

JUNE 2010

Olympic Experimental State Forest (OESF) HCP Planning Unit Forest Land Plan Draft EIS | ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT



WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF
Natural Resources
Peter Goldmark - Commissioner of Public Lands



Peter Goldmark
Washington State
Commissioner of Public Lands

June 2010

Dear Interested Party,

The Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) manages 270,000 acres of state trust lands in the Olympic Experimental State Forest (OESF). The OESF is on the west side of the Olympic Peninsula in Clallam and Jefferson counties. As in other parts of Washington, forested state trust lands in the OESF are managed to generate a sustainable source of revenue for the public schools and other trust beneficiaries, and protect habitat for fish and wildlife.

About 20 years ago, a 33-member citizen commission comprised of educators, researchers, industry and others worked with DNR to establish a clear vision for the OESF. The vision for the forest was to serve as a center for experimentation with innovative management techniques designed to help DNR and other landowners learn how to better integrate ecological values and commodity production across the landscape. Recently, the Olympic Experimental State Forest was welcomed into the national Network of Experimental Forests and Ranges, coordinated by the U.S. Forest Service. Over time this partnership and visibility for the OESF will support the vision to conduct scientific studies as part of adaptive management processes to assist DNR in continuously improving the health and productivity of the forest.

In order to guide activities in the OESF and address issues at the local landscape scale, DNR began a forest land planning process to implement the broad agency forest policies and plans—2006 Policy for Sustainable Forests [which includes the sustainable harvest calculation (2007)] and the 1997 Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). The Forest Land Plan will guide management of state trust lands in the OESF HCP Planning Unit, the boundary for which was defined in the 1997 HCP.

We offer for your review this environmental analysis of the OESF forest land plan. Consistent with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) describes the potential management alternatives and DNR's strategies to be implemented under each—and provides analysis of their potential impacts to the environment.

In this Draft EIS, DNR identifies nine environmental elements that are evaluated for probable, significant, adverse environmental impacts as a result of implementing either of the alternatives: forest conditions, riparian forest (including impacts to water quantity), stream channel conditions, water quality, fish, soils, wildlife, northern spotted owls, and marbled murrelets. Each of these environmental elements to some degree is affected by management activities such as timber harvest, building or use of forest roads, as well as natural disturbances such as blow-down of trees from windstorms, fire, landslides with resulting sedimentation or stream channel modification.

I invite you to examine the proposed alternatives, the environmental analysis, and provide your comments on our OESF Forest Land Plan Draft EIS. Information about submitting comments is in the following fact sheet. Public workshops were held in Olympia and Forks to provide an overview of the Draft EIS to help with the review of the document. Public hearings will be held in Port Angeles and Forks in mid-June. I encourage you to participate. If you have questions please contact Margaret Barrette at 360-902-1010. Thank you for your interest in the sustainable management of state trust lands.

Peter Goldmark
Commissioner of Public Lands
Washington State Department
of Natural Resources

Department of Natural Resources
1111 Washington ST SE
MS 47001
Olympia, Washington 98504-7001
(360) 902-1000



JUNE 2010

Olympic Experimental
State Forest (OESF)
HCP Planning Unit
Forest Land Plan
Draft EIS | ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Prepared by the
Forest Resources and Conservation Division

Data Stewardship Section
Joanne Wearley, EIS Project Manager

Responsible Official
Loren Torgerson, Northeast Region Manager



WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF
Natural Resources
Peter Goldmark - Commissioner of Public Lands

Fact Sheet

TITLE

Olympic Experimental State Forest
HCP Planning Unit Forest Land Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

DESCRIPTION

Forest Land Planning is the Department of Natural Resources implementation tool for the *2006 Policy for Sustainable Forests* and the *1997 Habitat Conservation Plan*. The planning process is designed to conduct planning from a landscape perspective and to learn how commodity production and conservation can be integrated across each of the eleven landscapes in the Olympic Experimental State Forest.

The No Action Alternative is not dependent upon landscape planning perspective; instead it conducts the Twelve-Step Watershed Assessment Procedure as outlined in Procedure 14-004-160 (Appendix E) in isolation from other land management decisions.

The Landscape Alternative is dependent upon planning from a landscape perspective and its use of forest-estate models to assist in the operational decision-making process of determining the riparian conservation strategy for each Type 3 watershed.

All project authors and contributors work with DNR unless otherwise identified.

PROJECT PROPONENT AND LEAD AGENCY

Washington State Department of
Natural Resources

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL

Loren Torgerson
Northeast Region Manager

PROGRAM DIRECTOR

Angus Brodie
*Assistant Division Manager, Forest Resources
and Conservation*

EIS PROJECT MANAGER

Joanne Wearley
Forest Resources and Conservation Division

CONTACT

Washington State Department
of Natural Resources (DNR)
SEPA Center
PO Box 47015
Olympia, WA. 98504-7015
Phone: (360) 902-2117
Fax: (360) 902-1789
E-mail: sepacenter@dnr.wa.gov
www.dnr.wa.gov/sepa

DATE OF ISSUANCE OF DRAFT EIS

June 1, 2010

NEXT ACTIONS

July 15, 2010

Close of public comments period for Draft EIS

December 2010

Expected publish date for Final EIS

DRAFT EIS COMMENT PERIOD

June 1, 2010 – July 15, 2010

Comments must be received by July 15, 2010 by 5:00 PM. Comments may be submitted electronically via e-mail or attachments sent to sepacenter@dnr.wa.gov or mailed to:

Washington State Department of Natural Resources
SEPA Center
P.O. Box 47015
Olympia, WA 98504-7015

PUBLIC HEARINGS-DRAFT EIS

June 16, 2010 – 6:30 – 8:30 pm

The Port Angeles Senior Center
328 East 7th Street
Port Angeles, WA.

June 17, 2010 – 6:30 – 8:30 pm

DNR's Olympic Region Office
411 Tillicum Lane
Forks, WA.

LOCATION OF COPIES OF THIS DRAFT EIS AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Availability and Cost

This Draft Environmental Impact Statement is available on the internet at:
www.dnr.wa.gov/ResearchScience/sepa

Copies also are available to read at select public libraries.

A very limited number of printed copies are available at no charge. CD copies also are available at no charge. Requests for printed copies, CDs, or supporting documents, listed below, may be mailed to:

Washington State Department of Natural Resources
SEPA Center
P.O. Box 47015
Olympia, WA 98504-7015
Phone (360) 902-2117

After the copies are distributed, additional copies will be available for the cost of printing or CD production, per RCW 42.17.

Copies of the supporting documents upon which the Alternatives are based—*2006 Policy for Sustainable Forests, 2004 Final EIS for Sustainable Forest Management, 1997 Habitat Conservation Plan, DNR Procedures, Washington Forest Practices Rules*—are available for review at each of the five Westside DNR Region Offices in Washington, and at the DNR SEPA Center at the agency headquarters at 1111 Washington Street, Olympia.

AUTHORS AND PRINCIPAL CONTRIBUTORS

All project authors and contributors work with DNR unless otherwise identified.

Executive Summary

Main Author: Angus Brodie

Chapter One

Main Author: Joanne Wearley

Chapter Two

Main Author: Angus Brodie

Forest Conditions and Management

Main Authors: Jeffrey Ricklefs, Joanne Wearley

Technical Reviewers: Angus Brodie, Scott Horton, Drew Rosanbalm

Riparian, Wetland, Water Quantity (Peak Flows)

Main Author: Jeffrey Ricklefs

Technical Reviewers: Richard Bigley, Scott Horton, Drew Rosanbalm

Stream Channel Conditions

Main Author: Jeff Grizzel

Technical Reviewers: Richard Bigley, Scott Horton, Weikko Jaross, Jeffrey Ricklefs, Drew Rosanbalm

Soils

Main Authors: Cassandra Koerner, Jeff Grizzel (Chapter 3-Landslides Discussion)

Technical Reviewers: Jeff Grizzel, Jeff Ricklefs

Water Quality

Main Author: Joanne Wearley

Technical Reviewers: Jeffrey Ricklefs, Scott Horton

Fish

Main Author: Scott Horton

Technical Reviewers: Angus Brodie, Cassandra Koerner, Heather McPherson, Jeffrey Ricklefs, Drew Rosanbalm, Joanne Wearley

Wildlife

Main Author: Heather McPherson

Technical Reviewers: Scott Horton, Drew Rosanbalm

Northern Spotted Owl

Main Authors: Heather McPherson, Teodora Minkova

Technical Reviewers: Scott Horton, Drew Rosanbalm

Marbled Murrelet

Main Author: Heather McPherson, Teodora Minkova

Technical Reviewers: Peter Harrison, Scott Horton

Cultural Resources

Main Authors: Cassandra Koerner, Joanne Wearley, Maurice Major

Technical Reviewer: Scott Horton, Lee Stilson, Drew Rosanbalm

Global Climate Change

Main Author: Cassandra Koerner

Technical Reviewers: Joshua Halofsky, Jeff DeBell, Jeffery Ricklefs

GIS Analyst

Chris Snyder

Forest Modeler

Weikko Jaross

Technical Reviewer: Angus Brodie

EDITORS

Jane Chavey, Margaret Pilaro Barrette,

Jeffrey Ricklefs, Joanne Wearley

COPY EDITOR, DOCUMENT DESIGN AND PRODUCTION

Cassandra Koerner

PHOTO CREDITS

Richard Bigley, Sabra Hull, Peter Harrison,

MAP CREDITS

Kara Kerksick, Rebecca Niggemann, Jeffrey Ricklefs

Special Thanks to Other OESF Project Contributors

Dave Christiansen, Dave Dietzman, Jim Hotvedt, Craig Magnuson, Mike Potter Lislle Sayers, Mark Teply, Susan Trettevik, Farra Vargas, Al Vaughn

DNR's SEPA Center

Patty Betts, Rochelle Knust

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary
19	Chapter 1
37	Chapter 2
69	Chapter 3
83	Forest Conditions and Management
119	Riparian
175	Stream Channel Conditions
185	Soils
207	Water Quality
211	Fish
233	Wildlife
235	Northern Spotted Owl
255	Marbled Murrelet
263	Cultural Resources
267	Global Climate Change
273	References

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	Scoping Notice, Response to Comments, Strategies
Appendix B	Adaptive Management
Appendix C	Modeling
Appendix D	Forest Conditions
Appendix E	Procedures
Appendix F	Riparian
Appendix G	Soils/ Road Summary
Appendix H	Northern Spotted Owl
Appendix I	Marbled Murrelet
Appendix J	Wildlife
Appendix K	Cultural Resources

LIST OF TEXT BOX

- 30** **Text Box 1-1.** How Do Trust Lands Benefit You?
- 88** **Text Box 3-1.** Forest Cohort Management
- 98** **Text Box 3-2.** Curtis' Relative Density (RD)
- 104** **Text Box 3-3.** What Are the Stand Development Stages?
- 145** **Text Box 3-4.** Terminology
- 189** **Text Box 3-5.** Landslides 101
- 211** **Text Box 3-6.** Salmon Definitions

LIST OF MAPS

- 48** **Map 2-1.** Illustrating the Outcome of the Simulated Twelve-Step Watershed Assessment Procedure for the No Action Alternative
- 76** **Map 3-1.** Vicinity Map of the Olympic Experimental State Forest (OESF)
- 77** **Map 3-2.** Landscapes within the OESF
- 79** **Map 3-3.** Watershed Administrative Units within the OESF
- 82** **Map 3-4.** Type 3 Watersheds within the OESF
- 120** **Map 3-5.** Major River Systems within the OESF
- 173** **Map 3-6.** No Action Alternative: Net Potential Impact to Riparian Function by Type 3 Watershed
- 174** **Map 3-7.** Landscape Alternative: Net Potential Impact to Riparian Function by Type 3 Watershed
- 180** **Map 3-8.** Coarse Sediment Sensitivity Rating for Selected Type 3 Watersheds
- 181** **Map 3-9.** Fine Sediment Sensitivity Rating for Selected Type 3 Watersheds
- 182** **Map 3-10.** Large Woody Debris Sensitivity Rating for Selected Type 3 Watersheds
- 183** **Map 3-11.** Peak Flow Sensitivity Rating for Selected Type 3 Watersheds
- 196** **Map 3-12.** Sub-Watersheds within the OESF
- 238** **Map 3-13.** Managed Owl Conservation Areas (MOCAs) in the OESF
- 239** **Map 3-14.** Spotted Owl Conservation Support Areas (CSAs) in the OESF

LIST OF FIGURES

- 32 **Figure 1-1.** Hierarchical Planning Model
- 43 **Figure 2-1.** Twelve-Step Watershed Assessment Procedure for Meeting Riparian Conservation and Management Objectives in the Olympic Experimental State Forest
- 45 **Figure 2-2.** Illustration of the four riparian strategies scenarios in the OESF, representing the potential outcomes of the No Action Alternative
- 46 **Figure 2-3.** Simplified Representation of the Twelve-Step Assessment Process
- 60 **Figure 2-4.** Age Class Distribution Projected over Four Time Periods (a, b, c and d) for the Landscape Alternative
- 72 **Figure 3-1.** Interpreting Box Plots
- 75 **Figure 3-2.** Multiple Levels for Analysis Within the OESF
- 124 **Figure 3-3.** Generalized Curves of Riparian Functions and Attributes
- 144 **Figure 3-4.** Analysis of Potential Impact
- 189 **Figure 3-5.** Deep-Seated Landslide
- 190 **Figure 3-6.** Debris Flow
- 217 **Figure 3-7.** Hypothetical Frequency Distribution of a Given Habitat Element

LIST OF TABLES

- 7 **Table ES-1.** Summary of the Management Alternatives for State Trust Lands in the OESF
- 17 **Table ES-2.** Summary of Financial Analysis of the Alternatives
- 35 **Table 1-1.** Steering Committee Members
- 45 **Table 2-1.** Brief Description of Four Forest-Estate Modeling Scenarios that Comprise the OESF No Action Alternative
- 47 **Table 2-2.** Riparian Area Assessment for the No Action Procedure
- 49 **Table 2-3.** Area Weighted Percentage of Riparian Scenario Choices by Landscape for the No Action Alternative
- 51 **Table 2-4.** Watershed Assessment Procedures and Modeling Assumptions
- 53 **Table 2-5.** Summary of the Management Alternatives for OESF Forest Land Planning
- 58 **Table 2-6.** Number of Decades Needed to Reach 20 Percent Old Forest Habitat and 40 Percent Young Forest Habitat and Better, Presented by Landscape and Alternative
- 59 **Table 2-7.** Decades to Reach 20 Percent Old Forest Habitat and 40 Percent Young Forest and Better Habitat using Forest-Estate Model Targets
- 60 **Table 2-8.** Projected Age Class, Used to Represent Stand Structure, by Alternative, and Compared to HCP Table IV. 14
- 61 **Table 2-9.** Summary of Financial Analysis of the Management Alternatives for Trust Lands in the OESF
- 74 **Table 3-1.** Land Ownership by Acres in the OESF

- 78 **Table 3-2.** Forested State Trust Lands in the OESF, by Landscape and Assessment Area
- 80 **Table 3-3.** Watershed Administrative Units in the OESF, by Landscape
- 81 **Table 3-4.** Number of Type 3 Watersheds within Selected Watershed Administrative Units where DNR Manages Greater than 20 Percent of the Land Base
- 84 **Table 3-5.** Current Forest Types (acres) on DNR-Managed Lands, by Landscape
- 85 **Table 3-6.** Current Forest Types (acres) by Watershed Administrative Unit with Greater Than 20 Percent DNR-Managed Lands
- 86 **Table 3-7.** Current Forest Types (acres) within the Riparian Inner Zone (first 75 ft.) by Landscape on DNR-Managed Lands
- 86 **Table 3-8.** Current Forest Types (acres) within the Riparian Outer Zone by Landscape on DNR-Managed Lands
- 87 **Table 3-9.** 50-year Site Index (SI) by Tree Species for DNR-Managed Lands within the OESF
- 90 **Table 3-10.** Average Acres Harvested per Decade, by Alternative on DNR-Managed Lands
- 92 **Table 3-11.** Acres Harvested on DNR-Managed Lands over 100 Years by Harvest Type, Land Class, and Alternative
- 93 **Table 3-12.** Total Harvest Activities (Variable Retention Harvest and Variable Density Thinning) Over 100 Years Showing Total Acres and Percentage of Harvest Types within Each Landscape
- 94 **Table 3-13.** Total Harvest Activities (Variable Retention Harvest and Variable Density Thinning) by Percentage of Harvest Types within Each Watershed Administrative Unit over 100 Years
- 99 **Table 3-14.** Current Overstocked Conditions by Forest Types in the OESF
- 102 **Table 3-15.** Current Standing Merchantable Volume (Million Board Feet, MMBF) on DNR-Managed Lands by Landscape
- 103 **Table 3-16.** Stand Development Stage Summary
- 111 **Table 3-17.** Predicted Change in Forest Conditions for Each Landscape under the No Action Alternative (2010-2110)
- 111 **Table 3-18.** Predicted Change in Forest Conditions for Each Landscape under the Landscape Alternative (2010-2110)
- 112 **Table 3-19.** Predicted Change in Watershed Administrative Unit Forest Conditions for the No Action Alternative (2010-2110)
- 112 **Table 3-20.** Predicted Change in Watershed Administrative Unit Forest Conditions for the Landscape Alternative (2010-2110)
- 113 **Table 3-21.** Current Old-Growth Potential within Landscapes on DNR-Managed Lands, Using Weighted Old-Growth Habitat Index (WOGHI)
- 114 **Table 3-22.** Current Old-Growth Potential within Watershed Administrative Units with Greater than 20 Percent DNR-Managed Lands
- 114 **Table 3-23.** Estimate of the Current Extent of Late Successional and Old-Growth Forest for All Ownerships within the OESF
- 116 **Table 3-24.** Changes in Acres of Structurally Complex Forests (2010-2110), by Alternative on DNR-Managed Lands
- 121 **Table 3-25.** Stream Length (miles) by Ownership within the OESF

- 121** **Table 3-26.** Stream Length (miles) within Selected Watershed Administrative Units on DNR-Managed Lands
- 123** **Table 3-27.** Estimated Extent of Wetlands within Watershed Administrative Units with Greater Than 20 Percent DNR-Managed Lands
- 125** **Table 3-28.** Indicators of Riparian Function with Associated Metrics, Spatial Extent and Type of Impact Analysis
- 134** **Table 3-29.** Current Large Woody Debris Recruitment Potential for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 135** **Table 3-30.** Current Leaf and Litter Recruitment Potential for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 137** **Table 3-31.** Current Percentage of Adequate Riparian Shade for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 138** **Table 3-32.** Current Riparian Microclimatic Maturity for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 140** **Table 3-33.** Current Windthrow Impact within Riparian Areas for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 142** **Table 3-34.** Current Peak Flow Conditions within Type 3 Watersheds for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 148** **Table 3-35.** No Action Alternative: Summary of Potential Adverse Environmental Impacts to Large Woody Debris Recruitment for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 149** **Table 3-36.** Landscape Alternative: Summary of Potential Adverse Environmental Impacts to Large Woody Debris Recruitment for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 152** **Table 3-37.** No Action Alternative: Summary of Potential Adverse Environmental Impacts to Leaf and Needle Litter Recruitment Potential for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 152** **Table 3-38.** Landscape Alternative: Summary of Potential Adverse Environmental Impacts to Leaf and Needle Litter Recruitment Potential for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 155** **Table 3-39.** No Action Alternative: Summary of Potential Adverse Environmental Impacts to Stream Shade for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 156** **Table 3-40.** Landscape Alternative: Summary of Potential Adverse Environmental Impacts to Stream Shade for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 159** **Table 3-41.** No Action Alternative: Summary of Potential Adverse Environmental Impacts to Riparian Microclimate for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 160** **Table 3-42.** Landscape Alternative: Summary of Potential Adverse Environmental Impacts to Riparian Microclimate for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 164** **Table 3-43.** No Action Alternative: Summary of Potential Adverse Environmental Impacts from Windthrow for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 164** **Table 3-44.** Landscape Alternative: Summary of Potential Adverse Environmental Impacts from Windthrow for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 168** **Table 3-45.** No Action Alternative: Summary of Potential Adverse Environmental Impacts to Peak Flow above the Ten Percent Detection Limit for Selected Watershed Administrative Units

- 168** **Table 3-46.** Landscape Alternative: Summary of Potential Adverse Environmental Impacts to Peak Flow above the Ten Percent Detection Limit for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 170** **Table 3-47.** Summary of Net Potential Impacts within Selected Type 3 Watersheds across All Time Periods Using All Riparian Indicators (n = 426), by Alternative
- 172** **Table 3-48.** Type 3 Watersheds Predicted to Experience Probable, Significant, Adverse, Environmental Impacts by Watershed Administrative Unit
- 176** **Table 3-49.** Coarse Sediment Sensitivity Ratings Based on Channel Gradient (percent) and Confinement
- 176** **Table 3-50.** Fine Sediment Sensitivity Ratings Based on Channel Gradient (percent) and Confinement
- 177** **Table 3-51.** Peak Flow Sensitivity Ratings Based on Channel Gradient (percent) and Confinement
- 177** **Table 3-52.** Large Woody Debris Sensitivity Ratings Based on Channel Gradient (percent) and Confinement
- 192** **Table 3-53.** Erosion, Compaction, and Displacement Potential by Watershed Administrative Unit (Percent of DNR-Managed Lands)
- 193** **Table 3-54.** Soil Erosion, Compaction, and Displacement Risk Rankings by Watershed Administrative Unit (1=highest risk, 17=lowest risk)
- 194** **Table 3-55.** Sediment Delivery Potential by Watershed Administrative Unit in Approximate Acres and Percent (1=highest delivery potential, 17=lowest delivery potential)
- 195** **Table 3-56.** Road Length and Density by Watershed Administrative Unit
- 210** **Table 3-57.** Changes in Acres of Structurally Complex Forests (2010-2110), by Alternative for the OESF
- 213** **Table 3-58.** Summary of Limiting Factors and Habitat Restoration Priorities
- 215** **Table 3-59.** Estimated Stream Miles Used by Native Salmonids, by Watershed Administrative Units
- 216** **Table 3-60.** Summary of the Status and Trends of Selected Stocks of Native Salmonids in the OESF
- 218** **Table 3-61.** Indicators for Fish Habitat
- 223** **Table 3-62.** Wildlife Species and Subspecies Endemic to the Olympic Peninsula
- 224** **Table 3-63.** Wildlife Species Known or Suspected to Occur on DNR-Managed Lands in the OESF
- 225** **Table 3-64.** Wildlife Guilds and Species Benefiting from Various Forest Conditions and Structures
- 227** **Table 3-65.** Stand Development Stages and Associated Vertebrate Species
- 227** **Table 3-66.** Wildlife Species Closely Associated with High-Contrast Forest and Shrub Edges
- 230** **Table 3-67.** Effects of Timber Harvesting on Wildlife
- 242** **Table 3-68.** Definitions of Northern Spotted Owl Habitat Types
- 246** **Table 3-69.** Estimated Current Northern Spotted Habitat as a Percentage of Each Landscape

- 249 **Table 3-70.** Decades to Reach 20 Percent Old Forest Habitat and 40 Percent Young Forest Habitat and Better
- 249 **Table 3-71.** Number of Landscapes that Fail to Achieve Northern Spotted Owl Habitat Thresholds by Alternative
- 250 **Table 3-72.** Harvest Activities (by Acres) in All Status 1 Owl Circles for the Entire OESF (2010-2020, Woodstock Model)
- 259 **Table 3-73.** Current Condition of Marbled Murrelet Indicators, by Landscape
- 260 **Table 3-74.** Projected Change in Marbled Murrelet Carrying Capacity Index for Each Landscape from 2010 to 2100, by Alternative
- 261 **Table 3-75.** Projected Harvest in Marbled Murrelet Sensitive Areas within Each Landscape, Decade 1, by Alternative
- 264 **Table 3-76.** Count and Description of Current Archaeological and Historical Sites in the OESF

LIST OF CHARTS

- 62 **Chart 2-1.** Projected Harvest Volumes on State Trust Lands in the OESF, by Alternative
- 62 **Chart 2-2.** Projected Harvest Area on State Trust Lands in the OESF, by Alternative
- 63 **Chart 2-3.** Projected Harvest Types (area) in OESF, by Alternative and Financial Feasibility
- 64 **Chart 2-4.** Projected Harvest Types (volume) in OESF, by Alternative and Financial Feasibility
- 65 **Chart 2-5.** Harvest Types by Variable Retention Adjustment Factor Classes and Alternative
- 73 **Chart 3-1.** Average Monthly Temperature and Rainfall for Forks, Washington
- 90 **Chart 3-2.** Acres with Variable Retention Harvests by Alternative and Decade on DNR-Managed Lands
- 90 **Chart 3-3.** Acres with Variable Density Thinning by Alternative and Decade on DNR-Managed Lands
- 91 **Chart 3-4.** Comparison of Harvest Types by Decade and Alternative on DNR-Managed Lands
- 92 **Chart 3-5.** Total Harvest Activities in the Uplands by Decade, by Alternative
- 93 **Chart 3-6.** Harvest Activities in Riparian Outer Zones by Decade and Alternative
- 95 **Chart 3-7.** Distribution of the Percent of Total Area Harvested, Based on Type 3 Watersheds, by Alternative and Harvest Type
- 96 **Chart 3-8.** Number of Harvest Entries by Harvested Acres over 100 Years by Alternative
- 97 **Chart 3-9.** Number of Projected Harvest Entries for East Fork Dickey Watershed Administrative Unit (WAU) over 100 Years by Alternative
- 97 **Chart 3-10.** Number of Projected Harvest Entries for Hoko Watershed Administrative Unit (WAU) over 100 Years by Alternative
- 99 **Chart 3-11.** Current Forest Types with a Relative Density (RD) Greater than 75 and Greater than 85 Feet in Height
- 100 **Chart 3-12.** Overstocked Conditions by Forest Types, by Alternative (2010-2020)
- 101 **Chart 3-13.** Overstocked Conditions by Forest Types, by Alternative (2070-2080)

- 101 Chart 3-14.** Overstocked Conditions by Forest Types, by Alternative (2100-2110)
- 102 Chart 3-15.** Change in Total Standing Volume over Time on DNR-Managed Lands
- 105 Chart 3-16.** Current 2010 Conditions for DNR-Managed Lands in the OESF, by Stand Development Stage
- 105 Chart 3-17.** Stand Development Stages in 2070 for the OESF
- 106 Chart 3-18.** Current Proportion of Stand Development Stages in Landscapes on DNR-Managed Lands within the OESF
- 106 Chart 3-19.** Current Proportion of Stand Development Stages by Watershed Administrative Units with Greater than 20 Percent DNR-Managed Lands
- 107 Chart 3-20.** Ecosystem Initiation Stand Development Stage for the Riparian Inner Zone
- 108 Chart 3-21.** Structurally Complex Stage for the OESF Riparian Inner Zone
- 108 Chart 3-22.** Competitive Exclusion Stage for the OESF Riparian Outer Zone
- 109 Chart 3-23.** Structurally Complex Stage for the OESF Riparian Outer Zone
- 109 Chart 3-24.** Biomass Accumulation Stand Development Stage for Wetlands
- 110 Chart 3-25.** Structurally Complex Stand Development Stage for Wetlands
- 110 Chart 3-26.** Structurally Complex Stand Development Stage for Uplands
- 133 Chart 3-27.** Current Large Woody Debris Recruitment Potential for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 135 Chart 3-28.** Current Leaf and Litter Recruitment Potential for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 136 Chart 3-29.** Current Percentage of Adequate Riparian Shade for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 138 Chart 3-30.** Current Riparian Microclimatic Maturity for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 139 Chart 3-31.** Current Windthrow Probability within Riparian Areas on DNR-Managed Lands in the OESF
- 140 Chart 3-32.** Current Modeled Windthrow Impact within Riparian Areas for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 141 Chart 3-33.** Current Peak Flow Conditions within Type 3 Watersheds for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 146 Chart 3-34.** Change over Time by Alternative in the Distribution of Large Woody Debris Recruitment Potential Scores for Selected Type 3 Watersheds
- 146 Chart 3-35.** Net Potential Impact to Large Woody Debris Recruitment Relative to Current Conditions, by Alternative
- 147 Chart 3-36.** Number of Type 3 Watersheds with an Observed Potential Adverse Environmental Impact to Large Woody Debris Recruitment, Relative to Current Conditions
- 147 Chart 3-37.** Potential Adverse Environmental Impact per Type 3 Watershed to Large Woody Debris Recruitment Relative to Current Conditions (n variable)

- 149 **Chart 3-38.** Change over Time by Alternative in the Distribution of Leaf and Needle Litter Recruitment Potential Scores for Selected Type 3 Watersheds (n = 405)
- 150 **Chart 3-39.** Net Potential Impact to Leaf and Needle Litter Recruitment Relative to Current Conditions, by Alternative
- 150 **Chart 3-40.** Number of Type 3 Watersheds with an Observed Potential Adverse Environmental Impact to Leaf and Needle Litter Recruitment, Relative to Current Conditions
- 151 **Chart 3-41.** Potential Adverse Environmental Impact per Type 3 Watershed to Leaf and Needle Litter Recruitment, Relative to Current Conditions (n variable)
- 153 **Chart 3-42.** Change over Time by Alternative in the Distribution of the Percent of the Riparian Area with Adequate Shade for Selected Type 3 Watersheds (n = 405)
- 154 **Chart 3-43.** Net Potential Impact to Stream Shade
- 154 **Chart 3-44.** Number of Type 3 Watersheds with an Observed Potential Adverse Environmental Impact to Stream Shade
- 155 **Chart 3-45.** Potential Adverse Environmental Impact per Type 3 Watershed to Stream Shade (n variable)
- 157 **Chart 3-46.** Change over Time by Alternative in the Distribution of the Percent of the Riparian Area in a Microclimatically Mature Condition for Selected Type 3 Watersheds (n = 410)
- 157 **Chart 3-47.** Net Potential Impact to Riparian Microclimate, Relative to Current Conditions
- 158 **Chart 3-48.** Number of Type 3 Watersheds with an Observed Potential Adverse Environmental Impact to Riparian Microclimate, Relative to Current Conditions
- 158 **Chart 3-49.** Potential Adverse Environmental Impact per Type 3 Watershed to Riparian Microclimate, Relative to Current Conditions (n variable)
- 161 **Chart 3-50.** Predicted Windthrow within Riparian Areas
- 161 **Chart 3-51.** Change over Time by Alternative in the Distribution of the Percent of the Riparian Area Impacted by Windthrow for Selected Type 3 Watersheds (n = 406)
- 162 **Chart 3-52.** Net Potential Impact to the Percent of the Riparian Area Affected by Windthrow, Relative to Current Conditions
- 162 **Chart 3-53.** Number of Type 3 Watersheds with an Observed Potential Adverse Environmental Impact in the Percent of the Riparian Area Affected by Windthrow, Relative to Current Conditions, by Alternative
- 163 **Chart 3-54.** Potential Adverse Environmental Impact per Type 3 Watershed in the Percent of the Riparian Area Affected by Windthrow, Relative to Current Conditions (n variable), by Alternative
- 165 **Chart 3-55.** Change over Time by Alternative in the Distribution of the Percent Change in Peak Flow for Selected Type 3 Watersheds (n = 426)
- 166 **Chart 3-56.** Net Potential Impact to Peak Flow above the Ten Percent Detection Limit, by Alternative
- 166 **Chart 3-57.** Number of Type 3 Watersheds with a Potential Adverse Environmental Impact to Peak Flow above the Ten Percent Detection Limit
- 167 **Chart 3-58.** Potential Adverse Environmental Impact per Type 3 Watershed to Peak Flow above the Ten Percent Detection Limit (n variable)

- 171 Chart 3-59.** Number of Riparian Indicators with Probable, Significant, Adverse, Environmental Impacts
- 171 Chart 3-60.** Summary of Net Potential Impacts within Selected Type 3 Watersheds across All Time Periods Using All Riparian Indicators (n = 426)
- 178 Chart 3-61.** Current Distribution of Coarse Sediment Sensitivity Scores by Watershed Administrative Unit
- 178 Chart 3-62.** Current Distribution of Fine Sediment Sensitivity Scores by Watershed Administrative Unit
- 179 Chart 3-63.** Current Distribution of Large Woody Debris Sensitivity Scores by Watershed Administrative Unit
- 179 Chart 3-64.** Current Distribution of Peak Flow Sensitivity Scores by Watershed Administrative Unit
- 195 Chart 3-65.** Proportional Distribution of Sediment Delivery Potential Ratings by Sub-Watershed within Watershed Administrative Units
- 197 Chart 3-66.** Road Sediment Delivery (Existing Road Network not including Road Traffic) for Sub-Watersheds (Grouped by Watershed Administrative Unit)
- 198 Chart 3-67.** Timber Removal (MMBF) from Low-Productivity (Site Class V) Acres in Each Decade for Watershed Administrative Units and Type 3 Watersheds with Greater Than 20 Percent DNR-Managed Lands
- 199 Chart 3-68.** No Action Alternative: Percent of Each Type 3 Watershed Harvested for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 200 Chart 3-69.** Landscape Alternative: Percent of Each Type 3 Watershed Harvested for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 201 Chart 3-70.** Estimated Road Sediment Delivery Influenced by the Existing Road Network (not Including Road Traffic) for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 202 Chart 3-71.** Number of Sub-Watersheds with High Traffic-Related Road Sediment Delivery Rates by Alternative
- 202 Chart 3-72.** Total Road Sediment Delivery (tons/stream mile/year) for the High Sediment Delivery Class by Decade and Alternative for Selected Watershed Administrative Units
- 203 Chart 3-73.** Change in Sediment Delivery (Sum of Road-Related and Traffic-Related) over Time, by Alternative
- 204 Chart 3-74.** Comparison of Background Sediment Delivery Rates to Road Sediment Delivery Rates for the No Action and Landscape Alternatives
- 231 Chart 3-75.** Structurally Complex Forest Development over Time
- 232 Chart 3-76.** Ecosystem Initiation Stand Development over Time
- 248 Chart 3-77.** Acres of Old Forest Habitat by Alternative
- 248 Chart 3-78.** Acres of Young Forest Habitat and Better by Alternative
- 250 Chart 3-79.** Sol Duc Landscape: Extent of Old Forest Habitat
- 260 Chart 3-80.** Estimate of Marbled Murrelet Carrying Capacity Index for State Trust Lands in the OESF, over Ten Decades