

United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest Service

Intermountain Region

June 2008



# Environmental Assessment

## Middle Fork Salvage Project

Boise National Forest  
Emmett Ranger District  
Boise and Valley Counties, Idaho



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Table of Contents-----TC-1  
 List of Figures -----TC-2  
 List of Tables -----TC-3

**CHAPTER 1 – PUPROSE AND NEED**-----1-1

    1.1 Introduction-----1-1  
 1.2 Location-----1-1  
 1.3 Background -----1-1  
 1.4 Project Area Description -----1-3  
 1.5 Forest Plan Direction -----1-3  
 1.6 Proposed Action -----1-6  
 1.7 Purpose and Need for Proposed Action -----1-6  
 1.8 Decisions to be Made -----1-9  
 1.9 Regulatory Requirements and Required Coordination -----1-9  
 1.10 Public Involvement -----1-11  
 1.11 Identification of Issues-----1-11

**CHAPTER 2 – ALTERNATIVES** -----2-1

    2.1 Introduction-----2-1  
 2.2 Development of Alternatives -----2-1  
 2.3 Alternatives Considered in Detail-----2-1  
 2.4 Summary of Alternatives-----2-14

**CHAPTER 3 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES** -----3-1

    3.1 Introduction-----3-1  
 3.2 Forest Vegetation-----3-1  
 3.3 Range -----3-26  
 3.4 Noxious Weeds -----3-27  
 3.5 Rare and Sensitive Plants -----3-29  
 3.6 Timber Economic Efficiency Analysis -----3-31  
 3.7 Recreation-----3-33  
 3.8 Wild and Scenic Rivers -----3-37  
 3.9 Visual Resources -----3-38  
 3.10 Roadless Resource -----3-42  
 3.11 Cultural Resources -----3-45  
 3.12 Air Quality -----3-46  
 3.13 Wildlife -----3-51  
 3.14 Overall Wildlife Conclusion-----3-79  
 3.15 Watershed and Fisheries Resources -----3-80  
 3.16 Soil Resources -----3-97  
 3.17 Transportation System -----3-106

**CHAPTER 4 – CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION**-----4-1

    4.1 Summary of Scoping, Public Involvement, and Comment -----4-1  
 4.2 List of those receiving Proposed Action Report-----4-1  
 4.3 Federal, State, and Local Agencies, Tribes, and Individuals Who Commented on the  
     Proposed Action Report -----4-1  
 4.4 List of Primary Preparers -----4-2

Appendix A - Findings and Disclosures -----A-1  
 Appendix B - Cumulative Effects – Past, Present and Future Projects -----B-1  
 Appendix C - Environmental Baselines – Current Conditions for Sixmile and Anderson Creek  
     Subwatersheds -----C-1  
 Appendix D - Middle Fork Salvage Project Comment Analysis – Proposed Action Report (PAR) -----D-1

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1.1 Vicinity Map -----1-2

Figure 1.2 Management Prescription Categories with the Project Area-----1-5

Figure 2.1 Proposed Activities in the Lucky Fire Area: Alternatives B and C -----2-10

Figure 2.2 Proposed Activities in the Lightning Fire Area: Alternative B -----2-11

Figure 2.3 Proposed Activities in the Lightning Fire Area: Alternative C -----2-13

Figure 3.1 RAVG Modeled Basal Area Mortality in the Lucky Fire Area -----3-2

Figure 3.2 RAVG Modelled Basal Area Mortality in the Lightning Fire Area -----3-3

Figure 3.3 Proposed Salvage Harvest Areas -----3-5

Figure 3.4 Potential Vegetation Groups-----3-10

Figure 3.5 Pre-Fire Tree Size Class -----3-11

Figure 3.6 Post-Fire Tree Size Class -----3-14

Figure 3.7 Pre-Fire Canopy Closure -----3-17

Figure 3.8 Post-Fire Canopy Closure-----3-18

Figure 3.9 Pre-Fire Species Composition -----3-20

Figure 3.10 Burn Pile 1-Hour Average PM2.5 Concentrations Downwind at Distance Intervals -----3-49

Figure 3.11 Burn Pile 24 -Hour Average PM2.5 Concentrations Downwind at Distance Intervals -----3-50

Figure 3.12 Project fire created snag densities within salvage units (Only Douglas-fir and ponderosa pine  $\geq 10''$  d.b.h) by alternative using values extrapolated from Russell et al. (2006;Figure 1) for snags  $\geq 10''$  d.b.h and Everett et al. (1999)for snags  $> 20''$  d.b.h.-----3-53

Figure 3.13 Key Habitat Characteristics of the Project Area-----3-55

Figure 3.14 Characterization of Habitat for Woodpeckers Relevant to the MF Salvage Project-----3-67

Figure B.1 Cumulative Effects: Past, Present, and Foreseeable Activities and Fire -----B-6

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 2.1 Comparison of Major Activities-----2-14

Table 3.1 RAVG Basal Area Mortality Acreage Estimates -----3-3

Table 3.2 Area of Potential Vegetation Groups within the Analysis Area-----3-8

Table 3.3 Pre-Fire and Post-Fire Tree Size Classes within the Analysis Area -----3-9

Table 3.4 Tree Size Class Assumptions -----3-12

Table 3.5 Pre-Fire and Post-Fire Canopy Closures within the Analysis Area -----3-15

Table 3.6 Canopy Closure Assumptions-----3-15

Table 3.7 Pre-Fire Cover Types within the Analysis Area -----3-19

Table 3.8 Pre-Fire Snag Densities in the Analysis Area Post-Fire -----3-22

Table 3.9 Eleven Plant Species Included in Rare and Sensitive Plant Analysis -----3-30

Table 3.10 Timber Sale-Related Economic Outputs by Alternative-----3-32

Table 3.11 Management Area 14 ROS Classification-----3-36

Table 3.12 Visually Sensitive Travel Routes and Visual Quality Objectives -----3-39

Table 3.13 Identified Sensitive Air Quality Areas-----3-48

Table 3.14 Comparison of Road Parameters by Alternative in the Two Fire Areas -----3-53

Table 3.15 Effects of the MF Salvage Project on T&E and Candidate Species -----3-56

Table 3.16 Effects of the MF Salvage Project on Region 4 Sensitive Species-----3-58

Table 3.17 Pre- and Post-implementation Snag Densities within Four Hypothetical Home Ranges  
in the MF Salvage Project Area-----3-66

Table 3.18 Effects of the MF Salvage Project on MIS, Neotropical Migrant Bird Species, and Other  
Species of Concern -----3-73

Table 3.19 MF Salvage Project RCA Distance by Water Source -----3-81

Table 3.20 Designated Beneficial Uses for the Middle Fork Payette Rive, Anderson Creek, and  
Lightning Creek -----3-82

Table 3.21 Effects Summary for Alternatives B and C in the Sixmile Subwatershed-----3-89

Table 3.22 Effects Summary for Alternatives B and C in the Anderson Subwatershed -----3-91

Table 3.23 Lucky Fire Area Existing Detrimental Disturbance Conditions by Salvage Unit-----3-98

Table 3.24 Lightning Fire Area Existing Detrimental Disturbance by Salvage Unit -----3-99

Table 4.1 Scoping Respondents-----4-1

Table 4.2 Respondents: 30-day Notice and Comment Period -----4-1

Table B.1 Cumulative Effects: Past, Present, and Foreseeable Activities and Fire -----B-1

Table C.1 Environmental Baseline – Current Conditions for the Sixmile Subwatershed C-1

Table C.2 Environmental Baseline – Current Conditions for the Anderson Subwatershed-----C-8