PINE CREEK
12	1705029318	EAGLE CREEK
	17050202 (13,14)	NF POWDER RIVER
	1705020210	UPPER POWDER RIVER
WASHINGTON		
COLVILLE		
1	1701021612(01-03)	SULLIVAN CREEK
	170102160903	
2	170102161101	SF SALMO RIVER
3	170102161001	SLATE CREEK
4	1701021614(01-03)	LE CLERC CREEK
NEVADA		
HUMBOLDT		
N1	17050102(16,17)	E.FORK JARBIDGE RIVER
N2		W.FORK JARBIDGE RIVER

Ecosystems: Water Resources & Watershed Management

Idaho Panhandle National Forests

-=SPEED MEMO=-

DATE:	10/3/95	SUBJECT:	2520 InFish Implementation
TO:	InFish Team Leader		
FROM:	RICK PATTEN Forest Hydrologist	"To protect your rivers... Protect your mountains."	

MESSAGE:

The Rocket Run Timber Sale was analyzed, documented in an EA, advertised and sold, and road were constructed prior to the development of the InFish Strategy. Many adjustments had been made to the project to address the issues that were identified in the EA; several have been made since then in response to watershed and fisheries concerns. The project has now been identified as a "high risk" project within a priority watershed in the InFish Strategy. Therefore, the evaluation for an action plan addressing the project's compatibility with the InFish interim RMO's and S&G's was done.

After an initial field review, we recommended that a site specific analysis be done for the project. We recognized that the elements of a comprehensive watershed analysis had been done at two stages of the project's initial development. It was also apparent that the elements of the project that had put it at risk were had already been addressed and modified (high-risk cutting units involving compacted tills were eliminated and over-snow yarding was required were erosion was a concern). The roads were already in place. And the primary elements that put the watershed at risk were past management practices. Another comprehensive watershed analysis would have been redundant and would not effectively address the problem any further. A site-specific evaluation from the perspective of the InFish RMO's and guidelines was still in order. The evaluation and recommendations are documented in a 2520 memo to the St. Joe DR dated 8/16/95, signed by myself and the Zone Fish Biologist.

The nature of the evaluation with its supporting documentation contains all six of the steps lined out in the Region 6 guidance, "Ecosystem Analysis at the Watershed Scale."

1. Characterization of the Watershed:
   This step is developed in the EA and the specialists' reports referenced in the evaluation. The dominant physical and biological processes are identified in the EA and supplemental reports; and the key riparian area processes (as well as non-riparian upland watershed processes) are highlighted in the report. The primary processes are related to rapid and concentrated runoff from plastered and compacted tills; erosion from oversteepened slopes into incised stream channels; sediment loading; and water yield increases.

2. Issues and key questions:

Again, these were well-developed by the EA and by specialists' reports. InFish generated some additional concerns because of the default RMO's it refers to. The essential issues in this project are 1) the extraordinary amount of shallow subsurface water that could be encountered by management practices; 2) direct influence on riparian areas and streams by adjacent cutting units; and 3) the potential for increasing the amount or rate of surface runoff. Only #2 directly relates to the RMOs and RHCAs in InFish; but the others may have an indirect, and possibly more profound, effect on the water resources.

3. Description of current conditions:

The EA and supplemental reports fully describe the present risks and condition of the watershed and water resources. This report further supplements them with the additions of the roads constructed since they were finished. The present conditions of the Rocky Run Creek watershed were defined mainly by the extensive over-designed roads and high-grade logging that took place several decades ago.

4. Changes over time and reference conditions:

Certain key indicators watershed conditions and effects that have occurred in the recent past are generally developed in the original documentation. This evaluation did not expand on that since the objective was to assure that the capability to achieve or recover to the RMO's would not be compromised by this project.

5. Synthesis and interpretation:

Existing and reference conditions were not explicitly compared in this evaluations. However, the results of the recommendations based on function and process were demonstrated in terms of the RMO's.

6. Recommendations:

Both this report and prior adjustments by the District developed the recommendations for the action plan to assure that the objectives of InFish would either be met or progress toward them would not be impeded by this project or other actions being undertaken in the watershed. The recommendations consisted of removing whole cutting units or moving their boundaries such that the riparian functions and processes would not be impeded or adversely affected. These were related to shade, cover, LOD supply & recruitment, and erosion into the stream. Stream structure and flow modification were not issues due the nature of the involved streams. In some cases, cable yarding systems over snow were recommended to be employed to assure that erosion and sediment delivery would not occur.

SIGNATURE: _____