



Photo Credit: U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service; USFWS/Line Art by Robert Shallenberger



RED-COCKADED WOODPECKER HABITAT AND CANEBRAKE RESTORATION PROJECT

**Draft
Environmental Assessment**

August 2004



**U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service
Chattahoochee and Oconee National Forests**

Red-Cockaded Woodpecker Habitat and Canebrake Restoration Project

Draft Environmental Assessment

**Chattahoochee and Oconee National Forests
Jones County, Georgia**

August 2004



**U.S. Department of Agriculture
Forest Service**



The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	PAGE
Table of Contents	i
List of Tables	ii
List of Figures	iii
Acronyms and Abbreviations	iv
1.0 Introduction	1-1
1.1 Background.....	1-1
1.2 Project Area Description.....	1-2
1.3 Purpose and Need for Action.....	1-5
1.3.1 Summary of Proposed Action.....	1-5
1.4 Decision Framework.....	1-6
1.5 Public Involvement.....	1-6
1.6 Issues and Scope of the EA.....	1-7
1.6.1 Key or Major Issues.....	1-7
1.6.2 Non-Key Issues.....	1-8
2.0 Alternatives Including the Proposed Action	2-1
2.1 Alternative 1: No Action (Current Management).....	2-1
2.2 Alternative 2: RCW Habitat Restoration (Proposed Action)	2-1
2.3 Alternative 3: RCW Habitat Restoration Without Herbicide Use.....	2-5
2.4 Alternatives Eliminated from Further Study.....	2-5
2.5 Mitigation Measures	2-6
2.6 Comparison of Alternatives	2-7
3.0 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences	3-1
3.1 Physical Environment.....	3-2
3.1.1 Water Quality.....	3-2
3.1.1.1 Affected Environment.....	3-2
3.1.1.2 Environmental Consequences.....	3-4
3.1.1.3 Cumulative Impacts	3-13
3.2 Biological Environment.....	3-14
3.2.1 Vegetation and Wildlife, Including Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, and Sensitive (PETS) Species.....	3-14
3.2.1.1 Affected Environment.....	3-15
3.2.1.2 Environmental Consequences.....	3-21
3.2.1.3 Cumulative Impacts	3-35
4.0 Consultation and Coordination	4-1
5.0 References Cited	5-1

6.0 List of Preparers6-1

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Glossary A-1
Appendix B: Environmental Laws and Regulations B-1
Appendix C: Standard Mitigation Measures for Prescribed Fire and Herbicide Use C-1
Appendix D: Biological Evaluation D-1
Appendix E: Herbicide Risk Assessment and Effects Analysis E-1
Appendix F: Public and Agency Comments on the EA F-1
Appendix G: Maps of the Alternatives G-1

LIST OF TABLES

NUMBER	TITLE	PAGE
1.6-1	Soil Series and Characteristics Covering the Majority of the Project Area.....	1-8
1.6-2	Herbicide Types, Application Methods, Mixtures, and Rates	1-10
1.6-3	25 Percent Fund and PILT Payments to Jasper County from Oconee National Forest for Selected Years	1-16
1.6-4	Estimated Volumes Proposed For Thinning From Selected Oconee National Forest Compartments and Predicted Range of Revenues	1-16
2.2-1	Acres Proposed for Thinning By Compartment under Alternative 2	2-2
2.2-2	Stands with the Potential for Herbicide Use under Alternative 2	2-3
2.2-3	Landings and Roads By Compartment under Alternative 2	2-4
2.4-2	Landings and Roads By Compartment under Alternative 2	2-4
2.5-1	Recommended Mitigation Measures by Resource Area.....	2-6
2.6-1	Comparison of Potential Impacts of the Alternatives by Key Issue	2-8
3.1-1	Riparian Corridor Widths By Slope Class and Stream Type for the Oconee National Forest.....	3-6
3.1-2	Stands Proposed for Thinning within Riparian Corridors under Alternative 2.....	3-6
3.2-1	Locations of Log Landings to be Maintained as Wildlife Openings by Compartment and Stand.....	3-29
4.1-1	Persons and Agencies Contacted	4-1
6.1-1	List of Preparers.....	6-1

LIST OF FIGURES

NUMBER	TITLE	PAGE
1.2-1	Location of the Project Area	1-3
3.3-1	Canebrake Restoration Sites	3-10

Maps of Project Activities by Alternative

Alternative 2-Compartment 5	G-3
Alternative 3-Compartment 5	G-4
Alternative 2-Compartment 6	G-5
Alternative 3-Compartment 6	G-6
Alternative 2-Compartment 8	G-7
Alternative 3-Compartment 8	G-8

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

BA	Basal Area
BMP	Best Management Practice
CAA	Clean Air Act
CCF	100 Cubic Feet
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CWA	Clean Water Act
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FSH	Forest Service Handbook
FSM	Forest Service Manual
GDNR	Georgia Department of Natural Resources
GNHP	Georgia Natural Heritage Program
HMA	Habitat Management Area
KV	Knutson-Vandenberg
MIS	Management Indicator Species
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NWI	National Wetlands Inventory
PILT	Payments in Lieu of Taxes
PETS	Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, and Sensitive
RCW	Red-cockaded Woodpecker
ROD	Record of Decision
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SIO	Scenic Integrity Objectives
SPB	Southern Pine Beetle
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
USC	United States Code
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFS	United States Forest Service
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
WMA	Watershed Management Area

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This environmental assessment (EA) documents the results of a study of the potential environmental impacts of actions proposed by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Forest Service (USFS) to restore habitat needed for the recovery of the Federally endangered red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) (*Picicoles borealis*) on the Oconee Ranger District of the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest in Georgia. It also documents the effects of proposed actions designed to restore rare canebrake communities important for species such as the Swainson's warbler (*Limnothlypis swainsonii*).

This EA was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 United States Code (USC) 4321 et seq.), which requires an environmental analysis for Federal Actions having the potential to impact the quality of the human environment; the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1500 through 1508) for implementing NEPA; Forest Service Procedures for Implementing CEQ regulations (Forest Service Manual (FSM) Chapter 1950); and the Forest Service Policy and Procedures Handbook (Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 1909.15).

A key objective of NEPA is to help Federal agency officials make well-informed decisions about agency actions. The District Ranger on the Oconee National Forest is faced with a decision as to what, if anything, the USFS should do to restore habitat for the RCW within the Sub-Habitat Management Area on the Oconee National Forest to aid in the recovery of the species. Additionally, what, if any, actions should be taken to restore rare canebrake communities important for Swainson's warblers and other species within the project area. This decision will be made within the overall management framework already established in the:

- *Land and Resource Management Plan for the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests* (Forest Plan, signed January 2004), and its accompanying EIS and Record of Decision (ROD);
- *Vegetation Management in the Coastal Plain/Piedmont Final EIS* (Volumes I and II) *and Supplement*; and
- *Revised Red-Cockaded Woodpecker Recovery Plan* (Recovery Plan, signed January 2003), prepared by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

The Forest Plan, EIS, and Recovery Plan establish overall rules and guidance for actions taken within the Oconee National Forest. Therefore, the alternative courses of action considered in this EA were crafted to be consistent with the concepts established in the above documents.

1.1 BACKGROUND

The RCW is endemic to open, mature and old-growth pine ecosystems in the southeastern United States. Due to a nearly complete loss of habitat, and subsequent extreme decline in population size, the RCW was federally listed as endangered in 1970. Currently, less than three percent of the species' former population size exists (USFWS, 2003a). The Oconee National

Forest (including the Hitchiti Experimental Forest) and the adjacent Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge both contain remnant RCW populations and the potential to support many more clusters, or family groups, of these woodpeckers.

In 1995, the USFS, Region 8 ROD for the *Management of the Red-cockaded Woodpecker and its Habitat on National Forests in the Southern Region* EIS directed National Forests to delineate Habitat Management Areas (HMAs) to support the recovery of the RCW. The management direction on the Oconee National Forest designated 52,966 acres of the Forest as a HMA for the RCW (USFS, 2001).

According to the revised RCW Recovery Plan, the Oconee National Forest and Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge together make up one secondary core population of RCW, referred to as the Piedmont Recovery Unit. The plan defines a secondary core population as “a population identified in recovery criteria that will hold at least 250 potential breeding groups at the time of and after delisting.” In 2000, the Piedmont Recovery Unit had 59 breeding pairs—20 on the Oconee National Forest and 39 on the Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge (USFWS, 2003a). To bring the RCW population in the Piedmont Unit up to the recovery objective of 250 breeding pairs, the USFS has developed a recovery program in accordance with the objectives and direction provided in the revised RCW Recovery Plan (January 2003). As part of this recovery program, the USFS, in coordination with the USFWS plans to translocate (bring in adult birds from another population) RCWs from a population with an excess number of birds to repopulate proposed habitat sites on the Oconee National Forest. In order to successfully translocate RCW breeding pairs, the proposed translocation sites must have suitable RCW foraging and nesting habitat. This habitat can be obtained by vegetation manipulation and other silvicultural methods.

As a result of several lawsuits dating back to the early 1990s, the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest has had to withdraw a number of projects and timber sales on the Forest, which has affected the ability to meet certain natural resource objectives. In addition, several needed resource management activities on the Forest have not been conducted in recent years due to lack of appropriated funds or not being eligible for KV (Knutson-Vandenberg) dollars. With the exception of a few activities to address the southern pine beetle (SPB) and some prescribed burning, there has been no active management to address RCW habitat needs on the Oconee National Forest.

1.2 PROJECT AREA DESCRIPTION

The project area is located on the Oconee Ranger District of the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest in Jones County, Georgia, approximately 18 miles southeast of Monticello (see **Figure 1.2-1**). The project area is located within a RCW Sub-HMA and encompasses approximately 1,430 acres of National Forest Service land located on the Hitchiti Experimental Forest within Compartments 5, 6 and 8. The project area has been treated with periodic prescribed burning by the USFS since the early to mid-1980s for the purposes of hazardous fuels reduction and wildlife habitat improvements, and will continue to be prescribed burned in the future.

The project area (Compartments 5, 6 and 8) comprises 6% percent of a sixth level Hydrological Unit Code (HUC) watershed. Land administered by the Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge comprises 45% percent of the watershed with private ownership making up the remaining 49% percent of the watershed.

The Hitchiti Experimental Forest in Jones County was formed by proclamation of President Roosevelt on December 7, 1937, and made part of the Oconee NF on September 18, 1964. It is currently managed day-to-day by the Georgia Forestry Commission through an agreement between the GFC and the Forest Service as the Ernst Brender Demonstration Forest. Research direction and oversight is by the USFS Southern Forest Experiment Station in Asheville, NC though the project leader of the USFS Forestry Sciences Laboratory on the campus of the University of Georgia in Athens, Georgia. The Oconee District Ranger is the responsible official for all land management activities.




Figure 1.2-1: Location of the Project Area

1.3 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

Under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), there are legislative requirements to positively manage for endangered species like the RCW on Federal lands. A prime objective of the Oconee National Forest is to comply with the ESA by providing habitat for the recovery of the RCW by restoring and managing a pine ecosystem, which furnishes preferred habitat for RCW foraging and nesting.

Existing habitat is not suitable for the RCW within the project area on the Oconee National Forest. A majority of the pine stands within the project area have excessive amounts of pine stems beyond the preferred habitat requirements (see Revised RCW Recovery Plan). Preferred habitat is between 40 and 70 basal area (BA), while current stand information within the project area shows basal areas over 90. Thus, at present, stands do not provide the open park-like stands that the RCW needs for suitable habitat. RCWs require open areas of mature pines 60 years and older for nesting. Foraging habitats vary in age but usually areas that are pine savannas with little, if any, midstory of hardwood (USFWS, 2003a).

The Hitchiti Experimental Forest (Management Area 3.B in the Revised Forest Plan; USFS, 2004a) is located within the RCW Sub-HMA and must comply with RCW management direction. The management of the RCW is currently listed as Goal 51 and Management Prescriptions 8.D and 8.D.1 in the Chattahoochee-Oconee Forest Plan (USFS, 2004a). Desired conditions for the RCW are stated here. The Oconee National Forest is not currently meeting these desired conditions. Under the ESA and RCW Recovery Plan, the Forest RCW population has been declared a Recovery population and the Forest is mandated by law to bring about this recovery. Habitat management is clearly necessary for the recovery of the species and therefore meeting the purpose and need.

Canebrake is considered a rare community in the Forest Plan. Goal 44 directs the identification and delineation of rare communities and then incorporates them into management prescriptions. Objective OBJ-9.F-05 establishes the need to restore 15 acres per year of canebrake on the Oconee NF. Canebrakes are important habitats for a number of species. Canebrake restoration will occur on sites currently supporting cane. Such sites can be found along Caney Creek which forms the northern border of the project area.

1.3.1 Summary of Proposed Action

The following is a general description of the Proposed Action (Alternative 2). A more detailed description of each activity and connected actions can be found in Section 2.2.

- a) Thin approximately 790 acres in Compartments 5, 6 and 8;
- b) Shelterwood harvest on approximately 93 acres. Majority of sites were previously impacted by SPB mortality. Where patches of overstory trees are too dense a shelterwood harvest (residual basal area of 40 square feet) will occur. A combination of artificial and natural regeneration will be utilized. Prescribed fire and mechanical site preparation along with hand and herbicide release (when needed) is proposed in order to insure survival of seedlings.

- c) Implement uneven-aged management on approximately 30 acres of loblolly pine. The Southern Research Station will incorporate this treatment into their long-term research program on the Hitchiti Experimental Forest.
- d) Conduct prescribed burning of approximately 1100 acres, including growing season burns within recruitment stands to control midstory vegetation;
- e) Develop thirty 10- to 20-acre RCW recruitment sites approximately ¼ to ½-mile apart (USFWS guidelines) in Compartments 5, 6, and 8.
- f) Create 120 RCW artificial cavities (at least 4 cavities for each RCW recruitment site);
- g) Use a combination of herbicides and mechanical methods to control noxious weeds (kudzu and privet) and midstory vegetation on approximately 790 acres;
- h) Use and maintain existing road system;
- i) Construct approximately 1 mile or less of temporary roads;
- j) Reopen approximately 4.5 miles of temporary roads and associated log landings within the project area to access timber stands;
- k) Provide nesting structures for squirrels within the recruitment stands: 2 structures within each new RCW recruitment area (60 structures total);
- l) Reforest approximately 139 acres (includes 93 acres of shelterwood harvest listed previously) of old SPB damaged stands scattered throughout the project area with pine seedlings;
- m) Restore 15 acres of canebrake along Caney Creek in five separate locations by reducing overstory shade through girdling. The girdled trees will be left in place.

1.4 DECISION FRAMEWORK

Given the purpose and need, the Responsible Official (Oconee District Ranger) will review the Proposed Action and the other alternatives in order to make the following decision:

- Select the No Action Alternative (deferring action); or
- Select an action alternative; or
- Select a modified action alternative.

Should a decision be made to select an action alternative or a modification of an action alternative, the actions would be implemented in the next five years.

1.5 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Public involvement during the NEPA process includes, at a minimum, public scoping, public review of the EA, and responses to comments submitted by the public. In accordance with CEQ's regulations for implementing NEPA, the Forest has involved the interested and affected public during the preparation of this EA.

On June 30, 2004, a scoping letter explaining the proposal to improve the habitat for RCW to meet the requirements of the Recovery Plan and RCW EIS within site specific information was

mailed to 71 individuals and organizations that had previously expressed interest in the management of the Oconee Ranger District. In addition, the proposed action appeared in both print and Internet versions of the quarterly Scheduled of Proposed Actions for the Chattahoochee–Oconee National Forest in Georgia 2004. A legal notice requesting comments was also published in the *Eatonton Messenger* in June 2004. Two written responses were received during scoping and both responses were in favor of the project.

The purpose of the scoping process is to determine the scope of issues to be addressed in the EA and to identify major or key issues relating to the Proposed Action. On July 15, 2004, the Oconee RD invited all cooperating agencies (Federal and State), conservation groups, and environmental organizations, such as Georgia Forestwatch and the Sierra Club, to a presentation and site visit of the proposed project sites. No one attended this presentation.

A copy of this Draft EA will be placed on the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest web site. All persons who requested a copy or commented during the scoping process, and, other pertinent agencies and individuals potentially affected by the Proposed Action will receive a Draft EA for review. This Draft EA will be available for public review for a minimum of 30 days. During this public review period, written comments on the Draft EA are invited from the public and interested agencies. All comments received on the Draft EA will be reviewed by multiple parties, and appropriate responses will be prepared. Appendix F of this Draft EA contains a more detailed discussion of this process.

1.6 ISSUES AND SCOPE OF THE EA

Issues can be defined as the relationship between the Proposed Action or its alternatives and the human and natural environment. Issues were identified by the Forest, State and Federal agencies, a review of similar projects, and by the public during the scoping process.

Issues are used to define and focus the discussion of the affected environment for each resource area and the analysis of the potential environmental consequences of an action. Issues were separated into two groups: key (or major) and non-key. Key issues are defined as those directly or indirectly caused by implementing the Proposed Action or its alternatives. Non-key issues are identified as those outside the scope of this EA; already decided by law, regulation, the Forest Plan, or other higher-level decision; irrelevant to the decision to be made; or conjectural and not supported by scientific or factual evidence. In addition, resource areas that would remain unaffected by any of the alternatives are considered non-key issues.

A summary of issues and resource areas analyzed in this EA is presented in Section 1.6.1 below. Those issues and resource areas that were dismissed from further analysis are discussed in Section 1.6.2, along with the rationale for their dismissal.

1.6.1 Key or Major Issues

The following two key issues are analyzed in this EA:

Water Quality (Key Issue #1)

Protection of water quality is required by the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA), as well as Georgia water quality regulations. Timber management activities could affect water quality, and subsequently, aquatic species, by exposing soils, leading to increased erosion during storm events and subsequent higher suspended solid loads and turbidity in downstream surface waters. In addition, water quality could be degraded by the use of herbicides. Activities within riparian areas and wetlands have the potential to degrade water quality. Therefore, impacts to water quality are analyzed in this EA.

Vegetation and Wildlife, Including Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, and Sensitive (PETS) Species (Key Issue #2)

Given the purpose and need of the project – to restore habitat for the RCW, a federally endangered animal species, both vegetation and wildlife, including PETS species, would be affected by the project. Plant communities in the project area would be affected by timber management, and even more so cumulatively with prescribed fire.

1.6.2 Non-Key Issues

The following issues and resources were dismissed from further analysis in this EA:

Soil Resources (Non-Key Issue)

Resource management activities, such as timber harvesting, prescribed burning, mechanical site preparation, roadwork, etc., under all action alternatives could potentially result in increased surface water runoff and soil erosion in the project area as a result of heavy equipment use and associated soil compaction, soil disturbance, and removal of vegetation. In addition, herbicide application within the project area under Alternative 2 has the potential to contaminate soils.

The soils in the project area have clayey, textured subsoils and loamy surfaces, and were formed in place (residuum) from the metamorphic bedrock underlying the area (USFS, 2001). Three soil series are present on National Forest lands within the project area (Compartments 5, 6 and 8). The Gwinnett soil series covers the majority of the land within the project area. These soil series are listed in **Table 1.6-1**, along with their general characteristics.

Table 1.6-1. Soil Series and Characteristics Covering the Majority of the Project Area

Soil Series	Depth Class	Drainage Class	Permeability	General Location	Slope (%)	Other Characteristics
Gwinnett	Deep	Well-Drained	Moderate	Ridges, Hillsides	6-25	Fine, sandy clay loam; very strongly acid to strongly acid
Starr	Deep	Well-Drained	Moderate	Slight Depressions, Around Drain-heads, Terraces, Foot Slopes	0-8	Fine, loamy, semi-active, strongly acid to slightly acid.
Wilkes	Shallow	Well-Drained	Moderately Slow	Narrow Ridges, Hillsides	6-35	Loamy; sandy; active; upper layers strongly acid to slightly acid, lower layers moderately acid to slightly acid

Source: NRCS, 1999

Only minimal adverse effects on soils are anticipated under any of the action alternatives because the soil types within the project area are predominantly deep and well-drained, reducing the potential for compaction, and would not be taken out of production with the proposed actions. In addition, routine implementation of Forest Plan standards, *Georgia's Best Management Practices for Forestry* (GDNR et al., 1999), and other mitigation measures (see Section 2.6 and Appendix C) would substantially reduce any potential impacts from temporary road construction and reconstruction, timber harvest, site preparation, and prescribed burning on soil resources. Herbicides proposed for use under Alternative 2 would be applied manually to minimize drift and soil contact. In the canebrake restoration areas, there would be no ground disturbing activities. Only hand tools would be used to girdle the trees which would be left standing. Overall, no adverse impacts are expected under Alternative 1 and only minor, short-term, localized adverse impacts would occur under Alternatives 2 and 3. Therefore, impacts to soils are not analyzed further in this EA.

Air Quality (Non-Key Issue)

Consideration of air quality impacts is required by the Federal Clean Air Act. Air quality has the potential to be degraded during management activities by dust/particulates and emissions from heavy equipment. Minor increases in carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, hydrocarbons, and particulate matter would be expected. None of these increases would result in a change in attainment status of the area, and all impacts on air quality would be short-term. Air quality would also be affected temporarily by prescribed fire. All prescribed fires on the Forest are planned in coordination with the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, which regulates prescribed burning in the State in accordance with the State Implementation Plan (USFS, 2003a). The low population density of the affected Forest compartments, distance to sensitive receptors, and need to prepare prescribed burn plans should mitigate impacts on air quality. Therefore, air quality is dismissed from additional analysis.

Herbicide Use (Non-Key Issue)

Herbicide treatments to eliminate unwanted species (including noxious weeds and certain midstory species) would be done within RCW foraging and nesting areas under Alternative 2 (see Section 2.2 below). After harvest operations are completed, prescribed fire would be used to reduce the existing ground fuels and aid in the reduction of unwanted vegetation. Treatments needed to control unwanted vegetation would be determined upon post-harvest evaluations. Herbicide treatments, such as foliar spray and/or injection applications or felling (cut stems) with stump treatment applications, may be chosen for the best control methods. A combination of foliar spray mixtures may be used for better control of unwanted species, depending on species composition. When implemented, foliar spray applications would be applied to unwanted vegetation less than 5 feet in height. Felling with stump treatment applications or injection applications would be used to treat unwanted vegetation over 5 feet in height. Areas with older and/or dense growth of unwanted vegetation may have selective treatments with herbicides prior to prescribed fire applications to better manage the desired control. Some of these areas may also have post prescribed fire selective treatments with herbicides. Areas where prescribed fire controls most of the unwanted vegetation would only have selective spot treatments with herbicides. Some areas may have unwanted vegetation controlled by prescribed fire and the use of herbicides may not be necessary. Under Alternative 2 herbicides would be used to girdle overstory trees to allow the restoration of canebrake along Caney Creek. Only herbicides approved for use in riparian areas would be used and direct application to individual trees would prevent water and soil contamination.

The Record of Decision for the *Vegetation Management in the Coastal Plain/Piedmont Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)* limits the application of herbicide active ingredients (a.i.) per acre. All herbicide applications will be prescribed not to exceed the a.i. limitations per acre. [Refer to the Forest Plan EIS (p. 3-382) for average number of stems per acre. The Piedmont/Oconee National Forest is represented by the code “P25p” in Table 3-150 of the EIS.]

Herbicide types, application methods, mixtures, and rates that may be applied upon post-thinning evaluations are presented in **Table 1.6-2**.

Table 1.6-2. Herbicide Types, Application Methods, Mixtures, and Rates				
Type	Application Method	Purpose	Mixture	Rate (Maximum Limit)
Surfactant	N/A	Added to non-aquatic mixtures for better leaf surface coverage	No more than a 1% solution of surfactant	0.90 lbs a.i./acre
Glyphosate (has aquatic label if surfactant not added)	Injection or stump surface treatment	Control of hardwood and conifer species	50% solution (with water)	0.65 gallons of mixture applied per acre (1.3 lbs a.i./acre)
	Foliar spray	Early season--controls hardwood and most conifer species. Late season--controls hardwood species	3% solution (with water)	8.3 gallons of mixture applied per acre (1.0 lbs a.i./acre)

Imazapyr	Injection	Control of hardwood species	25% solution (with water)	3 gallons of mixture per acre (0.75 lbs a.i./acre).
	Foliar spray	Control of hardwood species	½ ounce per gallon of water solution	15 gallons of mixture per applied per acre, well below the 0.75 lbs a.i./acre limit
Clopyralid	Foliar spray	Control of Kudzu	¼ ounce per gallon of water	25 gallons of mixture applied per acre, well below the 0.75 lbs a.i./acre limit
Triclopyr (amine)	Injection and stump treatment	Control of hardwood and conifer species	50% solution (with water)	5 gallons of mixture per acre (4 lbs a.i./acre)
Triclopyr (ester)	Foliar spray	Control of hardwood and conifer species	3% solution (with water)	17 gallons of mixture applied per acre (2 lbs a.i./acre)
	Foliar spray	Control of invasive species such as privet and wisteria	4% solution (with water)	12.5 gallons of mixture per acre (2 lbs a.i./acre)

The use of herbicides under Alternative 2 may pose a risk to humans, fish, and/or wildlife. However, any herbicides applied would be done according to the labeling information and at the lowest rate effective at meeting project objectives in accordance with guidelines for protecting the environment. When labeling and application directions are followed and safety recommendations are implemented, minimal adverse effects are expected. The effects of the treatment would be limited to the trees in the immediate vicinity of the application areas. All herbicides would be ground-applied through manual methods, such as with low pressure backpack sprayers and/or cut surface treatments (stump treatment or injection), and application would be restricted during unfavorable weather conditions, such as high winds.

A project-specific risk assessment to determine risks to humans, fish, and wildlife from herbicide use under Alternative 2 has been completed and is provided in Appendix E. This risk assessment determined that there would be no adverse effects on humans, wildlife, and fish from the use of herbicides under this project. In addition, with the provision of riparian buffer areas on stream zones, the risk of herbicide spills or movement into stream zones is further reduced. All applicable mitigation measures contained in the *Vegetation Management in the Coastal Plain/Piedmont Final EIS* (USFS, 1989a) would be followed. A complete discussion of the effects of herbicides is contained in this EIS, to which this document tiers. In addition, all herbicide applications would follow the guidelines of the Forest Plan and RCW Recovery Plan. Current risk assessments for the above-listed herbicides may be found at: www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/pesticide/risk.htm.

The use of herbicides carries some risks to human health and safety, particularly to the applicator. This risk is reduced by requiring the applicator to be trained in safety precautions, proper use, and handling of herbicides. Other factors reducing the risk of herbicide use to human health and safety is the low level of active ingredient per acre and placement of notice signs in areas where herbicide has been applied. The signs include information about the herbicide used, when it was applied, and who to contact for additional information. Appendix C of this EA also

contains a list of standard mitigation measures for herbicide use that would be followed during this project.

There would be no effects from herbicide use under Alternatives 1 and 3, since herbicides would not be used under either of these alternatives.

Cultural Resources (Non-Key Issue)

Consideration of potential effects on heritage resources is mandated by the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and NEPA. Consequently, an archeological survey of compartments 5, 6 and 8 was conducted. When Compartment 5 was surveyed 4 sites were identified, 1 site in Compartment 6 and 2 sites in Compartment 8. These sites and a 10 meter buffer are marked on the ground and are not included in the project area. The project leader will coordinate with the Forest Archeologist during the project planning and implementation. Therefore, this is a non-key issue that is not addressed further in this EA.

Recreation (Non-Key Issue)

Vegetation management activities have the potential to temporarily disrupt or displace recreational use in the three compartments due to the presence of workers and use of equipment. The Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge to the north and south of the project area offers game species hunting opportunities during a specified season. There are no recreational trails within or immediately adjacent to the project area. Fishing opportunities are provided in Caney Creek on the northern border of the project area and in Hurricane Creek just west of the project, as well as, in two public fishing areas on the Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge adjacent to the project area (USFWS, 1998).

Alternative 1 would not result in any direct, adverse effects on recreation in the area. Temporary, adverse effects on recreation may result from these activities due to the presence of workers and equipment, temporary effects on the visual quality of the area, and noise generated from equipment and vehicles. These impacts would only affect recreation users and opportunities immediately surrounding the activity sites, and for the short duration that a particular site is being worked on. While recreational use of public lands would not be restricted during the proposed activities, it is likely that use would decline due to disturbance in the area, and as a result of signs posted to notify the public of the activities. There would remain many acres of forest surrounding the project area that would remain unaffected and available to recreationists.

Beneficial impacts on recreation are anticipated over the longer-term from Alternatives 2 and 3. Thinning would result in increased visibility into forested areas, which would allow hunters to more easily identify game species and would provide a more manageable terrain for hiking. Wildlife viewing would also be enhanced. Reopening temporary roads in the area may allow hunters and hikers easier foot access to interior forest areas. However, unauthorized off-road vehicle (ORV) use may increase as a result of the open forest conditions created by thinning activities, particularly from unauthorized ORV riders using skid trails and logging landings. To

reduce impacts from potential ORV use of the area, skid trails and logging decks would be placed away from known high use areas by at least 50 feet. In the event that ORV use and resource degradation is evident, mitigation measures, such as lopping and strategically scattering slash in the vicinity of skid trails and log landings (piles 1 to 2 feet above the ground) would be performed to discourage unauthorized ORV riding, but to still allow for foot access.

Overall, neither the adverse nor the beneficial impacts on recreation from Alternatives 2 and 3 are of such a magnitude as to constitute a major issue; therefore, this is a non-key issue that is not addressed further in this EA.

Visual Resources (Non-Key Issue)

Visual resources have the potential to be adversely affected by the presence of workers and equipment during management activities. In addition, vegetation management by thinning, herbicide use, and prescribed fire, as well as temporary road construction and reconstruction, could alter the appearance of the project area.

The majority of the project area has been assigned a spectrum of high/medium and low scenic integrity objectives (SIOs; USFS, 2004b). The majority of the forested stands within the project area currently have high basal areas and a closed canopy. However, since the late 1990s, part of the canopy has opened up in areas as a result of SPB infestations and subsequent pine mortality. In 2000, cut-and-leave suppression was conducted on various SPB spots in the project area. Most spots resulted in canopy openings of less than 1 acre, and less than 10 acres were cut. Overall, the project area has relatively few viewers, with the primary viewers being hunters staying at the 3 year-round hunt camps within the project area, dispersed recreationists, and passersby on nearby roads. While gravel County roads transect forested areas in each of the compartments, they receive only limited use and do not have many viewers.

No direct impacts on visual quality would occur as a result of Alternative 1. Alternatives 2 and 3 would result in short-term, minor, very localized impacts on visual quality from the presence of workers and equipment in the project area. Thinning activities, as well as the use of herbicides to open up the midstory under Alternatives 2 and 4, would alter the visual character of the project area for a longer period of time by making forest stands appear more open. These impacts would affect only viewers in the immediate vicinity of treated stands. The more open appearance may have different impacts on different viewers, as some viewers may prefer a more open and managed forested setting (and subsequently, greater visibility into forested stands) and others a more heavily vegetated forest. However, since there would remain a mixture of thinned and unthinned areas within the overall project area, as well as a range of age classes, any long-term, adverse impacts on visual quality would be localized and negligible. In accordance with Forest Plan direction, thinning activities would be planned to achieve natural-appearing edges in the foreground distance zones. Therefore, thinning operations would not result in the failure of any of the proposed treatment stands to meet SIOs.

Temporary road rehabilitation/construction (including skid trails and landings) would primarily have short-term effects on the visual quality of the area. Negative visual impacts associated with logging decks and skid trails would be minimized by locating these areas away from frequently

used areas. The majority of temporary roads to be used were constructed about a decade ago, and contain mainly understory vegetation. No major clearing would be associated with reopening these roads, and reopening and reuse of these roads would not result in major changes in the visual quality of the landscape.

Up to 1 mile of new temporary roads would be constructed, and these may involve more vegetation clearing and greater landscape disturbance. Only very short stretches of new road would be constructed in any given area, and any clearing associated with these new roads is not anticipated to dominate the landscape or violate the SIOs of the project area. Although they would be occasionally used for administrative purposes, the majority of temporary roads would be seeded and allowed to revegetate following completion of activities. The only exceptions would be those temporary roads, skid trails, or landings to be permanently maintained as wildlife openings. These areas would remain open over the long-term, and would primarily contain early successional vegetation. These openings would be planned and designed so that their shapes appear natural in the landscape, and their presence does not significantly modify the landscape.

Other activities proposed under the action alternatives, including exotic species control and canebrake restoration, could have temporary, minor, adverse impacts on visual quality from dying vegetation and disturbance, but long-term impacts on visual quality would be beneficial. Since no major impacts on visual quality would occur as a result of the project, impacts on visual quality are not discussed further in this EA.

Human Health and Safety (Non-Key Issue)

All potential effects on worker and public safety under the action alternatives would be short-term, lasting, at most, a short period following completion of vegetation management activities. Thinning activities, road construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance, and several of the other proposed activities would require the use of heavy equipment. The use of heavy equipment and the movement of fallen timber present the highest potential for safety risks during these activities. Injuries to both workers and recreational users of the Forest could occur. Forest planning documents clearly require numerous safety precautions, as well as requirements for qualified personnel to conduct management actions. Equipment operators must demonstrate proficiency with the equipment and be licensed to operate it. In accordance with Forest Service Health and Safety Code Handbook (FSH 6709.11), vegetation management activities require all USFS workers to wear safety equipment, including hard hats, eye and ear protection, chaps, and fire retardant clothes. The USFS would stipulate these and other safety measures as part of the timber sale/services contract. In addition, since the project area is used for hunting, the USFS would stipulate in the contract that all workers wear orange vests, and not leave the project site without an orange vest being worn, in order to be visible to any nearby hunters. The USFS would make the contractor aware of the dates of the hunting season.

The USFS would notify the public of the proposed activities, locations of activities, and dangers at the sites prior to the onset of any activity. Notification would be made through newspaper releases, appropriate signage, and use of bulletin boards at information sites. The USFS would also post information on the project operations and times of project implementation on the Forest

website. Most of the general public is already aware of logging, burning, and other Forest operations.

The private contractor would be responsible for adhering to public safety protection measures during all vegetation management and service activities. These requirements may include, but are not limited to: removal of slash and debris from skid roads to facilitate public foot traffic; immediate repair of any damage to roads and ditches during activities; and use of appropriate devices, such as barricades, where necessary, to control entry to any open, dangerous site.

In addition to the use of heavy equipment and site safety risks, proposed herbicide use under Alternative 2 could potentially adversely affect worker health and safety, and to a lesser extent, public health and safety. As discussed above under the non-key issue *Herbicide Use*, a project-specific risk assessment to determine risks to humans, fish, and wildlife from herbicide use under Alternative 2 has been completed and is provided in Appendix E. This risk assessment determined that there would be only negligible adverse effects on human health and safety from the use of herbicides under this project. All applicable mitigation measures contained in the *Vegetation Management in the Coastal Plain/Piedmont Final EIS* (USFS, 1989a) would be followed. A complete discussion of the effects of herbicides is contained in this EIS, to which this document tiers. Current risk assessments for the above-listed herbicides may be found at: www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/pesticide/risk.htm.

The use of herbicides carries some risks to human health and safety, particularly to the applicator. This risk is reduced by requiring the applicator to be trained in safety precautions, proper use, and handling of herbicides. Other factors reducing the risk of herbicide use to human health and safety is the low level of active ingredient per acre and placement of notice signs in areas where herbicide has been applied. The signs include information about the herbicide used, when it was applied, and who to contact for additional information. Appendix C of this EA also contains a list of standard mitigation measures for herbicide use that would be followed during this project.

Since numerous measures to ensure worker and public safety would be in place during the proposed activities under all action alternatives, no significant adverse impacts on human health and safety would result from any of the alternatives. Any risks to workers or the public would be minor and short-term. Strict adherence to the safety measures described above and in Appendix C would minimize or eliminate adverse human health and safety effects.

Socioeconomics (Non-Key Issue)

Counties with National Forest land within their boundaries are paid 25 percent of the monies received from natural resources extraction and consumption, such as timber harvest, mining, and recreation (USFS, 2004b). County revenues from these 25 percent funds vary annually, depending on timber harvest, mining, and recreation use that year. If these payments by the USFS do not add up to at least \$1.75 per acre annually, then Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) are used to address the shortfall. PILT payments are payments to local governments/counties containing federally owned lands to compensate for non-taxed (Federal) property under the jurisdiction of those governments/counties.

Trends in the levels of the 25 percent funds and PILT payments in the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests over time are very important to individual counties, which depend on them as an important part of their tax base. In the last decade or more, as a result in the decline of timber harvest, there has been a downward trend in 25 percent funds. Jones County’s 25 percent fund payments declined from \$95,673 in 1986 to \$24,351 in 1997, a 75 percent decline (see **Table 1.6-3**). While PILT payments have risen dramatically, it has not been enough to make up for the lost revenue.

Table 1.6-3. 25 Percent Fund and PILT Payments to Jasper County from Oconee National Forest for Selected Years

Payment Type	1986	1990	1992	1995	1997	1999
25 % Fund Payments	\$95,673	\$83,302	\$79,645	\$6,573	\$24,351	NA
PILT payments	NA	\$1,648	NA	NA	\$10,071	\$7,067

The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (PL 106-393) gave counties options on how to contend with this funding shortfall that affected basic public facilities and services like roads and K-12 education. Counties could continue to receive 25 percent fund payments or elect to receive their share of the average of the three highest 25 percent payments during the period from 1986 through 1999 (USFS, 2004b). The latter is called the full payment option. Jones County has elected the full payment option (Ellis, 2003).

Under the action alternatives, thinning to benefit the RCW would occur within Compartments 5, 6 and 8. Sawtimber would be harvested in the estimated volumes shown in **Table 1.6-4** (for Alternatives 2 and 3).

Table 1.6-4. Estimated Volumes Proposed For Thinning From Selected Oconee National Forest Compartments and Predicted Range Of Revenues

Comp.	Sawtimber Volume (CCF)	Pole/Pulpwood Volume (CCF)	Predicted Range of Bids*	Hypothetical Range of 25 Percent Payments to County
5	4191	0	\$377,190 – \$461,010	\$94,297 - \$115,252
6	1131	0	\$101,790 - \$124,410	\$25,447 - \$31,102
8	1804	0	\$162,360 - \$198,440	\$40,590 - \$49,610
Totals	7126	0	\$641,340 - \$783,860	\$160,335 - \$195,965

* Assuming minimum bid prices of \$90 to \$110/CCF (hundred cubic feet) for pine sawtimber and \$5 to \$7/CCF for pine pulpwood and bidding that ranged from minimum bid price to 20 percent above minimum price, rounded to nearest \$1,000 (Walker, 2003).

** These are not annual payments, but spread out over the life of the project.

Given the likely range of 25 percent payments that would be made to Jones County during a multi-year timber sale under Alternatives 2 and 3, these would not exceed the payments now being made under the “full payment option” described above. In other words, the average of the three highest-year 25 percent payments from 1986 through 1999 is greater than the likely annual 25 percent payment that would be realized from the action alternatives. Therefore, none of the alternatives would have a fiscal impact on Jones County government’s budget, revenue, or expenditures.

Environmental Justice/Protection of Children (Non-Key Issue)

Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations*, requires that Federal agencies identify and address, as part of their action, any disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low-income populations. According to Executive Order 13045, *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*, directs Federal agencies to “identify and assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children” and to “ensure that [their] policies, programs, activities, and standards address disproportionate risks to children.”

The proposed project is located within the boundaries of a National Forest, and thus, would not cause any displacement of any residents, nor would it eliminate any employment opportunities. While there are private residences interspersed with public lands within the project area, the area is sparsely populated. Most of the residences are considered lower-middle income with a mixture of minority and non-minority families, which may include some children. However, there is not a disproportionate number of low-income, minority, or child populations within the project area. Therefore, none of the alternatives would have a disproportionate effect on these populations. All adverse effects resulting from the project would affect all persons within the project area, regardless of income, race, or age. In addition, none of the alternatives are expected to result in any major changes in the economic environment in or around the project area, result in long-term health or safety impacts.

2.0 ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

This section describes and compares the alternatives considered for the RCW habitat and canebrake restoration project. Three alternatives are examined in detail in this EA, and are described in Sections 2.1 through 2.4. In addition, one alternative was considered, but eliminated from further study. This alternative is described in Section 2.5, which also provides the rationale for its elimination. Section 2.6 lists mitigation measures, which would be implemented as part of the action to be taken. Section 2.7 presents the alternatives considered in comparative form, defining the differences in impacts resulting from each alternative.

Note on Reported Acreages – For the purposes of this assessment, all acreages for specific treatments, landscape analyses, etc. are calculated using GIS (Geographic Information System) based data sources. GIS based calculations of acreage and distances are made from an aerial perspective, and do not take into account topographic effects on area and length measurements. As a result, reported acreages in this document are considered to be approximate, and may vary slightly from acreages determined by ground-based methods.

2.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO ACTION (CURRENT MANAGEMENT)

Consideration of the No Action alternative is required by NEPA and CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA. Under Alternative 1, no vegetative thinning nor canebrake restoration would occur within the project area, and current management of Compartments 5, 6 and 8 would continue. Current management includes periodic prescribed burning, some level of noxious weed control, and other activities permitted in the Forest Plan. There would continue to be some efforts made for the protection and enhancement of the RCW, including monitoring, placement of inserts, and removal of predators and nest cavity competitors; however, no direct efforts to improve the quality and quantity of RCW foraging and nesting habitat would be made. This alternative would not meet the requirements of the ESA. In addition, other resource-related activities, including canebrake restoration and aggressive noxious weed treatment, would not occur under this alternative. The No Action alternative serves as a basis for comparison of the environmental impacts of the Proposed Action and its alternatives, and is a viable alternative.

2.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: RCW HABITAT AND CANEBRAKE RESTORATION (PROPOSED ACTION)

This alternative primarily consists of using vegetation manipulation by thinning and midstory control (via mechanical methods, herbicide use, and prescribed fire) to help restore habitat for

the RCW within Compartments 5, 6 and 8. Additionally, 5 areas along Caney Creek would be treated to restore canebrake. Specific activities that would occur under Alternative 2 are listed and described below. Maps of project activities, by compartment, under Alternative 2 are provided in Appendix G of this EA.

- Thin approximately 790 acres in Compartments 5, 6 and 8 to reduce stands to a 60 square-foot basal area (BA). Of the total acres to be thinned, the majority (576 acres) is mature pine saw timber, with smaller portions of immature pine saw timber (214 acres). **Table 2.2-1** shows a breakdown of the approximate number of acres proposed for thinning in each compartment. All vegetation management activities would be implemented in accordance with Forest Plan standards and *Georgia's Best Management Practices for Forestry* (GDNR et al., 1999).

Comp.	Stands	Total Comp. Acres*	No. Acres to be Thinned*	No. Acres For Each Stand Type*		
				Mature Pine Sawtimber	Immature Pine Sawtimber	Pine Pole Timber/ Precommercial
5	1-7, 9, 11, 50-54	680	504	504	0	0
6	1, 3, 7, 10-12, 17-23, 25-28, 31, 32, 58, 59	312	81	30	51	0
8	1, 3-6, 8-10, 12, 14, 15, 17-22, 26-29, 32, 33, 35-38, 63-65	441	205	42	163	0
TOTAL		1433	790	576	214	0

*Includes National Forest System lands only.

- Shelterwood harvest on approximately 93 acres of lightly stocked overmature stands previously impacted by SPB in Compartment 5 (stand 6); Compartment 6 (stand 10); Compartment 8 (stands 3, 5, and 7).
- Uneven-aged management on approximately 30 acres in Compartment 6 (stand 7). The Southern Research Station will incorporate this treatment into their long-term research program on the Hitchiti Experimental Forest.
- Conduct prescribed burning of approximately (1100 acres) over the next several years, including growing season burns within recruitment stands to control midstory vegetation.
- Develop thirty 10- to 20-acre RCW recruitment sites approximately ¼ to ½-mile apart (USFWS guidelines) on Compartment 5 (stands 1-7, 50, 52, 54, 55); Compartment 6 (stands 1, 3, 4, 6, 9-11, 15); Compartment 8 (1, 3-7, 10, 19); rehabilitate old recruitment sites on Compartment 5 (stand 50, 52, 53, 54), Compartment 6 (stand 9); and Compartment 8 (stand 12).
- Create 120 RCW artificial cavities/inserts (at least 4 cavities available for each RCW recruitment site) after thinning and prescribed burning, including boundary signage and tree marking.
- Use a combination of herbicides and mechanical methods to control unwanted vegetation on approximately 887 acres within RCW foraging and nesting areas (see **Table 2.2-2**). All hardwoods within the areas are not considered as unwanted vegetation. Hardwoods would

remain within riparian areas and on sites where determined to be the best species left in place. Fruit-bearing species would not be targeted for removal and hard mast bearing species (oaks and hickories) would be favored over other hardwood species. Unwanted vegetation also includes invasive species such as privet, kudzu, and wisteria. Treatments (herbicides, mechanical, prescribed fire) needed to control unwanted vegetation would be determined upon post-harvest evaluations. Herbicides would be applied manually (foliar spray or injection); no aerial application of herbicides would occur. When implemented, foliar spray applications would be applied to unwanted vegetation less than 5 feet in height. Felling with stump treatment applications or injection applications would be used to treat unwanted vegetation over 5 feet in height. Areas with older and/or dense growth of unwanted vegetation may have selective treatments with herbicides prior to prescribed fire applications to better manage the desired control. Some of these areas may also have post prescribed fire selective treatments with herbicides. Areas where prescribed fire controls most of the unwanted vegetation would only have selective spot treatments with herbicides. Some areas may have unwanted vegetation controlled by prescribed fire and the use of herbicides may not be necessary. Herbicide applications will be done with low pressure backpack sprayers and/or cut surface treatments (stump treatment or injection). Once post-harvest herbicide treatments are implemented, periodic prescribed fire is planned for all of the areas to maintain the control of the unwanted vegetation and reduction of ground fuels. Some areas may require periodic selective spot applications with herbicides along with periodic prescribed fire for control of unwanted vegetation. Refer to Section 1.6.2 and Appendix E for more information on herbicides. Noxious weed control would continue annually until the eradication of the targeted species is obtained (USFS, 2002a). During mechanical treatments, hand-controlled devices (such as chain saws) primarily would be used, with some exceptions where a machine could be used to grind the midstory. The areas planned to have post-harvest evaluation for vegetation control needs are listed in **Table 2.2-2**.

Table 2.2-2. Stands with the Potential for Herbicide Use under Alternative 2			
Compartment	Stands	Approx. Acres	RCW Habitat Type
5	1	58	Nesting
	2	60	Nesting
	3	40	Nesting
	4	84	Nesting
	5	19	Nesting
	6	61	Nesting
	7	53	Nesting
	9	21	Foraging
	11	9	Foraging
	50	31	Nesting
	51	10	Foraging
	52	17	Nesting
	53	9	Nest/Foraging
	54	57	Nesting
	55	6	Nesting
6	1	6	Nest/Foraging
	3	12	Nesting
	6	20	Nesting

	8	3	Foraging
	9	10	Nest/Foraging
	10	26	Nest/Foraging
	11	16	Nesting
	15	10	Nest/Foraging
8	1	26	Nest/Foraging
	3	11	Nesting
	4	32	Nest/Foraging
	5	19	Nesting
	6	21	Nesting
	7	16	Nest/Foraging
	8	34	Foraging
	10	29	Nesting
	11	19	Nesting
	13	6	Foraging
19	31	Nesting	
Total		887	

- Use and maintain the existing permanent road system. Annual maintenance, including blading, graveling/surface replacement, and mowing, and some pre-haul maintenance, including reshaping and ditch work for proper drainage, would occur on existing permanent roads in the project area prior to initiation of RCW habitat restoration activities (USFS, 2002a; 2003d).
- Construct approximately 1 mile of temporary road;
- Reopen and rehabilitate approximately 4.5 miles of temporary roads to access timber stands and utilize existing log landings within the project area where possible. These roads were used the last time timber was removed from the area (approximately 10 years ago), and reopening them would only involve minor disturbance. Understory vegetation would be cleared from the surfaces of these temporary roads, and gravel would be spread in dips, on slopes exceeding 10 percent, and at intersections with surfaced roads. **Table 2.2-3** presents a breakdown of the number of miles of existing and new temporary roads to be used in each compartment. In addition, this table presents the number and acreage of landings to be used in each compartment under Alternative 2.

Comp.	No. of Landings (Approx. Total Acres)	Miles of Existing Temp. Roads Reopened	Miles of New Temp. Road Construction
5	22 (6 acres)	2.2	.5
6	11 (3 acres)	0.8	.25
8	20 (5 acres)	1.5	.25
Total	53 (14 acres)	4.5	1.0

- Provide nesting structures for squirrels within the recruitment stands: 2 structures within each new RCW recruitment area (60 structures total). These structures would be placed on posts within RCW recruitment stands.

- Reforest approximately 139 acres of SPB damaged stands scattered throughout the project area with pine seedlings (includes the 93 acres of shelterwood harvest listed previously);
- Restore 15 acres of canebrake adjacent to Caney Creek in five separate patches by reducing the overstory through girdling to a BA of 40 square feet. The girdled trees will be left standing in place.

Upon completion of the proposed vegetation management activities, all of the temporary roads would be closed except for administrative use; permanent roads would continue to be maintained as permanent roads. The majority of these temporary roads would be seeded with wildlife mixtures and native grasses and allowed to revegetate. However, some would be permanently maintained as wildlife openings. In addition, roads that access a RCW insert or natural RCW tree would be seeded and maintained.

2.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: RCW HABITAT AND CANEBRAKE RESTORATION WITHOUT HERBICIDE USE

This alternative primarily consists of using vegetation manipulation by thinning and midstory control (via mechanical methods and prescribed fire only) to help restore habitat for the RCW within Compartments 5, 6 and 8. Specific activities that would occur under Alternative 3 would be the same as those listed under Alternative 2 above, with the exception that no herbicides would be used to control midstory vegetation or noxious weeds within project area. Hand-controlled devices (such as chain saws) would primarily be used, with some exceptions where a machine could be used to grind the midstory. Prescribed fire would be implemented along with the mechanical treatments, and would be conducted every three to five years, as needed, to eliminate midstory within RCW nesting and foraging areas. Likewise, the restoration of the canebrake would use mechanical methods to girdle the overstory trees reducing the BA to 40 in five locations along Caney Creek totaling 15 acres. Prescribed fire will be used on 7 to 10 year interval to control competing vegetation among the cane. Maps of project activities, by compartment, under Alternative 3 are provided in Appendix G of this EA.

2.4 ALTERNATIVES ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER STUDY

CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA require that Federal agencies explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action, and to briefly discuss the rationale for eliminating any alternatives that were not considered in detail. This section describes alternatives to the Proposed Action that were considered and eliminated from further study. The rationale for elimination is also given.

Improve Nesting Opportunities without Vegetation Management

An alternative of improving RCW nesting opportunities by drilling nest holes and placing inserts in the project area, but not conducting vegetation management activities (i.e., thinning), was considered. Under this alternative, although nesting opportunities would be increased, the future planned translocation of RCW would not occur. This alternative was dismissed from further consideration because it does not meet the purpose and need (as stated in Section 1.3 of this EA) of establishing overall favorable habitat for the RCW on the Forest and complying with the provisions of the ESA, the EIS and ROD for the *Management of the Red-cockaded Woodpecker and its Habitat on National Forests in the Southern Region*, the revised *Recovery Plan for the Red-cockaded Woodpecker*, and the direction established in the Revised Forest Plan. Without habitat management and restoration, the RCW would not migrate into the project area regardless of whether additional nesting opportunities were provided, and the RCW recovery objectives would not be met on the Oconee National Forest (Piedmont Recovery Unit). Therefore, this alternative was dismissed from further consideration.

2.5 MITIGATION MEASURES

During vegetation management activities, standard best management practices (BMPs) and Forest-wide standards and guidelines would be implemented as provided in the amended Forest Plan and *Georgia’s Best Management Practices for Forestry*. Implementation of these BMPs would control or reduce potential adverse impacts from soil erosion, surface water runoff, and sedimentation. In addition to these, other measures would minimize or avoid adverse impacts to environmental resources during the proposed activities. **Table 2.5-1** lists these other measures according to the resource area affected. Appendix C also lists standard mitigation measures for prescribed burning and herbicide use that would be implemented under the action alternatives.

Table 2.5-1. Recommended Mitigation Measures By Resource Area

Resource Area	Mitigation Measure
Water Quality and Aquatic Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The USFS would stipulate that the contractor avoid use of heavy equipment when soils are wet, such as after a storm event. If work on saturated soils is not preventable, the USFS would require the contractor to use low ground pressure equipment, logging mats, or other techniques. • Planning and approval of log landing and skid trail locations would ensure that they are located in stable, well-drained areas, away from gullies. Skidding and decking would be limited to designated and approved routes along ridgetops and gentle side slopes to protect sensitive soils (i.e., wet and micaceous soils). • The USFS would require the contractor to conduct all timber harvest and roadwork activities in accordance with <i>Georgia’s Best Management Practices for Forestry</i> and Forest Plan standards and guidelines. • Compacted soils on skid trails, temporary roads, and log landings would be tilled before seeding to increase water infiltration. • Drainage structures at existing stream crossings would be assessed to determine if maintenance, repair, or replacement is required to accommodate stream discharge and fish passage, and to protect water resources. • If wetlands within the project area are field-verified, thinning operations within the wetland boundaries would be minimized and performed to ensure

<p>Vegetation and Wildlife, Including PETS Species</p>	<p>that the function of the wetland is preserved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Log landing and skid trail locations would be reviewed and approved by the USFS prior to harvest to ensure they are appropriately planned to minimize soil impacts and damage to residual trees. • Compacted soils on skid trails, temporary roads, and log landings would be tilled before seeding to enhance revegetation. • No mechanical or herbicide treatment will be allowed during the RCW nesting season of April 4th through July 6th each year. • Certain log landings used for the project would be left open and maintained as wildlife openings over the long-term. These would include landings in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Compartment 5, Stands 1, 3, 4, 6, 7; ○ Compartment 6, Stands 7, 15, 16; ○ Compartment 8, Stands 2, 8, 12, 20; <p>Fruit trees would be planted along the edges of the above wildlife openings.</p>
--	--

2.6 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

Table 2.6-1 compares the potential environmental impacts resulting from the Proposed Action and its alternatives. Potential impacts are grouped according to key issue. Section 3.0 of this EA contains a detailed discussion of these potential impacts by key issue.

Key Issue	Measurements	Alternative 1: No Action (Current Management)	Alternative 2: RCW Habitat Restoration (Proposed Action)	Alternative 3: RCW Habitat Restoration Without Herbicide Use
Water Quality	Number of new road-stream crossings	0	0	0
	Miles of temporary road constructed and reconstructed/ reopened (and miles within riparian corridor)	0	1 mile new construction; ~4.5 miles reopened (0 miles within riparian corridor)	1 mile new construction; ~4.5 miles reopened (0 miles within riparian corridor)
	Number of log landings developed (and number within riparian corridor)	0	53 log landings (0 within riparian corridor)	53 log landings (0 within riparian corridor)
	Acreage of treatment stands within riparian corridor of perennial and intermittent streams and wetlands	0	53 acres within riparian corridor	53 acres within riparian corridor

<p>Vegetation and Wildlife, Including PETS Species</p>	<p>Changes in available habitat for management indicator species (MIS) and general wildlife in the project area</p>	<p><u>General:</u> --Continued loss of vegetation diversity and abundance in forest understory (decrease browse). --Long-term increase in mature, continuous canopy forest habitat and wildlife species. --No promotion of early successional habitat.</p> <p><u>MIS:</u> --Beneficial effect on pileated woodpecker and wood thrush and their habitats. --No noticeable effect on Acadian flycatcher, hooded warbler, field sparrow, prairie warbler, scarlet tanager, Swainson’s warbler, and white-tailed deer or their habitats. --Adverse effect on pine warbler and RCW and their habitats.</p>	<p><u>General:</u> --Increase in understory plant diversity and abundance (increased browse). --Increase in early successional habitat. --Increase in habitat diversity from a combination of thinning and prescribed burning.</p> <p><u>MIS:</u> --Beneficial effect on prairie warbler, pine warbler, RCW, and white-tailed deer and their habitats. --No noticeable effect on Acadian flycatcher, pileated woodpecker, hooded warbler, field sparrow or scarlet tanager or their habitats. Slight beneficial impact to Swainson’s warbler and its habitat through canebrake restoration. --Adverse effect (minor) on wood thrush habitat.</p>	<p><u>General:</u> --Increase in understory plant diversity and abundance (increased browse); greater increase than Alternative 2 over the short-term. --Increase in early successional habitat. --Increase in habitat diversity from a combination of thinning and prescribed burning.</p> <p><u>MIS:</u> --Beneficial effect on prairie warbler, pine warbler, RCW, and white-tailed deer and their habitats. -- No noticeable effect on Acadian flycatcher, pileated woodpecker, hooded warbler, field sparrow or scarlet tanager or their habitats. Slight beneficial impact to Swainson’s warbler and its habitat through canebrake restoration. --Adverse effect (minor) on wood thrush habitat.</p>
---	---	---	---	---

	Changes in forest health (changes in general forest conditions, SPB incidences, and noxious weeds)	--Tree growth and forest health would decline over time, and would stabilize at a lower level. --Increased potential for SPB attacks. --Noxious weeds would continue to take over portions of the project area, and would likely spread to adjacent areas.	--Tree growth and forest health would improve. --Decreased potential for SPB outbreaks to occur. --Decrease in spread of noxious weeds, benefiting natural vegetation.	--Tree growth and forest health would improve. --Decreased potential for SPB outbreaks to occur. --Decrease in spread of noxious weeds; however, mechanical treatments would be less effective at controlling noxious weeds, requiring several repeated treatments in order to eliminate these species.
	Effects on the RCW and available habitat for the species	--No promotion or creation of RCW habitat. --Alternative would not work toward recovery plan objectives or be in compliance with the Endangered Species Act.	--Long-term, beneficial impact on RCW populations and habitat. --About 3,500 acres of habitat would be improved for the RCW. --Alternative is in compliance with recovery plan objectives and with the ESA.	--Long-term, beneficial impact on RCW populations and habitat. --About 3,500 acres of habitat would be improved for the RCW. --Alternative is in compliance with recovery plan objectives and with the ESA.
	Effects on other PETS	No effects on any other PETS species.	No effects on any other PETS species.	No effects on any other PETS species.

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

This section has been organized according to environmental components, or resource areas. Each resource section contains information on the affected environment (existing conditions), direct and indirect environmental consequences of each alternative, and cumulative impacts.

The interdisciplinary study team (see Section 6.0, List of Preparers) first identified the specific activities, tasks, and subtasks involved in the Proposed Action and its alternatives. The full range of direct and indirect effects that could potentially occur as a result of the Proposed Action and its alternatives were then identified and analyzed. Direct effects are impacts caused by the alternative(s) at the same time and in the same location as the action. Indirect effects are impacts caused by the alternative(s) that occur later in time or farther in distance than the action.

A cumulative impact is an impact on the natural or human environment resulting from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of which agency, organization, or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor and insignificant, but collectively significant actions, taking place over a period of time. Cumulative impacts were assessed by combining the potential environmental impacts of the alternatives with the potential impacts of known projects that have occurred in the past, are currently occurring, or are projected to occur in the future within the region of the Proposed Action. Known past, current, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the project area are described below.

Historically, the land area managed by the USFS on the Oconee National Forest was primarily deciduous hardwood forest. Much of the land was subjected to severe erosion during the 1800s and early 1900s due to a lack of conservation practices during intensive agricultural use. This land was extensively cleared and farmed, and underwent cycles of land abandonment and re-clearing. As a result, millions of tons of soil were washed into the streams in the area, destroying water-related species. When the Federal government obtained the land in the 1930s, conservation practices, such as tree planting (pines), gully removal, soil restorations, gabion installation, and reintroduction of aquatic species, were implemented on the land. These conservation practices continue to occur, reducing additional sediment loads into streams. Currently, 72 percent of the Oconee National Forest is primarily covered in loblolly pine with some mixed hardwood (USFS, 2001; 2003c).

Forest cover and forest health on the Oconee National Forest have been and remain high concerns due to tree declines, non-native diseases, insect pests, and non-native plants. The SPB, a native insect, has been a recurrent challenge on an approximate 3- to 5-year cycle on the Forest. The most recent epidemic began in 1999 and continues today. This epidemic has resulted in severe pine tree mortality, and is threatening the RCW Sub-HMA (the proposed project area). In response to this epidemic, the USFS implemented cut-and-leave and salvage treatment programs on the Oconee National Forest (USFS, 2001). Cut-and-leave suppression

was conducted on various SPB spots during 2000. Most spots were less than 1 acre to a few acres in size. Many of those spots are located near these RCW cluster sites, and threatening cluster sites near the Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge. The intensity of the SPB is currently becoming evident in these areas. An outbreak of some degree could occur within the damage spots that were not treated in 2003. The majority of infested trees was pole-sized pine forest (diameters between 9 and 12 inches) under 40 years of age, which has not had a first thinning, but still provide foraging habitat. However, some trees (diameters greater than 12 inches) over 60 years old (which are suitable foraging and potential nest trees for RCW) have also been infested with SPB. These SPB infested areas are within or near cluster sites that are active, inactive, or may provide future recruitment sites (Caldwell, 2004).

Since 1991, the USFS has invested substantial time, money, and resources to aid in the recovery of the RCW within the Habitat and Sub-HMA on the Oconee National Forest. In fiscal year 2003, the Oconee Ranger District issued a Decision Memo regarding the use of prescribed burning within the HMAs and Sub-HMAs and Greene County to improve RCW habitat and other wildlife habitat. This decision involves burning approximately 18,300 acres over the next 2 years in these areas (USFS, 2003a).

3.1 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

3.1.1 Water Quality

Element: The Proposed Action and its alternatives may adversely affect water quality and aquatic species and habitats through increases in erosion, sedimentation, and nutrients to streams, as well as changes in riparian habitats.

Measurements:

- Number of new road-stream crossings
- Miles of temporary road constructed and reconstructed (and miles within riparian corridor)
- Number of log landings developed (and number within riparian corridor)
- Stands within riparian corridor of perennial and intermittent streams and wetlands

Bounds for Analysis:

- Spatial: The area potentially affected by the proposed activities includes project area streams, riparian areas, and wetlands. Stream effects could occur from locations within the project area to a short distance downstream of the project area.
- Temporal: Temporary effects include those effects lasting only during the actual treatments/activities. Short-term effects include those effects lasting up to a few years following cessation of activities. Long-term effects would be those effects that would last more than a few years, or those that would be permanent.

3.1.1.1 Affected Environment

Much of the land area managed by the USFS on the Oconee National Forest was subjected to severe erosion during the 1800s and early 1900s due to a lack of conservation practices during intensive agricultural use. This land was extensively cleared and farmed, and underwent cycles of land abandonment and re-clearing. As a result, millions of tons of soil were washed into the streams in the area, adversely impacting water resources. When the Federal government obtained the land in the 1930s, conservation practices, such as *Georgia's Best Management Practices (BMPs) for Forestry*, were implemented on the land. These conservation practices continue to occur, reducing additional sediment loads into streams (USFS, 2001).

There are no trout streams in the project area (GDNR et al., 1999). All surface waters within the project area drain into the Ocmulgee River. The proposed project area lies within a watershed management area (WMA). All of the project area (Compartments 5, 6 and 8) is in the Ocmulgee River-Rum Creek WMA. This WMA covers 17,637 acres, approximately 13 percent of which are USFS lands. The majority of this WMA (approximately 71 percent) is in forested land use; small portions are in urban (4 percent) and agricultural (2 percent) land uses. The Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge is also located within this WMA (USFS, 2004b). Three streams in this WMA run through the project area, Caney Creek, Falling Creek and Hurricane Creek.

Sediment in streams is natural, but human activities, such as road construction, agriculture, and off-road vehicle use, can accelerate sediment levels if certain mitigation measures are not followed. Healthy streams can handle some silt without negatively affecting fish or invertebrates. In general, the streams within the project area are healthy (USFS, 2001).

Wetlands

No wetlands were found in the project area according to USFWS's National Wetland Inventory.

Aquatic Species

Aquatic species known from the Oconee National Forest include redbreast sunfish (*Lepomis auritus*), yellow bullhead (*Ameiurus natalis*), snail bullhead (*Ameiurus burnneus*), creek chub (*Semotilus atromaculatus*), silver redhorse (*Moxostoma anisurum*), Christmas darter (*Etheostoma hopkinsi*), coastal shiner (*Notropis petersoni*), eels (*Anguilla rostrata*), and chain pickerel (*Esox niger*). As discussed above, sediment has accumulated in the project area streams from more than 100 years of extensive and destructive farming techniques prior to Federal ownership of the land. The aquatic species that now exist in the project area streams are a direct result of the existing sedimentation inherited at the time of becoming a National Forest. Sedimentation has the potential to limit reproduction of aquatic species and inhibit aquatic insect populations. The Forest Plan for the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests includes standards and guidelines, such as Georgia's BMPs for Forestry, designed to reduce or prevent sediment from entering streams and to maintain the hydrologic function of floodplains and wetlands.

Locally Rare Species

There are locally rare aquatic species known in the project area. Altamaha pocketbook (*Lampsilis dolabraeformis*) and Georgia elephantear (*Elliptio dariensis*) are on our Forest Locally Rare List (2004). The Georgia elephantear and Altamaha pocketbook were identified in the confluence of Falling Creek and the Ocmulgee River. These mussel species were evaluated and dropped from consideration due to their occurrence being outside the project area greater than 15 miles north of the areas to be thinned. Caney Creek flows into a section of Falling Creek which is approximately 15 miles southwest of the proposed areas to be thinned. Surveys revealed no mussels were identified within project areas to be thinned (John Alderman, August 2002).

The proposed action would have no direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to these species.

Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, and Sensitive (PETS) Species

Potentially affected aquatic PETS species were identified by (1) reviewing their general habitat preferences, (2) consulting records of known locations of PETS species prepared by the Georgia Natural Heritage Program (GNHP) historical records, (3) consultations with other agencies and universities, (4) reviewing data from PETS Risk Assessments for the Oconee National Forest, and (5) general observations. The following 2 aquatic species are within the range of the Oconee National Forest based on a review of the above sources.

<u>Common Name</u>	<u>Scientific Name</u>	<u>Status</u>
Altamaha Shiner (fish)	<i>Cyprinella xaenura</i>	Sensitive
Ocmulgee Shiner (fish)	<i>Cyprinella callisema</i>	Sensitive
Inflated Floater (mussel)	<i>Pygandon ibbosa</i>	Sensitive
Magarita Skimmer (insect)	<i>Macromia margarita</i>	Sensitive
Appalachian Snaketail	<i>Ophiogomphus incurvatus</i>	Sensitive

No listed Oconee National Forest PETS fish or mussel species were found within the project area during a 1998 survey. The Georgia Natural Heritage Database (August, 2004) was checked for the occurrence of Rare species information. The Georgia Heritage database listing of species for Jones county area for aquatic species showed the Altamaha Shiner, Ocmulgee shiner, and Goldstripe Darter. The Goldstripe darter is not listed on our Forest Locally Rare list nor TES list. None of the surveys have confirmed the presence of the Goldstripe Darter, therefore the proposed action should no effect the species. The inflated floater, a freshwater mussel, lives in soft mud and sand, and in sand bars generally found in slow-moving water. This Ocmulgee shiner is known to occur within the Ocmulgee and Altamaha River Drainage. The Inflated floater was not found during surveys in done in 2002 or 2003. It is unlikely that the project area would effect the species due to the absence habitat.

The Ocmulgee shiner and inflated floater are not listed as being present in the project area within Jones County (see Georgia Rare Species information for Jones County within project file). Surveys conducted by the Center for Aquatic Technology Transfer (CATT) identified Ocmulgee shiner within Caney Creek area located east of the project area. Altamaha shiners occur in the upper Altamaha River Drainage. Their preferred habitat is rocky and sandy pools of creeks and small rivers. This species was not detected during fish surveys done in 1995 (Caldwell, 2004).

Maps of the areas where Robust Redhorse has been discovered indicate this species is located south of Milledgeville, Georgia. However, reintroduction of the species into the Ocmulgee River was done in 2002. The Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge has ponds of Robust Redhorse being raised for release to reintroduce in rivers. It is likely that some fish may have washed into the tributaries of Caney Creek. However, no surveys have identified the Robust Redhorse in the Caney Creek area (per conversation with Jimmy Evans – GDNR Biologist August 2004). There should be no direct, indirect or cumulative effects to these aquatic species.

Insects that are listed on our sensitive list are the Margarita Skimmer and the Appalachian Snaketail. These species have not been identified on the Oconee National Forest (See the Biological Evaluation in Appendix D).

3.1.1.2 Environmental Consequences

The vegetation management and associated activities proposed for the project area can potentially have a variety of effects on water resources and aquatic species. These effects are generally described below by major activity, including vegetation management by commercial harvest and midstory control, road rehabilitation/construction and maintenance (including skid trails and landings), and canebrake restoration.

Alternative 1 (No Action: Current Management)

Under Alternative 1, none of the proposed vegetation management or other activities would occur. No additional adverse impacts on water resources would be anticipated under this alternative. In addition, since road maintenance activities would not occur, any drainage problems and subsequent sedimentation would continue, and would worsen with continued use of the roads. However, these impacts would be minor in intensity.

Aquatic Species

Under Alternative 1, no additional direct impacts on aquatic species, including PETS species, would occur. However, as discussed above, erosion from deteriorating road conditions would continue to occur, and could worsen over time, adversely impacting aquatic species in the area over the long-term. Effects on aquatic species from sedimentation are discussed in detail under Alternative 2 below. However, these adverse impacts under Alternative 1 would be minor in intensity.

Alternative 2 (Proposed Action: RCW Habitat and Canebrake Restoration)

Harvest and Midstory Control

The Oconee National Forest proposes to thin 790 acres, shelterwood harvest of 93 acres, and uneven-aged management on 30 acres of loblolly pine in Compartments 5, 6 and 8. Harvest activities would include tree removal, use of heavy equipment, reconstruction/use of log landings and skid trails, and road maintenance, reconstruction, and construction. Reforestation activities

would occur on 139 acres. In addition, midstory control would occur on approximately 887 acres by a combination of mechanical and chemical treatments. All of these activities cause soil disturbance, exposure, erosion, and compaction, which can degrade water resources by increasing water and pollutant runoff to streams.

Removal of vegetation through harvest, mechanical treatments, and herbicide use can degrade stream water quality by increasing sediment and nutrient runoff input to streams. Removal of vegetation can also affect the quantity of surface water runoff. Vegetation provides erosion control through water infiltration and uptake, reducing runoff to streams, and through soil stabilization. Vegetation removal as a result of harvest activities would reduce normal water infiltration and accelerate soil and nutrient loss through erosion within the project area over the short-term. Sediment and nutrient delivery to streams often increases significantly after timber harvest operations and is proportional to the area disturbed and maintained free of vegetation (Gucinski et al., 2001). As the density of the forest stand decreases, intercepted rainfall decreases, increasing the amount of surface water runoff from the area (Schultz, 1997). This impact would be greatest in stands with the highest basal areas (BA), due to the greater amount of trees that need to be removed to achieve the desired BA. Increased surface water runoff can increase stream flow and storm flow, which can lead to stream channel scouring, stream bank erosion, increased sedimentation and nutrients, and flooding (Fulton and West, 2002; USEPA, 2001; Miller, 1987).

Nutrients, including nitrogen and phosphorus, can enter waterbodies attached to sediment, dissolved in water runoff, or through the air (USEPA, 2001). Nutrient losses tend to increase proportionately with sediment losses (Schultz, 1997). Increased nutrient runoff to streams can have either adverse effects (Lemly, 2000) or potentially beneficial effects, depending on the level of nutrient runoff, and the current nutrient content of the streams (Tank and Webster, 1998). Many aquatic systems are nutrient poor, and therefore, small increases in nutrients can improve their productivity (USFS, 1989a).

Of particular concern are treatment areas encroaching on riparian areas and wetlands, where removal of vegetation can have the greatest impact. In accordance with the revised Forest Plan (2004), riparian corridors have been established on the Oconee National Forest, within which management practices are designed to maintain and protect riparian functions and values. Riparian corridor widths for the Oconee National Forest are presented in **Table 3.1-1**.

Table 3.1-1. Riparian Corridor Widths By Slope Class and Stream Type for the Oconee National Forest		
Slope Class	Minimum Width (feet) of Corridor on Each Side	
	Perennial Streams and Wetlands	Intermittent Streams
0 – 30%	100	50
31 - 45%	125	75
45%+	150	100

Source: USFS, 2004a

Implementation of forested riparian areas provide a buffer to streams and wetlands, protecting water quality by retaining and filtering pollutants in runoff before the runoff reaches the stream

channel or wetland. Within the project area, the majority of the riparian areas and wetlands are forested, and all have slopes between 0 and 30 percent.

Using the above riparian corridor widths, the study team identified the number of stands proposed for harvest under Alternative 2 that are within 100 feet of a perennial stream or wetland or within 50 feet of an intermittent stream. **Table 3.1-2** lists these stands, by compartment, as well as the acreage of these stands in riparian corridors.

Table 3.1-2. Stands Proposed for Thinning within Riparian Corridors under Alternative 2		
Comp.	Stands with Portions in Riparian Corridors	Approx. Acres in Riparian Corridor by Compartment
5	4, 8, 9	25
6	2, 7, 9, 11	9
8	14, 15	19
Approx. Total Acreage within Riparian Corridors		53 acres

Adverse impacts on water resources from potential increases in water runoff, sediment, and nutrient yields as a result of the proposed vegetation management activities would be minimized through implementation of *Georgia's Best Management Practices (BMPs) for Forestry* (GDNR et al., 1999) and Forest Plan standards and guidelines, which require measures/activity restrictions to be taken to minimize impacts within riparian corridors for the protection of water quality. In accordance with these guidelines, timber harvesting techniques that minimize soil disturbance, such as backing trees out with a machine and using low ground pressure equipment, logging mats, and equipment with booms or cable winches, would be used within riparian corridors. All streambank vegetation would be left uncut, and groundcover within the riparian corridors would be retained. Within the riparian corridor along perennial streams, Georgia BMPs require an average of 50 square feet of BA per acre to be left evenly distributed (or at least 50 percent canopy cover) after a harvest. Within the corridor along intermittent streams, an average of 25 square feet of BA per acre (or at least 25 percent of the canopy cover) must be left evenly distributed. Within 25 feet on either side of ephemeral streams, a minimum of 20 square feet per acre of basal area of canopy or midstory trees are required to be left in place following timber harvest activities. In addition, no handling, mixing, or storing of toxic or hazardous materials (fuels, lubricants, pesticides, fertilizers) is permitted within the riparian corridors (GDNR et al., 1999).

Although some of the proposed harvest and midstory control operations may occur within riparian zones in the project area, any harvesting within these areas would be performed in a manner that ensures the continued function of the riparian zone. Implementation of the above

guidelines during timber harvest would reduce increases in surface water runoff entering streams as a result of vegetation removal and soil compaction, thereby reducing impacts on stream flow and channel erosion; avoid or greatly minimize any impacts on water temperature through prohibition of tree removal near streams and other water bodies; reduce channel erosion by increasing stream bank stability; and reduce the amount of nutrients and sediment entering streams, thereby protecting water quality. No wetland areas (as identified by the NWI) are found within areas proposed for thinning treatments. If wetlands are found, thinning operations within the wetland boundaries would be restricted to ensure that the function of the wetland is preserved.

Overall, surface water runoff, erosion, and sedimentation impacts from vegetation removal through thinning and midstory control would be short-term, lasting only until understory vegetation in thinned areas begins to grow. Thinning would allow more sunlight to reach the forest floor, which would encourage and increase the amount and growth rate of understory plants. This understory vegetation would increase rainfall infiltration, reducing surface water runoff and soil erosion in the area, and thus reducing adverse impacts on water quality.

Road Rehabilitation/Construction and Maintenance (including Log Landings/Skid Trails)

Some permanent road maintenance and temporary road construction and reconstruction/reopening would be necessary for conducting the proposed thinning activities under Alternative 2. Less than 1 mile of new temporary roads would be constructed, and approximately 4.5 miles of temporary roads would be reopened under Alternative 2 to conduct the proposed thinning activities. The mileage breakdown for each compartment is provided in **Table 2.2-3** in Section 2.2 of this EA. The existing temporary roads to be reopened were last used approximately 10 years ago; reopening the roads would involve removing vegetation from the road surface and graveling the surface in areas of dips greater than 10 percent slopes and intersections with surfaced roads. Reopening these roads would involve minor to moderate ground disturbance, including compaction from heavy vehicle use, and vegetation removal for a 12- to 15-foot wide clearing. Road erosion is normally greatest during and immediately following the construction phase, after which soil erosion and sedimentation effects decrease exponentially (Grace et al., 1997). Where possible, the approximately 53 existing log landings would be utilized within the project area for timber harvesting.

Road construction, reconstruction, and use can adversely affect water quality through removal of vegetation and litter cover, which act to stabilize soils, decrease surface water runoff and trap sediment and nutrients; compaction, exposure, and disturbance of soils, leading to erosion and sedimentation to streams; and increased chemical contamination as a result of spills. Road construction, reconstruction, and use are reported to be the primary source of erosion and sediment resulting from timber harvest activities (England, 1987; Fulton and West, 2002; Seehorn, 1987; Gucinski et al., 2001; Williams et al., 1999). As much as 90 percent of sediment entering streams resulting from timber harvest can be linked to the roads, log landings, and other components of the transportation system (Seehorn, 1987). Sedimentation impacts from temporary road construction and use for timber harvest activities are typically short-lived, occurring at the highest levels during and for a few years after road construction or reopening.

Impacts decrease in intensity as the road surface and cut-fill slopes stabilize, and roads begin to revegetate (Fulton and West, 2002; Gucinski et al., 2001).

Road construction can also affect the hydrology of the area, resulting in changes in water yields and stream morphology. These changes in hydrology affect the amount of time required for rainfall to enter stream channels, thereby altering the timing of peak flows, and can cause changes in stream channel morphology (Gucinski et al., 2001; Miller, 1987). Skid trails, log landings, and roads can also alter natural drainage patterns and impair water quality by intercepting, diverting, and concentrating surface runoff to streams increasing flow velocities and sediment and nutrient delivery (Gucinski et al., 2001).

The majority of adverse impacts on water resources and water quality resulting from the road system and associated log landings are directly related to the length/size, placement, and conditions of the roads and landings. Road and log landing construction adjacent to stream channels poses the highest risk for adverse impacts. Under Alternative 2, no new road-stream crossings would be constructed and all temporary roads proposed for construction or reopening/reconstruction would be located outside of the riparian corridors presented in **Table 3.1-1** above. In addition, all existing log landings are located outside these riparian corridors. Effects on water resources from potential increases in water runoff, sediment, and nutrient yields from roadwork under Alternative 2 would be minimized with the use of mitigation measures designed to reduce erosion and sediment. The use of and adherence to *Georgia's BMPs for Forestry* (GDNR et al., 1999) and Forest Plan standards and guidelines would ensure compliance with the Clean Water Act.

For temporary roads and log landings, increased erosion would be primarily limited to the period of use of the roads and landings, as erosion levels would rapidly decline to baseline levels following the closure and reseeded of temporary roads and landings. Upon completion of thinning activities, skid trails, log landings, and temporary roads unplanned for management activities would be closed by water bars and seeded with native grasses to stabilize and rehabilitate exposed soils. Compacted soils on skid trails and log landings would be tilled before seeding to increase water infiltration. Groundcover vegetation should regenerate rapidly from greater light penetration to the forest floor, stabilizing soils and reducing erosion and water runoff. In addition, all retired access roads would be inspected periodically by the USFS to assure effective stabilization. Therefore, temporary roads, log landings, and skid trails would not contribute to sedimentation over the long-term.

Of the existing 53 log landings proposed for use under Alternative 2, 12 would be maintained permanently as wildlife openings. These openings would not contribute to sedimentation to streams over the long-term, since native grasses and shrubs would be established and maintained in each opening, providing adequate runoff control over the long-term.

In addition to temporary road construction and reopening, several miles of existing permanent roads within and adjacent to the project area would need to undergo maintenance for the proposed harvest activities. This maintenance work would include blading and graveling, and potentially reshaping and ditch work for proper drainage. These activities would improve road conditions and drainage structures, thereby reducing potential sediment and water yields,

sediment and water yield from these roads during timber harvest activities would still be higher than baseline conditions.

In addition, annual maintenance on permanent roads would be performed under Alternative 2. Annual maintenance would include activities like reshaping and repairing the road surface, graveling, and drainage repairs and/or improvements. All of these activities would have long-term, minor, beneficial impacts on water quality through reducing runoff, soil erosion, and sedimentation.

Canebrake Restoration

There are opportunities along Caney Creek to restore canebrake and are proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3. Successful restoration of canebrake normally requires existing canebrake and the removal of overstory trees that are blocking the sunlight. Five areas along Caney Creek have been identified as restoration sites. In these five areas a portion of the overstory trees will be killed by herbicide in Alternative 2 to allow for the expansion of the canebrake. This activity will take place in the riparian zone along the creek within 100 feet of the creek, and, in places up to 200 feet from the creek. There will not be any earth disturbing activity that would cause sedimentation. Machinery will not be needed in this action. Treated trees will be left standing to further decrease the possibility of soil disturbance. It is possible that herbicides could accidentally enter Caney Creek and affect water quality. The herbicides applied to kill the overstory trees will be directly injected to the tree. Spray or broadcast application will not be used which limits the possibility of herbicides entering the stream. Only herbicides labeled for use near water will be used. These actions should minimize the possibility of polluting Caney Creek. Figure 3.3-1 displays the locations of the restoration work along Caney Creek for Alternatives 2 and 3.




Figure 3.3-1 Canebrake Restoration Areas

Aquatic Species

Aquatic organisms depend on numerous physical stream characteristics for survival, including temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, light, nutrients, sediment particle size, and flow. Impacts on aquatic species and habitats resulting from vegetation management activities are indirect, and occur as a result of impacts on water quality and quantity, as well as changes in surrounding habitat. The potential for water quality impacts resulting from vegetation

management increases with an increase in the severity of site disturbance, as discussed above. Many of these effects can be greatly reduced through the use of BMPs.

Harvest and Midstory Control

As discussed above, harvest and midstory control activities have the potential to affect the water quality of streams and indirectly affect aquatic organisms and habitat in those streams within and adjacent to the project area through the clearing of vegetation, soil disturbance, and compaction associated with the use of heavy equipment. Increased surface water runoff from compaction and vegetation removal can increase stream flow and storm flow, which can lead to stream channel scouring, stream bank erosion, increased sedimentation and nutrients, and flooding, all of which can impact aquatic organisms (Fulton and West, 2002; USEPA, 2001; Miller, 1987).

Runoff contains suspended sediments and cat ion nutrients, and the amount of sediment and nutrients in runoff increases as the amount of overstory in the area decreases (Schultz, 1997). Increased sediment loads could potentially reduce water quality and may adversely affect fish or spawning areas. Sedimentation to streams increases turbidity and suspended solids in the water, which could block sunlight, impair photosynthesis by algae and aquatic plants, reduce oxygen replenishment, and harm fish respiratory systems. Once deposited on stream bottoms, sediment can adversely affect spawning areas, bury or smother eggs and fry, prevent larvae emergence, and fill in pools that are essential as fish cover (USFS, 1989a; USEPA, 2001; Seehorn, 1987; Gucinski et al., 2001).

Nutrient losses tend to increase proportionately with sediment losses (Schultz, 1997). Increased nutrient runoff to streams can have either adverse effects (Lemly, 2000) or potentially beneficial effects, depending on the level of nutrient runoff, and the current nutrient content of the streams (Tank and Webster, 1998). Many aquatic systems are nutrient poor, and therefore, small increases in nutrients can improve their productivity (USFS, 1989a). Nutrient runoff may adversely affect fish species through the proliferation of algae or other microorganisms (algal blooms) (Lemly, 2000; USEPA, 2001), which can increase biological oxygen demand, and therefore, decrease levels of dissolved oxygen in waterbodies (USEPA, 2001).

However, harvest and midstory control under Alternative 2 would only remove a portion of the trees from the project area; there would still be many trees remaining. Loblolly pine stands are well-suited for promoting site stability and minimizing surface water runoff and soil erosion. Loblolly pines control erosion through shedding needles that resist surface water movement on the forest floor (Schultz, 1997), thereby reducing sediment and nutrient delivery to nearby streams, which might otherwise be harmful to aquatic communities. In addition, residual cover requirements in riparian zones reduces the potential for changes in water temperature due to reduced stream bank shading.

Surface water runoff and erosion, and subsequent impacts on aquatic species, from thinning and midstory control would be highest immediately following tree removal. As discussed above, these impacts would be short-term, lasting only until understory vegetation in thinned areas begins to grow, and would be minor with implementation of *Georgia's BMPs for Forestry* and Forest Plan standards and guidelines. Understory vegetation would increase rainfall infiltration,

reducing surface water runoff and soil erosion in the area, and thus reducing adverse impacts on water quality and aquatic organisms. No significant adverse impacts on aquatic species or their habitat are expected to result from the proposed thinning, reforestation and midstory control activities under Alternative 2.

Road Rehabilitation/Construction and Maintenance (including Log Landings/Skid Trails)

As discussed above, some road maintenance and temporary road construction and reopening would be necessary for conducting the proposed activities. The vast majority of adverse impacts from roads on aquatic species result from direct effects on their habitat, including changes in water quality, water temperature, and hydrology (Gucinski et al., 2001). Road construction adjacent to stream channels poses the highest risk for adverse impacts on aquatic organisms. However, under Alternative 2, no new temporary roads would be constructed or reopened within the established riparian corridors.

Under Alternative 2, adverse effects on aquatic species and habitats would be minimized through proper planning and subsequent rehabilitation of skid trails, log landings, and roads, and by following Georgia BMPs, as discussed above directly under water quality. Sedimentation impacts from temporary road construction and use for thinning activities would be short-lived, occurring at the highest levels during and for a few years after road construction. Impacts would decrease in intensity as the road surface and cut-fill slopes stabilize, and roads begin to revegetate (Fulton and West, 2002; Gucinski et al., 2001). Therefore, only minor, short-term, adverse effects on aquatic species are expected to occur from temporary road rehabilitation or construction under Alternative 2.

Canebrake Restoration

Under Alternative 2 the overstory would be reduced to BA of 40 on 15 acres. This action would slightly increase the stream temperature near the areas of the treatment and allow more light to reach the stream course. The effects would be local in proximity to the restoration sites and would result in minimal change downstream. The girdling of trees for canebrake restoration in Alternative 2 would exclude trees on the stream bank. The only slight effect that might occur is girdling of trees with a large crown that extends over the stream but the base of the tree is a fair distance from stream bank. In this case there could be some local temperature elevations but the stream temperatures should quickly recover downstream once shading reoccurs. These actions would not be expected to elevate the stream temperature significantly.

Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, and Sensitive (PETS) Species

Implementation of Alternative 2 would not directly impact the Ocmulgee shiner, Altamaha Shiner, or the Robust Redhorse due to the location of the project area. The nearest project area location (C-5) is located almost 2 miles east of the Ocmulgee River and does have tributaries would eventually flow into the Ocmulgee River. The Proposed Action to implement vegetation management by thinning the project areas will not impact the sensitive aquatic species listed on the Oconee National Forest. Currently, a recovery plan is being developed to help make sure the Robust Redhorse is not listed as endangered. The Robust Redhorse Conservation Committee

(RRCC) and GDNR Recovery Team meet annually to discuss the locations and progress of the studies of reintroduction and management objectives (Caldwell, 2004).

Alternative 3 (RCW Habitat and Canebrake Restoration Without Herbicide Use)

Impacts on water resources and aquatic species under Alternative 3 would be similar to those resulting from Alternative 2. Refer to Alternative 2 above for a discussion of these impacts. The primary difference in impacts under Alternative 3 would be that mechanical treatments used to control all midstory vegetation and noxious weeds within project area stands would be less likely to kill targeted vegetation than a combination of herbicides and mechanical treatments proposed under Alternative 2. The result would be a very slightly lesser amount of runoff and subsequent sedimentation and nutrient loading from the project area over the short-term under Alternative 3. This difference would be barely detectible. The effects of canebrake restoration activities on Caney Creek would be similar to Alternative 2. In Alternative 3 the overstory trees will be killed by using a chainsaw or other mechanical device to girdle the trees. These trees will not be removed or completely cut down. Thus, there will be no soil disturbing activities and no potential to increase sedimentation by this activity.

3.1.1.3 Cumulative Impacts

Although Alternative 1 would not result in any direct, adverse impacts on water resources or aquatic species, the beneficial effects from gully restoration and road maintenance activities would not occur under this alternative. This alternative would not work toward improving water quality or aquatic habitat on the Forest. However, since other Forest activities are aimed at erosion and sediment control and improving degraded water quality, Alternative 1 would not contribute to significant, adverse, cumulative impacts on water resources or aquatic species.

Although some SPB suppression activities have been conducted on National Forest lands within the project area within the past few years, little timber harvesting has occurred on these lands over the last decade or so. However, prescribed fire has been conducted on lands in the project area. Prescribed fire can lead to short-term increases in soil erosion, runoff, and sedimentation due to a loss of understory vegetation, which can adversely affect water quality and aquatic species. Cumulative impacts on water resources and aquatic species from prescribed burning, however, are considered minimal, as understory vegetation quickly reestablishes in burned areas to stabilize soils and reduce sediment (USDA, 1989a).

Impacts on water resources and aquatic species from timber harvests are normally recovered before a new cycle of harvesting begins, and as a result, cumulative impacts from successive harvesting operations would be expected to be minimal for the majority of harvested areas. In those areas that produce a significant amount of grasses and legumes following harvest operations, increased water infiltration and reduced runoff and sedimentation would be anticipated. Resultant soil stabilization can provide long-term benefits to water resources. Areas that are repeatedly used for logging decks and skid trails in stands that have frequent entries have the potential to suffer more continuous periods of increased water runoff, and subsequent erosion and sedimentation impacts. Although rehabilitation of these sites decreases the duration of these

adverse water quality impacts and lessens the potential for cumulative degradation of water resources, the reopening and use of these areas during successive harvest operations generally results in increased sediment and decreased water quality and aquatic species habitat in the vicinity of these sites.

Agricultural and timber harvest activities on private lands are expected to contribute to both short-term and long-term adverse impacts on water resources and aquatic species and would interact cumulatively with the proposed activities under Alternatives 2, and 3. However, overall cumulative impacts from these activities on private lands are expected to be minimal, since the majority of the project area is forested and would remain in forested land use, which contributes comparatively little sediment relative to private uses.

3.2 BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT

3.2.1 Vegetation and Wildlife, Including Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, and Sensitive (PETS) Species

Element: The Proposed Action and its alternatives could change vegetative composition and structure within the project area, subsequently affecting the availability of habitat for wildlife species, including the RCW, other PETS species, and management indicator species (MIS) within the project area.

Measurements:

- Changes in available habitat for MIS and general wildlife within the project area
- Changes in forest health (changes in general forest conditions, SPB incidences, and noxious weeds)
- Effects on the RCW and available habitat for the species
- Effects on other PETS species

Bounds for Analysis:

- Spatial: The area potentially affected by the proposed activities includes habitat within and immediately adjacent to the project area streams. Effects could occur from stands within the project area to a short distance around, but outside of, the project area.
- Temporal: Temporary effects include those effects lasting only during the actual treatments/activities. Short-term effects include those effects lasting up to a few years following cessation of activities. Long-term effects would be those effects that would last more than a few years, or those that would be permanent.

3.2.1.1 Affected Environment

Biological diversity (biodiversity) refers to the variety of life in an area, including the variety of genes, species, communities, ecosystems, and processes through which individual organisms interact with one another in their environment. Although the different aspects of biodiversity can

be subdivided as finely as desired, the most significant parts are community diversity, species diversity, successional diversity, and interaction among elements (USFS, 2001).

The vast majority of Compartments 5, 6 and 8 are forested, with a mosaic of evergreen, deciduous, and mixed (hardwood-pine and pine-hardwood) forest communities. These compartments are primarily in evergreen forest cover with a few stands of hardwood and mixed pine-hardwood. There is limited private lands intermingled with public lands in the area. These private lands include pastures, private woodlots, industrial forested land, homes, and some small farm acreage.

Within these compartments, the project area is dominated by loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*), with a mixture of hardwood species, including cherry (*Prunus* spp.), dogwood (*Cornus* spp.), elm (*Ulmus* spp.), hickory (*Carya* spp.), oak (*Quercus* spp.), persimmon (*Diospyros virginiana*), sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*), red maple (*Acer rubrum*), redbud (*Cercis canadensis*), and yellow poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera*). The dominant understory species include blackberry (*Rubus* spp.), greenbriar (*Smilax rotundifolia*), Harbison's hawthorn (*Crataegus harbisonii*), honeysuckle (*Lonicera* spp.), muscadine (*Vitis rotundifolia*), and Virginia creeper (*Parthenocissus quinquefolia*) along with many other forbs and grasses (USFS, 2001).

Successional diversity refers to the plant and animal communities that inhabit or utilize habitats of different successional stages. Early successional habitats contain dense cover, high fruit and browse production, and complex ground-level structure necessary for many bird species. Late-successional stages produce abundant dens and hard mast and complex structure that improve as the forest matures. All successional stages are necessary to maintain diversity.

Of the forest stands proposed for harvest under Alternative 2, approximately 73 percent are mature loblolly pine sawtimber and 27 percent are immature loblolly pine sawtimber. **Table 2.2-1** in Chapter 2 of this EA provides a breakdown of stand classes by compartment. Mature pine sawtimber includes age classes 61 to 80 years, immature pine sawtimber includes 41 to 60 year old stands, and pole timber includes stands that are 21 to 40 years old. Habitats of other age classes, including early successional stages (0 to 20 years old), are also interspersed on private and public lands within and around the project area. This includes recently harvested areas, planted or grassed wildlife openings, and areas with young pines and hardwoods, which are approximately from 5 to 10 feet tall, interspersed with herbaceous plants, woody vines, and briars.

The majority of the forested stands within the project area currently have high basal areas and a closed canopy. However, since the late 1990s, part of the canopy has opened up throughout the Oconee National Forest as a result of SPB infestations and subsequent pine mortality. Groups of tall, infested pines varying in size from one to more than 25 acres eventually give way to an emerging deciduous and evergreen overstory (USFS, 2004b). Within the project area, the USFS has implemented cut-and-leave and salvage programs to suppress infestations. In 2000, cut-and-leave suppression was conducted on various SPB spots within the project area. Most spots resulted in canopy openings of less than 1 acre to a few acres. In addition, the USFS has conducted prescribed burning within the project area since the early 1980s, generally burning patches within each compartment every few years to open up the understory.

Management Indicator Species

The Oconee National Forest hosts approximately 350 species of wildlife and fish and 1,500 species of plants (USFS, 2001). This great number of species makes it difficult to manage for every species on every acre of the Forest. Therefore, the USFS has identified 15 MIS for the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests to represent the many different ecological communities and associated successional stages and species within the Forest. The primary objective with every project is to ensure that viability of any species present is not adversely affected. National Forests use MIS as a tool for identifying specialized habitats and creating habitat objectives and standards and guidelines. The idea behind the MIS concept is to identify a few species that are representative of many other species, and to evaluate management direction by the effects of management on MIS habitats. Both population and habitat data are used to monitor MIS on National Forests. Trends in MIS populations are normally assessed relative to trends in their respective habitat.

Of the 15 terrestrial MIS, 4 do not occur on the Oconee National Forest (or, in the case of birds, may occur, but do not breed on the Forest). These MIS include the black bear (*Ursus americanus*), smooth coneflower (*Echinacea laevigata*), chestnut-sided warbler (*Dendroica pensylvanica*), and ovenbird (*Seiurus aurocapillus*), (USFS, 2004b).

The following is a description of the 11 terrestrial MIS that do occur on the Oconee National Forest and the condition of their existing habitat. These MIS species are indicative of the major forest types in the project area and respond to changes in community diversity, successional diversity, and plant species diversity.

Acadian Flycatcher (Empidonax virescens)

The habitat for the Acadian flycatcher consists of deciduous forests near streams with a moderate understory. This bird typically constructs its nest in branches directly overhanging streams. It requires a high dense canopy with an open understory (USFS, 2003b; NatureServe Explorer, 2002). Acadian flycatcher habitat is currently fairly good, with riparian areas common across the forest and in generally good condition (USFS, 2001; 2003b). Population levels have been relatively stable for this species on the Forest, with surveys showing an increasing trend in abundance Statewide during the past 35 years. The quality and integrity of riparian habitat on the Forest is expected to remain constant over time (USFS, 2003b).

Pileated Woodpecker (Dryocopus pileatus)

The pileated woodpecker is associated with mature (60+ years) and extensive hardwood and hardwood-pine forest. Deciduous forests are preferred over coniferous forests. The species is found in deep woods, swamps, river bottom forests, and open, upland forest of mixed types. The species bird forages and nests on and in dead trees (snags), with some foraging also occurring on fallen logs and other forest debris (USFS, 2001; 2003b). It prefers woods with a tall, closed canopy and a high basal area (NatureServe Explorer, 2002).

Bird survey data indicate that pileated woodpecker populations have remained relatively stable both on the Forest and throughout the State over the past 10 years. In addition, habitat for the species has been relatively stable over the past 15 years, and is expected to remain stable or increase in the future (USFS, 2003b).

Hooded Warbler (*Wilsonia citrina*)

Hooded warblers are primarily found in mature (although young forests can also be used), mesic deciduous forests with a dense understory and midstory structure. The species nests in the understory of deciduous forests, especially along streams and ravine edges, as well as thickets in riverine forests. A dense shrub layer and scant ground cover are important to the species (NatureServe Explorer, 2002).

Field Sparrow (*Spizella pusilla*)

The field sparrow prefers old fields, brushy hillsides, overgrown and weedy pastures, thorn scrub, deciduous forest edge, untilled and idle cropland, brushy woodlands, sparse second growth, hedgerows, and fencerows. The species nests on or near ground in weed clumps or grass tufts. Woody vegetation and dense grass appear to be critical components for habitat suitability. Optimal habitat includes dense, moderately tall grass, and low to moderate shrub density (NatureServe Explorer, 2002).

Prairie Warbler (*Dendroica discolor*)

The prairie warbler is an early-successional species that is found in areas with shrubby vegetation, including brushy second growth, dry scrub, low pine-juniper, mangroves, pine barrens, burned-over areas, sproutlands, abandoned fields, powerline corridors, and revegetating strip-mined areas. Breeding habitats for the species are typically suitable beginning about 5 years after burning or clearing, and continuing for about 10 to 20 years. The species typically nests in a shrub, sapling, thicket, or fern clump (NatureServe Explorer, 2002).

Wood Thrush (*Hylocichla mustelina*)

The wood thrush is a forest interior species typically found in mature deciduous or mixed forests with a dense tree canopy and a fairly well-developed deciduous understory. Bottomlands and other rich hardwood forests are optimal habitats. The species is also found in pine forests with a deciduous understory (NatureServe Explorer, 2002).

Scarlet Tanager (*Piranga olivacea*)

The scarlet tanager is an MIS for the upland oak community, and is not very common on the Oconee National Forest (USFS, 2004b). The species is found in deciduous forests and mature deciduous woodlands, including deciduous and mixed swamp and floodplain forests and rich moist upland forests, preferring oak trees. The species nests most commonly in areas with a relatively closed canopy, dense understory with a high diversity of shrubs, and scanty ground

cover. The species also sometimes nests in wooded parks and orchards (NatureServe Explorer, 2002).

Swainson's Warbler (*Limnothlypis swainsonii*)

Swainson's warbler is found in early-successional riparian habitats in the Piedmont, and is strongly associated with canebrakes, tangles, and thick shrubby understories of open bottomland hardwoods and mixed forests. The species is found in rich, damp, deciduous floodplain and swamp forests, requiring areas with deep shade from both canopy and understory cover. The species nests in understory canes, shrubs, vine tangles, and similar sites, typically within about 200 meters of open water (NatureServe Explorer, 2002).

Pine Warbler (*Dendroica pinus*)

The pine warbler is associated with pine and pine-oak forests, generally occurring only where some pine component is present. The highest numbers of the species occur where pure stands of pine are found; the species is less abundant as the proportion of hardwood tree species increases. Optimal nesting habitat for the species is provided by pure, dense, mature pine stands that lack a tall understory (NatureServe Explorer, 2002).

Red-cockaded Woodpecker (*Picoides borealis*)

The red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW), a federally listed endangered species, currently occupies habitat on the south end of the Oconee National Forest in the project area and in the Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge. According to the revised RCW Recovery Plan, the Oconee National Forest and Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge together make up one secondary core recovery population of RCW, referred to as the Piedmont Recovery Unit. The plan defines a secondary core population as "a population identified in recovery criteria that will hold at least 250 potential breeding groups at the time of and after delisting." In 2000, the Piedmont Recovery Unit had 59 breeding pairs—20 on the Oconee National Forest (including the Hitchiti Experimental Forest) and 39 on the Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge.

Under the direction of the RCW Final EIS and ROD and the ESA, the Oconee National Forest must not jeopardize endangered species and must carry out programs for their conservation (16 U.S.C. 1536 (a)). Therefore, the Oconee National Forest must protect all cavity trees, protect foraging and nesting habitat, and provide future foraging and nesting habitat. The recovery objective is to create and protect enough RCW habitat to support a genetically sustainable population of 250 breeding pairs. There are currently seven inactive clusters and several acres of potential recruitment areas for the RCW on the Oconee National Forest.

The RCW uses open pinewoods, which can be longleaf (*Pinus palustris*), loblolly (*P. taeda*), shortleaf (*P. echinata*), or slash (*P. elliotti*). Habitat is generally of mature trees (80+ years) with little or no midstory (resembling a park-like conditions). RCWs nest and roost each day in cavities they excavate in live pine trees (USFS, 2001; USFWS, 2002).

Four active clusters of RCW are present in Compartment 5. Currently, potential foraging habitats within the project area of Jones County are fragmented and have thick midstory vegetation, which hinders RCW foraging and increases competition from other vertebrates. There are some stands of early- to mid-successional stands of pine trees (future foraging and nesting habitat).

White-tailed Deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*)

White-tailed deer are very adaptable and use a variety of habitat types and successional stages to meet their year-round needs. Grassed openings and closed temporary roads, along with regeneration areas, supply the early successional habitats preferred by the species. Foraging habitat is represented in all forest age classes up to 80 years. Availability of browse and escape cover year-round and hard mast during the fall and early winter are key factors for white-tailed deer success. Riparian habitats supply much of the hard and soft mast (USFS, 2001; 2003c).

While there has been a slight decrease in the availability of deer browse on the Forest over the past 10 years due to a decline in early successional habitat, the white-tailed deer is very adaptable. Deer populations are higher on the Oconee (Piedmont) than in the Georgia mountains, with both populations stable to increasing. Since the deer population has been at or above carrying capacity in the Piedmont, State regulations have been liberalized to help reduce population densities to within habitat capability levels (USFS, 2003b).

Locally Rare Species

The Georgia Natural Heritage Database was checked for the occurrence of rare species information. This database lists the counties with the listing of rare species of concern throughout Georgia. The listing of species was Bog spicebush, Indian Olive, and Relict Trillium. The Bog Spicebush and Indian Olive have not been listed on the Chattahoochee-Oconee TES list or locally rare list. Oglethorpe oak, Bay starvine, and Schwerin Flase Indigo did not appear on the list for Jones County. Botanical surveys conducted in 1999 or 2004 did not show identifications of TES plants listed for the Oconee NF. There should be no direct, indirect or cumulative effects to these species. Relict Trillium is evaluated in Appendix D and within the TES section of the analysis.

From a list of 24 animal species (not including aquatic animal species) listed on the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest 2002 Locally Rare Species List (USFS, 2002b), the GNHP indicates the four-toed salamander (*Hemidactylum scutatatum*) occurs in Jones County. The four-toed salamander has been recorded from the Hillsboro Northwest, Southwest, and Southeast Quarter Quads, all of which are some distance from the project area. The four-toed salamander is known to inhabit swamps, boggy streams and ponds, and wet woods (GDNR, 2003).

The Georgia Heritage database was checked for occurrences of locally rare species information. The database has information listed by counties with the species that are federally listed, state listed, and species of concern. The Georgia database information was compared with the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest Locally Rare Plant list for 2004. Of the 84 locally rare

plant species on our Forest list none were listed on the database. Surveys conducted (FY 2004) within the proposed project areas did not identify any locally rare species. Therefore, there should be no direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to any locally rare species. Relict Trillium is a federally endangered plant and is evaluated in the biological evaluation.

From a list of 24 animal species (not including aquatic species) for the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest 2004 list only the Four-toed salamander (*Hemidactylium scutatum*) was found on the Georgia Heritage database. The Four-toed salamander has been recorded from the Hillsboro Northwest, Southwest, and Southeast Quarter Quads, all of which are some distance from the project area. The four-toed salamander is known to inhabit swamps, boggy streams, ponds, and wet woods (GADNR, 2003). The proposed areas to be thinned would not occur within these areas. The Forest Plan protects riparian areas and wetlands. Buffers are applied to protect these areas. Therefore, there should be no direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to the species.

From a list of 30 aquatic species two locally rare species the Altamaha pocketbook (*Lampsilis dolabraeformis*) and Georgia elephantear (*Elliptio dariensis*) are listed on the Chattahoochee-Oconee List for 2004, and were identified by surveys conducted by John Alderman, within the confluence of Falling Creek and the Ocmulgee River. The areas where these species were identified are 15 miles north of the project areas. These species were discussed in the Aquatic section (3-3). Proper mitigations, following Best Management Practices (BMP's), and protection of riparian areas will minimize any erosion to the proposed project area. Based on the habitat requirements (NatureServe, 2003) and survey information for these mussel species there should not be direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to the species.

Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, and Sensitive (PETS) Species

There are 116 species (26 federally listed and 90 sensitive) on the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest PETS species list. From this list, potentially affected species were identified by: 1) reviewing their general habitat preferences, 2) consulting records of known locations of PETS species prepared by the GNHP historical records, and 3) consultations with other agencies and universities, as well as reviewing data from Neotropical Migratory Bird (NTMB) Point Samples, GDNR Bald Eagle Flights, Breeding Bird Census Routes, PETS Risk Assessment for the Oconee National Forest, and general observations (Caldwell, 2004). The following 12 terrestrial PETS species are within the range of the Oconee National Forest based on a review of the above sources.

<u>Common Name</u>	<u>Scientific Name</u>	<u>Status</u>
(Plants)		
Relict trillium	<i>Trillium reliquum</i>	Federally Endangered
Oglethorpe oak	<i>Quercus oglethorpensis</i>	Sensitive
Scherwin's false indigo	<i>Amorpha schwerinii</i>	Sensitive
Bay Starvine	<i>Schisandra glabra</i>	Sensitive

(Terrestrial Animals)

Red-cockaded woodpecker	<i>Picoides borealis</i>	Federally Endangered	
Bald eagle (nests)	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	Federally Threatened	
Wood stork (foraging habitat)	<i>Mycteria americana</i>	Federally Endangered	
Bachman's sparrow	<i>Aimophila aestivalis</i>	Sensitive	
Migrant loggerhead shrike	<i>Lanius ludovicianus migrans</i>	Sensitive	
Rafinesque's Big-eared bat	<i>Corynorhinus rafinesquii</i>	Sensitive	
(Aquatics)			
Altamaha Shiner	<i>Cyprinella xaenura</i>	Sensitive	
Inflated Floater	<i>Pygandon gibbosa</i>	Sensitive	
Ocmulgee Shiner	<i>Cyprinella callisema</i>	Sensitive	
Robust Redhorse	<i>Moxostoma robustum</i>	Sensitive	S
(Insects)			
Appalachian snaketail	<i>Ophiogomphus incurvatus</i>	Sensitive	
Margarita river skimmer	<i>Macromia margarita</i>	Sensitive	

Of these, all but 5 were dropped from further consideration because their range does not extend into the project area or their specific habitat requirements are not found in the areas of proposed activities. A detailed rationale for elimination of these species is presented in the Biological Evaluation (BE) available in Appendix D of this EA (Caldwell, 2004).

Relict Trillium

The Georgia Natural Heritage Program listing by county did show the occurrence of Relict trillium within the Jones County area. Relict Trillium has been identified within the Jones County but more than 5 miles from the project area on private lands and not within the Oconee National Forest. Occurrences for this species usually will be north facing slopes within hardwood areas with mesic soils. Soils where PETS plants usually occur within the Piedmont area usually are within the Iredell soils. Iredell soils may be present within the areas throughout the Hitchiti near the Falling Creek areas. However, the project area lies east of the Falling Creek area and Ocmulgee River. Based on the information from the Georgia Natural Heritage database, district surveys, soil information, and general observations no identification of the listed species has occurred within the project area. In addition, contractor John Paul Schmidt conducted a FY 1999 plant survey (1000 acres) on the Oconee National Forest within the Hitchiti Experimental Forest with the 10 compartments in June 1999. There were no PETS plant species found within the project areas of pine and pine-hardwood habitat. Several acres that were surveyed are similar habitats including loblolly pine as the main species. Majority of the areas are upland pine and very xeric sites. A contractor conducted a plant survey (FY 2004) within some areas of concern and no TES species were located. Plant surveys were done within the areas to be thinned and no TES species were identified. Therefore, the proposed action within the project will not adversely affect the relict trillium.

Red-cockaded Woodpecker (RCW)

The RCW currently occupies habitat on the south end of the Oconee Ranger District and the Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge within the project area. It is most abundant on the Hitchiti Experimental Forest (14 active cluster sites) and the Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge (39 cluster sites). This species use open pinewoods, which can be longleaf, loblolly, shortleaf, or slash. Habitat is generally of mature trees with little or no midstory (resembling a park-like stand). RCWs nest and roost each day in live pine trees. The dead pine trees (snags) created by the SPB infestation are an ephemeral foraging habitat, which will soon disappear. RCW are located in the project area and protection from further SPB infestation is necessary to provide for future foraging and nesting habitat. Several acres of potential recruitment areas for the RCW exist within the project area (Caldwell, 2004).

Bachman's Sparrow

This species is found within open southern pine forests subject to frequent fires. The specific habitat this species prefers is large areas of well-developed bunch grass and herb layer with limited shrub and hardwood midstory. This bird has not been detected in five years of inventories on the Forest. Bird inventories are done on the forest yearly. Reports from the GDNR and the Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge found several RCW sites in the Refuge with Bachman sparrows present last year. Even though this species has not been reported on the Oconee National Forest in the past, it did occur within some stands last year within the RCW areas (Caldwell, 2004).

Altamaha Shiner

This species occurs in the upper Altamaha River Drainage, North Central Georgia. The only area where this species is found includes both the north-central Ocmulgee and Oconee Systems. The 5th level watersheds that may include this species are Oconee River-Greenbrier Creek, Ocmulgee River-Rum Creek, Little River-Lower, and Apalachee River –Lower watersheds on the Oconee National Forest. This species of fish is listed as S2 (Imperiled) by the NatureServe database (NatureServe, 2003). Surveys conducted in September 2003 did not identify the Altamaha Shiner within this project area. Identifications were made in watersheds outside the Oconee National Forest.

The preferred habitat is rocky and sandy pools in creeks and small rivers. There is existing habitat for this species in the streams within the project area. According to Chris Skelton (Ga DNR Fisheries Biologist) identification of the Altamaha shiner was found within the Murder Creek tributary (per conversation on October 20, 2000), which is northeast of the project area within Putnam County approximately 25 miles. Fish surveys done September, 2003 show that there is potential habitat that would host the species within the locations of Apalachee-Lower, Oconee River-Greenbrier Creek, and Ocmulgee River-Rum Creek watersheds (per conversation with Craig Roghair, September 2003). Limiting factors would include the loss of water quality and high loads of sedimentation due to erosion. The Altamaha Shiner was not identified within the Caney Creek Area but within the Falling Creek tributary which is southwest of the project area approximately 5 miles.

Management actions that would propose or create adverse effects would be those that disturb soil, potentially causing erosion and sedimentation levels to increase. Vegetation alterations within the watersheds would potentially increase water flow into streams. The Riparian Prescription included in the Revised Plan provides direction designed to maintain and enhance water quality. Therefore, plan implementation should have little potential for adverse impacts to individuals. Throughout the Oconee National Forest many private lands are currently in a degraded state due to increase development and agricultural use, making presence of quality habitats on national forest land increasingly important to the species. Following the State BMPs and streamside management zones will minimize any disturbance to the streams and wetlands, and should prevent any impacts to fish and other aquatic species.

Ocmulgee shiner (Cyprinella callisema)

This species of shiner (fish) is located in small range of streams in Georgia, but common and stable in preferred habitat within the Ogeechee (uncommon) and Altamaha (locally common), river drainages (NatureServe, 2003). The 5th level watersheds that may include this species are Oconee River-Greenbrier Creek, Ocmulgee River-Rum Creek, Little River-Lower, and Apalachee River –Lower watersheds on the Oconee National Forest. This species of fish is currently listed as a S3 (Vulnerable) within the NatureServe database (NatureServe, 2003).

This species is usually found in larger streams in open sand (usually) and/or gravel bottomed channels with water and little if any vegetation. Sandy and rocky rivers of small to medium size may also contain habitat for this species. The rivers and creeks here on the Oconee are likely to have habitat that would meet these requirements. The species has been identified by the DNR within the Ocmulgee and Altamaha River drainages. These areas of identification were several miles from the national forest. A survey conducted September 2003 by the Center for Aquatic Technology Transfer (CATT) Research Team from Asheville, North Carolina surveyed surrounding tributaries of the Apalachee, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers for the species. The Ocmulgee Shiner was identified in the Caney Creek area north of the project area.

Management actions that would propose or create adverse effects would be those that disturb soil, potentially causing erosion and sedimentation levels to increase. Vegetation alterations within the watersheds would potentially increase water flow into streams. The Riparian Prescription included in the Revised Plan provides direction designed to maintain and enhance water quality. Therefore, plan implementation should have little potential for adverse impacts to individuals. Throughout the Oconee National Forest many private lands are currently in a degraded state due to increase development and agricultural use, making presence of quality habitats on national forest land increasingly important to the species. Following the State BMPs and streamside management zones will minimize any disturbance to the streams and wetlands, and should prevent any impacts to fish and other aquatic species.

3.2.1.2 Environmental Consequences

Habitat alteration changes the diversity and abundance of wildlife species in a given area. Vegetation management can affect each species' habitat in a different way, benefiting some

species, while harming others. Planning regulations define diversity as “the distribution and abundance of different plant and animal communities and species within [an] area...” (36 CFR 219.3(g)).

In general, forested areas that are in various stages of development and include periodic openings support a wide diversity of species and habitats. The maintenance of forest habitat diversity tends to increase wildlife populations and land values, since the majority of animals do not utilize a single stand or single forest type throughout their lives. Management activities that encourage layering of different types of vegetation such as prescribed burning, thinning, and occasionally herbicides, increase wildlife diversity. Impacts beneficial to wildlife are typically greater with a combination of management activities versus any of the treatments separately.

Alternative 1 (No Action: Current Management)

Vegetation

Under Alternative 1, no harvest activities would occur. Without the increased light to the forest floor provided by thinning, understory development would be limited to that produced naturally, and that produced as a result of occasional prescribed burns. Any understory development would be limited to woody vegetation, such as sweetgum, red maple, pine seedlings, blackberry, and dogwood. Only small increases in grasses and legumes would occur, most often near roadsides and in openings. Soil conditions in the project area would remain intact, and no reductions in soil plant productivity would occur.

In the absence of thinning harvests, the general health of forest stands in the project area would likely decline gradually and stabilize at a new lower level. The incidence of SPB attacks, which are significantly decreased by reducing stand density and removing infected trees from a given stand, would increase, as infected trees spread the beetle to those trees nearby. Forest stands in the project area would continue to develop overcrowded conditions, resulting in greater competition for nutrients, decreased growth, and increased potential for infection and insect attack, as well as increased natural mortality rates. Given the real possibility of SPB attacks under these conditions, an increase in salvage logging operations may become necessary.

Under Alternative 1, no noxious weed control would occur within the project area. If left uncontrolled, noxious weeds would continue to spread, would take over surrounding natural vegetation, and would become a much bigger problem over the long-term. Tree health would decline, which could increase the susceptibility of trees to SPB infestations.

General Wildlife

Under the Alternative 1, no harvest or other vegetation management activities would occur. The forest stands within the project area would continue to mature, and canopies would gradually close, reducing light and decreasing understory vegetation. Understory vegetation would primarily consist of shade-tolerant species, and herbage would be sparse. Implementation of this alternative would benefit those species dependent on mature forest for foraging habitat and cover.

Over time, seedling/shrub habitat within the project areas would develop into poletimber habitat, which would then develop into sawtimber habitat. This progression would create a more mature and continuous forest canopy, benefiting wildlife that requires this type of habitat. However, over a prolonged period of time, the abundance of sweetgum and other pioneering species within the project area would increase, and these would slowly overtake pine and hard mast species. This could be detrimental to those species that prefer pine or mixed pine forests.

Early successional habitat and edge habitat would not be created, unless pine mortality occurs. Gap-phase dynamics would likely occur, where some trees within the stands die for a variety of reasons, and are replaced by trees in the midstory or by new reproduction. Small areas of early successional habitat may be created as pine mortality occurs. As trees die, increased sunlight would reach the floor in those locations, resulting in increased herbaceous understory growth in those areas. However, breaks in the forest canopy as a result of dead or dying trees would be short-term, as surrounding trees grow and close up the canopy (Baker and Hunter, 2002).

Implementation of Alternative 1 would increase the potential for SPB infestation within the project area. If SPB infestation were to occur within these areas, sanitation cuts would be necessary to control the disease. Sanitation cuts would result in small clearcut areas within the forest stand, which would be beneficial to some species by providing openings, early successional habitat, and edge habitat, but could be detrimental to other species, including forest-interior species.

Under Alternative 1, there would be no deliberate attempts to create wildlife habitats (openings, installation of wildlife structures) within the project area. While none of the benefits on wildlife from these activities would occur, this alternative would not directly adversely affect wildlife; existing conditions would continue.

Management Indicator Species

Acadian Flycatcher

Implementation of Alternative 1 would have no effect on riparian deciduous forested habitat for the Acadian flycatcher. Habitat trends and patterns for this species in the area would continue.

Pileated Woodpecker

Implementation of Alternative 1 would have a beneficial effect on habitat for the pileated woodpecker. The forest within the project area would continue to mature, and basal areas would remain high, under this alternative. Pileated woodpeckers would be attracted to the area, particularly to mixed forest areas.

Hooded Warbler (Wilsonia citrina)

Implementation of Alternative 1 would not affect the availability or structure of mature, mesic deciduous forested habitat for the hooded warbler. Habitat trends and patterns for this species in the area would continue.

Field Sparrow (Spizella pusilla)

Implementation of Alternative 1 would have no effect on the field sparrow, since no old fields, woodlands, or other preferred habitat of the species would be affected. Habitat trends and patterns for this species in the area would continue.

Prairie Warbler (Dendroica discolor)

Implementation of Alternative 1 would not noticeably affect habitat for the prairie warbler. While stands within the project area would continue to become more crowded under this alternative, increasing the potential for pine mortality and SPB infestations and associated salvage cuts, any resultant early successional habitat created by pine mortality would provide only a small amount of short-term marginal habitat for the species.

Wood Thrush (Hylocichla mustelina)

The project area would continue to provide habitat for the wood thrush under Alternative 1, benefiting the species over the long-term. Deciduous species would continue to increase in the understory and midstory of the project area under this alternative, and the tree canopy would continue to be dense, providing suitable habitat for the wood thrush. Over time, portions of the project area, particularly areas of mixed forest and deciduous forest, would likely become more suitable for the species, and populations of the species in the project area would likely increase.

Scarlet Tanager (Piranga olivacea)

Implementation of Alternative 1 would have no effect on upland oak or other deciduous forested habitat for the scarlet tanager. Habitat trends and patterns for this species in the area would continue.

Swainson's Warbler (Limnothlypis swainsonii)

Implementation of Alternative 1 would have no effect on early-successional riparian or deciduous floodplain/swamp forested habitat for the Swainson's warbler. Habitat trends and patterns for this species in the area would continue.

Pine Warbler (Dendroica pinus)

Implementation of Alternative 1 would have an adverse effect on the availability of pine warbler habitat in the project area. Without the proposed vegetation management, the proportion of pioneering hardwood species in the understory of the project stands would increase, decreasing the suitability of the area for the pine warbler over the long-term.

Red-cockaded Woodpecker

Habitat for the RCW would not be favored or created under Alternative 1. Although the pine stands within the project area would become more mature with time under this alternative, they would continue to be overstocked and would become more crowded. Over time, potential RCW foraging and nesting habitat within the project area would become less suitable as future habitat for the species. Although Alternative 1 would not directly affect the RCW, indirect effects on potential habitat for the species would be adverse.

Currently, much of the potential RCW foraging habitat within Jones County has thick midstory vegetation, which hinders RCW foraging and increases competition from other vertebrates. Under Alternative 1, the overstocked stands of early- to mid-successional pine trees (potential RCW foraging and nesting habitat) would continue. The USFS would neither be protecting existing habitat nor providing future foraging and nesting habitat for the RCW in the project area under this alternative. RCW would not be able to be recruited to the project area in the future if no vegetation management activities are conducted.

White-tailed Deer

Implementation of Alternative 1 would not affect the white-tailed deer or its habitat on the Forest, since this species utilizes so many different habitat types and is extremely adaptable. The project area would continue to project habitat for the species over the long-term, and populations would be expected to continue under current trends and patterns.

Locally Rare Species

Since no locally rare plants are known from the project area, implementation of Alternative 1 would not have any effect on these species. Locally rare aquatic species would not be effected by the implementation of Alternative 1. The Four-toed salamander would not be effected by the implementation of Alternative 1.

Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, and Sensitive (PETS) Species

Relict Trillium

Alternative 1 would have no effect on the Relict Trillium .

Red-cockaded Woodpecker

The No Action alternative may adversely affect the species and would result in a violation of the ESA, RCW EIS guidelines, the RCW Recovery Plan, and the current Forest Plan for the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests.

Bachman's Sparrow

Likewise, Bachman's sparrow habitat would not be promoted under Alternative 1, and potential habitat for the species within the project area would be lost over the long-term.

Altamaha Shiner

Alternative 1 would have no effect on the Altamaha Shiner.

Ocmulgee shiner

Alternative 1 would have no effect on the Ocmulgee shiner

Alternative 2 (Proposed Action: RCW Habitat and Canebrake Restoration)

Vegetation

Harvest and Midstory Control

Under Alternative 2, thinning would remove both non-hard mast-producing hardwoods (sweetgum, elm, and maple) and softwoods (loblolly pine). Thinning would have slightly different effects on vegetation, depending primarily on the age class of the stand and the level of harvest extraction. Thinning activities would promote optimal tree spacing and improve the health of the forests in the area. Evidence suggests that the increase in tree growth vigor and selective cutting of diseased and stressed trees significantly reduces the risk of loss from SPB attacks and other diseases (Belanger et al., 2000).

Thinning generally results in greater light penetration to the forest floor, and as a result, induces both woody and herbaceous understory growth. Vegetation diversity on the forest floor would increase immediately following thinning, with the greatest diversity and abundance likely to occur within the first six to eight years (Miller et al., 1995). Without further vegetation control, the abundance of grasses and forbs would slowly diminish with development of woody vegetation in the shrub and subcanopy layers, and as the tree canopy slowly closes. However, under Alternative 2, a combination of herbicide use, mechanical treatments, and prescribed burning to control midstory vegetation within thinned areas and areas immediately adjacent to thinned areas would reduce the development of woody vegetation and promote and maintain understory growth. Prescribed fire would be conducted during the dormant season and growing season, depending on location and time of year. Dormant burns are conducted when herbaceous plants are below ground and not impacted by fire.

Thinning activities do come with some biological risks, including potential for physical damage that can occur to residual trees as a result of the harvesting process, to soils on which future plant growth and/or biomass production may be reduced (i.e., on highly eroded or compacted areas), and to existing shrub and herbaceous vegetation damaged as a result of the harvesting process. Physical damage to residual trees as a result of harvesting activities is normally minor. Sites would be reviewed and approved prior to harvest to ensure that log landing and skid trail locations are appropriately planned to minimize soil impacts and damage to residual trees.

Damage to existing shrub and herbaceous vegetation during the harvesting process would be temporary, and plants in the understory would quickly regain their vigor due to increased light availability to the forest floor.

Road Rehabilitation/Construction and Maintenance

Temporary road construction and reopening operations, as well as construction of log landings and skid trails, would require the clearing of vegetation within the road right-of-way, as well as the disturbance and compaction of soils along the road travel way. Thus, road construction would result in both the direct removal of vegetation and in a reduction in the ability of soils along the roadway to support plant growth. The extent of the vegetation clearing would be dependant on how long it has been since the temporary road was last used (i.e., cleared). Reopening temporary roads within the project area would likely require the removal of woody vegetation and shrubs, and potentially a few saplings. New temporary road construction, on the other hand, may involve the removal of larger trees. However, only a small amount (approximately one mile) of temporary road is proposed for construction under Alternative 2. Therefore, removal of this vegetation would not likely have a noticeable effect on forest cover or forest health.

For the most part, impacts on vegetation from temporary roads, log landings, and skid trails would be short-term. The majority of these areas would be seeded with native vegetation upon completion of timber harvest activities and allowed to vegetate. This would increase the proportion of the stand covered by grasses and legumes, provide forage for wildlife, and decrease the amount of time required to rehabilitate compacted or disturbed soils. Small trees would quickly develop along these sites from seed sources in the nearby stands; however, these areas would continue to have reduced soil productivity and full recovery may take many years (USFS, 1989a). Soil compaction effects on these sites are generally long-term; as a result, soil productivity can be reduced for decades. However, the USFS would require that compacted areas be tilled prior to seeding to reduce the potential for this adverse effect.

Pre-haul and heavy pre-haul maintenance activities may involve removal of some roadside vegetation to increase visibility and enhance surface conditions. However, any impacts on vegetation resulting from these activities would be minimal, as only early successional vegetation would be removed or damaged. No new permanent road construction would occur under Alternative 2.

Other Activities

Of the other activities proposed under Alternative 2, eradication of the noxious weeds within the project area would have the greatest effects on vegetation. Adverse impacts on non-target and natural vegetation during herbicide application would be negligible, due to the use of direct foliar spray herbicide delivery methods. Any adverse effect on natural vegetation resulting from herbicide use would be short-term in duration, as any killed vegetation would quickly be replaced with new vegetation.

Rather, long-term, beneficial effects on vegetation would occur as a result of this activity. Efforts to eradicate kudzu and privet from the project area would allow natural vegetation to reestablish in infested areas, and would prevent the potential for the invasive species to spread onto adjacent sites and kill the vegetation on those sites.

General Wildlife

Harvest and Midstory Control

Vegetation management activities can affect wildlife directly through disturbance, injury, or mortality. While the use of heavy equipment during thinning activities could cause some direct mortality of some animals, most animals would temporarily move from the area during thinning activities due to human disturbance and the noise generated from the equipment. Typically, vertebrate species are able to escape in advance of equipment and not be harmed. However, some reptiles and amphibians may be killed by equipment (USFS, 1989a). Because of large populations, direct mortality of some individuals would not hurt populations as a whole. Noise generated from the use of heavy equipment or hand-held equipment for midstory control would temporarily disturb and/or startle wildlife within and adjacent to the project areas, and could cause the temporary displacement of these species. Noise from these activities may also cause nesting birds to abandon nest sites and their young, if harvest activities occur during nesting season. However, since noise-generating equipment would only be used for a short duration, any displaced wildlife would be expected to return to the area upon completion of activities. In addition, there would be undisturbed forest stands in each of the compartments, as well as in other surrounding compartments, for the displaced wildlife during vegetation management activities.

Vegetation management activities can also affect wildlife indirectly through short-term and long-term habitat alteration. Although thinning and midstory control can temporarily reduce cover, food sources, and habitat from site preparation activities and the timber harvest itself, thinning also reduces the basal area (BA) and canopy coverage within stands over the short-term. Opening up the forest canopy encourages understory growth and leads to improved wildlife habitat. Thinning allows light to reach the forest floor, which increases the amount and growth rate of wildlife food plants, including berries, forbs, and shrubs (Schultz, 1997; Baker and Hunter, 2002). Reducing the proposed treatment stands to approximately 60 BA under Alternative 2 would considerably open up the forest stand, most noticeably in stands that currently have the highest BA. Approximately 93 acres would be thinned to 40 BA as part of a shelterwood treatment and 30 acres will be managed as uneven-aged stand for research purposes.

In addition to thinning, midstory control would be conducted within the project area, both on thinned stands and on some adjacent stands that would not undergo thinning. Midstory control would result in a more open forest setting, and would further increase understory growth by increasing available sunlight and nutrients.

Thinning activities themselves neither create openings nor result in forest fragmentation. Although the major forest composition post-thinning would remain basically the same as pre-thinning conditions, vertical diversity would increase as the amount of understory species

increases and as diameter growth of remaining trees increases. In loblolly pine stands, as the vertical diversity of vegetation increases, the number of wildlife species within the stand increases (Schultz, 1997). Thinning in dense stands can increase timber volume within the stand, and provide enhanced bird habitat (Meyers and Johnson, 1978).

In some cases, individual trees that are beneficial to wildlife due to their form may be removed during thinning, although den trees with cavities present and snags are retained per the minimum management requirements in the Forest Plan. Removal of trees used for nesting by birds could result in forceful abandonment of nest sites or direct mortality of young birds if thinning is conducted during nesting season.

Increases in forest health resulting from thinning also have beneficial impacts on wildlife. Animal diversity is closely related to plant diversity (USFS, 1989a). Soon after thinning is conducted, vigorous growth in the understory begins in response to the increase in light reaching the forest floor in thinned areas (Schultz, 1997; Cain, 1995). From this stage through the next few years, the abundance of birds and small mammals is typically the greatest. In response to an increase in prey activity, predatory mammal and raptor populations would increase in abundance (USFS, 1989a; Baker and Hunter, 2002; Perkins et al., 1988). This impact would be greatest in the stands proposed for a greater reduction in BA.

One- to two-year vegetation consists of dense stands of forbs and perennial grasses that make excellent habitat for small herbivores and small seed-eating mammals. However, most forage components, including herbage, vines, grasses, and woody vegetation, decrease with stand age (Mengak et al., 1988). In the third and fourth years, the grasses are replaced with shrubs, which do not favor the small seed-eating mammals, but does improve habitat conditions for birds. Under Alternative 2, midstory control and the use of prescribed burning on a three to five-year cycle would work to maintain forbs and perennial grasses in the understory of selected stands within the project compartments.

Road Rehabilitation/Construction and Maintenance

Under Alternative 2, roadwork would be conducted to allow for access to stands proposed for timber management activities, and would consist of road maintenance, rehabilitation, and temporary road reopening and construction. These activities would increase the amount of human disturbance to wildlife during vegetation management activities and disturb any nesting sites in the affected area. The creation and use of log landings and skid trails would remove trees and understory vegetation, which currently serve as food sources, escape cover, and breeding/nesting sites for wildlife.

During temporary road construction and reopening, a 12 to 15-foot-wide path would be cleared of trees and other vegetation. Since the treatment stands are proposed to be reduced to 60 BA, this small path width would not be any larger than the distance between trees in the project area post-thinning. Temporary road construction and reopening would likely neither result in an edge effect along the road, nor contribute to forest fragmentation.

Most of the temporary roads would not be surfaced/graveled; gravel would only be spread in dips, on steeper slopes, and at intersections with surfaced roads. Herbaceous vegetation would likely encroach onto the less often used portions of the roads long before road closure, which could provide early successional habitat for some species during thinning activities. However, it is unlikely that this habitat would be greatly used due to the presence of workers and disturbance from activities.

Upon completion of vegetation management activities, the majority of temporary roads, log landings, and skid trails would be seeded with native vegetation and allowed to fully vegetate. The seeding mixes include seed plants that are beneficial to wildlife as a source of forage and as a year-round source of seeds. Seeding of temporary roads would benefit wildlife by creating wildlife strips. These areas would also benefit insectivorous birds, since insects are more abundant in grasses than in thick forest floor litter. The open habitat created in these areas would benefit those species that prefer early successional habitat. Over time, as the surrounding forest matures, grasses and forbs in these areas would be shaded out and the forest canopy would close, and species that prefer mature forested habitat would be favored. However, to maintain a diversity of habitats within the project area, some log landings scattered throughout the project area would be maintained permanently as wildlife openings, and the USFS would plant fruit trees in selected wildlife openings to provide additional forage. These areas would provide early successional habitat for wildlife over the long-term. **Table 3.2-1** lists those stands, by compartment, in which a log landing would be maintained as a wildlife opening over the long-term.

Table 3.2-1. Locations of Log Landings to be Maintained as Wildlife Openings by Compartment and Stand	
Compartment	Stands
5	1, 3, 4, 6, 7
6	7, 10, 15
8	2, 8, 12, 20
*Fruit trees would be planted in these openings.	

Other Activities

In addition to the above-mentioned harvest, midstory control, and road reconstruction/maintenance activities, approximately 45 acres of old SPB sites would be reforested with pine seedlings within the project area under Alternative 2. These areas range in size from 0.25 acres to several acres. While these sites currently provide early successional wildlife habitat, this habitat will only be available over the short-term, as early pioneering species would quickly establish and take over these areas if no action were taken. Reforestation of these sites with pine would provide for more continuous pine habitat over the long-term within the project area. Approximately 93 acres of shelterwood treatments will be treated with artificial and natural regeneration, with the remaining overstory retained indefinitely.

Management Indicator Species

Acadian Flycatcher

Implementation of Alternative 2 would not noticeably affect riparian deciduous forested habitat for the Acadian flycatcher. A small portion of the project area under Alternative 2 is located within riparian areas with mixed forest composition, which may have a minor amount of deciduous forest habitat interspersed. In these areas, habitat for the Acadian flycatcher may become less suitable under Alternative 2 due to reductions in the forest canopy. However, only a very small amount of marginal Acadian flycatcher habitat would potentially be affected under this alternative, and no noticeable effect on the species or its habitat would occur.

Pileated Woodpecker

Alternative 2 would not have a measurable adverse effect on pileated woodpecker habitat within the project area. The project area is primarily loblolly pine habitat, which is not preferred habitat for the pileated woodpecker. However, during thinning activities under Alternative 2, some mature hardwoods may be harvested, and thinning would occur in some mixed pine-hardwood stands. This may result in a loss of a small amount of habitat for the species. There would continue to be many acres of suitable habitat for the pileated woodpecker on surrounding public and private lands that would remain unaffected by Alternative 2, including preferred pileated woodpecker habitat. Alternative 2 would not affect deciduous river bottom forests.

Hooded Warbler (Wilsonia citrina)

Implementation of Alternative 2 is not anticipated to noticeably affect hooded warbler habitat within the project area. The proposed activities are targeting loblolly pine and mixed pine stands within the project area; mesic deciduous forest habitat would remain largely undisturbed by the project.

Field Sparrow (Spizella pusilla)

Neither the field sparrow nor its habitat would be affected by implementation of Alternative 2. None of the proposed activities would occur in habitats used by the species. The amount and availability of habitat for this species on the Forest would remain unchanged under this alternative.

Prairie Warbler (Dendroica discolor)

Implementation of Alternative 2 would create a small amount of habitat for the prairie warbler over the short- and long-term. Over the short-term, temporary roads, skid trails, and log landings that are reseeded would provide early successional habitat for the species. Over the long-term, suitable early successional habitat for the species would be provided in selected log landing sites maintained as wildlife openings after completion of vegetation management activities. Repetitive prescribed burning of the project area would add to this beneficial effect. Alternative 2 would create habitat for the prairie warbler within the project area, and the species would likely be more attracted to the area than under current conditions.

Wood Thrush (Hylocichla mustelina)

The project area may currently contain a small amount of suitable habitat for the wood thrush. While mature, deciduous forested habitat would remain largely unaffected by project implementation, pine and mixed forested habitat that may currently be suitable for the wood thrush within the project area due to a dense tree canopy and a well-developed deciduous understory would become less suitable as a result of Alternative 2. Alternative 2 would reduce the deciduous understory/midstory component of the affected stands, and thinning activities would result in a much less dense forested canopy. However, since the habitat affected by the project is not optimal wood thrush habitat, implementation of Alternative 2 would only have minor adverse effects on wood thrush habitat, but would not noticeably affect its overall habitat availability on the Forest.

Scarlet Tanager (Piranga olivacea)

Implementation of Alternative 2 is not anticipated to affect scarlet tanager or its habitat within the project area. The proposed activities are targeting loblolly pine and mixed pine stands within the project area; upland oak and deciduous woodland/forest habitat would remain largely undisturbed by the project.

Swainson's Warbler (Limnothlypis swainsonii)

The project area may currently contain a small amount of suitable habitat for Swainson's warbler. Habitat for Swainson's warbler is found in bottomland sites near water. Canebrake is a normal nesting site. Alternative 2 is attempting to restore 15 acres of canebrake in Compartment 5 which will provide additional habitat for this warbler. This alternative will have a beneficial effect on Swainson's warbler.

Pine Warbler (Dendroica pinus)

The pine warbler would be beneficially affected by implementation of Alternative 2. Under this alternative, midstory control would be undertaken in pine stands to decrease the density of midstory, including the hardwood component. This would make the project area more suitable as pine warbler habitat. In addition, reforestation of old SPB spots would provide more continuous pine forest cover in these areas. This would amount to a slight increase of suitable habitat for the pine warbler over the long-term.

Red-cockaded Woodpecker

Activities proposed under Alternative 2 would enhance the quality of RCW habitat on the forest. Opening up the pine forest through thinning, with a focus on mature pine stands, and conducting midstory control through mechanical and chemical methods would not only improve forest health and reduce threats on RCW clusters from SPB infestations, but would make the project area more suitable for the RCW nesting and foraging. In combination with past and proposed future prescribed burning, which would maintain midstory control, the vegetation management activities under Alternative 2 would create ideal habitat for the RCW within the project area. Vegetation management in immature pine stands would enhance potential future habitat for the

species within the project area, once the stands have matured. Likewise, old SPB spots that have undergone salvage cutting would be reforested with pine seedlings under Alternative 2. This would provide for additional future habitat for the RCW within the project area, as well as more continuous, pine forest stands.

Upon completion of vegetation management activities (thinning and burning) under Alternative 2, 28 RCW recruitment stands would be established within the project area. Inserts would be placed throughout these stands, which would provide nesting habitat for the species. The boundaries of RCW areas would be marked and monitored to ensure protection of the species and the habitat. In addition, nesting structures would be provided for squirrels within the recruitment stands to reduce competition for RCW nesting cavities.

Alternative 2 would be working toward the recovery objective for the RCW on the Oconee National Forest. In addition, this alternative would be keeping with the direction of the RCW Final EIS and ROD, Recovery Plan, and the ESA.

White-tailed Deer

Thinning would benefit the white-tailed deer by encouraging shrubby and grassy understory areas by opening up the forest canopy. Temporary roads, skid trails, and log landings that are reseeded would provide grasses for an early spring source of forage and as a year-round source of seeds. Alternative 2 would create habitat for the white-tailed deer within the project area, and the species would likely be more attracted to the area. Maintenance of early successional habitats in wildlife openings would supply high-quality browse for this species over the long-term.

Locally Rare Species

Since no locally rare plants are known from the project area, implementation of Alternative 2 would not have any effect on these species. Although the four-toed salamander is known to inhabit swamps, boggy streams and ponds, and wet woods within or adjacent to the project area, Alternative 2 would not affect these areas (due to riparian corridor restrictions). The mussel species listed on the locally rare list would not be effected by Alternative 2 due to the riparian and corridor restrictions and BMP's. Therefore, no effects on locally rare animal or aquatic species or their habitat would occur as a result of Alternative 2.

Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, and Sensitive (PETS) Species

Relict Trillium

The Georgia Natural Heritage Program listing by county did show the occurrence of Relict trillium within the Jones County area. Relict Trillium has been identified within the Jones County but more than 5 miles from the project area on private lands and not within the Oconee National Forest. Occurrences for this species usually will be north facing slopes within hardwood areas with mesic soils. Soils where PETS plants usually occur within the Piedmont area usually are within the Iredell soils. However, the project area lies east of the Falling Creek

area and Ocmulgee River. Based on the information from the Georgia Natural Heritage database, district surveys, soil information, and general observations no identification of the listed species has occurred within the project area. In addition, contractor John Paul Schmidt conducted a FY 1999 plant survey (1000 acres) on the Oconee National Forest within the Hitchiti Experimental Forest with the 10 compartments in June 1999. There were no PETS plant species found within the project areas of pine and pine-hardwood habitat. Several acres that were surveyed are similar habitats including loblolly pine as the main species. Majority of the areas to be thinned are upland pine and very xeric sites. A contractor conducted a plant survey (FY 2004) within some areas to be thinned and no TES species were located. Therefore implementation of Alternative 2 is not likely to adversely affect the relict trillium.

Red-cockaded Woodpecker

Effects from Alternative 2 on the RCW and its habitat are more fully discussed under MIS above. The immediate effect of thinning within the project area under Alternative 2 may be the loss of some foraging habitat. However, beneficial effects on RCW habitat would be anticipated over the long-term. SPB infestations have been serious during the past couple of years. This infestation has occurred because of the lack of reducing the stems per acre. Therefore, the removal or cutting of dense trees would result in a cumulative beneficial effect, since it would stop the spread of the SPB infestation and minimize loss of habitat. Based on the information that is within project file, RCW EIS Standards and Guidelines, general observations, and requirements of the RCW Recovery Plan, the species would not be adversely affected by thinning the stands to 40 and 60 BA to improve the foraging and nesting habitat for the RCW. Intervals of prescribed fire on a 2-5 year basis and midstory control (mechanical and chemical) would promote the optimal habitat requirements needed for the species. Growing season controlled burns are preferred and would be implemented when parameters can be met (Caldwell, 2004). Canebrake restoration activities would have no effect on RCW recovery efforts.

Alternative 2 is not likely to adversely affect the RCW. Implementation of the proposed activities would be in accordance with the ESA (Section 7), RCW EIS guidelines, RCW Recovery Plan, and the current Forest Plan for the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests (Caldwell, 2004).

Bachman's Sparrow

While implementation of Alternative 2 might disturb a few individuals, this effect is unlikely due to low population densities within the project area. Overall, Alternative 2 would benefit the Bachman's sparrow by conducting vegetation control and lowering basal areas, thereby improving habitat conditions for the species within the project area (Caldwell, 2004).

Altamaha Shiner and Ocmulgee Shiner

The Altamaha Shiner and Ocmulgee shiner are fish species found in the Altamaha Drainage. Surveys conducted by the Center for Aquatic Technology Transfer (CATT) identified Ocmulgee shiner within Caney Creek area located east of the project area. Altamaha shiners occur in the

upper Altamaha River Drainage. Their preferred habitat is rocky and sandy pools of creeks and small rivers. This species was not detected during fish surveys done in 1995 (Caldwell, 2004). The implementation of Alternative 2 will decrease vegetation within the project area, however, there would be no decrease in vegetation within riparian corridors according to the Forest Plan restrictions. Implementation of BMP's along with protection of the riparian corridors should not effect a change in water temperature and prevent erosion within the areas. Use of herbicides within the project areas to be thinned would not effect fisheries habitat if mitigation measures and Forest Plan restrictions are followed. Only aquatic herbicides will be used within potential areas where perennial streams are located (See Appendix E). Therefore, the Ocmulgee or Altamaha Shiner would not be impacted by implementation of Alternative 2.

Alternative 3 (RCW Habitat Restoration without Herbicide Use)

Short- and long-term impacts on forest vegetation and wildlife under Alternative 3 would be similar to those resulting from Alternative 2. Refer to the discussion of these impacts under Alternative 2 above. However, under Alternative 3, no herbicides would be used for noxious weed and midstory control within the project area; noxious weed and midstory control would be conducted using mechanical methods only and the girdling of trees would be accomplished by mechanical methods. The impacts on vegetation and wildlife from the use of this different method are described below.

Vegetation

Under Alternative 3, mechanical release treatments (chainsaws/brushsaws) would be performed to remove much of the above-ground portion of midstory species, as well as competing vegetation, within the project area. Unlike herbicide treatments, midstory vegetation and noxious weeds would not likely be killed as a result of mechanical treatments, at least initially. As a result, several mechanical release treatments would be required to eliminate these species due to the continual re-growth of selectively cut vegetation. More than one mechanical treatment in the same growing season may be required in some cases, and numerous mechanical treatments would likely be required in each stand over the next four to five years, especially in areas that contain invasive species, such as kudzu, wisteria, and tree-of-heaven. While short-term impacts on vegetation (midstory vegetation and noxious weeds) within the project area would be slightly different under Alternative 3 than under Alternative 2, long-term impacts on vegetation would be the same as those described under Alternative 2 above, assuming repeated mechanical treatments occur.

General Wildlife

Under Alternative 3, mechanical treatments for midstory and noxious weed control would have a greater potential to temporarily affect wildlife in the project area due to noise generated from handheld equipment. Equipment would be used for a longer period of time under Alternative 3 than under Alternative 2, since all selected vegetation would be removed mechanically. In addition, the use of mechanical methods would require two to three treatments over a three- to five-year period, resulting in repeated noise disturbances within and around each affected stand. However, noise-generating equipment would only be used for a very short duration in any given

area during any given season. All displaced wildlife would be expected to return to the areas upon completion of management activities, and no long-term impacts on wildlife are anticipated to result from noise disturbance during activities. In addition, there would be undisturbed pine and hardwoods stands in the immediate vicinity of project area for the displaced wildlife during management activities.

The primary difference between short-term impacts on wildlife habitat under Alternatives 3 and 2 is that, under Alternative 3, there would be a larger amount of downed vegetation within the project area immediately following the mechanical treatments. This downed vegetation would provide habitat for small mammals, reptiles, and amphibians until such vegetation decomposes. In addition, areas treated mechanically recover faster due to sprouting of severed stems, and vegetative re-sprouts provide a more palatable source of food to insects and wildlife. Since the entire area proposed for midstory control would be treated mechanically under Alternative 3, there may be a small increase the amount and diversity of wildlife within the treatment areas shortly following treatments due to more re-sprouting.

While short-term impacts on wildlife within the project area would be slightly different under Alternative 3 than under Alternative 2, long-term impacts on wildlife would be the same as those described under Alternative 2 above, assuming repeated mechanical treatments occur to control midstory and noxious weeds.

Management Indicator Species

Impacts on MIS under Alternative 3 would be very similar to those resulting from Alternative 2. Refer to the discussion under Alternative 2 for these impacts. The primary difference between Alternatives 2 and 3 is that Alternative 3 may provide more enhanced habitat for the white-tailed deer over the short-term from vegetative re-sprouting resulting from mechanical methods. In addition, the use of mechanical methods would take a longer amount of time to make the project area optimal for the pine warbler, since several treatments would be necessary to control midstory vegetation, including hardwood species.

Locally Rare Species

Since no locally rare plants are known from the project area, implementation of Alternative 3 would not have any effect on these species. Although the four-toed salamander is known to inhabit swamps, boggy streams and ponds, and wet woods within or adjacent to the project area, Alternative 3 would not affect these areas (due to riparian corridor restrictions). Therefore, no effects on locally rare animal species or their habitat would occur as a result of Alternative 3.

Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, and Sensitive (PETS) Species

Impacts on PETS species under Alternative 3 would be the same as those resulting from Alternative 2. Refer to the discussion under Alternative 2 for these impacts. However, slightly more disturbance may be necessary under Alternative 3 to control midstory vegetation, since mechanical methods are somewhat less effective at vegetation control than herbicides.

3.2.1.3 Cumulative Impacts

Alternative 1

In the absence of thinning under Alternative 1, the general health of forest stands in the project area would likely decline gradually and stabilize at a new lower level. The incidence of SPB attacks would likely increase, and the potential for infected trees to spread the beetle to nearby trees on public and private lands would also increase. However, SPB suppression efforts have been conducted within the project area, and would continue to be conducted in the future. Since these activities are working to decrease adverse impacts associated with SPB, Alternative 1 would not result in significant cumulative increase in outbreaks in the project area. However, Alternative 1 may result in increased necessity for SPB suppression/salvage activities to occur.

Alternative 1, however, may cumulatively result in an increase in the potential for a catastrophic wildfire within the project area. An increase in hazardous fuel loading is already occurring due to SPB outbreaks, where mature trees are either dying or being cut and left on the ground in suppression efforts. Although prescribed burning is working to reduce these hazardous fuels and the potential for a catastrophic wildfire, overstocking of the forest stand would increase under Alternative 1, contributing to an increase in the potential for wildfire.

Implementation of Alternative 1 would neither provide open forest habitat, nor create a measurable amount of additional early successional habitat. Early successional habitat would only be created in the event of pine mortality. Prescribed burning within the project area would enhance the quality of this early successional habitat. However, these impacts would be short-term, as the surrounding forest canopy would quickly close over the openings.

Under Alternative 1, forest stands within the project area would continue to mature, shading out understory vegetation and reducing the quantity of browse for various wildlife species. Prescribed fires in these areas would help to improve foraging habitat for wildlife by increasing browse production. In addition, prescribed fires in these areas would help delay succession of the forest stands to hardwoods, which have lower resistance to fires (Yahner, 2000). Although biodiversity would increase in the understory as a result of periodic prescribed burn treatments in some stands, this increase would be very slight, since the closed canopy would prevent sunlight from reaching the forest floor. Diversity in the canopy and subcanopy would likely remain at current levels under Alternative 1.

Over the longer-term, early successional habitat may be provided on recently cleared areas and in agricultural fields on private land. Depending on activities of the landowners, this type of habitat may be continually provided over the long-term if timber harvest continues on these lands in short-rotation. Lands converted to cultivated uses would provide field and edge habitat over the long-term. In areas where this private land is located adjacent to mature forested habitat, edge habitat would be created. Therefore, when combined with activities on private lands, the No Action alternative may still allow for a mosaic of habitats that would benefit a variety of different species, although open forest habitats would decline.

Alternatives 2 and 3

Prescribed burning has been occurring within the project area over the past couple of decades, and would continue to occur in the future. The combined use of thinning and prescribed burns is considered optimal for maintaining an abundant source of understory vegetation for wildlife browse (Cain, 1995; Haywood et al., 1998; Schultz, 1997; USDA, 1989b). Periodic prescribed burning generally topkills most small, developing hardwood sprouts and shrubs (USDA, 1989a; 1989b; Schultz, 1997). This stimulates the growth of multiple sprouts from surviving root stocks and maintains the majority of hardwood sprouts in an optimal state for wildlife forage and cover. Yield and quality increases are often observed in herbage, legumes, and hardwood sprouts following a fire, and when combined with thinning operations that increase light penetration to the forest floor, increases would be noticeable. Further discussion of the benefits to vegetation communities associated with prescribed fire use are covered in the *Vegetation Management in the Coastal Plain/Piedmont EIS* (USFS, 1989a), and in the *Guide for Prescribed Fire in the Southern United States* (USFS, 1989b).

Low intensity prescribed fires conducted by the USFS rarely cause direct wildlife mortality, and any mortality typically has a negligible effect on wildlife populations (USFS, 1989a; Lyon et al., 2000; Landers, 1987). Impacts on wildlife from prescribed burning are primarily indirect, through effects on habitat and food sources. Prescribed fire can have temporary adverse impacts on animal populations by eliminating cover, food sources, habitat, or destroying nesting sites (Lyon et al., 2000; Schultz, 1997). However, fire can cause a short-term increase in productivity, availability, or nutrient content of forage and browse, as well as stimulate fruit and seed production (USFS, 1989a; 1989b; Schultz, 1997; Lyon et al., 2000). These improvements may, in turn, contribute to an increase in herbivore populations, and subsequently, an increase in their predators. Large carnivores and omnivores have extensive home ranges and their populations may change little in response to fire; however, they thrive where their preferred prey is most plentiful, often in areas of recent burns (Lyon et al., 2000). Prescribed fire also temporarily opens up the understory, benefiting those species that prefer more open areas for foraging, escape, and nesting, but adversely affecting other species that require protection of dense understory growth (Landers, 1987). Prescribed fires can also increase edge effects and create habitat mosaics that contain semi-open and open conditions (USFS, 1989b). Prescribe fire on aquatics are determined by fire size, intensity, severity, postfire weather, and physical, chemical and biological characteristics of individual sites. The topography, soil properties, and moisture, fuel moisture and loads, density of vegetation, type of vegetation, microclimates associated with slope, aspect, and topographic position. The Hitchiti has been managed for RCW's (since 1980's), which has included prescribed fire on a 3-5 year rotation. Burning plans are done on each area considering the topography, weather, aspect, and fuel/moisture loads. Fish surveys still show the presence of Ocmulgee shiners and many other fish species. Majority of the prescribed fires are done during dormant season. There is not likely to be direct, indirect, or cumulative effects on the aquatic species. Cumulative effects on wildlife resulting from the combination of prescribed burning and thinning would be beneficial. There would be a greater increase in the production of herbaceous food sources within the project area, which would likely increase wildlife populations in the area.

Prescribed burning, in combination with thinning, would help to create a more mosaic forest structure, thereby increasing plant and animal species diversity. This mosaic of habitat types

would be enhanced by the diversity of cover on adjacent public (deciduous and mixed forest) and private lands (forested land and fields), and by the creation and maintenance of wildlife openings under Alternatives 2 and 3. Wildlife openings favor wildlife that prefer open areas, early successional, or shrub habitat, while mature forested conditions favor forest interior species. Therefore, habitat types that would be created and/or present within and adjacent to the project area would include early successional habitat, edge habitat, open land (small amounts), mature forested habitat, and open forest habitats. When considered in a cumulative context, implementation of Alternative 2 and 3 would provide a wide array of habitat types for a variety of wildlife, including wildlife MIS, over the long-term.

Implementation of Alternative 2 or 3, in conjunction with prescribed burning, would also decrease the potential for a catastrophic fire or SPB outbreak to occur. Thinning would increase forest health and reduce crowded conditions, while burning would eliminate grounded fuels from the area, cumulatively benefiting the forest stand.

Management Indicator Species

Since Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would have no effects, or only minimal effects, on habitat for the Acadian flycatcher, pileated woodpecker, hooded warbler, field sparrow, and scarlet tanager, these alternatives would not contribute to cumulative impacts on these species.

All Forest actions are monitored as to their effects on MIS. The potential for pine mortality (either natural or from SPB infestations) would be greater under Alternative 1 due to poor forest health and overcrowded conditions. Temporary habitat (openings, early successional areas) would be created for prairie warbler and white-tailed deer in the event of pine mortality under Alternative 1. SPB suppression and salvage cuts occurring in the area would increase the possibility for openings to be created. In addition, prescribed burning would enhance the quality of the early successional habitat created by these openings. These cumulative impacts would be short-term, however, only lasting until the forest canopy closes.

Thinning in combination with prescribed burning under Alternatives 2 and 3 would benefit the RCW, white-tailed deer, and pine warbler within the project area more than thinning or prescribed burning alone. The creation and maintenance (through prescribed fire) of wildlife openings within the project area would also provide additional habitat for these species, as well as for the prairie warbler. Therefore, a beneficial cumulative impact on these species would occur as a result of Alternatives 2 and 3.

Prescribed burning provides the foundation for the restoration and maintenance of the pine ecosystem upon which the RCW and many other species depend. Burning, when used effectively, has been noted to be the most efficient and “natural” way to maintain RCW habitat (nesting and foraging) in optimal condition (USFS, 2003a). Burning would reduce the midstory within the forest stands, while thinning would open up the canopy, creating open, park-like conditions preferred by the RCW.

Locally Rare Species

Since none of the alternatives would have any effects on locally rare plant, aquatic, or animal species or their habitats, implementation of any of the alternatives would not contribute to cumulative impacts on locally rare species.

Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, and Sensitive (PETS) Species

Since none of the alternatives would have any effect on the Relict Trillium, implementation of any of the alternatives would not contribute to cumulative impacts on this species.

All Forest actions are monitored as to their effects on PETS species. The potential for pine mortality (either natural or from SPB infestations) would be greater under Alternative 1 due to poor forest health and overcrowded conditions. There would be a greater potential under Alternative 1 for SPB infestations to adversely affect RCW and Bachman's sparrow habitat. While prescribed burning would slightly enhance the quality of habitat within the project area for these species, Alternative 1 would not contribute to these beneficial effects.

Thinning in combination with prescribed burning under Alternatives 2 and 3 would benefit the RCW and Bachman's sparrow within the project area more than thinning or prescribed burning alone. Therefore, a beneficial cumulative impact on these species would occur as a result of Alternatives 2 and 3. Intervals of prescribed fire on a 2- to 5-year basis and midstory control (mechanical and chemical) would promote the optimal habitat requirements needed for the species. Prescribed burning would be implemented during the growing season when parameters can be met (Caldwell, 2004). Prescribed burning provides the foundation for the restoration and maintenance of the pine ecosystem upon which the RCW and many other species depend. Burning, when used effectively, has been noted to be the most efficient and "natural" way to maintain RCW habitat (nesting and foraging) in optimal condition (USFS, 2003a). Burning would reduce the midstory within the forest stands, while thinning would open up the canopy, creating open, park-like conditions preferred by the RCW.

Thinning in combination with prescribed burning under Alternatives 2 and 3 would not impact the Ocmulgee and Altamaha shiner. Management actions that would propose or create adverse effects would be those that disturb soil, potentially causing erosion and sedimentation levels to increase. Vegetation alterations within the watersheds would potentially increase water flow into streams. The Riparian Prescription included in the Revised Plan provides direction designed to maintain and enhance water quality. Therefore, plan implementation should have little potential for adverse impacts to individuals. Throughout the Oconee National Forest many private lands are currently in a degraded state due to increase development and agricultural use, making presence of quality habitats on national forest land increasingly important to the species. Following the State BMPs and streamside management zones will minimize any disturbance to the streams and wetlands, and should prevent any impacts to fish and other aquatic species.

In addition, the removal or cutting of dense trees would result in an additional beneficial cumulative effect by stopping the spread of SPB infestations and minimizing loss of habitat.

4.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

Consultation and coordination have occurred with numerous agencies during the preparation of this EA. **Table 4-1** lists the agencies, organizations, and persons contacted for information, which assisted in identifying issues, developing alternatives, and analyzing impacts of the alternatives.

Person Contacted	Agency/Organization
William Nightingale, District Ranger	U.S. Forest Service, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests, Oconee Ranger District
Elizabeth Caldwell, Wildlife Biologist	U.S. Forest Service, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests, Oconee Ranger District
Christy Smith, Procurement and Property	U.S. Forest Service, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests
John Petrick, Forest Planner	U.S. Forest Service, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests
Timothy Walker, Forester	U.S. Forest Service, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests
Tony Wild, District Fire Management Officer	U.S. Forest Service, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests, Oconee Ranger District
Melissa Anderson, Engineering Technician	U.S. Forest Service, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests
Michael Hurst, Wildlife Biologist	U.S. Forest Service, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests
Sarah Melville	U.S. Forest Service, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests, Oconee Ranger District
Ray Ellis, Natural Resources Staff Officer	U.S. Forest Service, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests
James Rickard, Wildlife Biologist	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Georgia Ecological Services
W. Ray Luce, Division Director, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer	Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division
Serena Bellow, Environmental Review Coordinator	Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division
Katherine Medlock, Staff Ecologist	Georgia Forestwatch
John Stanturf, Project Leader	Southern Research Station
Jeff McDonald, ORA/Wildlife Biologist	Oconee Ranger District
John Moore, Forester	Georgia Forestry Commission, Brender Demonstration Forest

5.0 REFERENCES CITED

(Baker and Hunter, 2002). Baker, James C. and William C. Hunter. 05 October 2002. Chapter 4: Effects of Forest Management on Terrestrial Ecosystems. In: *Southern Forest Resource Assessment, Final Report*, United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Region and Southern Research Station, in collaboration with the United States Environmental Protection Agency, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Tennessee Valley Authority, and State forestry agencies of the Southern United States.

(Belanger et al., 2000). Belanger, Roger P., Thomas Miller, Stanley J. Zarnoch, Stephen W. Fraedrich, and John F. Godbee. December 2000. An Integrated Approach Toward Reducing Losses From Fusiform Rust in Merchantable Slash and Loblolly Pine Plantations. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. Research Paper SRS-23.

(Cain, 1995). Cain, Michael D. 13 June 1995. Growth Expectations from Alternative Thinning Regimes and Prescribed Burning in Naturally Regenerated Loblolly-Shortleaf Pine Stands Through Age 20. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Forestry Services Laboratory, Monticello, Arizona. Reprinted from: *Forest Ecology and Management*, XI (1996), pp. 227-241.

(Caldwell, 2004). Caldwell, Elizabeth. 29 May 2004. Biological Evaluation For Red-Cockaded Woodpecker (*Picoides borealis*) and Bachman Sparrow (*Aimophila estivalis*) Habitat Improvement Project, Compartments 113, 114, 117, 118, and 119. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Oconee National Forest.

(Cowardin et al., 1979). Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States*. United States Fish and Wildlife Service Pub. FWS/OBS-79/31, Washington, DC, 103p.

(Ellis, 2003). United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests. 16 July 2003. Personal communication with Ray Ellis, Natural Resource Staff Officer.

(England, 1987). England, R.H. January 1987. Fisheries Management on Georgia National Forests. In: *Managing Southern Forests for Wildlife and Fish, A Proceedings*. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station. General Technical Report SO-65.

(Fulton and West, 2002). Fulton, Stephanie and Ben West. 05 October 2002. Chapter 21: Forestry Impacts on Water Quality. In: *Southern Forest Resource Assessment, Final Report*, United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Region and Southern Research Station, in collaboration with the United States Environmental Protection Agency, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Tennessee Valley Authority, and State forestry agencies of the Southern United States.

(GDNR et al., 1999). Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Forestry Commission, and Georgia Forestry Association. January 1999. *Georgia's Best Management Practices for Forestry*.

(GDNR, 2001). Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division. June 2001. Total Maximum Daily Load for Forty-One Stream Segments in the Ocmulgee River Basin For Sediment. Submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4.

(GDNR, 2003). Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Division, Georgia Natural Heritage Program. 11 June 2003. Locations of Special Concern Animals, Plants, and Natural Communities in Jasper County, Georgia, by Quarter Quad Names Starting with (B), and by Quarter Quad Names Starting with (H).

(GDNR, 2004). Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division. 09 January 2004. 2004 Rivers/Streams Partially Supporting Designated Uses, Draft.

(Grace et al., 1997). Grace, John M., Bob Rummer, and Bryce J. Stokes. August 1997. Sediment Production and Runoff from Forest Road Sideslopes. Written for presentation at the August 10-14, 1997 ASAE Annual International Meeting. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. SRS-4703.

(Gucinski et al., 2001). Gucinski, Hermann, Michael J. Furniss, Robert R. Ziemer, and Martha H. Brookes (Eds.). May 2001. *Forest Roads: A Synthesis of Scientific Information*. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. Portland, Oregon. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-509.

(Haywood et al., 1998). Haywood, James D. September 1998. Seasonal Burning and Woody Plant Control Influence Native Vegetation in Loblolly Pine Stands. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. Research Paper SRS-14.

(Landers, 1987). Landers, J. Larry. January 1987. Prescribed Burning for Managing Wildlife in Southeastern pine Forests. In: *Managing Southern Forests for Wildlife and Fish, A Proceedings*, United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station. General Technical Report SO-65.

(Lemly, 2000). Lemly, Dennis L. 2000. Techniques of Fisheries Management: Water Quality Assessment with Stream Insects. Workshop Notes: Silviculture in the Appalachian Mountains Program of Advanced Studies in Silviculture. February 29–March 17, 2000. Virginia Cooperative Extension Service, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, College of Natural Resources. Pgs. 30-31.

(Lyon et al., 2000). Lyon, L. Jack, Mark H. Huff, Robert G. Hooper, Edmund S. Telfer, David S. Schreiner, and Jane K. Smith. January 2000. *Wildland Fire in Ecosystems: Effects of Fire on Fauna*. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-42-Volume 1.

(Mengak et al., 1988). Mengak, Michael T., David H. Van Lear, and David C. Guynn, Jr. 1988. Impacts of Loblolly Pine Regeneration on Selected Wildlife Habitat Components. In: *Proceedings of the Fifth Biennial Southern Silvicultural Research Conference, Memphis, Tennessee, November 1-3, 1988*. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station, 1989. General Technical Report SO-74. Pgs. 612-618.

(Meyers and Johnson, 1978). Meyers, Joseph M. and A. Sydney Johnson. 1978. Bird Communities Associated with Succession and Management of Loblolly-Shortleaf Pine Forests. In: *Proceedings of the Workshop Management of Southern Forest for Nongame Birds, Atlanta, Georgia, January 24-26, 1978*. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station. General Technical Report SE-1.4. Pgs. 50-65.

(Miller, 1987). Miller, Edwin. January 1987. Effects of Forest Practices on Relationships Between Riparian Area and Aquatic Ecosystems. In: *Managing Southern Forests for Wildlife and Fish, A Proceedings*, United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station. General Technical Report SO-65.

(Miller et al., 1995). Miller, James H., Bruce R. Zutter, Shepard M. Zedaker, M. Boyd Edwards, and Ray A. New'hold. August 1995. Early Plant Succession in Loblolly Pine Plantations as Affected by Vegetation Management. Reprinted from: *Southern Journal of Applied Forestry*, Vol. 19, No. 3.

(NatureServe Explorer, 2002). NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. 2002. Version 1.6. Arlington, Virginia, USA: NatureServe. Accessed on 15 May 2003. Accessed at: <http://www.natureserve.org/explorer>.

(NRCS, 1999). United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 1999. *Soil Survey of Jasper County, Georgia*. In cooperation with University of Georgia, College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences; Agricultural Experiment Stations; United States Forest Service; and United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge.

(Perkins et al., 1988). Perkins, Carroll J., George A. Hurst, and E. Randy Roach. 1988. Relative Abundance of Small Mammals in Young Loblolly Pine Plantations. In: *Proceedings of the Fifth Biennial Southern Silvicultural Research Conference, Memphis, Tennessee, November 1-3, 1988*. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station, 1989. General Technical Report SO-74. Pgs. 589-591.

(Schultz, 1997). Schultz, Robert P. 1997. Loblolly Pine: The Ecology and Culture of Loblolly Pine (*Pinus taeda* L.). In: *Agricultural Handbook 713*, United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington, D.C. 493 pp.

(Seehorn, 1987). Seehorn, Monte E. January 1987. The Influence of Silvicultural Practices on Fisheries Management: Effects and Mitigation Measures. In: *Managing Southern Forests for*

Wildlife and Fish, A Proceedings, United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station. General Technical Report SO-65.

(Tank and Webster, 1998). Tank, Jennifer L., and J.R. Webster. 1998. Interaction of Substrate and Nutrient Availability on Wood Biofilm Processes in Streams. *Ecology*, 79(6): 2168-2179.

(USEPA, 2001). United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Nonpoint Source Control Branch. February 2001. National Management Measures to Control Nonpoint Source Pollution from Forestry, Draft. Prepared by Tetra Tech, Inc.

(USFS, 1989a). United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Region. January 1989. *Vegetation Management in the Coastal Plain/Piedmont Final Environmental Impact Statement*.

(USFS, 1989b). United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Region. February 1989. *A Guide For Prescribed Fire in Southern Forests*. Technical Publication R8-TP 11.

(USFS, 2001). United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Region, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests. November 2001. *Final Environmental Assessment for the Suppression of Southern Pine Beetle within the Red-cockaded Woodpecker Subhabitat Management Area on the Oconee National Forest*.

(USFS, 2002a). United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Region 8, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests. File data: 09 September 2002. USDA Forest Service Stewardship Contracting Pilots Monitoring/Evaluation Report, FY 2002. Red Cockaded Woodpecker and Bachman's Sparrow Habitat Improvement.

(USFS, 2002b). United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests. 2002. Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest 2002 Locally Rare Species List.

(USFS, 2003a). United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests, Oconee Ranger District. 2003. Decision Memo, Prescribed Burning. Issued by William Nightingale, District Ranger.

(USFS, 2003b). United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Region, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests. Revised and updated May 2003. *Management Indicator Species Population and Habitat Trends*.

(USFS, 2003c). United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Oconee National Forest. May 2003. Stewardship Project Temporary Road Information. Spreadsheet.

(USFS, 2003d). United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Oconee National Forest. 29 May 2003. Stewardship Project Proposed FS Haul Roads. Transmitted via email from Elizabeth Caldwell, Wildlife Biologist, to Mangi Environmental.

(USFS, 2004a). United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Region, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests. January 2004. *Land and Resource Management Plan Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests*.

(USFS, 2004b). United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Region, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests. January 2004. *Final Environmental Impact Statement, Land and Resource Management Plan Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests*.

(USFWS, 1998). United States Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge. October 1998. *Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge Fishing Regulations* (brochure).

(USFWS, 2002). United States Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Clemson Field Office. October 2002. *Red-cockaded Woodpecker* (brochure).

(USFWS, 2003a). United States Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Southeast Region. Approved 27 January 2003. Recovery Plan for the Red-cockaded Woodpecker (*Picoides borealis*), Second Revision. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Atlanta, Georgia. 296 pp.

(USFWS, 2003b). United States Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. As of 01 June 2003. National Wetlands Inventory. Accessed at: <http://wetlands.fws.gov/>.

(Walker, 2003) USDA Forest Service, Oconee National Forest. 2003. E-mail communication from forester Timothy Walker. July 31.

(Webb & Associates, 2003). R.S. Webb & Associates. 26 February 2003. *Archeological Survey of 1,247 Acres in Compartments 113, 114, 118, and 119, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests, Oconee District, Jasper County, Georgia*. Prepared by William R. Jordan and Phillip W. Quirk. Prepared for United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests.

(Williams et al., 1999). Williams, Thomas M., Donal D. Hook, Donald J. Lipscomb, Xiaoyan Zeng, and Joseph W. Albiston. February 1999. Effectiveness of Best Management Practices to Protect Water Quality in the South Carolina Piedmont. In: *Proceedings of the Tenth Biennial Southern Silvicultural Research Conference*, Shreveport, Louisiana, February 16-18, 1999. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station, 1999. General Technical Report SRS-30. Pgs. 271-276.

(Wood and Wood, 1985). Wood, K.G. and W. Dean Wood. 1985. A Cultural Resources Reconnaissance Survey of Compartments 116 and 117, Oconee National Forest, Jasper County, Georgia. Southern Archeological Services, Inc. Athens, Georgia.

(Yahner, 2000). Yahner, Richard H. 2000. *Eastern Deciduous Forest Ecology and Wildlife Conservation, Second Edition*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

6.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

The following people contributed to the preparation of this EA:

Name	Title
Bill Nightingale	District Ranger
Tim Walker	Forester
Sherry Koonce	Geographic Information Specialist
Jeff McDonald	Wildlife Biologist/ORA
Liz Caldwell	Wildlife Biologist
John Mayer	Archeologist
Mike Murphy	Forester
Michael Hurst	Wildlife Biologist
Dick Rightmyer	Soil Scientist
Charlene Breeden	Hydrologist

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK