

NOTICE: if the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

R5-G-3-j TAMP#314

R-10

Report to Congress

Anadromous Fish Habitat Assessment

January 1985

J. TRP. 10 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
R-10

JLM065

Fish Habitat Assessment

United States Department of Agriculture
Forest Service
Pacific Northwest Research Station
Alaska Region



R10-NR-279

1985

0383 F

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065

Report to Congress
Anadromous Fish Habitat Assessment
January 1995

United States Department of Agriculture
Forest Service
Pacific Northwest Research Station
Alaska Region

R10-MB-279



NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLMO65




TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	i
Synthesis Report (white pages)	1
Appendix A. Anadromous Fish Habitat Assessment Plan	pink pages
Appendix B. Anadromous Fish Habitat Assessment Interim Report	blue pages
Appendix C. An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Current Procedures for Protecting Anadromous Fish Habitat on the Tongass National Forest	orange pages
Appendix C.1. Tongass Fish Habitat Objectives	green pages
Appendix C.2. Expert Field Review	yellow pages
Appendix C.3. Alaska Region Watershed Analysis Team Report	gray pages
Appendix D. Status Report on Water Quality and Fish Habitat Effectiveness Monitoring	gold pages

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065

PREFACE

The Conference Committee Report on the Fiscal Year 1994 Congressional Appropriations Act for Interior and Related Agencies directed the USDA Forest Service to study and report to Congress on the effectiveness of Forest Service salmon and steelhead habitat protection on the Tongass National Forest and determine if any additional protection is needed. This document, the Anadromous Fish Habitat Assessment, constitutes the report to Congress. The assessment was completed jointly by the Alaska Region and the Pacific Northwest Research Station of the Forest Service.

Assessment Managers

John C. Capp	Regional Director Wildlife, Fisheries, Ecology and Watershed Alaska Region, Forest Service
Fred H. Everest	Program Manager Aquatic/Land Interactions Research Pacific Northwest Research Station, Forest Service

Synthesis Authors

Fred H. Everest	Program Manager Aquatic/Land Interactions Research Pacific Northwest Research Station, Forest Service
John C. Capp	Regional Director Wildlife, Fisheries, Ecology and Watershed Alaska Region, Forest Service
Jeffrey L. Kershner	National Fish Ecologist Wildlife, Fish and Rare Plants Staff Washington Office, Forest Service
Martha H. Brookes	Writer/Editor Pacific Northwest Research Station, Forest Service

Fish Habitat Analysis Team


Jeffrey L. Kershner (leader)	National Fish Ecologist Wildlife, Fish and Rare Plants Staff Washington Office, Forest Service
------------------------------	---



NOTICE: if the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLMO65



Mason D. Bryant	Fisheries Scientist Pacific Northwest Research Station, Forest Service
Max J. Copenhagen	Hydrologist Regional Watershed Program Leader Alaska Region, Forest Service
Steven J. Kessler	Fisheries Biologist Tongass Land Management Planning Team Alaska Region, Forest Service
Calvin H. Caspitt	Regional Fisheries Program Leader Alaska Region, Forest Service
Steyen J. Paustian	Hydrologist Chatham Area, Tongass National Forest Alaska Region, Forest Service
John D. McIntyre	Fisheries Research Scientist Intermountain Research Station, Forest Service (retired)
Rebecca T. Baldwin	Economist/Analyst Alaska Region, Forest Service (resigned)
*Lana C. Shea	Regional Supervisor, Habitat and Restoration Division Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Tamra L. Faris	Fisheries Biologist National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Watershed Analysis Team

Michael H. Kuehn (leader)	Regional Watershed Analysis Team Regional Hydrologist Alaska Region, Forest Service
Richard S. Aho (leader)	Stikine Area Watershed Analysis Team Fisheries Biologist Stikine Area, Tongass National Forest Alaska Region, Forest Service
John T. Day	GIS Analyst Tongass Land Management Plan Alaska Region, Forest Service

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than the notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065

Ronald L. Dunlap	Fisheries Habitat Relationships Coordinator Alaska Region, Forest Service
*James M. Ferguson	Forester/Economist Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
Daniel F. Kelliher (leader)	Chatham Area Watershed Analysis Team Hydrologist Chatham Area, Tongass National Forest Alaska Region, Forest Service
Ronald H. Medel (leader)	Ketchikan Area Watershed Analysis Team Fisheries Biologist Ketchikan Area, Tongass National Forest Alaska Region, Forest Service
Douglas N. Swanston	Research Geologist Pacific Northwest Research Station, Forest Service

Monitoring Team

Randy Coleman (leader)	Regional Monitoring Coordinator Alaska Region, Forest Service
Douglas N. Swanston	Research Geologist Pacific Northwest Research Station, Forest Service
Steven J. Paustian	Hydrologist Chatham Area, Tongass National Forest Alaska Region, Forest Service
*James M. Ferguson	Forester/Economist Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
Julianne E. Thompson	Hydrologist Stikine Area, Tongass National Forest Alaska Region, Forest Service
Maria S. Dudzak	Hydrologist Ketchikan Area, Tongass National Forest Alaska Region, Forest Service
Larry H. Meshew	Ecosystem Management Staff Ketchikan Area, Tongass National Forest Alaska Region, Forest Service

Jere J. Christner

Fish, Wildlife, Watershed, Ecology Staff
Chatham Area, Tongass National Forest
Alaska Region, Forest Service

Other Contributors


Many others contributed to the assessment by serving as consultants, sources of information, peer reviewers, expert field reviewers or by providing literature review, editing, or support services. Please see appendices C.1, C.2, and C.3. These people represented the Forest Service's Washington Office, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Intermountain Research Station, Southeastern Research Station, Pacific Southwest Region, and Pacific Northwest Region, as well as *Oregon State University, *University of Washington, *Weyerhaeuser Company, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

*Non-federal participants were excluded from all Team decision making and formulation of recommendations due to provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065



NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREST SERVICE

REPORT TO CONGRESS

SYNTHESIS:
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT

January 1995

Alaska Region
Pacific Northwest Research Station



NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TM-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065




TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Objective	1
Scope of Assessment	1
Perspectives on Salmonid Habitat	2
Marine Ecology	2
Freshwater Habitat	2
Habitat Disturbance	3
Habitat Management	4
Hatcheries	4
Methods	5
Results	6
Directive 1 - Effectiveness of Current Procedures	6
The Literature Review	7
The Expert Field Review	7
Watershed Analysis	8
Monitoring on the Tongass	9
Summary of Results Pertaining to Directive 1	9
Directive 2 - Additional Needs	10
Recommendations	11
Improvements Recommended for Examination in the Tongass Land Management Plan	11
Improvements Recommended for Strengthening Habitat Protection Under Current Direction	12
Conclusions	14
Information Base	19

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLMO65

INTRODUCTION

The Conference Committee Report on the Fiscal Year 1994 Congressional Appropriations Act (Appendix A) directs the USDA Forest Service to respond to the following two directives on fish habitat management in the Tongass National Forest:

Proceed with stream analyses and studies and review procedures related to the PACFISH strategy in 1994 in order to study the effectiveness of current procedures [for protecting the habitat of anadromous salmonids].

Determine if any additional protection [for anadromous fish habitat] is needed.

Numerous species and discrete spawning populations (stocks) of Pacific salmon, steelhead trout, and anadromous cutthroat trout represent outstanding natural resources in Southeast Alaska. The Alexander Archipelago and the mainland of Southeast Alaska support one of the most productive and highly valued salmon fisheries in the world. The commercial salmon fisheries yield 160 million pounds (average annual production from the Tongass) worth about \$250,000,000 annually and provide over 5,000 direct jobs in the Southeast Alaska economy. The sport fishing industry is smaller in economic and employment effects, but this sector is growing at an average of 10 percent per year. Sport fishing now provides over 1,200 direct full-time job equivalents with over \$28,000,000 in earnings and 250,000 angler days. Sport fishers spend more than \$90 for each salmon caught. The subsistence harvest of salmon is in excess of 1.2 million pounds annually. Harvesting salmon in traditional areas is important to sustaining the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian cultures. Activities associated with salmon produce the most natural resources jobs annually in Southeast Alaska. The long-term conservation of a harvestable surplus of salmon and steelhead across the Tongass is essential to the economic future of Southeast Alaska.

Objective

The objective of this assessment is to provide a technical response to the two Congressional directives contained in the Conference Committee Report.

Scope of Assessment

- (1) A broad temporal and spatial perspective was used to respond to the two Congressional directives.
- (2) The assessment is a joint product of the Forest Service Alaska Region and Pacific Northwest Research Station.
- (3) The assessment was a technical and scientific analysis directed specifically to respond to the two Congressional directives.
- (4) The assessment is not a direction-setting document nor does it imply or suggest applying, or not applying, PACFISH to the Tongass National Forest.
- (5) The recommendations are not intended to apply on lands other than those on the Tongass National Forest.

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLMO65



- (6) The information applies to the habitat of all anadromous salmonids on the Tongass National Forest, with emphasis on Pacific salmon and steelhead and their habitats.
- (7) The assessment was directly focused on current timber harvest and associated procedures, and their implementation, for managing anadromous fish habitat--that is, since passage of the Tongass Timber Reform Act of 1990.

Perspectives on Salmonid Habitat

Pacific salmon and steelhead in Southeast Alaska have complex life histories that depend on both marine and freshwater environments. Reproduction is in freshwater streams, primarily in forested watersheds, where adults must reach spawning grounds, eggs hatch, and juveniles rear for a variable period before they migrate downstream to the sea. Juvenile fish in the sea feed voraciously, grow and mature into adults over one or more years, and then return, generally to the same freshwater streams, to reproduce. Maintaining salmon and steelhead stocks and populations, then, depends on favorable conditions in both freshwater and marine environments. Salmon and steelhead populations can become stressed if either marine or freshwater habitat quality declines. Rapid movement towards extinction is possible if both marine and freshwater habitat productivity decline simultaneously.

Marine Ecology. The productivity of marine waters in the Gulf of Alaska, and thus the survival of salmon and steelhead in Southeast Alaska, are both highly variable and cyclic. Productivity is heavily influenced by the subarctic boundary current flowing into the eastern Pacific Ocean along the west coast of North America. Over cycles of about 20 to 30 years, the current flows predominantly north into the Gulf of Alaska, or alternatively south along the coast of British Columbia, Washington, Oregon, and northern California. When the current flows north, salmon and steelhead from Southeast Alaska enjoy exceptional marine survival. That favorable condition has persisted in Alaska for about the past 15 years and is currently reflected in high commercial, sport, and subsistence catches of salmon. Oceanographers indicate that the cycle is likely to reverse again within the next decade, leaving Alaskan marine waters less productive than now. Salmon and steelhead populations and catches will probably decline, and maintaining the freshwater habitats in good condition during these periods of unfavorable ocean conditions is essential to maintain viability and productivity of salmon and steelhead populations. Based on Alaska catch records (1900-present), the low point of the last current cycle was in the mid-1970s, and the high point appears to have been reached in the early 1990s.

The number of salmon and steelhead harvested in one year, or for a few consecutive years, is not by itself a measure of the health of individual stocks or of freshwater habitat conditions. Salmon harvests in any one year are determined by many factors, including number of salmon successfully hatched and reared in freshwater, salmon survival at sea, hatchery releases and their survival at sea, fish harvest regulations, weather, number of fishers participating in the fishery, and successful returns to freshwater spawning habitats. It is critical to recognize that populations fluctuate on a long-term-cyclical basis and therefore future fluctuations can be anticipated.

Managing fishery harvest can affect the status of salmon and steelhead stocks. The traditional goal of fish harvest management is to keep catches at or near the maximum yield that populations can sustain. Inherent in that goal is maintaining a harvestable surplus of fish well above what is needed to sustain stock viability. If stocks are overharvested, they can recover when harvest is reduced if both marine and freshwater habitats are healthy and productive.

Freshwater Ecology. Salmon and steelhead have exacting freshwater habitat requirements and are vulnerable to human-caused changes in habitat quality. The fish have adapted to the variable conditions in stream environments along the Pacific coast and in the Gulf of Alaska since the last major period of

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065

deglaciation. As a result, steelhead and the five species of Pacific salmon are now segregated into stocks that are specifically adapted to local landscapes, and many stocks, presumably, to local watersheds. The quality of fish habitat in any stream depends on the condition of the area that it drains. Thus, watersheds are the basic active unit of forested landscapes; they control the quality of salmon and steelhead habitat and, to a large extent, the populations of anadromous fish present and numbers of fish that can be sustainably harvested.

The Alexander Archipelago contains many islands with small watersheds and short stream systems that together are believed to contain numerous stocks of salmon and steelhead. A stock can be recognized under the Endangered Species Act, and can therefore be listed as either threatened or endangered if population size and trend, or threats to habitat, warrant. The populations of individual stocks in these short stream systems are small, making them highly vulnerable to watershed disturbances that affect the quality of freshwater habitat. Significant disturbance of habitat in these watersheds, coupled with poor marine conditions and continued intense fish harvest, can quickly place stocks with small populations at high risk of extinction.

Habitat Disturbance. Watersheds in Southeast Alaska are disturbed by both natural events and human activities, but the effects of these disturbances on fish habitat are generally different. The primary differences are related to the frequency and extent of disturbances across forested landscapes, and the potential for recovery of disturbed landscapes and fish habitats.

Natural disturbances (e.g., floods, landslides, windthrow of trees, insect outbreaks, earthquakes) that create spatial and temporal variability in fish habitats across forested landscapes can cause negative effects to fish habitat. These disturbances, however, are infrequent and sporadic so that whole watersheds are rarely affected by a single event. Also, the recurrence interval for large natural disturbances such as earthquakes and glaciation is often in the range of centuries to millennia for any given site. Because usually only a small area of the landscape is affected at any one time, and disturbances are infrequent, refuges are usually available to assure survival of salmon and steelhead stocks until the disturbed area recovers naturally, which might take a century or more. Salmon and steelhead stocks have evolved adaptive strategies to cope with the effects of natural disturbances, and consequently, are rarely placed at risk of extinction from natural events.

Human disturbances are typically more frequent and widespread than natural disturbances. The most common forms of human disturbance in forested watersheds of Southeast Alaska are logging and road construction. Projected harvest schedules on the Tongass National Forest would mean that most forested acres in any watershed classified as suitable-available under the Tongass Land Management Plan would be harvested during a timber rotation cycle, if allowable sale quantity was maintained throughout the rotation. Because logging is projected for all watersheds containing suitable-available acres during a rotation, and could be planned to recur over the entire area for repeated rotations, the disturbance could be relatively frequent in both time and space across the entire landscape subject to timber harvest. The cumulative effects¹ of frequent disturbances in the Pacific Northwest have been

¹ "Cumulative effects" is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time (CEQ Guidelines, 40 CFR 1508.7, issued 23 April 1971). Effects and impacts as used in these regulations are synonymous (1508.8 (b)).

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLMO65

0395

shown to substantially reduce the quality of freshwater fish habitats resulting in negative consequences for species, stocks, and populations of fish that depend on them, even if coniferous cover is left in buffer strips along the fish-bearing streams. Fish-bearing streams represent only a small portion of stream mileage in any watershed. Because recovery of fish habitat from the effects of extensive logging in a watershed may take a century or more, recovery may never be complete if forests are clearcut harvested and watersheds are disturbed extensively on rotation cycles of about 100 years. Few refuges remain in a watershed that fish can use during such widespread, intense, and recurrent disturbances. Because extensive large clearcuts have no analogue in natural disturbance regimes of Southeast Alaska, salmon and steelhead most likely have not developed adaptive strategies to cope with such unnatural disturbances.

Should freshwater habitats be degraded for long periods, salmon and steelhead stocks will eventually be confronted simultaneously with low marine productivity and degraded freshwater habitat. The likely result of such double jeopardy could be high, long-term risk of extinction. Although the double jeopardy risk to individual stocks may be watershed by watershed, the overall risk to Southeast Alaska fisheries and the people who depend on them is determined in part by the total number of watersheds degraded.

Habitat Management. Because fluctuating ocean conditions are beyond human control, long-term viability and productivity of salmon and steelhead stocks on the Tongass National Forest depend heavily on maintaining high-quality freshwater habitats in forested watersheds. Regulation of fish harvest is beyond the control of the Forest Service, but one of our responsibilities is to conserve the quality of freshwater habitats on the National Forests. To do so requires that landscape disturbances, both natural and human-caused, be evaluated in a watershed context.

Natural and human disturbances have additive effects on freshwater fish habitat, so analysis of effects and planning for activities that cause disturbance should be at large spatial and temporal scales. Many management plans and protective measures for fish habitat on public and private land, however, are still applied on a smaller project area basis (e.g., for a single timber sale). Although project-level analyses are important, more attention should be given to larger spatial and temporal analyses so as to improve cumulative effects analyses. Watershed-scale planning, analysis, and implementation of management activities (such as logging) can better place fish habitat protection in the proper context.

Mixed assemblages of wild anadromous fish in watersheds complicate habitat management. Most watersheds on the Tongass National Forest contain five or more species of anadromous salmonids—a common mix includes coho, chum, and pink salmon, steelhead trout, sea-run cutthroat trout, and Dolly Varden char. These species may all reside together in the same watershed, but each uses available habitat in a slightly different way. Management disturbances in such watersheds can have severe effects on some stocks and species and little effect on others. Management plans should be designed to protect habitat for all stocks, but special consideration should be given to the most vulnerable species or stocks. The most vulnerable are often those whose juveniles stay in freshwater for the longest time (e.g., steelhead and sea-run cutthroat trout) before migrating to sea. Vulnerability can be assessed through watershed analysis. National Forest Management Act regulations provide for managing habitat to maintain the viability of existing native and desired non-native fish species on the Tongass, including non-anadromous fish. The Endangered Species Act extends protection to all species, subspecies, or distinct population segments once listed under terms of the Act.

Hatcheries. Salmon hatchery operations in Southeast Alaska have been successful in increasing salmon harvest in the past 10 years. Hatcheries have added millions of salmon to commercial, sport, and subsistence fisheries. An abundance of fish from hatchery supplementation, however, provides no assurance that wild stocks in natural habitats will be maintained. On the contrary, intense fishing pressure on hatchery fish, which are almost always mixed with wild stocks at sea, has been shown to result in depletion of wild stocks in the Pacific Northwest. Also, hatchery stocks generally experience lower

NOTICE: if the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065

survival in the ocean than wild stocks, especially when ocean habitats decline on a cyclic basis as discussed earlier under Marine Ecology.

METHODS


The assessment included a comprehensive examination of existing information, collection of new field data, professional field observations and evaluations, and consensus among consulting Federal professionals (Appendix C). Principal tasks included

- Technical analyses in the field of three Tongass watersheds and a Regional synthesis of the findings (Appendix C.3).
- Field evaluations by scientists of four additional Tongass watersheds (Appendix C.2).
- Comprehensive literature review on Pacific salmon and steelhead habitat characteristics, processes, uses, and management interactions in Alaska and the Pacific Northwest (Appendix C).
- Completion of reports on monitoring the implementation and effectiveness of fish-habitat protection on the Tongass and recommendations for improvement (Appendix D).
- Review of reports on the status and uniqueness of salmon and steelhead genetic stocks in Southeast Alaska (Appendix C).
- Evaluation of the Alaska Region database on stream-channel-type attributes (Appendix C.1).
- Evaluation of the proposed PACFISH Pacific salmon and steelhead initiative (Appendix C).
- Peer review of draft reports by additional scientists and Tongass Area fish biologists (Appendix C).
- Review of draft reports by Forest Supervisors, Regional Staff Directors, and Tongass Area staff officers (Appendix C).

More than 50 scientists, resource specialists and managers were directly involved in completing the assessment. These participants represented the Alaska Region, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Intermountain Research Station, Southeastern Research Station, Washington Office, Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Weyerhaeuser Company, National Marine Fisheries Service, Environmental Protection Agency, Oregon State University, and the University of Washington. Non-federal participants were excluded from the final analysis of information, and from formulation of conclusions and recommendations.

Definitions of **current procedures**, **implementation**, and criteria used to evaluate **effectiveness** were needed before studies could be designed and completed to respond to the directives.


- **Current procedures** were defined as the set of requirements used in commercial timber harvest operations since passage of the Tongass Timber Reform Act. Procedures used to protect fish habitat in 1994 are better than those used immediately after passage of the Reform Act, but no activities planned in 1994 have yet been implemented. Post-Reform Act procedures and



NOTICE: if the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-FMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065



applications that were applied to projects planned prior to the Reform Act but retrofitted to conform to Reform Act direction were used as our baseline for evaluating effectiveness.

- **Implementation** was defined as how well current procedures are carried out on the ground.
- **Effectiveness** was evaluated against two criteria: (1) a goal established by the Tongass Land Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement (1979) and, (2) Department of Agriculture direction (Departmental regulation 9500-4).
 1. The Tongass Land Management Plan includes a goal to "...preserve the biological productivity of every fish stream on the Tongass."
 2. Departmental regulation 9500-4 directs the Forest Service to manage "habitats for all existing native and desired non-native plants, fish, and wildlife species in order to maintain at least viable populations of such species" and avoid actions "which may cause a species to become threatened or endangered."

If current procedures achieve the criteria listed above, then they would be defined as effective. If they fail to achieve these criteria, then the identifiable deficiencies in effectiveness would be addressed under directive-2 on page 10 of this report.

RESULTS

The concurrent studies and accomplishments described in the Methods section of this synthesis of the assessment provided sufficient information for us to respond definitively to both of the directives in the FY 1994 Conference Committee Report (Appendix B). The responses and our reasoning are summarized below.

Directive 1 - Effectiveness of Current Procedures


Current procedures and their application have improved the way fish habitats on the Tongass are managed, compared to past protective procedures. Protection of streams and riparian zones has improved rapidly since the late 1980s and has continued to improve since passage of the Tongass Timber Reform Act. Improvements are:

- Use of Best Management Practices as authorized by Section 208 and required by Section 319 of the Clean Water Act for protecting beneficial uses of water, and some monitoring of their effectiveness.
- Active protection of class I and II streams post-Tongass Timber Reform Act.
- Some investment in stream inventory, including some basin-scale analyses.
- Development and application of a state-of-the-art channel-type classification and geographic information system.
- A willingness to increase protection measures for fish habitat as new information reveals deficiencies in previous procedures.

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLMO65



Despite large advances in protecting salmon and steelhead habitats in recent years, current procedures as presently applied on the Tongass have not fully achieved either of the criteria used to evaluate effectiveness. Current practices on the Tongass do not meet either the goal of the Tongass Land Management Plan to "preserve the biological productivity of every fish stream on the Tongass," or the long-term goal of avoiding the possible need for listing of salmon and steelhead stocks under the Endangered Species Act. Due to freshwater habitat conditions, timber harvest practices on the Tongass observed as part of this study were found to increase risk over natural risk levels to both habitat productivity and to individual stocks of salmon and steelhead. The degree of risk varies with the way timber harvest is planned and implemented.

Two types of deficiencies in current practices were found: (1) incomplete implementation of current procedures, and (2) need for additional direction for fish habitat protection. Current procedures were not fully implemented on all sites in any of the timber sale projects reviewed. Results of the analyses, however, indicated that even completely implementing current procedures would not be fully effective in protecting anadromous fish habitat productivity and salmon and steelhead stocks over the long term. Additional procedures were deemed necessary to reduce risk.

Long-term application of current procedures could lead to, or in some cases continue, declines in habitat productivity and eventual loss of stocks or need for listing of salmon and steelhead stocks as endangered or threatened. The primary evidence for arriving at this conclusion is summarized below:

The Literature Review (Appendix C). A thorough literature review of more than 1,540 publications addressing the effects of logging and other forest management activities on Pacific salmon and steelhead habitat revealed the following significant conclusions:

- No research studies of the effectiveness of post-Tongass Timber Reform Act procedures (procedures in effect since 1990) and their application for protecting fish habitats have been completed in Southeast Alaska because the site-specific effects of new procedures cannot be fully assessed for at least several years.
- Pre-Tongass Timber Reform Act studies showed that streams in Alaska respond to disturbances (e.g., loss of channel complexity, sedimentation, harvest of streamside trees, and disturbance of headwater streams and basins) like streams in similar coastal landscapes and conditions of the Pacific Northwest.
- Procedures similar to those currently used to protect fish habitat on the Tongass National Forest (especially buffer strips along fish-bearing streams), after being applied for nearly two decades to similar landscapes and conditions in coastal Washington and Oregon, failed to prevent declines in fish habitat capability, and resulted in increasing and now significant risk to the viability of salmon and steelhead stocks there.
- Timber harvest on unstable slopes and near small headwater streams in coastal zones of the Pacific Northwest resulted in simplified and degraded fish habitats regardless of geographic location.
- Buffer strips of conifers in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska that are prescribed for fish habitat protection during logging operations tend to lose trees subsequently because of windthrow during major storm events. Where buffer strips blew down in the Pacific Northwest, most of their effectiveness for long-term habitat protection was lost.

The Expert Field Review (Appendix C.2). The expert field review identified several items of concern with the application of current management procedures for protecting anadromous fish habitat. Those

NOTICE: if the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065

items, in combination, result in increasing long-term risk to salmon and steelhead stocks, populations, and habitats on the Tongass National Forest. The most significant concerns are summarized below:

- Aquatic inventory data are incomplete and inconsistent across the administrative units of the Tongass National Forest. The result is inconsistent application and sometimes misapplication of current procedures for fish habitat protection.
- Timber harvest and road management activities have not been monitored or studied enough to assess their effects on fish habitat capability and populations and to measure effectiveness of current procedures and help guide and improve future management procedures and strategies.
- Stream buffers of coniferous trees along some class I streams (salmon and steelhead streams), though wider than 100 feet on each side of the stream, were observed to be too narrow to fully protect fish habitat against sedimentation and habitat simplification in two of the seven watersheds examined (Appendix C.2).
- Stream buffers along some class II streams (important for resident fish and water quality) were too narrow to fully protect fish habitat against sedimentation and habitat simplification in three of the seven watersheds examined (Appendix C.2).
- Perennial non-fish-bearing streams (class III streams important for water quality) were not given enough protection to fully control sedimentation and prevent probable long-term degradation of fish habitat in downstream waters in all watersheds examined.
- Clearcut timber harvesting was observed on some steep and unstable slopes, creating an increased risk of landslides and subsequent unacceptable amounts of sedimentation in salmon and steelhead habitats.
- A few roads were constructed on unstable soils, increasing risk of mass erosion and sedimentation in salmonid habitats. Some roads which were constructed on wetlands caused re-routing of water and increased sedimentation.
- Some drainage culverts did not appear to provide adequate upstream passage for adult and juvenile salmon and steelhead.
- Deficiencies in maintaining road drainage systems and in closeout of temporary roads were frequently identified as potential causes of road failure and thus likely sources of excessive sediment delivery to salmon and steelhead habitats.
- Current guidelines for protecting salmon and steelhead habitat were inconsistently applied across the Tongass, resulting in highly variable habitat protection on similar site conditions.

Watershed Analysis (Appendix C.3). The watershed analysis effort revealed that more comprehensive planning for fish habitat protection at the watershed scale should reduce the risk to fish habitat and populations resulting from timber harvest activities. This reduction is possible because the current condition of salmon and steelhead habitat can be better assessed, and the risk to habitat from future human-caused disturbances, or natural events like storms, can be better estimated. Current procedures for fish habitat protection are now applied primarily on a project area basis; consequently, the much more important cumulative effects of timber harvest on fish habitat in a watershed are not fully assessed.

In comparing protection measures that the watershed analysis teams would have designed on the three watersheds under a PACFISH-like habitat conservation strategy with management procedures

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199


JLM065

currently being applied on the Tongass National Forest (as defined in the Methods section), the three Tongass Area Watershed Analysis Teams found these differences:

- A considerable percentage of the area harvested in the three watersheds fell within the proposed Riparian Management Areas; total area of overlap is 6 percent for Kadake Creek, 27 percent for Game Creek, and 52 percent for Old Franks Creek watershed. Some portion of the overlap would probably not have been harvested.
- Riparian Management Area delineation identifies the sensitive riparian areas, wetlands, and sediment source areas in watersheds more clearly and completely than current procedures do.
- The riparian habitat conservation strategies developed by the Teams would have provided for more scrutiny of, and emphasis on, riparian-dependent resources and stream processes than do current procedures, especially resource protection needs adjacent to class III streams.
- With watershed analysis, some management prescriptions for timber harvest within the Riparian Management Areas would probably have been different from the management prescriptions that were implemented.
- Most class III streams are not currently being buffered to prevent negative effects of timber harvest and roads, such as loss of woody debris and changes in energy sources and nutrients, that can degrade downstream fish habitats.
- Some unstable soils and wetlands are currently being subjected to timber harvest and road construction. These activities increase risk to fish stocks and populations, and no measurements are being taken to assess these risks.
- Concerns about potential cumulative effects of timber harvest and other disturbances are unresolved and increasing rapidly where timber harvest is most intensive and extensive.
- Aquatic habitat inventory information is insufficient for development of protection that meets either definition of effectiveness; information is essentially lacking in many areas and inaccurate in others.

Monitoring on the Tongass (Appendix D). Monitoring is useful for assessing both the implementation of procedures and the effects of logging and other disturbances on fish habitat. The results of effectiveness monitoring are an important component of adaptive management; monitoring results can be quickly used to guide and improve the procedures for protecting fish habitat. Implementation and effectiveness monitoring on the Tongass since passage of the Reform Act is in an expansion phase: monitoring efforts have begun to assess the effectiveness and stability of buffer strips; yarding effects on soil disturbance; prescriptions for protecting class III streams; effects of roads on sedimentation and fish passage; landslide frequency and mitigation in relation to logging; and aspects of cumulative effects. Definitive results from effectiveness monitoring are not yet available, however.

The Tongass National Forest produces an annual monitoring and evaluation report. In 1993, fish and riparian standards and guidelines were successfully implemented in more than 90 percent of the situations examined Forest-wide. Minimum stream buffer widths (post-Reform Act) were achieved in more than 90 percent of the situations examined. Also, Best Management Practices for protecting beneficial uses of water were successfully implemented in about 90 percent of the situations examined. In all cases, only a small percentage of activities were monitored.



NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-THE-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065

More implementation and effectiveness monitoring is needed to better assess the effects of logging on fish habitats. Monitoring needs to occur on more timber harvest and road disturbances and over longer time periods on individual sites. Effectiveness monitoring needs major improvement in both design and implementation. More research guidance would improve both design and interpretation of the monitoring program. Although some controversy is evident, current procedures appear to have been well implemented in the sample of activities that were monitored. The effectiveness of these procedures, however, has not been established through monitoring or research.

Summary of the Results Pertaining to Directive 1. The cumulative information resulting from the literature review, the expert field review, the three watershed analyses, peer review, and other sources provides a consistent message that current procedures and their implementation on the Tongass National Forest to protect fish habitat are not fully effective to prevent habitat degradation or fully protect salmon and steelhead stocks over the long term. The largest deficiencies in current procedures are related to protecting headwater streams and their watersheds (class III streams, unclassified intermittent and ephemeral streams, and unstable soils), which to a large degree determine the productivity of downstream fish habitats. The results of these studies, and other information, provide an early diagnosis of symptoms indicating that fish habitat is in decline in some areas as a result of logging, and that longer term application of current procedures could lead to stock declines.

Directive 2 - Additional Needs

Additional needs were identified to help reduce the risk to anadromous fish habitat. These needs fall into two categories: (1) information and analyses to better understand the ecology and conditions of anadromous fish habitats, and (2) the implementation of activities to directly protect habitat once the analyses are complete. The most important needs identified are:

- Quantitative and measurable objectives for anadromous fish habitats should be developed for watersheds where timber harvest and other disturbances have and/or will occur. Future aquatic inventory procedures should include these habitat objectives.
- A formal watershed analysis procedure should be implemented for watersheds with salmon and steelhead populations on the Tongass National Forest. The more timber harvest activities in a watershed or the more unstable the soils, the higher the priority for completing watershed analyses. Watershed analyses that are completed before planned disturbances can more effectively assess potential cumulative effects and risks to fish habitat.
- Riparian management areas should be identified for long-term fish habitat protection on all classes of streams in watersheds where timber is harvested and roads constructed.
- A new class of streams that includes intermittent and ephemeral channels should be defined, inventory standards written, and these areas provided with more protection to minimize cumulative effects on salmon and steelhead habitats downstream.
- Forest-wide definitions, inventory standards, and interpretations of mass-movement-hazard areas should be developed, and a full inventory and analysis of high-hazard and very high-hazard soils should be conducted.
- Specific procedures for analyzing cumulative effects on watersheds producing salmon and steelhead and containing suitable-available acres for timber should be developed for the Tongass National Forest, and included in watershed analysis procedures.

NOTICE: if the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065

- Best Management Practices for protecting water quality should be more fully implemented, monitored, and improved as necessary, specifically focusing on anadromous salmonid habitats, landscape and temporal scales, and cumulative effects of watershed disturbances on habitat capabilities.
- Implementation monitoring of Best Management Practices should continue, and effectiveness monitoring should be accelerated.
- Additional information should be gathered as soon as possible on life histories, distributions, site-specific habitat requirements, and genetic attributes of salmon and steelhead stocks on the Tongass.
- Repeatable, long-term baseline research measurements should be established as soon as possible on some salmon and steelhead streams across the Tongass for research on habitat attributes and capabilities. These measurements can be used to track changes in the structure of anadromous fish habitats that have resulted from human and natural disturbances. Both disturbed and undisturbed habitats should be sampled.
- Salmon and steelhead habitat capability models should be developed for field use in assessing habitat capability conditions and projected changes after timber harvest.


RECOMMENDATIONS

Current direction for anadromous fish habitat protection on the Tongass National Forest is less than fully effective, and additional protection is needed to make timber harvest more compatible with maintaining high-quality fish habitat and long-term conservation of anadromous fish stocks. The highest risks to fish habitat productivity and viability are in watersheds already intensively logged. The strength of the concern resulting from these findings warrants improving fish habitat protection efforts under current procedures prior to completion of the Tongass Land Management Plan Revision. The needs for additional improvements in fish habitat protection, described in the response to Directive 2, can be divided into two categories:

- (1) those that should be examined during the Tongass Land Management Plan Revision because they may have socioeconomic impacts, and public disclosure and participation are needed; and,
- (2) those activities relevant to current direction in the Tongass Land Management Plan that should be strengthened prior to completing the revision.

Improvements Recommended for Examination in the Tongass Land Management Plan Revision

- **Increased protection on headwater areas--steep slopes, high-hazard soils, and class III and IV streams.** Headwater areas greatly influence downstream fish habitat capabilities. They serve as sources and conduits for sediment from natural and human-caused disturbances. Currently these areas are not fully classified, and it is vitally important that new management direction be developed and applied to minimize long-term downstream impacts.
- **Modification of streamside buffers on flood plains and confined alluvial channels.** Establishing site-specific buffers on flood plains and confined alluvial channels should be through watershed



NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065



analysis and subsequent project design. The purpose is to provide for protection for small off-channel streams associated with flood plain streams, and to provide for long-term sources of woody debris.

- **Clarification of the current Tongass plan direction of "...preserve biological productivity of all fish streams on the Tongass."** This direction is interpreted inconsistently across the Tongass and has caused confusion. It can be interpreted that productivity of all fish streams must be maintained at 100 percent, allowing for no reduction due to human-caused disturbances. This is a difficult goal to meet, while allowing for the other multiple uses of the Forest. The Tongass plan revision should clarify this and define appropriate goals for fish habitat productivity on the Tongass between the 100 percent level and the level needed to conserve fish stocks for continued use by Alaska fisheries, as well as addressing acceptable levels of risk or probability of attaining goals.
- **Establish quantitative objectives for fish habitat capability.** Without quantitative measures of fish habitat attributes, it is very difficult to identify habitat capability changes resulting from human-caused activities in a watershed. Project planning and evaluations are currently not quantitative regarding anadromous fish habitat capability, and therefore, are less effective in achieving habitat capability goals.

Improvements Recommended for Strengthening Habitat Protection Under Current Direction

- **Begin implementing watershed analysis.** Use of watershed analysis comparable to that employed in PACFISH would move the Forest an important step toward the agency goal of ecosystem management and long-term sustainability of all forest resources by helping managers make better decisions. It would provide large-scale analyses of how best to manage watersheds with steep unstable areas, highly productive fisheries, productive timber lands, important and sensitive wildlife resources, high-value recreation and visual resources, cultural resources, and other considerations. It would address many of the concerns about effectiveness of current procedures for protecting fish habitats, including more protective prescriptions for stream classes, high-hazard soils, steep slopes, wetlands, road location and design, timber sale layout, logging, fish passage, and cumulative effects of watershed disturbances over time. Watershed analyses would also provide for assessments and management direction better founded on natural disturbance ecology, including management approaches more consistent with site-specific ecological processes and functions, resulting in a systems approach to management.

Initial application of watershed analysis could begin conservatively, aimed at the highest priority watersheds based on the highest risks to anadromous fish.

Because aquatic habitats and fish populations are subject to the continuing effects of all previous disturbances in a watershed, the effects of additional planned management activities should be viewed as additive to existing effects. Analysis procedures for cumulative effects are needed to examine these additive effects, and would be key components of watershed analysis.

- **Develop a Forest-wide restoration strategy for degraded watersheds.** The Alaska Region should develop a watershed restoration strategy to identify and address its watershed restoration needs. The strategy should incorporate the principles of ecosystem management and the concepts of watershed restoration planning (including watershed analyses) into an orderly and coordinated process for developing and carrying out a comprehensive restoration program in

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065



the Alaska Region. The program would accelerate recovery of selected priority watersheds whose function and productivity have been impaired by natural and human disturbances.

- **Inventory anadromous fish habitats and fish communities.** Aquatic inventory information on both habitat and fish provides important data for habitat protection and watershed analyses. If inventory procedures are quantitative and replicable, they become powerful tools for monitoring trends in habitat condition over time and assessing whether timber harvest affects anadromous fish habitats and populations. Aquatic inventories are a high priority and should be institutionalized on the Tongass, just as timber stand and soils inventories have been. Initial inventory should be aimed at the highest priority watersheds based on highest risk to anadromous fish.
- **Develop Forest-wide definitions, inventory standards, and interpretations of mass-movement-hazard areas, and conduct full inventory and analysis of high-hazard and very high-hazard soils.** Timber harvest operations on unstable soils at any location in a watershed present risk to fish habitat. Accelerated mass erosion often results when unstable soils are disturbed. The processes of mass erosion can transport sediments for long distances before deposition--usually in low-gradient streams supporting anadromous fish. Improved management and protection of unstable soils will help control risk to fish habitats.
- **Increase monitoring on implementation and effectiveness of procedures for anadromous fish habitat protection.** More long-term monitoring is needed to answer questions like, "Did protective measures like buffer-strips persist after many years, or after large storm events?" Research studies should be key components of effectiveness monitoring. Highest priority risks to habitat loss should be studied. Watersheds subject to pilot watershed analysis for this assessment are high priority for long-term monitoring.
- **Ensure that management direction for habitat protection is consistently applied.** Examination of watersheds revealed some inconsistencies in the way timber sale procedures for protecting aquatic habitats were implemented. Additional resources should be made available to ensure more complete and consistent application of management direction for protecting anadromous fish habitats.
- **Classify streams draining intermittent and ephemeral channels.** Intermittent and ephemeral headwater channels often represent more than 50 percent of the total stream mileage in a watershed. These channels are conduits for routing sediment, nutrients, and debris downstream to fish-bearing waters and therefore are key components of anadromous fish habitats. Logging disturbs these streams and can cause reductions in fish habitat capability downstream. Most often, these headwater channels which should be included in a class IV designation, currently receive little or no protection during logging. Once these channels are defined and mapped during project reconnaissance, their needs for protection can be examined during watershed analysis.
- **Further develop the process for setting quantitative objectives for fish habitat.** The goal of quantitative objectives for salmon and steelhead habitat protection is to maintain desired habitat capabilities on a sustained basis. The team recommends that managers should quantitatively define the features of desirable salmon and steelhead habitat that are attainable in a given geomorphic setting and that they hope to maintain. This effort is currently underway on the Tongass.
- **Examine and Improve Best Management Practices.** Best Management Practices have never been fully implemented, and thus have never fully protected fish habitats. Review and update

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TWP-32 RPT. TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLMO65

0405

of Alaska Region Best Management Practices and their direction for application is important as new information from research and monitoring becomes available.

- **Accelerate acquisition of research information.** The assessment revealed large gaps in knowledge important to manage and protect the habitats and stocks of anadromous fish on the Tongass. An accelerated and sustained research effort is recommended to provide additional information for management. At least one long-term watershed study, like the Alsea Watershed study in Oregon, or the Carnation Creek watershed study in British Columbia, should be performed on the Tongass to assess the long-term cumulative effects of timber management on anadromous fish stocks and their habitats. Research should address the role of class III and class IV streams in maintaining anadromous fish habitat capability on the Tongass. Research priorities should be set jointly by the Alaska Region and the Pacific Northwest Station.

CONCLUSIONS

Freshwater habitat for wild fish should be carefully managed within individual watersheds and with a long-term watershed perspective to ensure needed fish habitat protection. The assessment concludes that current practices for timber harvest planning and application are not fully effective in protecting anadromous fish habitats on the Tongass National Forest. However, no significant risk is perceived to fish habitat from implementation of current procedures for timber harvest during the next one or two years while the Tongass Land Management Plan is being revised, if actions are taken to strengthen activities under current procedures. Increased headwater protection from timber harvest, increased buffers on flood plains and alluvial channels, and completion of cumulative watershed effects analyses to evaluate natural and human disturbances, are very important protective measures that are needed. As discussed in the Results section of this assessment, several other areas merit concern as well.

Protecting the salmon and steelhead resources of Alaska and the Pacific Northwest is truly a national concern. Extinct and declining stocks in California, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington have prompted development of fish habitat protection measures specified under the Pacific Anadromous Fish Strategy (PACFISH). Although these measures have not been applied to Alaska, the comparison requested in the Conference Committee Report is appropriate. A comparison among current procedures for fish habitat protection on the Tongass, procedures in the PACFISH Strategy, and recommendations of the Anadromous Fish Habitat Assessment Team can be found in Table 1.

Preventing the need to list species is established as a Federal policy by USDA Regulation 9500-4, the 2670 section of the Forest Service Manual, and a Memorandum of Understanding to conserve species tending toward listing signed by the Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, and National Marine Fisheries Service in January of 1994. Conservative approaches should be taken to avoid the need for listing anadromous fish stocks under the Endangered Species Act. Once stocks are listed, many resource management options are precluded and the resulting effects on local economies can be severe and immediate.

Management that uses disturbance ecology, and simulates the natural spatial and temporal range of forest disturbances consistent with ecological processes and functions, is currently believed to provide the highest probability of conserving the salmon and steelhead habitats needed to sustain stocks. The further management plans stray from natural disturbance ecology, the greater the risk to anadromous fish stocks.

The success of fish and wildlife conservation depends on a systems rather than species focus in forest plans. Comprehensive assessments of what is needed to conserve biodiversity and planning at the

NOTICE: if the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLMO65

landscape scale are emerging as common features of revised forest plans and of conservation biology. Because little information exists on individual salmon and steelhead stocks in Southeast Alaska, conserving fish habitat and stocks at the landscape scale must rely heavily on applying the best current principles of habitat management, landscape ecology, and conservation biology.

The assessment concludes that providing for more anadromous fish habitat protection on the Tongass is necessary and practicable. More comprehensive watershed analyses comparable to those in the PACFISH Strategy, if just applied on priority watersheds where timber will be harvested, will provide for both timber harvest and anadromous fish habitat protection. This process will help define timber harvest that is sustainable over time. Additional protection procedures and improved application of all procedures will reduce risk to fish populations. Costs of timber harvest programs may increase with additional habitat protection, but sustained habitats for anadromous fish stocks and harvests, as well as a sustainable rate of timber harvest, are both important goals.

This assessment provides important information for use in considering new management direction and revising the Tongass Land Management Plan. Until more information is available, anadromous fish habitat protection should be both responsive and conservative.




Table 1--Current management procedures, PACFISH Strategy, and Fish Habitat Analysis Team: comparison of components

Component	Current management procedures	PACFISH	Team Recommendations
<p>Riparian management objectives</p>	<p>The 1986 Aquatic Habitat Management Handbook directs the use of aquatic habitat management units (AHMU's) for managing streamside areas. The units are based on stream class and riparian vegetation, and--when available--land type, soils, and additional stream classification. Objectives and direction for management within the units are provided in the Handbook. A riparian management area is defined in the 1991 proposed revision of the Tongass Land Management Plan. The area includes minimum 100-foot buffers on all streams, 150-foot buffers on some channel types, riparian soils, and very high measurement hazard soils adjacent to streams and riparian soils. Management prescriptions (zoning ordinances) within the riparian management area are guided by stream class and channel type, and call for minimum 100-foot no-commercial timber harvest buffers adjacent to all class I streams and those class II streams that flow directly into a class I stream, as required by the 1990 Tongass Timber Reform Act; 100- to 500-foot buffers for lakes; 200-foot no-harvest buffers on most flood plains; and other stream- and channel-type-specific guidance. On class III streams, harvest is allowed on most channel types to the stream edge, but the harvest rate in a watershed is limited. No maximum buffer size is set for any stream. Most current projects have been incorporating the guidelines proposed by the Forest Plan Revision for managing by channel type and stream class, although using them is optional.</p>	<p>Interim widths of riparian habitat conservation areas in the absence of site-specific information are 300 feet for fish-bearing streams and lakes, 150 feet for permanently flowing non-fish-bearing streams, ponds, reservoirs, and wetlands greater than 1 acre, 100 feet in key watersheds and 50 feet in non-key watersheds for seasonally flowing or intermittent streams, wetlands less than 1 acre, and landslides and landslide-prone areas. Most commodity activities are permitted in Habitat Conservation Areas if they do not retard or prevent attainment of riparian management objectives</p>	<p>We recommend following the process described in the proposed Tongass Plan revision, with the following changes: the riparian management area expands to include high mass-movement-hazard soils and wetland fans; before completing both watershed and project analyses, adopt no-harvest buffers for the entire flood plain for class I and II streams and no-harvest buffers of one site-potential tree for confined alluvial channels on class I and II streams; and plan for limited harvest buffers of 100 feet for class III streams. We propose a new no-harvest stream-class IV it requires special consideration during timber harvest but typically no continuous buffer strip. The proposed watershed Management Areas that will modify those described in the Tongass Plan Revision process</p>
<p>Riparian management objectives</p>	<p>The Aquatic Habitat Management Handbook describes some measurable objectives for: streambank and stream channel stability; temperature sensitivity; fish passage through stream crossings; special road-construction mitigative measures; water quality; and large woody debris. Qualitative objectives for primary and secondary aquatic production are also described</p>	<p>Interim Riparian Habitat Management Objectives that provide quantifiable definition of desirable habitat conditions are being developed to guide land management decisions until watershed analysis is completed.</p>	<p>We recommend fish habitat objectives for large woody debris width/depth ratio, and pool frequency based on currently undisturbed conditions. We also recommend riparian health analysis and inventory to establish additional habitat objectives</p>

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT. TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
9501399


JLMO65



NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065




Component	Current management procedures	PACFISH	Team Recommendations
Key watersheds	Key watersheds are not directly addressed, but values are applied to watersheds through Value Comparison Units. Those with 'high' fish ratings might be comparable to PACFISH.	Key watersheds are identified by selecting a subset of watersheds that are important to 'at risk' stocks, currently are in 'good' condition, or have a high potential for restoration.	No change from current management procedures is recommended
Wetlands	Presidential Executive Orders 11988 and 11990 require that Federal agencies avoid undertaking or providing assistance for new construction (e.g. roads) in wetlands/flood plains unless the head of the agency finds no practicable alternative and the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands and flood plains. The proposed revised Tongass Land Management Plan states that all management activities under the proposed action will conform to these directives. Specific guidance is given for river, lake, and estuary wetlands.	River, lake, forested, and non-forested wetlands will have special standards and guidelines	No change from current management procedures is recommended. The value of wetland fens would be emphasized, however, through their incorporation into the Riparian Management Area
Stream class	Stream classes are mapping units that display specific identified values for aquatic resources. Class I is defined as "streams with anadromous or adfluvial fish habitat, plus reasonably enhanceable habitat upstream of barriers." Class II is defined as "streams with resident fish and generally steep gradient (6-15%)." Class III is defined as streams with no fish populations but with potential water-quality influence on downstream aquatic habitat.	Specific stream classifications are not stated, but stream values are stratified as fish-bearing streams, permanently flowing non-fish-bearing streams, and seasonally flowing or intermittent streams.	We recommend adding a set of physical criteria to the determination of class II and III streams. In addition, we recommend adding a class IV stream category
Upland stability	Areas of very high mass-movement hazard are removed from the timber base in the 1991 proposed revision to the Tongass Land Management Plan	Areas of high and very high mass-movement hazard are included in Habitat Conservation Areas and are not included in the land base used to determine the Allowable Sale Quantity	Areas of very high mass-movement hazard are removed from the timber base. We recommend a reassessment of the rating systems for mass-movement hazard—consistent across the Forest—and no clear-cut harvest on high mass-movement hazard areas before this reassessment.
Sensitive stocks	Identification and management of sensitive stocks is directed by Forest Service Manual 2670. The most recent Regional Forester's Sensitive Species List was updated in January 1994. Three fish stocks are on the list. The revised Tongass Plan collected information prioritizing categories of species associated with forests. Forest Service and Alaska Natural Heritage Program are currently cooperating to inventory potentially sensitive areas	PACFISH recommends a comprehensive inventory of at-risk and unique stocks, and these stocks are currently being studied by the Forest Service and the Alaska Chapter of the American Fisheries Society.	We recommend research on stock identification, assessment, and viability

Component	Current management procedures	PACFISH	Team Recommendations
Restoration	Restoration is addressed through the revised Tongass Plan project schedules and in the regional watershed-improvement-needs inventory	Key watersheds receive priority for restoration. Restoration is guided by watershed analysis.	Watershed analysis guides restoration activities
Watershed analysis	Screening, analysis, or both of cumulative watershed effects is required for projects with significant vegetation-removal or soil-disturbing activities to ensure that the project, considered with other activities, will not increase sediment or water yields beyond acceptable limits. No specific watershed-analysis guidelines have been developed	Watershed analysis is required before implementation of some activities in Habitat Conservation Areas. It proposes measurable and repeatable indices of habitat quality. A Federal Agency Guide to Pilot Watershed Analysis (1994) has been issued as guidance.	Watershed analysis is recommended before timber harvest and other major land-disturbing activities. This recommendation is similar to PACFISH
Monitoring	A memorandum of agreement (1992) between the Forest Service and the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation commits the Forest Service to perform Best Management Practices (BMP) monitoring tasks as described in the Alaska Nonpoint Source Pollution Strategy (1990). Types of BMP monitoring required are implementation, effectiveness, and validation. Implementation monitoring programs were formally established on the Tongass in 1991. In April of 1994, the Regional Forester adopted an effectiveness monitoring strategy for the Tongass. The following issues will receive priority consideration: riparian buffer stability, buffer effectiveness in protecting fish habitat; the effects of roads on fish passage, stream flow, sedimentation, and channel stability; effectiveness of class III stream protection in minimizing erosion and downstream sedimentation; and soil mass movement in relation to roads and harvest units.	Requires watershed-specific monitoring of implementation standards and guidelines, and their effectiveness in achieving the Management Objectives.	The team recommends increased emphasis on monitoring. Most monitoring recommendations fall under the priority items shown in the current management procedures. Additional recommendations include an annual program of monitoring culverts and a monitoring program for fish habitat objectives

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199


JLMO65



NOTICE: if the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT 950199

JLM065



INFORMATION BASE

The documents listed below were used to complete our assessment and report. The documents represent field work, Congressional Acts, anadromous fish conservation biology, gathering and analysis of additional information, team discussions and consensus of consulting technical professionals, and review by scientists, technical experts, and the Assessment Managers. We do not list all sources of information, but only the principal documents examined and used. Other important sources of information used to complete this report are on file in the Regional Office, Alaska Region, Juneau.

Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. 1980. Public Law 96-487.

Endangered Species Act. 1973. Public Law 93-205.

Halupka, K.C., J. Troyer, M. Willson, and F. Everest. 1993. Identification of unique and sensitive chinook salmon stocks of Southeast Alaska. Report to Alaska Region, USDA Forest Service. 92 p.

Halupka, K.C., J. Troyer, M. Willson, and F. Everest. 1993. Identification of unique and sensitive coho salmon stocks of Southeast Alaska. Report to Alaska Region, USDA Forest Service. 141 p.

Halupka, K.C., J. Troyer, M. Willson, and F. Everest. 1993. Identification of unique and sensitive sockeye salmon stocks of Southeast Alaska. Report to Alaska Region, USDA Forest Service. 235 p.

Halupka, K.C., M. Willson, M. Bryant, and F. Everest. 1994. Biological characteristics and population status of anadromous salmon in Southeast Alaska. Chum Salmon. Report to Alaska Region, USDA Forest Service. 141 p.

Meehan, W., 1991. Influences of forest and rangeland management on salmonid fishes and their habitats. Special Publication 19. Bethesda, MD: American Fisheries Society. 751 p.

National Environmental Policy Act. 1970. Public Law 91-190.

National Forest Management Act. 1976. Public Law 94-588.

Pearcy, W. G. 1992. Ocean ecology of North Pacific salmonids. Washington Sea Grant Program, Books in Recruitment Fishery Oceanography. University of Washington Press. Seattle. 179p.

Reiman, B., D. Lee, J. McIntyre, K. Overton, and R. Thurow. 1993. Consideration of extinction risks for salmonids. Boise, ID: USDA Forest Service. Fish Habitat Relationships Technical Bulletin 14. 12 p.

Root, C., and L. Margolis, ed., 1991. Pacific salmon life histories. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press. 564 p.

Thorpe, J. F. 1993. Salmonid flexibility: Responses to environmental extremes. Trans. Am. Fish Soc. 123: 606-612.

Tongass Timber Reform Act. 1990. Public Law. 101-626.

USDA Forest Service. 1991. Forest Service Manual, Section 2670.12, Secretary of Agriculture's Policy on Fish and Wildlife 9500-4 (WO Amendment 2600-91-3).

NOTICE: if the film image is less clear than the notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065

USDA Forest Service. 1991. Forest Service Manual, Section 2670.22, Sensitive Species (WO Amendment 2600-91-3).

USDA Forest Service. 1992. Best Management Practices. Implementation Monitoring Report 1992. Unpublished. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Juneau, AK. 37 p.

USDA Forest Service. 1993. Best Management Practices. Implementation Monitoring Report 1993. Unpublished. U. S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Juneau, AK. 40 p.

USDA Forest Service. 1994. Fish habitat analysis team report. An evaluation of the effectiveness of current procedures for protecting anadromous fish habitat on the Tongass National Forest. Anadromous Fish Habitat Assessment, USDA Forest Service. 63 p. plus appendices.

USDA Forest Service. 1994. Effectiveness monitoring team report. Report of the Effectiveness Monitoring Team, Anadromous Fish Habitat Assessment, USDA Forest Service. Letter dated 9/7/94 from R. Coleman to F. Everest and F. Norbury, 4 p.

USDA Forest Service. 1994. Interim report, Anadromous Fish Habitat Assessment, Alaska Region and Pacific Northwest Research Station. Letter dated 3/17/94 from M. Barton and C. Philpot to Chief, USDA Forest Service. 14 p.

USDA Forest Service. 1994. Draft watershed restoration strategy, Alaska Region. Juneau, AK. 21 p.

USDA Forest Service and USDI Bureau of Land Management. 1994. Environmental assessment for implementation of interim strategies for managing anadromous fish-producing watersheds in eastern Oregon and Washington, Idaho and portions of California. 68 p.

U.S. Government. 1994. A Federal Agency Guide for Pilot Watershed Analysis. Jan. 1994 (version 1.2) Washington, DC 140p.

U.S. Government. 1994. Memorandum of understanding between the USDA Forest Service, USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, USDI Bureau of Land Management, USDI National Park Service, and USDC National Marine Fisheries Service. Framework for cooperation for conservation of species tending toward Federal listing under the Endangered Species Act.

APPENDIX C

**An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Current Procedures
for Protecting Anadromous Fish Habitat
on the Tongass National Forest**

The Fish Habitat Analysis Team

September 1994

All supporting materials are available by contacting Cal Casipit, USDA Forest Service,
Alaska Region (907-586-7918).

To cite this document: FHAT [Fish Habitat Analysis Team]. 1994. An evaluation of the effectiveness of current procedures for
protecting anadromous fish habitat on the Tongass National Forest. Juneau, AK: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service,
Alaska Region. 63 p. and appendices.

NOTICE: if the film image is
less clear than this notice, it
is due to the quality of
the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 PPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065

0439

NOTICE: if the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-7MP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065

The Fish Habitat Analysis Team

Jeff Kershner, Chair	USDA Forest Service, Washington Office, Fisheries Biologist
Mason Bryant	USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Fisheries Biologist
Calvin Casipit	USDA Forest Service, Alaska Region, Fisheries Biologist
Max Copenhagen	USDA Forest Service, Alaska Region, Hydrologist
Tamra Faris	USDC NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service, Fisheries Biologist
Steve Kessler	USDA Forest Service, Tongass Land Management Planning Team, Fisheries Biologist
Steve Paustian	USDA Forest Service, Tongass National Forest, Chatham Area, Hydrologist
Lana Shea ¹	Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Habitat and Restoration Division, Habitat Biologist

¹ Because of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, non-Federal personnel were excluded from all Team decision making and formulating of recommendations.

0440

CONTENTS

Summary	1
Chapter 1. Background	3
Chapter 2. Biogeographic Setting	6
Geographic Setting	6
Life History of Salmonids of Southeast Alaska	10
Attributes of Healthy Aquatic Systems and Key Fish Habitat Objectives	12
Current Watershed Condition	15
Chapter 3. The Studies	17
Literature Review	17
Expert Field Review	19
Watershed Analysis	25
Chapter 4. Adequacy of Current Procedures and Recommendations	36
Are Current Procedures Effective for Protecting Fish Habitat?	36
Is Additional Protection Needed?	38
Chapter 5. Conclusions	44
Acknowledgments	48
Literature Cited	49
Glossary	59
Appendix C.1 Tongass Fish Habitat Objectives	
Appendix C.2 Expert Field Review	
Appendix C.3 Watershed Analysis	

NOTICE: if the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950199

JLM065

0441

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

FEDERAL FOREST SERVICE
NORTHWEST FISHERY HABITAT ASSESSMENT
PROJECT

JLM065



Summary

This report was prepared in response to direction from Congress in the Conference Committee Report to the FY 1994 Appropriations Act for Interior and Related Agencies. The Committee Report asked for a study of the effectiveness of current procedures in protecting fish habitat on the Tongass National Forest, followed by a determination of whether any additional protection is needed.

This report will be incorporated into a broad based report—addressing these and other issues raised by the Committee—that is being produced by the Alaska Regional Office and the Pacific Northwest Research Station, USDA Forest Service. Responsibility for this report was assigned to a study team, called the Fish Habitat Analysis Team (the Team), consisting of fishery biologists and hydrologists from the Forest Service management and research branches, as well as, a fishery biologist from the National Marine Fisheries Service and a habitat biologist from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Following direction by the Regional Forester and the Station Director, we conducted studies to evaluate the effectiveness of current procedures and reported our findings. Requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act prevented the State representative from participating during the Team's evaluation and recommendation deliberations.

Current direction for protecting fish habitat on the Tongass is to implement the requirements of law as specified by the Tongass Timber Reform Act, the National Forest Management Act, the Clean Water Act, and other laws, as well as the standards and guidelines established by the Forest Service Alaska Region Aquatic Habitat Management Handbook, the Soil and Water Conservation Handbook—Best Management Practices, and the Tongass Land Management Plan. The Tongass Timber Reform Act of 1990 is unique to other forest management legislation in that it directs the Tongass National Forest to protect riparian habitat by establishing a no-commercial-timber-harvest buffer of no less than 100 feet on each side of all anadromous fish streams, and resident-fish-bearing streams that flow directly into anadromous fish streams. The goal for fish habitat management on the Tongass National Forest, as stated in the Forest's land management plan, is to "preserve the biological productivity of every fish stream on the Tongass."

To respond to the study request by Congress, we used a series of interrelated inquiries. Existing published and unpublished reports and data pertaining to forest management effects on fish habitat in Southeast Alaska were collected and analyzed to determine forest management influences on fish habitat in the Pacific Northwest and Southeast Alaska. Established experts in watershed science and fish habitat relations examined a set of managed watersheds and evaluated the effectiveness of current management procedures to protect fish habitat. Three watersheds representing a range of management conditions on the Tongass National Forest Administrative Areas were analyzed by using *A Federal Agency Guide for Pilot Watershed Analysis* (1994).

The assessment of literature yielded 1,542 citations on the relation of land management activities to anadromous fish habitats. Although no studies directly assess Best Management Practices or buffers as applied on the Tongass National Forest, studies in landscapes similar to Southeast Alaska show declines in salmonid habitat capability after timber harvest of more than 25 percent of the watershed. Harvest treatments included some without streamside buffers, some with retained buffers on fish bearing streams but with completely harvested headwaters, and others with a mixture of patch cuts in the riparian area. As a group, these streams incorporated a mix of streamside management that included buffers similar to those currently applied on the Tongass, as well as past Tongass practices. In all of the streams with greater than 25 percent of the watershed harvested, salmonid habitat quality declined.

NOTICE: if the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

JUNE 10, 1977 TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
940194

JLNM065

0443

The results of the expert field review showed that, for current conditions, two watersheds rated as having low risk of a detectable adverse change in fish habitat and watershed condition, five as having moderately low risk, and one as moderate risk. With continuation of timber harvest and roading into the next 30 and 100 years, experts rated risk to fish habitat at either moderate or moderately high. Experts expressed concerns for fish habitat where they observed too narrow buffers on class I and II streams; class III streams that needed buffers; timber harvest activity on unstable slopes; problems with road location, design, and management; and variability in implementing guidance.

The results of the pilot watershed analyses led us to conclude that current fish habitat condition is relatively good and has not been significantly altered by management activities on Game Creek (5 percent timber harvest) and Upper Old Franks Creek (6 percent timber harvest). Kadake Creek (15 percent timber harvest) may be an exception to the conclusion. Watershed analysis, as part of a riparian habitat conservation strategy, was found to provide for more scrutiny of, and emphasis on, riparian-dependent resources and stream processes than do current procedures, especially resource-protection needs adjacent to class III streams.

The conclusion of the Team, based on the information displayed, is that current procedures are not entirely effective in protecting fish habitat. Current procedures have clearly improved the treatment of anadromous fish streams and provided improved protection for valuable stream habitat compared to previous procedures, but they are not completely effective in precluding increased risk to some anadromous fish stocks over the long term.

Current procedures were found to be less than adequate in five ways: inventory and classification of fish habitat and streams, and protecting their associated riparian areas and wetlands; timber harvest on steep, unstable slopes; road design, mitigation, maintenance, and closure; problems with certain aspects of forest and timber-sale planning; and institutional concerns.

The team concluded that additional protection for fish habitat is needed to reduce risk to fish habitat quality on the Tongass National Forest. If these measures are implemented in their entirety, we think additional risk to fish habitat associated with timber management activities will be minimized, and the goal of preserving the biological productivity of fish streams on the Tongass will be met, although risk can never be eliminated.

We recommend an ecosystem approach for evaluating and protecting watershed processes and functions at the landscape scale as a precursor to timber sales and other management activities that could significantly influence fish habitat. Parallel with the ecosystem approach, we recommend fully implementing existing Best Management Practices in planning and carrying out activities that could affect aquatic ecosystems. Additional recommendations are made to address institutional, monitoring, and information needs.

NOTICE: if the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J TWP 100 PPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
200109

JLM065



Chapter 4. Adequacy of Current Procedures and Recommendations

QUESTION 1: ARE CURRENT PROCEDURES EFFECTIVE FOR PROTECTING FISH HABITAT?

Current procedures for protecting fish habitat have clearly improved the treatment of anadromous fish streams and provided improved protection for valuable stream habitat compared to previous procedures. How effective current procedures actually are often depends on how well existing guidelines were interpreted and practiced on the ground. Analysis of the results of the several parts of this study has shown deficiencies in both current practices and current procedures for protecting fish habitat that could have long-term adverse effects on salmonid populations on parts of the Tongass National Forest. In this chapter, application of current practices on the ground and the direction and guidelines for providing for fish habitat (procedures) are considered together under the combined discussion on current procedures.

Based on the information displayed, we determined that current procedures, as implemented, are not entirely effective in protecting fish habitat. A common element that appears throughout the analysis is that existing guidelines are not implemented consistently throughout the Forest. In addition, the Tongass Timber Reform Act and current procedures do not address fish habitat and watershed processes over long time frames and over large landscape scales. Our review and comparison of current procedures to various proposed procedures also showed a lack of measurable criteria against which to measure the effectiveness of existing guidelines.

Current procedures were not found to be completely effective, and risk to fish habitat remains. Procedures were found to be less than adequate in five ways: inventory and classification of fish habitat and streams, and protecting their associated riparian areas and wetlands; timber harvest on steep and unstable slopes; road design, mitigation, maintenance, and closure; problems with certain aspects of forest and timber-sale planning; and institutional concerns. We observed that these problems do not always exist across the Forest; in some locations, some of the procedures were found to be adequate and reflect excellent work by field personnel.

Inventory and Classification of Fish Habitat and Streams

We recognized that efforts are being made to clarify the stream protection requirements of the Tongass Timber Reform Act to better and more consistently implement buffers on class I and II streams, as evidenced by the Chatham Area 1993 policy on Reform Act buffers. In some areas, flood-plain habitat, streams, riparian areas, and important wetlands are not well protected because they are misclassified or simply did not show up on inventories used for sale planning and layout. Large woody debris and wetland functions were sometimes not fully recognized in buffer designs during timber-sale layout. Many buffers are designed too narrow to withstand high wind. Some streams, classified as class III and not given a buffer, should have been classified as class II and buffered, based on habitat characteristics for resident fish.

The Tongass Timber Reform Act does not require minimum buffers on class III streams but does require the application of Best Management Practices to them. Class III streams comprise about half of a typical watershed's channel network. These streams are transport channels for the sediment, bedload, and woody debris routed through the streams to downstream fish habitat. We observed

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

JLMP 10 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
1991

JLMO65



that class III streams sometimes are not given buffers or sufficient protective measures to maintain all of their important functions.

Unstable Slopes

The evaluation of landslide hazard and mitigation measures applied to timber harvest and road activities on steep unstable slopes is not always adequate. Slopes with the highest (MMI4) mass-movement rating--based on the Tongass landslide rating system--are considered unsuitable for timber production in the proposed Forest Plan Revision but may be available for timber harvest under the current Plan. The MMI3 category is considered suitable, but these slopes are required to have further site-specific inventory and prescriptions before timber harvest and road activities are planned. Inadequate field checking of the soils data base to verify the hazard associated with the mass-movement classification was apparent from the field review, although our team recognizes that decisions to operate on high-risk soils may have been accepted by Forest leadership in some locations. Tongass procedures for operating on MMI3 areas are generally adequate for minimizing short-term soil displacement and effects of surface erosion. The long-term effects (5-25 years), we believe, are not well addressed by current procedures.

The most serious long-term effect of the current procedures on high mass-movement-hazard soils will be loss of root strength and the resultant increases in mass wasting over the long term. When these steep slopes are clearcut, the roots of the harvested trees slowly decompose and no longer hold the soil in place. Peak loss of root strength, before the strength associated with regrowth of trees returns, is usually at about 10 to 15 years after timber harvest. During periods of intense rainfall, landslides can deliver large amounts of sediment and debris to streams and toeslope areas. Negative effects to fish habitat are not always immediate, but accelerated rates of mass wasting are thought to cause long-term, chronic effects (Swanston 1971, Swanson et al. 1987, Swanston and Erhart 1993). Other soil productivity concerns accompany these mass-wasting events, but they are not directly related to fish habitat. Given current procedures, we expect that future timber harvesting and road building will continue to access increasing acreage of MMI3 areas. Complex and unpredictable negative effects will accumulate on downstream fish habitat if wide-spread harvest activities on these MMI3 soils continue over the long term.

Roads

Problems were noted associated with design, construction, maintenance, mitigation, and closure of roads, especially on steep, unstable slopes. Stream crossings are sometimes designed for less than the critical flow, and ditch relief culverts are sometimes not sufficient to maintain the hydrology of steep slopes, hollows, and wetlands. We saw an instance where road construction on highly erosive soils continued through fall storm events, contributing to the sedimentation of streams. Culvert crossings of roads on steep mountain-slope channels was another concern expressed by our Team. These culverts have a tendency to fail and plug with bedload, becoming persistent maintenance problems.

Based on the expert field review and our own observations, road construction problems sometimes needing more timely, consistent mitigation included erosion control at stream crossings, grass seeding on midslope cut-and-fill slopes, and fish passage at class I and II culvert crossings. Also of concern in some locations was the failure to act on decisions to close road segments.

Maintaining roads was a concern identified by some of the field-review experts and our Team. Funds for maintaining the many miles of open roads on the Tongass seem inadequate. Low-use

NOTICE: if the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J. TMP. 12. RPT. TO CONGRESS
ANADAPKOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
4-0193

JLM065

0479

roads typically are not stabilized or 'put to bed'--such as by removing culverts, constructing waterbars, outsloping road surfaces, and seeding--after timber harvest.

Timber Harvest Planning

Our Team and the expert reviewers expressed general concerns with the planning process. Problems include not evaluating potential cumulative watershed effects thoroughly (although we recognize that the Stikine Area has had a process for analyzing cumulative effects thresholds in place for a few years), lack of a holistic approach in describing the important watershed functions and processes and how they should be protected, lack of a long-term view over a large watershed landscape, lack of contingency planning for large stochastic events (such as floods and windstorms), and minimal concern for aquatic species other than salmon. All of these examples of planning deficiencies could be due to the pressure to produce timber sale offerings.

Institutional Concerns

Institutional concerns include incomplete updating of the Forest corporate data base; insufficient project-scale inventories for conducting site-specific assessments in sale planning and layout; inadequate input from specialists on geomorphology and fluvial processes; a management climate where the burden of proof is sometimes on fisheries and hydrology specialists to show that activities in riparian areas are detrimental to fluvial processes and fish habitat, rather than other specialists showing that proposed activities in riparian areas will not negatively affect fish habitat and fluvial processes; and emphasis on timber targets rather than on land stewardship.

Giving District personnel the ability to strongly influence harvest unit and road layout during design and implementation was viewed as positive when interdisciplinary teams were given the discretion to design habitat-protection strategies to match on-the-ground conditions. When project decision makers chose to modify recommendations in an effort to meet timber harvest targets or other specific objectives, we often viewed the action as not providing the best or desired fish habitat protection. Best Management Practices and Record of Decision requirements were sometimes not implemented completely because of other commitments of personnel and resources. The Team and the field-review experts expressed strong concern about the current management emphasis on monitoring timber harvest and road-related activities.

QUESTION 2: IS ADDITIONAL PROTECTION NEEDED?

We concluded that the answer to this question is yes. We recommend additional measures to reduce the risk to fish habitat capability on the Tongass National Forest. If these measures are implemented in their entirety, we think additional risks to fish habitat associated with timber management activities will be minimized and the goal of preserving the biological productivity of fish streams on the Tongass will be met, although risk can never be eliminated. Additional protection for fish habitat requires two parallel efforts: the first is an ecosystem approach for evaluating and protecting watershed processes and functions at the landscape scale, and the second is the full implementation of existing Best Management Practices in planning and implementing activities that could affect aquatic ecosystems. Recommendations are also included for addressing research, institutional, and information needs.

Fully implementing an ecosystem approach will require additional measures not currently included in the Tongass Land Management Plan. These measures should be fully examined, disclosed,

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREST SERVICE
NADP-ANRORS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
1990-91

JLM065



and included in the Plan revision. Fully implementing Best Management Practices, however, does not require additional analysis; it simply requires us to follow existing direction.

We recommend implementing watershed analysis using the concepts presented in *A Federal Agency Guide for Pilot Watershed Analysis* (1994) as a precursor to timber sales and other management activities that could significantly influence fish habitat. The cornerstone of our approach is an ecosystem analysis applied at the watershed scale.

Although some procedures in watershed analysis are currently implemented as part of timber-sale planning, we believe that the watershed analysis process provides important new information about fish habitat needs and the important factors that influence habitat. Given our concerns about the inconsistent application of riparian management guidelines in class III and smaller streams, the inadequate identification and consideration of high mass-movement soils, and a need for better planning of timber management activities that may influence fish habitat, we believe that this analysis should be a precursor to additional timber management in most watersheds. Watershed analysis places each stream in the context of a continuum where small stream processes provide input into successively larger streams throughout the river system (Vannote et al. 1982). Maintaining this connectivity is important for protecting healthy watersheds and fish habitat (Hicks et al. 1991, Naiman et al. 1992).

We recommend, as part of watershed analysis, that Riparian Management Areas be defined and the area within them managed to fully protect fish habitat in the long term. Key physical and biological processes should be considered when establishing riparian zones on all streams. Because watershed analysis on all Tongass watersheds will not be implemented immediately, we propose the following interim recommendations:

- 1. We recommend that riparian zones adjacent to unconfined alluvial flood plain channels, alluvial fan channels, and glacial outwash channels (Paustian 1992) should not be subject to timber harvest unless they are fully evaluated. The entire floodplain should be considered as the interim Riparian Management Area. In these channel types, riparian zones may extend beyond the minimum width specified under current procedures because the stream is often dissected into a main low-flow channel with several side channels. These side channels are important fish habitat (Hartman and Brown 1987). Ecosystem-scale analysis should consider the whole riparian area, as defined by riparian soils and vegetation. Site specific harvest is only allowable when these riparian areas are fully evaluated and the purpose is consistent with the goal of full riparian protection.
- 2. We recommend using a distance equivalent to the height of a site-potential tree to determine the Riparian Management Area width (assuming it is greater than 100 feet) for confined alluvial channel types of class I and II streams. In no case would Riparian Management Areas be less than 100 feet wide. Again, proposed harvest in these areas should fully protect riparian values. We had similar concerns about confined alluvial channel types that are class I and II streams. In these channels, debris recruitment may come from beyond a fixed 100-foot distance, depending on bank slope, topography, and tree height of the dominant debris-producing trees.
- 3. We recommend minimum 100-foot buffers on each side of class III streams until individual needs are identified during watershed analysis. Class III streams have important water quality values. These streams are also sources for woody debris recruitment and litter, and they deliver nutrient and sediment inputs into larger streams (Hicks et al. 1991, Gregory and Swanson 1991, FEMAT 1993, appendix C.2). These streams are typically high-gradient streams often associated with steep, unstable terrain. Timber management opportunities

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

JUNE 12, 1987 U.S. CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
1987-09

JLM065



within the buffers are evaluated case by case, considering mass-movement hazards as well as debris, litter, nutrient, and sediment input.

- 4. We recommend defining a new category, class IV streams for the intermittent or ephemeral colluvial channels and small, perennial spring-fed rill channels that are not dominant sediment-transport streams. Streams that are currently unclassified and class III streams that are misclassified cause some confusion. They should be managed primarily to protect water quality. These streams are typically very small, high-gradient streams draining mountain slopes. They rarely need buffer strips, but often require special provisions for felling, yarding, and determining where to place landings and roads.

We recommend that consistent Forest-wide definitions, inventory standards, and interpretations of mass-movement-hazard areas be developed, and that a full inventory and analysis of high- and very high-hazard soils be conducted. As part of an ecosystem approach to watershed planning, mass-movement hazard should be incorporated into the design of all Riparian Management Areas. Given the results of the comparison between post-Reform Act buffers and watershed analysis recommendations, we believe watershed analysis more accurately blends riparian area concerns with high-hazard geomorphic conditions to identify Riparian Management Areas.

We recommend adopting the following additional management measures where steep slopes, high-hazard soil conditions, or both threaten fish habitat:

- High-hazard soils should not be clearcut or roaded before their mass-movement potential is assessed on-site;
- No slopes greater than 94% should be clearcut; and
- No colluvial hollows or highly dissected mountain slopes greater than 70% should be clearcut.

We recommend including cumulative-effects procedures as part of watershed analysis to display the effects from past management; this analysis would identify where current operating thresholds exist that could influence fish habitat and aquatic resources.

We recommend that a set of objectives for fish habitat management be adopted. They should be measurable and reflect the diversity of fish habitat needs, in addition to serving as key monitoring indicators. We recommend that the current set of interim objectives be improved and expanded to include other measures. We recommend that future inventories be conducted on a watershed-scale that include these objectives as a starting point; regional training will be necessary to ensure consistency in collection methods and interpretation.

We recommend that current guidance expressed in Best Management Practices and other direction be re-examined annually and implemented consistently to protect fish habitat. The following areas need re-emphasis and additional attention.

Design, Layout, and Maintenance of Roads

- Stream crossings should be designed and maintained to ensure the upstream and downstream movement of all life stages of anadromous fish. Similar passage criteria are

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

JUNE 12, 1987
ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF CONGRESS
AND STATE AFFAIRS
FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
740174

JLM065

0482

desirable for resident streams. Site-specific exceptions are to be approved by a line officer in consultation with a fisheries biologist and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

- Best Management Practices for mitigating effects of erosion and sedimentation from roads should be implemented consistently.
- Building roads on steep slopes and through flood plains and fens should be avoided. When roads are built in these areas, then stringent implementation of Best Management Practices should be used for timing construction, road standards, season and condition of use, and maintenance.
- A program for annually checking and maintaining culverts should be implemented for the entire Tongass Forest. Where culverts have a high risk of failure during large flow events because of potential debris inputs, contingency designs for road overtopping should be implemented to prevent damage.
- All roads not essential for forest transportation and management needs should be identified and closed. Timely closure of unneeded roads and immediate road drainage and erosion mitigation measures should be vigorously pursued.
- Open-bottom stream-crossing structures or bridges should be used more frequently on low-to-moderate gradient streams where fish passage is required.

Riparian Management Areas

- Windthrown timber in riparian areas should not be subject to timber salvage unless approved by a line officer in consultation with a fisheries biologist or hydrologist and others.
- Streams misclassified during inventory should be correctly classified and riparian management adjusted accordingly during all phases of timber harvest.
- A set of physical criteria should be developed to use with the existing biological criteria for differentiating between class II, III, and IV streams.
- Training in recognizing stream classes should be expanded immediately.

Several monitoring needs that are critical to understanding the long-term effects of forest management on fish habitat were identified during the Team review. We recommend that the current implementation monitoring of Best Management Practices continue, to determine compliance with buffer/riparian area guidelines and road standards. We recommend that studies should be initiated to evaluate the effectiveness of riparian area prescriptions and management practices for protecting fish habitat as expressed by the preliminary fish habitat objectives. A standardized monitoring protocol should be established across the Tongass to facilitate data comparisons.

Significant gaps remain in our understanding of how current management affects fish habitat and aquatic ecosystems in Southeast Alaska. We recommend continuing studies that are designed to help understand the basic life-history requirements of anadromous and resident fish in streams. We also recommend aquatic ecosystem studies that explore the relations between terrestrial and aquatic environments as outlined by the Alaska Working Group on Cooperative Forestry/Fisheries Research. In addition, we recommend additional support of research in the following areas:

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

JUNE 12, 1994 REPORT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
950194

JLMO65

0483

- The effects of windthrow on fish habitat in both the short and long terms and how negative effects can be minimized.
- Movement of large woody debris through stream systems.
- Sediment routing studies to determine the risk resulting from mass failures on fish habitat.
- Key measures of habitat and ecosystems to be used as management indicators for aquatic ecosystems.
- Hydrological and biological effects of roads and timber harvest on fens and other wetlands.
- Cumulative effects of management activities on watershed processes and fish habitat.
- Population viability assessment for anadromous fish stocks in Southeast Alaska.
- Adaptive management areas for "learning to manage by managing to learn" (Bormann et al. in press). These areas could be used for testing various stream buffer widths and harvest prescriptions in high mass-wasting hazard areas, for example.

In addition to interim and long-term guidance, several institutional and administrative needs were identified to implement this strategy. We identified these needs as opportunities for improving management of fish and aquatic resources.

Watershed analysis requires a significant commitment of personnel and funds in the short term, but has significant cost-saving potential for the long term. We recommend that a team of watershed analysts including at least a hydrologist/geomorphologist, fisheries biologist, ecologist, geographic information systems analyst, and soil scientist be acquired by each Area to work exclusively to complete watershed analyses for all major watersheds with suitable timber lands on the Tongass. These watershed analysis teams will require new personnel on each of the Areas and the funds to complete the analysis. We recommend that the analyses should be completed by the year 2000. We also recommend that a regional watershed analysis-coordinator position should be established to coordinate information exchange among the Areas, coordinate watershed analysis training for field personnel, and provide information from the analyses to the data base managers to update the corporate data base.

We recommend that the Region expand the role of hydrologists and geologists to include hillslope and fluvial geomorphology. Although some personnel already have these skills, the need for this expertise is critical for evaluating mass-movement hazard and predicting effects from land management on streams and fluvial processes. We recommend continuing the partnership with the Juneau Forestry Sciences Laboratory to calibrate the land form and soils inventory for mass-movement hazard ratings. We recommend geomorphology training for all field personnel working in sale layout, as well as expanded training for hydrologists and geologists in advanced geomorphological concepts. In addition, the Region should acquire geomorphologists for each Area on the Forest.

We recommend timely updating of information from field units so that information is truly "corporate" in the Tongass data base. We consistently identified errors in the Tongass data base during our expert-review exercise. These discrepancies occurred when new information from Districts and

NOTICE: if the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J-TMP-12 RPT TO CONGRESS
AMADPOMCUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
9/01/99

JLM065

0484

Areas was not incorporated into the Forest data base. More-accurate maps and inventory information will be required if our recommendations for riparian areas, class III streams, and high hazard soil areas are implemented. The tentatively suitable timber-harvest lands need to be analyzed when the land management plan is revised and the data base adjusted accordingly.

NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J. IMP. IN RPT. TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
940199

JLM065

0485

Chapter 5. Conclusions

Current procedures for protecting fish habitat have clearly improved the treatment of anadromous fish streams and provided improved protection for valuable stream habitat compared to previous procedures. We concluded, however, that fish habitat is at risk on parts of the Tongass and ultimately stocks of salmon and steelhead over the long term because of deficiencies in current procedures discussed in this report. These deficiencies could have undesirable effects on harvests of salmon and steelhead for commercial, sport, and subsistence uses when oceanic conditions controlling carrying capacity in the Gulf of Alaska decline and freshwater habitat capability becomes more of a controlling factor (Beamish and Bouillon 1993).

Under the proposed Tongass Forest Plan revision, most suitable timber will be harvested within the next 70 years. Given the inconsistent application of Best Management Practices, clearcut harvest on high-hazard soils, inconsistent application of buffer guidelines, and insufficient protection for many headwater streams, we believe that fish habitat capability could be compromised in future decades. We are particularly concerned where timber harvest is in small, island watersheds where small stocks of salmon and steelhead are highly vulnerable to disturbances. Given our lack of knowledge about the viability of these stocks and the status of natural populations, we believe that a more conservative approach to salmon and steelhead habitat protection is necessary.

We made several recommendations for new or revised procedures that should minimize risk to fish habitat, although the risk can never be eliminated. Additional protection for fish habitat requires two parallel efforts: the first, an ecosystem strategy for evaluating and protecting watershed processes and functions at the landscape scale, and the second, full implementation of existing direction, such as Best Management Practices, in planning and implementing activities that could affect aquatic ecosystems.

Interest in protecting the salmon and steelhead resources of the Pacific Northwest region of the United States is national. Concern over declining stocks in California, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington have led to the development of fish habitat protection measures specified under the Pacific Anadromous Fish Strategy (PACFISH). Although these measures have not been applied in Alaska, we believe that a comparison is appropriate. A comparison between current direction, PACFISH procedures, and Team recommendations can be found in table 11.

We believe that the protection of salmon and steelhead habitat on the Tongass National Forest has been substantially improved. Forest personnel are to be commended for their dedication and commitment to protecting this habitat. We believe that implementing the additional measures outlined in this report will increase the likelihood that salmon and steelhead habitat will be protected for the future.

Component	Current management procedures	PACFISH	Team Recommendations
Key watersheds	Key watersheds are not directly addressed, but values are applied to watersheds through Value Competition Units. Those with 'high' fish ratings might be comparable to PACFISH.	Key watersheds are identified by selecting a subset of watersheds that are important to 'at risk' stocks, currently are in 'good' condition, or have a high potential for restoration.	No change from current management procedures is recommended.
Wetlands	Presidential Executive Orders 11988 and 11990 require that Federal agencies avoid undertaking or providing assistance for new construction (e.g. roads) in wetlands/food plains unless the head of the agency finds no practicable alternative and the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands and flood plains. The proposed revised Tongass Land Management Plan states that all management activities under the proposed action will conform to these directives. Specific guidance is given for river, lake, and estuary wetlands.	Implies river, lake, forested, and non-forested wetlands will have special standards and guidelines.	No change from current management procedures is recommended. This value, however, through their incorporation into the Riparian Management Area.
Stream class	Stream classes are mapping units that display specific identified values for aquatic resources. Class I is defined as 'streams with anadromous or adfluvial fish habitat, plus reasonably enhanceable habitat upstream of barriers.' Class II is defined as 'streams with resident fish and generally steep gradient (6-15%).' Class III is defined as streams with no fish populations but with potential water-quality influence on downstream aquatic habitat.	Specific stream classifications are not stated, but stream values are stratified as fish-bearing streams, permanently flowing, non-fish streams, and seasonally flowing or intermittent streams.	We recommend adding a set of physical criteria to the determination of class II and III streams. In addition, we recommend adding a class IV stream category.
Upllope stability	Areas of very high mass-movement hazard are removed from the timber base in the 1991 proposed revision to the Tongass Land Management Plan.	Areas of high and very high mass-movement hazard are removed from the timber base.	Areas of very high mass-movement hazard are removed from the timber base. We recommend a reassessment of the rating systems for mass-movement hazard—consistent across the Forest—and no clearcut harvest on high mass-movement hazard areas before this reassessment.

NOTICE: if the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

J. THE-32 RPT TO CONGRESS
ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT
050194

JLMO65



NOTICE: If the film image is less clear than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed

JUNE 13, 1994 U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
 SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY DELIVERY AND CONSERVATION
 HEARING ON THE STATE OF THE ALASKA FISHERIES
 HABITAT ASSESSMENT

JLM065



Component	Current management procedures	PACFISH	Team Recommendations
Sensitive stocks	Identification and management of sensitive stocks is directed by Forest Service Manual 2570. The most recent Regional Forester's Sensitive Species List was updated in January 1994. These fish stocks are on the list. The revised Tongass Plan collected information prioritizing categories of species associated with forest. Forest Service and Alaska Natural Heritage Program are currently cooperating to inventory potentially sensitive areas.	PACFISH recommends a comprehensive inventory of at-risk and unique stocks, and these stocks are currently being studied by the Forest Service and the Alaska Chapter of the American Fisheries Society.	We recommend research on stock identification, assessment, and viability.
Restoration	Restoration is addressed through the revised Tongass Plan project schedules and in the regional watershed-improvement-needs inventory.	Key watersheds receive priority for restoration. Restoration is guided by watershed analysis.	Watershed analysis guides restoration activities
Watershed analysis	Screening, analysis, or both of cumulative watershed effects is required for projects with significant vegetation-removal or soil-disturbing activities to ensure that the project, considered with other activities, will not increase sediment or water yields beyond acceptable limits. No specific watershed-analysis guidelines have been developed.	Watershed analysis is required before commodity extraction in key watersheds and in all Conservation Areas, and is recommended for repeatable indices of habitat quality. A Federal Agency Guide to Pilot Watershed Analysis (1994) has been issued as guidance.	Watershed analysis is recommended before timber harvest and other major land-disturbing activities. This recommendation is similar to PACFISH.
Monitoring	A memorandum of agreement (1992) between the Forest Service and the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation commits the Forest Service to perform Best Management Practices (BMP) monitoring tasks as described in the Alaska Nonpoint Source Pollution Strategy (1990). Types of BMP monitoring required are implementation, effectiveness, and validation. Implementation monitoring programs were formally established on the Tongass in 1991. In April of 1994, the Regional Forester adopted an effectiveness monitoring strategy for the Tongass. The following issues will receive priority consideration: riparian buffer stability; buffer effectiveness in protecting fish habitat; the effects of roads on fish passage, stream flow, sedimentation, and channel stability; effectiveness of class III stream protection in minimizing erosion and downstream sedimentation; and soil mass movement in relation to roads and harvest units.	Requires watershed-specific monitoring of implementation standards and guidelines, and their effectiveness in achieving the Management Objectives, based on watershed analysis.	The team recommends increased emphasis on monitoring. Most monitoring recommendations fall under the priority items shown in the current management procedures. Additional recommendations include an annual program of monitoring culverts and a monitoring program for fish habitat objectives.