

Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Volume 3, Chapter 3, Part 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Table of Contents is divided into 6 Parts. Each Part begins with page 1. Information at the top and bottom of each page identifies the Part and page number being viewed.

4. Species of the Sierra Nevada	1
4.1. General Methods for Species Assessments	2
4.1.1. Species viability	2
4.1.2. Assessing Environmental Consequences	2
4.1.3. Species Viability Assessments	3
4.1.4. Dealing with Uncertainty	7
 4.2. Vertebrate Species	 1
4.2.1. Broad-Scale Trends in Vertebrate Species	1
Measures Used to Assess Trends in Terrestrial Vertebrate Species	1
Methodology for Assessing Terrestrial Vertebrate Species, including Assumptions and Limitations	3
I. Affected Environment	4
II. Environmental Consequences	6
Summary of Effects of the Alternatives on Terrestrial Vertebrate Species	15
4.2.2. Mammals	23
4.2.2.1. MULE DEER (<i>Odocoileus hemonius</i>)	23
4.2.3. Birds (<i>Abstracted from Hejl 2000</i>)	28
4.2.3.1. Terrestrial Land Birds	29
Moderate and Low Vulnerability Bird Species	29
I. Affected Environment	29
II. Environmental Consequences	29
4.2.3.2. Diurnal and Nocturnal Raptors (<i>Abstracted From Keane 2000b</i>)	39
Forest/Woodland Habitats Assessment Group	40
Broad Elevational Distribution/ Habitat Generalist Assessment Group	42
Low Elevational Distribution/Open Habitats Assessment Group	43
Broad Elevational Distributions/Open Habitats Assessment Group	45
Aquatic Habitats Assessment Group	46
4.2.4. Amphibians	48
Aquatic, Riparian, and Meadow Associates	48
TERRESTRIAL ASSOCIATES	50
(OLD FOREST AND LOWER WESTSIDE HARDWOOD)	50
Broad Scale Trends in Amphibians	52
4.2.5. Fish	64
I. Affected Environment	64
II. Environmental Consequences	67
4.2.6. Reptiles (<i>Abstracted from Staub 2000</i>)	70
Broad Scale Trends in Reptiles	70
Affected Environment	70
Environmental Consequences	70

4.3. Endangered, Threatened, and Proposed Species	1
4.3.1 Mammals	1
4.3.1.1. SIERRA NEVADA BIGHORN SHEEP (<i>Ovis canadensis californiana</i>)	1
4.3.2 Birds	7
4.3.2.1. BALD EAGLE (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>)	7
4.3.2.2. CALIFORNIA CONDOR (<i>Gymnogyps californianus</i>)	13
4.3.2.3. SOUTHWESTERN WILLOW FLYCATCHER (<i>Empidonax traillii extimus</i>)	18
4.3.3. Amphibians	27
4.3.3.1. CALIFORNIA RED-LEGGED FROG (<i>Rana aurora draytonii</i>)	27
4.3.4. Fish	40
I. Affected Environment	40
Little Kern Golden Trout (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss whitei</i>)	40
Piaute Cutthroat Trout (<i>Oncorhynchus clarki seleniris</i>)	41
Lahonton Cutthroat Trout (<i>Oncorhynchus clarki henshawi</i>)	43
Modoc Sucker (<i>Catostomus microps</i>)	45
Warner Sucker (<i>Catostomus warnerensis</i>)	47
Shortnose Sucker (<i>Chasmistes brevirostris</i>) and	51
Lost River Sucker (<i>Deltistes luxatus</i>)	51
Central Valley Chinook, ESUs (<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>)	53
Spring run, Winter run	53
Central Valley Steelhead (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus</i>)	56
Owens tui chub (<i>Gila bicolor snyderi</i>),	61
Cowhead Lake tui chub (<i>G. b. vaccaceps</i>),	61
Owens pupfish (<i>Cyprinodon radiosus</i>),	61
Sacramento splittail (<i>Pogonichthys macrolepidotus</i>)	61
II. Environmental Consequences	62
4.4. Forest Service Sensitive Species (Focus species)	1
Overview	1
4.4.1. Mammals	2
4.4.1.1. PACIFIC FISHER (<i>Martes pennanti</i>)	2
4.4.1.2. MARTEN	19
4.4.1.3. SIERRA NEVADA RED FOX	37
4.4.1.4. WOLVERINE	46
4.4.1.5. PALLID BAT (<i>Antrozous pallidus</i>)	55
4.4.1.6. TOWNSEND'S BIG-EARED BAT (<i>Plecotus townsendii</i>)	59
Environmental Consequences	62
Summary of Consequences to Townsend's Big-Eared Bat	63
4.4.1.7. SIERRA NEVADA SNOWSHOE HARE (<i>Lepus americanus</i>)	66
4.4.2. Birds	70
4.4.2.1. CALIFORNIA SPOTTED OWL	70
4.4.2.2. NORTHERN GOSHAWK	114
Preferred Alternative	135
4.4.2.3. WILLOW FLYCATCHER (<i>Empidonax traillii</i>)	144
4.4.2.4. GREATER SANDHILL CRANE	198
4.4.2.5. CALIFORNIA YELLOW-BILLED CUCKOO (<i>Coccyzus americanus occidentalis</i>)	204
4.4.3. Amphibians	209
WIDELY DISTRIBUTED AND N.O.I. SPECIES	209
4.4.3.1. FOOTHILL YELLOW-LEGGED FROG	209
4.4.3.2. MOUNTAIN YELLOW-LEGGED FROG	215
4.4.3.3. YOSEMITE TOAD	220
4.4.3.5. NORTHERN LEOPARD FROG	228
Species occurring on only One or Two Forests	229
4.4.3.6. BATRACHOSEPS RELICTUS SPECIES COMPLEX	232
4.4.3.7. OTHER FOREST SERVICE SENSITIVE SALAMANDERS	232
4.4.4. Fish	246
I. Affected Environment	246
GOOSE LAKE LAMPREY (<i>Lampetra tridentata ssp.</i>)	246

CHINOOK SALMON, Fall run (<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>).....	247
EAGLE LAKE RAINBOW TROUT (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss aquilarum</i>).....	250
VOLCANO CREEK GOLDEN TROUT (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss aguabonita</i>).....	252
GOOSE LAKE REDBAND TROUT (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp.</i>).....	253
MC CLOUD RIVER REDBAND TROUT (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp.</i>).....	256
WARNER VALLEY REDBAND TROUT (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp.</i>).....	256
GOOSE LAKE SUCKER (<i>Catostomus occidentalis lacusanserinus</i>).....	257
LAHONTON LAKE TUI CHUB (<i>Oncorhynchus clarki pectinifer</i>).....	258
GOOSE LAKE TUI CHUB (<i>Gila bicolor thalassina</i>).....	259
HARDHEAD (<i>Mylopharodon conocephalus</i>).....	261
II. Environmental Consequences.....	262
Environmental Outcomes.....	266
4.4.5 Reptiles.....	268
4.4.5.1. NORTHWESTERN POND TURTLE (<i>Clemmys marmorata</i>).....	268
4.4.5.2. CALIFORNIA LEGLESS LIZARD (<i>Anniella pulchra pulchra</i>).....	272
4.4.5.3. SIERRA NIGHT LIZARD.....	274
4.4.5.4. PANAMINT ALLIGATOR LIZARD (<i>Elgaria panamintina</i>).....	274
4.4.5.5. COAST HORNED LIZARD (<i>Phrynosoma coronatum</i>).....	276
4.5. Moderate and High Vulnerability Species and Species of Concern.....	1
4.5.1. Mammals.....	1
4.5.1.1. WHITE-TAILED HARE.....	1
4.5.1.2. PYGMY RABBIT (<i>Brachylagus idahoensis</i>).....	6
4.5.1.3. SPOTTED BAT (<i>Euderma maculatum</i>).....	13
4.5.1.4. SMALL-FOOTED MYOTIS (<i>Myotis ciliolabrum</i>).....	17
4.5.1.5. SILVER-HAIRED BAT (<i>Lasionycteris noctivagans</i>).....	21
4.5.1.6. LONG-LEGGED MYOTIS (<i>Myotis volans</i>).....	27
4.5.1.7. HOARY BAT (<i>Lasiurus cinereus</i>).....	31
4.5.1.8. FRINGED MYOTIS (<i>Myotis thysanodes</i>).....	35
4.5.1.9. WESTERN MASTIFF BAT (<i>Eumops perotis</i>).....	39
4.5.1.10. WESTERN RED BAT (<i>Lasiurus blossevillii</i>).....	43
4.5.1.11. LONG-EARED MYOTIS (<i>Myotis evotis</i>).....	47
4.5.2. Birds.....	51
4.5.2.1. BAND-TAILED PIGEONS (<i>Columba fasciata</i>).....	51
4.5.2.2. BLACK TERN (<i>Chlidonias niger</i>).....	56
4.5.2.3. FORSTER'S TERN (<i>Sterna forsteri</i>).....	61
4.5.2.4. SWAINSON'S THRUSH (<i>Catharus ustulatus</i>).....	65
4.5.2.5. YELLOW-BREASTED CHAT (<i>Icteria virens</i>).....	75
4.5.2.6. MOUNTAIN WHITE-CROWNED SPARROW.....	80
(<i>Zonotrichia leucophrys oriantha</i>).....	80
4.5.2.7. BANK SWALLOW (<i>Riparia riparia</i>).....	84
4.5.2.8. LONG-EARED OWL (<i>Asio otus</i>).....	89
4.5.2.9. OLIVE-SIDED FLYCATCHER (<i>Contopus cooperi</i>).....	96
4.5.2.10. Purple Martin (<i>Progne subis</i>).....	103
4.5.3. Amphibians.....	109
4.5.3.1. MOUNT LYELL SALAMANDER (<i>Hydromantes platycephalus</i>).....	109
4.5.4. Fish.....	111
I. Affected Environment.....	111
KERN BROOK LAMPREY (<i>Lampetra hubbsi</i>).....	111
Pacific LAMPREY (<i>Lampetra tridentate tridentate</i>).....	112
KERN RIVER RAINBOW TROUT (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss gilberti</i>).....	113
OWENS SUCKER (<i>Catostomus fumeiventris</i>).....	114
MOUNTAIN SUCKER (<i>Catostomus platyrhynchus</i>).....	114
EAGLE LAKE TUI CHUB (<i>Gila bicolor ssp.</i>).....	115
PIT RIVER TUI CHUB (<i>Gila bicolor ssp.</i>).....	115
SACRAMENTO HITCH (<i>Lavinia exilicauda exilicauda</i>).....	117
OWENS SPECKLED DACE (<i>Rhinichthys osculus ssp.</i>).....	118
PIT RIVER ROACH (<i>Lavinia symmetricus mitrulus</i>).....	118
RED HILLS ROACH (<i>Lavinia symmetricus ssp.</i>).....	119

SAN JOAQUIN ROACH (<i>Lavinia symmetricus</i> ssp.).....	119
ROUGH SCULPIN (<i>Cottus asperrimus</i>)	120
II. Environmental Consequences.....	120
Effects of the Alternatives	121
Cumulative Effects.....	125
4.5.5. Aquatic Invertebrates	126
I. Affected Environment	126
II. Environmental Consequences.....	127
4.5.6. Reptiles	132
I. Affected Environment	132
II. Environmental Consequences.....	133
4.6. Vascular Plants, Bryophytes, and Fungi.....	1
Introduction	1
4.6.1. Vascular plants	1
4.6.2. Bryophytes, lichens, and fungi.....	2
4.6.2.1. Bryophytes	2
4.6.2.2. Lichens.....	3
4.6.2.3. Fungi	4
4.6.3. Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Plants	5
I. Affected Environment.....	5
II. Environmental Consequences	20
Existing Condition and Environmental Consequences for rare plant species	35

Volume 3, Chapter 3

LIST OF TABLES

The Lists of Tables and Figures is divided into 6 Parts. Each Part begins with page 1. Information at the top and bottom of each page identifies the Part and page number being viewed.

(There are no tables or figures in Part 4.1. There are no figures in Part 4.5 or Part 4.6.)

Part 4.2

Table 4.2.1a. Aggregate habitat utility values summed over 578 taxa, by major vegetation type and ownership class, compared to aerial extent of each grouping.	5
Table 4.2.1b. Summary statistics calculated for the taxa assigned to eight clusters through a nonhierarchical multivariate clustering technique based on their changes in habitat utilities across alternatives. The first five rows in the body of the table are counts; the remaining rows are averages. Cluster Rsqr is a measure of the degree of correlation between an individual taxon's score and the cluster score.	9
Table 4.2.1c. Cluster scores for the current condition, summarized by major forest types.	10
Table 4.2.1d. Percentage changes from current conditions in composite cluster scores (the sum of clusters 1 through 8) for each forest type projected through time for Alternative 8 Modified.	14
Table 4.2.1e. Listing of taxa included in the cluster analysis described in Section 4.2.1.	17
Table 4.2.2.1a. Estimated Deer Populations for the Six DAUs in the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Project Area (CDFG 1998). These six DAUs total 28,732,160 acres (44,894 square miles).	24
Table 4.2.2.1b. Projected Percent Change in Mule Deer Habitat Utility Scores Over 50 Years as a Result of Implementation of the Alternatives (Appendix B).	26
Table 4.2.3.1a. Number of land bird species (of 142) with more (+), similar (~), or less (-) conifer (CON) or montane hardwood (MHD) habitat units in 50 years under each alternative.	30
Table 4.2.3.1b. Average relative changes in habitat units (in percent) for land birds with optimal habitat in each combination of vegetation and age or structural stage.	31
Table 4.2.3.1c. Consequences of Alternatives on Bird Species.	34
Table 4.2.3.2a. Distribution of diurnal raptors in the Sierra Nevada Bioregion by assessment groups.	40
Table 4.2.3.2b. Projected percent change in overall habitat utility for raptors in the forest and woodland assessment group, from current conditions to 50 years in the future by FEIS alternative.	42
Table 4.2.3.2c. Projected percent change in overall habitat utility for raptors in the broad elevational distribution/ habitat generalists assessment group, from current conditions to 50 years in the future by FEIS alternative.	43
Table 4.2.3.2d. Projected percent change in overall habitat utility for raptors in the low elevational distribution/ open habitats assessment group, from current conditions to 50 years in the future by FEIS alternative.	45
Table 4.2.3.2e. Projected percent change in overall habitat utility for raptors in the broad elevational distribution/ open habitats assessment group, from current conditions to 50 years in the future by FEIS alternative.	46
Table 4.2.3.2f. Projected percent change in overall habitat utility for raptors in the aquatic habitats assessment group, from current conditions to 50 years in the future by FEIS alternative.	47

Table 4.2.4a. Aquatic, riparian, and meadow associated amphibian species, criteria for inclusion on the DEIS/FEIS list, risk analysis approach, main habitat association, important habitat elements, and key management issues.....	57
Table 4.2.4b. Aquatic, riparian, and meadow associated amphibian species distributions across the 11 Sierra Nevada National Forests.	59
Table 4.2.4c. Forest, woodland, and other habitat associated amphibian species, criteria for inclusion on the DEIS/FEIS list, risk analysis approach, main habitat association, important habitat elements, and key management issues.....	60
Table 4.2.4d. Forest, woodland, and other habitat associated amphibian species distributions across the 11 Sierra Nevada National Forests.	62
Table 4.2.4e. Percentages of historic and current distributions (range) of amphibian species at risk that occur across various land allocations.....	63
Table 4.2.5a. Fishes of concern within the planning area identified by Moyle and others (1996) as declining, or identified through the vulnerability assessment (Appendix R).	65
Table 4.2.6a. Percentages of historic and current distributions (range) of reptile species at risk that occur across various land allocations.....	71

Part 4.3

Table 4.3.1.1a. Comparison of management activities that could affect habitats for the Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep by alternative.....	5
Table 4.3.1.1b. Average assessment ratings for the Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep.....	5
Table 4.3.1.1c. The estimated population outcomes through the planning horizon for the Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep.	6
Table 4.3.2.1a. Bald eagle breeding population data for California, 1990 to 1999.	9
Table 4.3.2.1b. Bald Eagle territories and distribution by national forest.	10
Table 4.3.2.1c. Comparison of management activities that could affect habitats for the bald eagle by alternative over the 50 year planning horizon.....	10
Table 4.3.2.1d. Average assessment ratings for the bald eagle.....	11
Table 4.3.2.1e. Estimated population outcomes through the planning horizon for the bald eagle.....	12
Table 4.3.2.2a. Comparison of management activities that could affect habitats for the California condor by alternative over the 50 year planning horizon.	16
Table 4.3.2.2b. Average assessment ratings for the California condor.	17
Table 4.3.2.2c. Estimated population outcomes through the planning horizon for the California Condor.....	17
Table 4.3.2.3a. Southwestern willow flycatcher status and distribution in California, 1999.....	23
Table 4.3.2.3b. Comparison of management activities that could affect habitats for the Southwestern Willow flycatcher by alternative over the 50 year planning horizon.	24
Table 4.3.2.3c. Average assessment ratings for the Southwestern Willow flycatcher.....	25
Table 4.3.2.3d. Estimated population outcomes through the planning horizon for the Southwestern Willow flycatcher.....	26
Table 4.3.3.1a. A summary of primary risk factors and key conservation measures/management (standard and guideline # in parantheses) actions across FEIS alternatives for low to mid-elevation species, the California red-legged frog (<i>Rana aurora draytonii</i>) and foothill yellow-legged frog (<i>Rana boylei</i>), focusing on the aquatic habitat of these species.	32
Table 4.3.4a. The preferred water temperature for various life stages of steelhead	58
Table 4.3.4b. Fish species federally endangered, threatened, or proposed for listing and occur on Sierra Nevada national forest lands	62
Table 4.3.4c. The assessment ratings over the planning horizon for the Federally listed fish species.....	65
Table 4.3.4d. The assessment ratings over the planning horizon for the Federally listed fish species.....	66

Part 4.4

Table 4.4.1.1a. Key habitat features for fisher resting and denning sites.....	3
Table 4.4.1.1b. Average home range sizes for fishers in California.....	4
Table 4.4.1.1c. Level of risk to coarse woody debris by alternative.	12
Table 4.4.1.1d. Outcome ratings for the fisher. Environment outcomes evaluate the estimated environmental conditions on Forest Service lands after 50 years under each alternative. Population outcomes evaluate the estimated population conditions based on the environment outcome and other risk factors.	16
Table 4.4.1.2a. Westside suitable habitat in the marten core elevation range (5,500 to 10,000 feet).....	20
Table 4.4.1.2b. Eastside suitable habitat for the marten.	21
Table 4.4.1.2c. Marten home range sizes in the Sierra Nevada.	21
Table 4.4.1.2d. Projected percent change in habitat utility values for the most frequent marten prey species in the Sierra Nevada, after each alternative has been implemented for 50 years.....	32
Table 4.4.1.2e. Outcome ratings for the marten. Environment outcomes evaluate the estimated environmental conditions on Forest Service lands after 50 years under each alternative. Population outcomes evaluate the estimated population conditions based on the environment outcome and other risk factors.	34
Table 4.4.1.2f. Outcome ratings for the Sierra Nevada red fox. Environment outcomes evaluate the estimated environmental conditions on Forest Service lands after 50 years under each alternative. Population outcomes evaluate the estimated population conditions based on the environment outcome and other risk factors.....	43
Table 4.4.1.1d. Outcome ratings for the wolverine. Environment outcomes evaluate the estimated environmental conditions on Forest Service lands after 50 years under each alternative. Population outcomes evaluate the estimated population conditions based on the environment outcome and other risk factors.	53
Table 4.4.1.5a. Affects of implementing Alternatives 2 through Modified 8.....	57
Table 4.4.1.5b Average assessment ratings for the pallid bat. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future.	58
Table 4.4.1.5c. Average cumulative effect assessment ratings for the pallid bat. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future.....	58
Table 4.4.1.6a. Effects of implementing Alternatives 2 through Modified 8.....	63
Table 4.4.1.6b. Average assessment ratings for the Townsend's big-eared. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future.....	64
Table 4.4.1.6c. Average cumulative effect assessment ratings for the Townsend's big-eared bat. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future.....	65
Table 4.4.1.7a. Comparison of management activities that could affect habitats for the Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare by alternative.	68
Table 4.4.1.7b. Average assessment ratings for the Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. (See Chapter 4, Part 4.1.5.) Total score for each alternative is 100.....	68
Table 4.4.1.7c. represents the estimated population outcomes through the planning horizon for the Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare.....	69
Table 4.4.2.1a. Number of California spotted owl sites by status known on Forest Service lands and non-Forest Service lands, since 1987, within the boundaries of the National Forests in the project area reported in the California Department of Fish and Game database (Fall 1998).....	71
Table 4.4.2.1b. Estimates of the finite rate of annual population change (λ) from four California spotted owl demographic studies conducted in the Sierra Nevada, 1986-1998. Overall change is computed by extrapolating λ over the period of study.	72
Table 4.4.2.1c. Range of mean values of some attributes in suitable habitat for spotted owls in Sierra Nevada mixed-conifer forests (from Verner et al. 1992:96).....	74
Table 4.4.2.1d. Distribution of known California spotted owl sites by reproductive status and fire hazard risk rating.	82
Table 4.4.2.1e. Percentage of California spotted owl activity centers in land allocations where limited vegetation treatments are allowed.	84

Table 4.4.2.1f. Projected percent changes in the amount of high and moderate suitability spotted owl nesting and foraging habitat from the current to 50 years in the future under the FEIS Alternatives.....	93
Table 4.4.2.1g. Projected percent changes in overall habitat suitability scores based on CWHR habitat models from the current to 50 years in the future across the FEIS Alternatives.....	93
Table 4.4.2.1h. Projected percent changes in overall habitat suitability scores for select prey species of California spotted owls based on CWHR habitat models from the current to 50 years in the future across the FEIS Alternatives.....	96
Table 4.4.2.1i. Likelihood (high, moderate, low) of retaining important structural attributes of spotted owl habitat following vegetation treatment prescriptions projected in the alternatives.....	97
Table 4.4.2.1j. Number of acres (in thousands) scheduled for vegetation treatments by alternative in the first and second decades (excludes brush, plantation, and retreatment acres).....	98
Table 4.4.2.1k. Proportion of the spotted owl activity centers that occur within the urban intermix zone, by geographic area of concern.....	100
Table 4.4.2.1l. Total of the projected annual acres of wildfire burned and the estimated annual acres of higher intensity vegetation treatments* (in thousands).....	104
Table 4.4.2.1m. Environmental outcome ratings for the California spotted owl. Ratings other than "current" represent the outcome most likely to be realized 50 years in the future. (See Chapter 4, Part 4.1.5.).....	106
Table 4.4.2.2a. Number of northern goshawk breeding territories reported by Sierra Nevada National Forests.....	115
Table 4.4.2.2b. Distribution of northern goshawk territories reported by Sierra Nevada National Forests and in the California Department of Fish and Game database in the Sierra Nevada Bioregion by fire hazard risk rating.....	121
Table 4.4.2.2c. Percent of known northern goshawk breeding territories reported by Sierra Nevada National Forests and in the California Department of Fish and Game database that are located in land allocations (wilderness, integrated biodiversity reserves, old forest emphasis areas) designated to receive limited treatment under each FEIS Alternative.....	130
Table 4.4.2.2d. Consequences of the alternatives on eight factors affecting northern goshawks.....	130
Table 4.4.2.2e. Projected percent changes in the amount of high and moderate suitability northern goshawk nesting and foraging habitat from the current to 50 years in the future across the FEIS Alternatives.....	132
Table 4.4.2.2f. Projected percent changes in overall habitat suitability scores based on CWHR habitat models from the current to 50 years in the future across the FEIS Alternatives.....	132
Table 4.4.2.2g. Projected percent changes in CWHR habitat suitability for select northern goshawk prey species from the current time to year 50 across the FEIS alternatives.....	139
Table 4.4.2.2h. Distribution of known northern goshawk territories reported by Sierra Nevada National Forests by major land allocation under the preferred alternative. Numbers in parentheses are territories located in the California Department of Fish and Game database.....	137
Table 4.4.2.2i. Estimated outcome ratings for the northern goshawk. Environmental outcomes evaluate the estimated environmental conditions on Forest Service lands after 50 years under each alternative. Population outcomes evaluate the estimated population conditions based on the environment outcome and other risk factors.....	137
Table 4.4.2.3a. Nest success for willow flycatchers across various studies and years.....	153
Table 4.4.2.3b. Acres of shrubby wet meadows containing known or potential willow flycatcher habitat in active, inactive, non-allotments, and outside allotments on Forest Service land within Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Project Planning Area.....	169
Table 4.4.2.3c. Acres of Wet Shrubby Meadows Containing Known or Potential Willow Flycatcher Habitat Inside and Outside 5-mile Buffers in active, inactive, non-allotments and outside allotments on National Forest lands in Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Project Planning Area.....	170
Table 4.4.2.3d. Acres of Shrubby Wet Meadows Containing Known or Potential Willow Flycatcher Habitat Inside and Outside 100-foot Stream Buffers in active, inactive, non-allotments, and outside allotments on National Forest lands in Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Project Planning Area.....	171
Table 4.4.2.3e. Environmental outcomes for willow flycatchers by alternative.....	194
Table 4.4.2.3f. Estimate of Wet Shrubby Meadows Containing Known or Potential Willow Flycatcher Habitat (acres) by Ownership within Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Project Planning Area.....	194

Table 4.4.2.3g. Estimate of Known Willow Flycatcher Sites (acres) by Ownership in active, inactive, non-allotments and outside allotments within Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Project Planning Area.....	195
Table 4.4.2.3h. Population outcomes for willow flycatchers by alternative.....	197
Table 4.4.2.4a. Comparison of management activities that could affect habitats for the greater sandhill crane by alternative.....	201
Table 4.4.2.4b. Average assessment ratings for the greater sandhill crane.....	202
Table 4.4.2.4c. represents the estimated population outcomes through the planning horizon for the greater sandhill crane.....	203
Table 4.4.2.5a. Average assessment ratings for the California yellow-billed cuckoo.....	208
Table 4.4.2.5b. represents the estimated population outcomes through the planning horizon for the California yellow-billed cuckoo.....	208
Table 4.4.3.1a. Average assessment ratings for the foothill yellow-legged frog. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. (See Chapter 4, Part I.) Total score for each alternative is 100.....	213
Table 4.4.3.2a. Average assessment ratings for the mountain yellow-legged frog. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. (See Chapter 4, Part 1.) Total score for each alternative is 100.....	218
Table 4.4.3.3a. Average assessment ratings for the Yosemite toad. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. (See Chapter 4, Part 1) Total score for each alternative is 100.....	223
Table 4.4.3.6a. A summary of primary risk factors and key conservation measures/ management actions (standard and guideline # in parantheses) across FEIS alternatives for high elevation species, the mountain yellow-legged frog (<i>Rana muscosa</i>) and the Yosemite toad (<i>Bufo canorus</i>), focusing on the aquatic habitat of these species.....	240
Table 4.4.4a. Sierra Nevada bioregion fish focal species.....	263
Table 4.4.4b. Assessment ratings over the 50 year planning horizon for Forest Service sensitive fish species.....	266
Table 4.4.4c. represents the assessment ratings over the planning horizon for the Forest Service sensitive fish species.....	267
Table 4.4.5.1a. Comparison of management activities that could affect habitats for the western pond turtle by alternative.....	270
Table 4.4.5.2a. Comparison of management activities that could affect habitats for the California legless lizard by alternative.....	273
Table 4.4.5.4a. Comparison of management activities that could affect habitats for the Panamint alligator lizard by alternative.....	275
Table 4.4.5.5a. Comparison of management activities that could affect habitats for the coast horned lizard by alternative.....	277

Part 4.5

Table 4.5.1.1a. Average assessment ratings for the white-tailed hare. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. (See Chapter 4, Part 4.1.5.).....	4
Table 4.5.1.1b. Average assessment ratings for the white-tailed hare. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. (See Chapter 4, Part 4.1.5.).....	5
Table 4.5.1.2a. Comparison of management activities that could affect habitats for the pygmy rabbit by alternative.....	10
Table 4.5.1.2b. Average assessment ratings for the pygmy rabbit. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future.....	10
Table 4.5.1.2c. Average cumulative effect assessment ratings for the pygmy rabbit. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future..	12
Table 4.5.1.3a. Affects of implementing Alternatives 2 to Modified 8 on spotted Bat.....	14
Table 4.5.1.3b. Average assessment ratings for the spotted bat. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future.....	15

Table 4.5.1.3c. Average cumulative effect assessment ratings for the spotted bat. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. 16

Table 4.5.1.4a. Effects of implementing Alternatives 2 through Modified 8 for the small-footed myotis. 18

Table 4.5.1.4b. Average assessment ratings for the small-footed myotis. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. 19

Table 4.5.1.4c. Average cumulative effect assessment ratings for the small-footed myotis. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. 20

Table 4.5.1.5a. Affects of implementing Alternatives 2 – Modified 8 for the silver-haired bat..... 23

Table 4.5.1.5b. Average assessment ratings for the silver-haired bat. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. 24

Table 4.5.1.5c. Average cumulative effect assessment ratings for the silver-haired bat. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. 26

Table 4.5.1.6a. Affects of implementing Alternatives 2 through Modified 8. 28

Table 4.5.1.6b. Average assessment ratings for the long-legged myotis. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. 29

Table 4.5.1.6c. Average cumulative effect assessment ratings for the long-legged myotis. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. 30

Table 4.5.1.7a. Effects of implementing Alternatives 2 through Modified 8. 33

Table 4.5.1.7b. represents the assessment ratings for the hoary bat. Ratings represent the average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. 34

Table 4.5.1.7c. Average cumulative effect assessment ratings for the hoary bat. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. 34

Table 4.5.1.8a. Effects of implementing Alternatives 2 through Modified 8. 37

Table 4.5.1.8b. Average assessment ratings for the fringed myotis. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. 38

Table 4.5.1.8c. Average cumulative effect assessment ratings for the fringed myotis. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. 38

Table 4.5.1.9a. Effects of implementing Alternatives 2 through Modified 8 for the Western mastiff bat.41

Table 4.5.1.9b. Average assessment ratings for the Western mastiff bat. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. 42

Table 4.5.1.10a. Affects of implementing Alternatives 2 to Modified 8 for Western red bat. 45

Table 4.5.1.10b. Average assessment ratings for the Western red bat. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. 46

Table 4.5.1.10c. Average cumulative effect assessment ratings for the Western red bat. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. 46

Table 4.5.1.11a. Affects of implementing Alternatives 2 through Modified 8. 49

Table 4.5.1.11b. Average assessment ratings for the long-eared myotis. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. 50

Table 4.5.1.11c. Average cumulative effect assessment ratings for the long-eared myotis. Ratings represent average degree of confidence in each outcome being realized 50 years in the future. 50

Table 4.5.2.1a. Summary of tables from Part 3.3 "Hardwood Ecosystems." 54

Table 4.5.2.1b. Estimated Population Outcomes for each alternative. 55

Table 4.5.2.2a. Comparison of management activities in riparian/meadow communities that could affect habitat for the black tern. 59

Table 4.5.2.2b. Environmental Outcomes of Alternatives on national forest lands..... 60

Table 4.5.2.2c. Environmental Outcomes of Alternatives on national forest lands and non-federal lands. 60

Table 4.5.2.3a. Comparison of management activities in riparian/meadow communities that could affect habitat for the Forster's tern..... 63

Table 4.5.2.3b. Environmental Outcomes of Alternatives on national forest lands for the Forster's tern.64

Table 4.5.2.3c. Environmental Outcomes of Alternatives on national forest lands and non-federal lands for the Forster's tern..... 64

Table 4.5.2.4a. Environmental consequences of implementing the proposed alternatives. 73

Table 4.5.2.4b. Environmental Outcomes of Alternatives on national forest lands for the Swainson's thrush..... 74

Table 4.5.2.4c. Environmental Outcomes of Alternatives on national forest lands and non-federal lands for the Swainson's thrush..... 74

Table 4.5.2.5a. Comparisons of the Alternatives for the yellow-breasted chat 78

Table 4.5.2.5b. Environmental Outcomes of Alternatives on national forest lands for the yellow-breasted chat	79
Table 4.5.2.5c. Environmental Outcomes of alternatives on national forest lands and non-federal lands for the yellow-breasted chat	79
Table 4.5.2.6a. Environmental Outcomes.	83
Table 4.5.2.6b. Population Outcomes.	83
Table 4.5.2.7a. Environmental Outcomes of Alternatives on national forest lands for the Bank swallow.....	87
Table 4.5.2.7b. Environmental Outcomes of alternatives on national forest lands and non-Federal lands for the bank swallow.....	88
Table 4.5.2.8a. Relative rankings comparing the contribution of each alternative toward maintaining and restoring hardwood ecosystems sustainability, native species biodiversity in hardwood ecosystems, and aquatic, riparian, and meadow ecosystems.....	94
Table 4.5.2.8b. Estimated environmental outcomes (after 50 years) by alternative for long-eared owl on planning area Forest Service lands.	95
Table 4.5.2.8c. Estimated population outcomes (after 50 years) by alternative for long-eared owl on all lands in the Sierra Nevada Bioregion.....	95
Table 4.5.2.9a. Estimated average annual burn acres during first decade (thousands of acres)*, estimated average annual acres treated during first 2 decades (thousands of acres), and relative overall ranking comparing the contribution of each alternative toward maintaining and providing potential olive-sided flycatcher habitat.	101
Table 4.5.2.9b. Estimated environmental outcomes (after 50 years) by alternative for olive-sided flycatcher on planning area Forest Service lands.	101
Table 4.5.2.9c. Estimated population outcomes (after 50 years) by alternative for olive-sided flycatcher on all lands in the Sierra Nevada Bioregion.....	102
Table 4.5.2.10a. Environmental consequences of implementing the proposed alternatives over the 50 year modeling horizon.....	107
Table 4.5.2.10b. Environmental Outcomes of Alternatives on national forest lands for the purple martin.	107
Table 4.5.2.10c. Environmental Outcomes of Alternatives on national forest lands and non-federal lands for the purple martin	108
Table 4.5.4a. Moderate and high vulnerability species and species of concern.....	120
Table 4.5.4b. The assessment ratings over the planning horizon for the moderate to high vulnerable fish species.	124
Table 4.5.4c. The assessment ratings over the planning horizon for the moderate to high vulnerable fish species.	125
Table 4.5.5a. Summary of distribution of aquatic invertebrate species with respect to six general habitat types. Several species occur in more than one habitat type so several boxes may be checked in a row. Asterisks (*) indicate that the habitat is most suitable if it is closely associated with cold springs in the immediate vicinity.	130
Table 4.5.5b. Summary of land management activities or conditions threatening the viability of aquatic invertebrate species. The (?) qualifier indicates a potential rather than observed threat that has not been specifically identified in published literature as causing historic or current detrimental impacts.....	131

Part 4.6

Table 4.6.3a. Threatened, endangered, and candidate plant species in Sierra Nevada national forests. Please see Biological Assessment for details on federally listed plants.	6
Table 4.6.3b. Summary of endemism, land ownership, and taxonomic characteristics of the 135 threatened, endangered, proposed, and sensitive (TEPS) plant species.	8
Table 4.6.3c. Distribution of the 135 threatened, endangered, and sensitive plant species by habitat guilds. Species may occur in more than one guild, thus the total is greater than 135. Ten species did not fit into guild descriptions.	13
Table 4.6.3d. Major threats for meadows and seeps guild.	13
Table 4.6.3e. Major threats for bogs/fens guild.	14
Table 4.6.3f. Major threats for vernal wet guild.	14
Table 4.6.3g. Major threats for riparian woodland guild.	15
Table 4.6.3h. Major threats for riparian forest guild.	15
Table 4.6.3i. Major threats for lakeshore guild.	16
Table 4.6.3j. Major threats for rock outcrop guild.	16
Table 4.6.3k. Major threats for ultramaphic guild.	17
Table 4.6.3l. Major Threats for cliff guild.	17
Table 4.6.3m. Major threats for edaphic specialists guild.	17
Table 4.6.3n. Major threats for interior forest guild.	18
Table 4.6.3o. Major threats for gap phase guild.	18
Table 4.6.3p. Major threats for fire-following guild.	19
Table 4.6.3q. Major threats for general openings guild.	20
Table 4.6.3r. Major threats for species with no guild assignment.	20
Table 4.6.3s. High vulnerability species occurring in the yellow pine type as defined by Munz and Keck (1968) (includes the mixed conifer belt). These species are most likely to be affected by management activities aimed at reducing fuels if they are in general forest, or by grazing and trampling by livestock if they occur in meadows surrounded by forests.	26
Table 4.6.3t. High vulnerability species occurring in the foothill woodland type. These species would be affected by the hardwood strategy.	26
Table 4.6.3u. High vulnerability species occurring in the chaparral type.	27
Table 4.6.3v. High vulnerability species not listed in the Calflora database as occurring in the Yellow Pine, Foothill Woodland, or Chaparral Munz types, but affected by the Aquatic, Riparian, and Meadow strategy.	27
Table 4.6.3w. Comparison of Habitat and Population Outcome Class for Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Plant species by alternative.	70

LIST OF FIGURES

Part 4.2

Figure 4.2.1a. Cumulative frequency distribution for current estimates of habitat utility available within the planning area for 578 taxa including mammals, birds, amphibians, and reptiles. 6	6
Figure 4.2.1b. Relative cumulative frequency distributions for taxa grouped into eight clusters. The horizontal axis refer to the current total habitat utility, summed across forest vegetation types on the national forests. The vertical axis is scaled such that cluster are successively stacked. Cluster 1 is on the bottom and ranges from 0 to 100; Cluster 2 ranges from 100 to 200, and so forth.....	10
Figures 4.2.1c-h. Relative cluster scores through time for each alternative, summarized over all forest types. Cluster scores are weighted averages of the individual taxa habitat utility values, where each taxon belongs to a single cluster. Absolute values for cluster scores were divided by the current condition estimate to generate relative scores depicted below.	11
Figure 4.2.1i. The composite cluster score through time for Alternative 8 Modified, summarized over all forest types and taxa.	15

Part 4.3

Figure 4.3.2.1a. Bald Eagle Breeding Population Trend in California, 1977 to 1999.	9
--	---

Part 4.4

Figure 4.4.2.1a. Distribution of owl nest plots by CWHR class on the Sierra, Eldorado, and Lassen National Forests.	75
Figure 4.4.2.1b. Region-wide projected acres of pooled CWHR classes 4M, 4D, 5M, 5D and 6.	89
Figure 4.4.2.1c. Region-wide projected change in CWHR class 5D.	90
Figure 4.4.2.1d. Region-wide projected change in CWHR class 5M.	90
Figure 4.4.2.2a. Region-wide projected acres of pooled CWHR classes 4M, 4D, 5M, 5D and 6.	140
Figure 4.4.2.2b. Region-wide projected acres of pooled CWHR class 5D.	140
Figure 4.4.2.2c. Region-wide projected acres of pooled CWHR class 5M.	140
Figure 4.4.2.2d. Region-wide projected acres of pooled CWHR class 4D.	141
Figure 4.4.2.2e. Region-wide projected acres of pooled CWHR class 4M.	142
Figure 4.4.2.2f. Region-wide projected acres of pooled CWHR class 6.	142
Figure 4.4.2.2g. Region-wide projected change in CWHR habitat utility units for northern goshawks across the FEIS alternatives.	143
Figure 4.4.2.3a. Number and Distribution of known willow flycatcher sites in the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Project Planning Area by Ownership.....	151
Figure 4.4.2.3b. Cumulative percent of successful and unsuccessful Willow Flycatcher nests fledging by date in the Sierra Nevada: 1983, 1984, 1986, 1987, 1997, 1998, and 1999*	173