TIMBERLINE SKI AREA
MOUNTAIN BIKE TRAILS AND SKILLS PARK

DECISION NOTICE
and
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

USDA FOREST SERVICE
MT. HOOD NATIONAL FOREST
ZIGZAG RANGER DISTRICT
CLACKAMAS COUNTY, OREGON

T3S, R9E, Sections 7, 12, & 13, Willamette Meridian

The Mt. Hood National Forest has completed the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Timberline Ski Area Mountain Bike Trails and Skills Park project in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other relevant Federal and State laws and regulations.

BACKGROUND

RLK & Company (RLK), the operators of the Timberline Lodge and Ski Area Complex, submitted a proposal for a lift-assisted downhill mountain biking trail system and skills park to the Forest Service in 2010. Lift-assisted mountain biking involves riders using a modified chairlift to bring themselves and their mountain bikes to the top of a mountain bike trail system. Rather than using ski runs as trails, downhill, lift-assisted mountain biking uses trails between 16 and 66 inches in width to descend from the top of the ski lift to the bottom, using turns and following natural contours as they cross though ski runs and the areas between them at a much less steep grade than the ski runs themselves. Grade-reversals, dips, and other techniques are used to control speed, keep riders on the trail, and maintain the trails and the natural resources they pass through.

RLK's goal was to develop a managed, high-quality mountain bike park that would appeal to families and feature predominantly beginner and intermediate level trails, as well as for learning biking skills and riding etiquette. RLK considers lift-assisted mountain biking to be an efficient way to capitalize on existing infrastructure beyond just the ski season by providing year-round recreation opportunities. Existing infrastructure such as roads, ski lifts, parking lots, lodge facilities, restrooms and signage would be used to support the use of a mountain bike park.

Restoration projects were proposed by the Forest Service in order to correct existing sedimentation issues in the West Fork Salmon River and Still Creek watersheds due to roads and ski area facilities. The areas that would be restored overlap with the area that would be used for the mountain bike park.

DECISION

I have decided to authorize the amendment of RLK's Special Use Permit (SUP) to include the Timberline Mountain Bike Trails and Skills Park as described in the Proposed Action, as stated in Section 2.3 of the EA. My decision incorporates all of the project design criteria outlined in Section 2.3.7. I have also decided to implement the restoration projects as described in Section 2.3 of the EA. I made this decision following my review of the EA, the supporting materials referenced by the EA, additional information contained in the project file, and the responses to public comments in **Appendix A** of the EA.

My decision tiers to, and incorporates by reference, the programmatic and site-specific decisions and/or direction stated in Sections 1.5 and 1.6 of the EA.

REASONS FOR MY DECISION

I have carefully considered all aspects of the proposal and its potential effects that were described and analyzed in the EA. I reviewed the comments received by the public and the concerns raised. I found that any adverse environmental effects of the mountain bike proposal would be fully offset through project design measures, including avoidance and minimization, and that the restoration projects would improve conditions in two watersheds beyond their current state. The remaining questions I had were tied to the social concerns raised—would the implementation of this proposal have an adverse effect to historic and/or cultural resources within the Timberline SUP area, and would the implementation of this proposal be compatible with all the visitors' sense of place? Would the proposal be compatible with the vision and purpose for Timberline, as prescribed in the Mt. Hood Forest Plan, and as described by Franklin Delano Roosevelt at his dedication speech for Timberline Lodge?

The Mt. Hood National Forest received nearly 200 comments in response to scoping of the proposal in 2010, and nearly 1,000 comments in response to publication of the Preliminary Assessment in 2011. Many of the comments came from individuals and organizations in the mountain biking community; many of the comments came from individuals and organizations in the environmental community. What was immediately apparent upon reading the public comments was the polarity regarding the numerous thoughts and feelings about Timberline Lodge, its immediate environment, and what people felt were the "appropriate uses" that should take place within this remarkable setting. Many respondents expressed their great desire to participate in lift-served mountain biking at Timberline as a means of appreciating and enjoying this environment, similar to the skiing and snowboarding that takes place in the SUP area today. Others voiced their concerns about the trade-offs that may be associated with mountain bike use on Mt. Hood, in general, and the SUP area specifically.

The concerns raised and our responses are described in Chapter 1 of the EA. The results of the analysis related to several concerns were particularly important in my decision-making process, and is described below.

Environmental Issues

Sediment/Aquatic Resources: I find that the design of the mountain bike trails and skills park, including siting of the trails away from streams to the extent possible and the design of surface water control features (like grade reversals and sediment traps), would minimize sediment mobilization and delivery to streams. With the concurrent implementation of the restoration projects, there would be a net decrease in sediment delivered to streams overall (EA, Sec. 3.2.2). The project is consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy (EA, Sec. 3.2.4). I am approving the watershed restoration projects and requiring that they be implemented concurrent with the bike park construction.

Wildlife: I find that disturbance to wildlife and habitat will be minimal (EA, Sec. 3.5.2). Several project design criteria relate to how habitat will be maintained, and include criteria such as keeping downed logs on site, no trees greater than 6" will be cut, and trails will be routed around large trees and roots. The hours of operation for the bike park will be limited to daytime only in order to limit disturbance to wildlife, including elk and nocturnal wildlife.

Vegetation: Measures are in place to minimize the spread of invasive species, such as the requirement to wash all bikes prior to entering the bike park and after leaving the park (EA, Sec. 2.3.7). Off-trail riding was also a concern expressed by the public, and I find that adequate measures are in place to prevent such unauthorized use, such as trail design and monitoring/patrolling the bike park.

Monitoring: In order to make sure that the mountain bike park and restoration projects are implemented and maintained properly, and are consistent with the analysis in the EA, I am requiring monitoring be conducted collaboratively between RLK and the Forest Service, that it would be done on a regular basis, and that an annual monitoring report be prepared in order to ensure that the project design criteria (PDC) are implemented properly. I recognize that there are still some uncertainties in operations that we may not know just yet, such as the availability of parking in the Lodge area to accommodate all visitors. Monitoring will enable us to anticipate, react, and adapt as appropriate.

Social Concerns

Having found that the biophysical effects of the proposal are relatively minor, I considered whether the addition of a mountain bike park would be at odds with the foundational principles associated with Timberline Lodge and its environs, a concern expressed by many commenters. I find that a mountain bike park is indeed aligned with those principles.

When Franklin Delano Roosevelt dedicated Timberline Lodge in 1937, he said,

> *Those who will follow us to Timberline Lodge on their holidays and vacations will represent the enjoyment of new opportunities for play in every season of the year. I mention especially every season of the year because we, as a nation, I think, are coming to realize that the summer is not the only time for play. I look forward to the day when many, many people from this region of the Nation are going to come here for skiing and tobogganing and various other forms of winter sports. Among them, all of those visitors,*

> *in winter and summer, spring and autumn, there will be many from the outermost parts of our Nation, travelers from the Middle West, the South and the East, Americans who are fulfilling a very desirable objective of citizenship - getting to know their country better.*

Roosevelt viewed Timberline Lodge as a monument to American skill and workers, but he did not intend for the Lodge or its setting to be a museum. In the aforementioned quote, Roosevelt made clear that Timberline would be valued for ***active recreational use*** occurring throughout the four seasons. With the increasing amount of available leisure time, growing affluence, and the emergent and diverse recreational tastes of many Americans since the 1930s, hiking the Timberline Trail, summer skiing at the Palmer Glacier, weddings and special events at the Silcox Hut, guided or individual climbs of Mt. Hood, and later, snowboarding camps would appear to lend a bit of prophetic truth to President's Roosevelt's remarks. I believe that mountain biking at Timberline represents yet another new opportunity for play in every season of the year. As the Responsible Official for this project, my concern is ensuring that no *specific use* of the Timberline environs (mountain biking) diminishes and/or inhibits any other use (such as visiting the Lodge, skiing, or hiking) on the mountain.

To better understand the many values the public associates with the Lodge, its environs, and various uses of both, I commissioned a report on "sense of place[1]." That report, which is incorporated in its entirety in Chapter 3 of the EA, describes the several ways in which people value and perceive Timberline Lodge and its immediate environs. Upon reviewing the report, Roosevelt's speech, and the uniquely wonderful history of Portlanders' love of Mt. Hood, I feel that the implementation of a mountain bike park is complementary with the various types of four-season use of the presently occurring within the permit area, as well as safeguards the keenly important historic, artistic, and cultural assets represented by Timberline Lodge.

The public demand for mountain biking is increasing, as discussed in Section 3.10 of the EA. This demand is already being demonstrated on the recently-completed Timberline to Town Trail, constructed at Timberline by the Forest Service. I believe that the opportunity for RLK to operate the *Jeff Flood Express* lift during the summer is a wise use of existing facilities that would otherwise lie dormant in the summer. The proposed skills park and trail system also clearly meets the intent of the Ski Area Recreational Opportunity Enhancement Act of 2011 to encourage year-round visitation and use at the nation's many ski areas, while protecting natural resources.

The approval of a bike park at Timberline is also consistent with the Forest Plan, as described in Section 1.2 of the EA:

> *The proposal would help to meet the Desired Future Condition for Timberline as described in the Forest Plan. The Timberline permit area, including the proposed project area, is in the Winter Recreation Area management area (Forest Plan, p. Four - 190). The goal for the*

[1] The term "sense of place" has been defined and used in many different ways, by many people. To some, it is a characteristic that some geographic places have and others do not, while to others it is a feeling or perception held by people (not the place itself). It is often used in relation to those characteristics that make a place special or unique, as well as to those that foster a sense of authentic human attachment and belonging.

> *management area is to provide for areas of high quality winter and summer recreation opportunities, and the Desired Future Condition includes providing summer recreation activities such as hiking, mountain bicycling, and horseback riding (Forest Plan, p. Four–190 and -191).*

Finally, I considered the potential cumulative effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, including roads, trails, ski areas, and forest management projects in the area (see EA, Chapter 3). I also considered the overall scope of the Timberline Master Development Plan (MDP). The MDP includes a potential parking area and lodge in the vicinity of the Molly's Express bottom terminal. I have evaluated this potential project in relation to the bike park proposal and I have found that the bike park and potential parking lot each have independent utility (i.e., they are not connected actions). The parking lot concept is still being evaluated for feasibility and has not been proposed by RLK as an actual project (i.e., it is not reasonably foreseeable), and as a result, sufficient information does not exist regarding the scope and scale of the parking lot to assess whether its environmental effects would overlap in space and time with the effects of the bike park. Consistent with my review of the MDP, the EA has not identified any cumulative effects associated with the MDP.

CHANGES BETWEEN THE PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

While describing changes between the draft and final documents are not a requirement, I believe it is important to describe the changes that were made to the EA in response to public input. We did not change any aspect of the proposed mountain bike park, but we did add/modify the PDC and revisited some of the analysis.

We clarified the concerns raised by internal and public scoping. There were no issues that drove the creation of new alternatives, but several of the concerns did drive the creation of project design criteria. Several of the original issues were found to be outside the scope of the analysis. The issues that are now in the EA are those that describe substantive management concerns and required resolution. We were able to resolve those issues through project design criteria.

Due to the level of concern expressed by a commenter on the topic of hydrology, I felt it best to incorporate the soils, hydrology, and fisheries reports in the EA in their entirety, as all three are closely related. I recognize that the analysis in those reports is lengthy and fairly technical, but I felt that we would be more responsive to the commenter if we included them in their entirety. Those reports did not vary much between draft and final versions of the EA; we did improve the sediment modeling to incorporate ideas raised by the public and other Forest Service specialists and the conclusion was similar to our initial conclusion, but more robust.

As referenced in the Decision Rationale section, the EA incorporated the "sense of place" report in its entirety. I feel that the report is incredibly informative relevant to the social issues associated with Timberline Lodge and its environs. Also related to social issues, the recreation, market demand, and visuals sections were modified to provide better clarity on the affected environment and the proposal's likely effects.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

This project was first published in the spring 2010 issue of the Mt. Hood National Forest's Schedule of Proposed Actions, and has appeared in each quarterly issue since then. On June 29, 2010, a scoping letter and map describing the project was mailed to a list of approximately 170 agencies, organizations, and individuals that have been identified as being interested in projects on the Forest. The letter and map were simultaneously posted on the main page of Forest's website. Approximately 200 letters and emails were received from the public in response to scoping. A field trip was also hosted in September, 2010, where members of the public were invited to view the proposed trails on the ground and ask questions of the Forest Service, RLK, and Gravity Logic. Nearly 30 members of the public attended.

A letter and/or email announcing a 30-day comment period on the Proposed Action and Preliminary Assessment was mailed on March 3, 2011 to everyone who had expressed interest in the project during the scoping period. The Preliminary Assessment was also posted on the Forest's website on March 3rd. A legal notice for the 30-day comment period was published in *The Oregonian* on March 5, 2011. In addition, the Zigzag Ranger District hosted a public open house on March 17, 2011 which was attended by over 100 people. Nearly 1,000 comment letters were received during the comment period. While it is not necessary to provide a "response to comments" in an EA, I wanted to ensure that I fully understood, and that the EA addressed, substantive comments raised by the public and other agencies. I directed the interdisciplinary team to catalog the substantive comments, track them with regard to edits in the EA, and provide responses. I am satisfied that the EA adequately addressed public input, and I have considered that input in making this decision. A summary of the comments and the agency responses are found in Appendix A of the EA, and copies of the letters are in the project file at Zigzag Ranger District.

The Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon reviewed the proposal and had no concerns with the proposal moving forward.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

After considering the environmental effects described in the EA, I have determined that these actions will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment considering the context and intensity of impacts (40 CFR 1508.27). Thus, an Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared. I base my finding on the analysis in the EA, and summarize my finding below:

1. Analysis of the beneficial and adverse impacts

My finding of no significant environmental effects is not biased by the beneficial effects of the action. I find that my decision will have neither a significant beneficial or adverse impact because the area affected by the bike park and restoration projects is a very small percentage of comparable acres at that elevation on Mt. Hood. The anticipated effects of the project are benign or beneficial, especially once project design criteria are incorporated. The change to the current condition of the natural and social environment would not be significant; therefore, this is not a significant federal action.

2. The degree to which the Proposed Action affects public health and safety:

There will be no significant effects on public health or safety. While mountain biking is not a risk-free activity, visitors to the bike park acknowledge that they are choosing to assume some risk. Slight increases in traffic may occur as a result of the presence of the bike park, but any interaction or co-location between different users and/or user groups would not constitute a significant adverse effect to public health or safety. The restoration projects would have no measurable effect on public health or safety.

3. The unique characteristics of the geographic area:

No prime farmlands, parklands, wild and scenic rivers, wilderness, potential wilderness, inventoried roadless areas, unroaded areas or ecologically critical areas overlap within the area proposed for the bike park or restoration projects. Historic and cultural resources will be protected by the application of project design criteria, and environmentally-sensitive resources (such as stream crossings, sensitivity to invasive species, and larger trees) will also be protected by project design criteria (EA, Ch. 3). Essential fish habitat will not be adversely affected (EA, Ch. 3). Land use allocations that are included within the project area include Special Interest Area, General Riparian Areas, Scenic Viewshed, Riparian Reserves, and Tier 1 Key Watershed (EA, Sec. 1.5).

4. *The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial:*

The effects on the quality of the human environment are not likely to be highly controversial. There is no known scientific controversy over the impacts of the project. The types of activities proposed (mountain biking and restoration) currently take place at Timberline, and have taken place in similar areas. The resulting effects are well-known and understood.

5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks:

There were no highly uncertain, unique or unknown risks identified in this project. Activities approved in this decision are projects similar to those that have been implemented at Timberline (Timberline to Town Trail); nearby in Sandy (Sandy Ridge mountain bike trail system on BLM lands); and at other ski resorts in the Pacific Northwest (e.g., Willamette Pass, OR and Stevens Pass, WA); and in other regions (e.g., Whistler, B.C. and Winter Park, CO) over the last decade. None are unique or involve unknown risks.

6. The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects:

The action is not likely to establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects because this action is not unusual in and of itself, nor does it lead to any further actions (i.e., independent utility).

7. Whether the action is related to others actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant impacts:

The effects analyses for each resource area in the EA discuss cumulative effects; none were found to be significant (EA, Ch. 3).

8. The degree to which the action may affect scientific, cultural, or historical resources:

The action will have no adverse effect on districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places due to the nature of the project, as well as project design criteria (see Appendix 1 of this document, and effects analysis in Chapter 3). The action will not cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources. The State Historic Preservation Office concurred on August 31, 2011 that the project would have no adverse effect on any known cultural resources.

9. The degree to which the action may adversely affect endangered or threatened species or habitat:

The action complies with the Endangered Species Act of 1973 for wildlife, aquatic and botanical species.

Suitable habitat for Lower Columbia River (LCR) steelhead trout exists within and downstream of the Project and Action Area in Still Creek. Suitable habitat for Lower Columbia River (LCR) Chinook and LCR coho salmon does not exist within the Action Area but is present downstream in the Salmon River and Zigzag River Watershed. Sediment, stream drainage network increases, and disturbance of riparian reserves would be the most likely avenue of potential effects. For this reason, the proposed action **May Affect, but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect** LCR steelhead trout and designated critical habitat, and would have **No Effect** to LCR coho salmon, LCR Chinook salmon and associated designated critical habitat. No Essential Fish Habitat, as designated under the 1996 Amendment to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, is found in the project area. There is no evidence bull trout populations exist in the Upper Sandy Watershed, therefore the Proposed Action will have **No Effect to bull trout**.

No threatened or endangered wildlife or botanical species are located within the analysis area, or would be affected by the project.

10. Whether the action threatens a violation of environmental laws or requirements:

Discussion of compliance with environmental laws or requirements is identified in the preceding paragraph and in the following section on compliance with other laws and regulations. This project will not violate any environmental laws and regulations.

FINDINGS REQUIRED BY OTHER LAWS AND REGULATIONS

The project was prepared consistent with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), and other relevant Federal and

State laws and regulations. The project is consistent with the Mt. Hood National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, as amended by the Northwest Forest Plan and its standards and guidelines (EA, Sec. 1.5).

The project is consistent with the Record of Decision and Standards and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measures Standards and Guidelines (USDA and USDI, 2001).

The project would either have No Impact or "May Impact Individuals or Habitat" to species on the Regional Forester's Special Status Species list (December 9, 2011). Effects conclusions of "May Impact…" are not significant, as the effects would be minimal in nature. Five aquatic species on the Regional Forester's list are or may be present within the analysis area. There would be no impact to two of the species. For the three remaining species, the project may impact individuals or habitat, but will not likely contribute to a trend towards Federal listing or loss of viability to the population or species.

Six terrestrial wildlife species on the Regional Forester's list may be present within the analysis area. For those species (except for the fringed myotis, which would have no impact), the project may impact individuals or habitat, but will not likely contribute to a trend towards Federal listing or loss of viability to the population or species. No terrestrial wildlife Survey and Manage Species are expected to be present within the analysis area. Habitat for multiple botanical species on the Regional Forester's Special Status Species list is present within the project area (EA, Sec. 3.5.1). The project would either have "No Impact" or "May Impact Individuals or Habitat," but would not lead to a loss in population viability for those species.

I have considered the effects to management indicator species (MIS) as disclosed in Chapter 3 of the EA. Aquatic MIS present within the analysis area includes cutthroat trout. Project elements and design criteria are in place that would greatly minimize, if not eliminate, effects to habitat or individuals in the sub-watersheds; therefore, the viability of the species would not be impacted. While the project may have a small negative impact to wildlife MIS populations, it is not predicted to cause a measurable reduction in those populations, including deer and elk, pileated woodpecker, and American marten. The project would not contribute to a negative trend in viability on the Forest for those species.

The project is consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives (EA, Sec. 3.2.4). I have also considered the existing condition of riparian reserves, including the important physical and biological components of the fifth-field watersheds and the effects to riparian resources. I find that the proposed action is consistent with riparian reserve standards and guidelines, and will contribute to maintaining or restoring the fifth-field watersheds over the long term. Also, this project will meet Clean Water Act standards.

The project has been designed to reduce the likelihood of invasive plant introduction, and prevent establishment and spread of any invasive plants that *are* introduced (see EA, Sec. 2.5 and Appendix A). Therefore, this project is consistent with the Pacific Northwest Invasive Plant Program Preventing and Managing Invasive Plants Record of Decision issued in 2005 and the

Site-Specific Invasive Plant Treatments for Mt. Hood National Forest and Columbia Gorge Scenic Area in Oregon Record of Decision issued in 2008.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OR APPEAL OPPORTUNITIES

This decision is subject to appeal pursuant to Forest Service regulations at 36 CFR 215. Any individual or organization that submitted comments or expressed interest during the comment period in spring 2011 may appeal. Any appeal of this decision must be in writing and fully consistent with the content requirements described in 36 CFR 215.14. The Appeal Deciding Officer is the Regional Forester. An appeal should be addressed to the Regional Forester at any of the following addresses. For postal delivery, mail to: Regional Forester, Appeal Deciding Officer, USDA Forest Service, PO Box 3623, Portland, OR 97208. The street location for those submitting hand-delivered appeals is 333 SW First Ave., Portland, OR, 97204. The office hours are 8-4:30 M-F, excluding holidays. For fax, send to 503-808-2339. Email: appeals-pacificnorthwest-regional-office@fs.fed.us. Electronic appeals must be submitted as part of the actual e-mail message, or as an attachment in Microsoft Word (.doc), rich text format (.rtf), or portable document format (.pdf) only. E-mails submitted to email addresses other than the one listed above, or in formats other than those listed, or containing viruses, will be rejected. It is the responsibility of the appellant to confirm receipt of appeals submitted by electronic mail.

An appeal, including attachments, must be postmarked or received by the Appeal Deciding Officer within 45 days of the date legal notice of this decision is published in *The Oregonian*. For further information regarding these appeal procedures, contact Kristy Boscheinen at (503) 668-1645.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE

Implementation of this decision may occur on, but not before, 5 business days from the close of the 45-day appeal filing period described above. If an appeal is filed, implementation may not occur for 15 business days following the date of appeal disposition (36 CFR 215.10).

The EA, this decision, and other materials related to this project can be downloaded from the Forest web site at http://www.fs.usda.gov/projects/mthood/landmanagement/projects.

CONTACT

For additional information related to this project or decision, contact Kristy Boscheinen, Mt. Hood National Forest, 16400 Champion Way, Sandy, Oregon, (503) 668-1645.

/s/ Christopher C. Worth *11/19/2012*

CHRISTOPHER C. WORTH Date
Mt. Hood Forest Supervisor

APPENDIX A

Project Design Criteria/Mitigation Measures

The National Environmental Policy Act defines "mitigation" as avoiding, minimizing, rectifying, reducing, eliminating or compensating project impacts. The following design criteria and mitigation measures are an integral part of this project and will be carried out when the project is implemented.

PDC #	Monitoring and Project Design Criteria (PDC)	Construction or Operation?	Monitoring Plan?
	Monitoring (Mon)		
Mon-1	The Forest Service Permit Administrator or his/her designee would monitor the implementation of the PDCs during construction and operations on regular basis according to the Monitoring Framework Plan and will have the authority to provide direction and/or take action if construction or operations are not conducted according to the project design criteria.	Both	Yes - specify "regular" in the plan.
Mon-2	RLK would provide a written annual report to the Forest Service detailing any trail damage, soil erosion, vegetation trampling, wildlife issues, "rogue riders," user conflicts, successes and issues, and restoration efforts in the mountain bike park. The Forest Service would review the report and, if need be, work with RLK to institute needed changes in the management of the mountain bike park.	Both	Yes
Mon-3	A Monitoring Framework Plan would be prepared prior to construction and would be used to provide the basis for the annual monitoring plan.	Both	Yes
	Heritage Resources (Her)		
Her-1	Trails and trail terrain features have been sited to be the least visible from West Leg Road, allowing for consideration of riparian protection. If the trail design changes, the Forest Service Permit Administrator would provide direction and/or take action.	Both	No
Her-2	No new man-made openings in the forest along West Leg Road would be created for this project. Trail crossings of West Leg Road have been sited in naturally occurring or previously created clearings/openings.	Construction	Yes - RLK would visit West Leg Road during construction and photo-document approved crossings and verify that no new

			openings in the forest have been created.
Her-3	No cutting of trees larger than 6" DBH would occur along West Leg Road.	Both	No
Her-4	Historic culverts on West Leg Road have been avoided; no trails would be placed adjacent to culvert locations.	Construction	No
Her-5	No treated lumber would be used for terrain features.	Both	No
Her-6	Mountain bike trails have been located within forested areas or tree islands between ski trails to the extent possible to provide vegetative screening and to lessen the visual impacts of the bike park.	Both	No
Her-7	Intentionally left blank.		
Her-8	As specified in the Signage Plan (see Rec-6), bike trail signs or any types of barriers along West Leg Road would be compatible with the character and design of the historic roadway. Wood posts or stone barriers are compatible options.	Both	No
Her-9	Wood or stone barriers, or other approved materials, would be used to delineate the skills park.	Both	No
Her-10	If any heritage resources are discovered during construction, work would be stopped in the vicinity of the discovery and the Forest Archaeologist would be contacted immediately to determine a course of action	Construction	No
	Recreation (Rec)		
Rec-1	Parallel trails have been joined into one trail prior to crossing West Leg Road. Mountain bikers would enter each crossing through a chicane (i.e., S-curves) which would slow the rider down and give them clear sight lines down and up the road for at least 50 yards. Signage would be placed to warn mountain bikers and motorists of trail crossings over the road.	Both	No
Rec-2	Bike trail crossings of Forest Service trails and West Leg Road would include signage and the use of chicanes and uphill grades to reduce the speed of bikers as they cross the road or trails.	Construction	Yes – RLK bike park staff would monitor the crossings daily to ensure that speed controls are in place and working.
Rec-3	As specified in the Signage Plan, bike trail crossings of Forest Service trails and West Leg Road would include signage directing	Operations	No

	bikers to stay on designated bike trails.		
Rec-4	As specified in the Signage Plan, Forest Service trails and West Leg Road would include signage at bike trail crossings and throughout the bike park to warn trail users/motorists of the presence of cyclists and trail crossings.	Operations	No
Rec-5	If events are proposed, a Spectator Management Plan would be prepared by RLK and approved by the Forest Service prior to the event to address the management of spectators. The plan would include the following: • Definition of the roles of the Forest Service and RLK. • Spectator viewing areas would be located in existing disturbed areas; location of viewing areas would be dependent on the event type and location (e.g., skills park or specific bike trail). • Defining spectator areas with rope, fencing, or other similar means. • Access corridors for spectators via West Leg Road, or other roads and trails (including bike park trails). • Spectator parking would not be allowed along West Leg Road. • Preventing spectator access to sensitive areas such as wetlands, meadows, subalpine/timberline environments, and designated riparian areas. • Restroom facility location(s).Port-Potties would not be allowed at the bottom terminal of the *Jeff Flood* chairlift during the summer operation, Porta-Potties may be placed near the bottom terminal but outside of riparian reserves. • The use of shuttles or other means to bring spectators to the site when the parking lots are full. • The management of garbage and human waste. The Forest Service Permit Administrator or his/her designee would review each upcoming event with RLK to assess spectator locations	Operations	Yes – implementation and effectiveness monitoring. The plan would be updated and kept current.

	and access. The Forest Service Permit Administrator or his/her designee would review the site after each event to assess the success of the plan and provide direction to RLK to address issues for future events.		
Rec-6	A signage plan would be prepared by RLK and approved by the Forest Service prior to the installation of bike park signs, Forest Service trail signs, and signs along West Leg Road.		No
Rec-7	The conversion of the Glade Trail from road to trail would meet Forest Service standards for trail construction as described in the Forest Service Manual and Handbook. A qualified trails designer would oversee the trail layout and design and the final design would be approved by the Forest Service Permit Administrator or his/her designee. Trail maintenance for the converted Glade Trail within the Timberline SUP area would be carried out by RLK. The converted section of the Glade Trail would meet the Forest Wide Standards and Guidelines on page Four-115 and 116 of the Forest Plan for visual quality within five to ten years of conversion activities. Any new trail that is not converted on the road bed (e.g., new switchbacks in the trail that extend outside of the existing road bed) should meet standards within one year of construction.	Construction	Yes – maintenance of the Glade trail would be monitored for implementation and effectiveness.
	Soil Resources (Soil)		
Soil-1	Stabilization of mountain bike trail surfaces would be accomplished through a combination of rock armoring and wooden features or other similar protective measures. Any rock or wood used for armoring would be sourced from either the bike park or watershed restoration construction limits, or from an approved offsite source. No quarrying of rock materials would take place.	Both	Yes – implementation and effectiveness
Soil-2	The spacing of surface water control structures along the length of the bike trail network would be per the Forest Service Handbook guidelines at a minimum. The spacing of surface water control structures (e.g., grade reversals, drain dips, water bars) along mountain bike trails within 200 feet of a stream crossing would be no less than 50	Construction	Yes – implementation and effectiveness

	feet to minimize extension of the stream drainage network and to minimize sediment delivery to riparian reserves. Water bar placement along decommissioned roads would be determined in the field based on site conditions and approved by the Forest Service Permit Administrator or his/her designee.		
Soil-3	Wood features (e.g., ladder bridges, boardwalks), native soil causeways, and/or rock armoring would be incorporated into mountain bike trails to avoid impacting sensitive resources such as steep soils, tree roots, vegetation, and wet areas. Wood materials would be sourced from local suppliers and would be free of invasive species. (See also Veg-5.)	Both	Yes – implementation and effectiveness
Soil-4	Additional surface water controls, rock armoring, wooden features, or other acceptable measures would be installed on trails that exhibit unacceptable erosion. If drainage continues to be a problem along a section of trail, trail would be re-designed to remedy the erosion.	Both	Yes – implementation and effectiveness monitoring primarily after construction. Monitoring would inform Adaptive Management in problem areas.
Soil-5	Bike park staff (RLK employees) would monitor trail conditions throughout the hours of operation on a daily basis to ensure that erosion or sediment mobilization away from the trail corridor is not occurring and/or to implement corrective action in accordance with the project design criteria.	Operations	No
Soil-6	A Travel Route Plan would be required and included in the SWPCP/Construction Plan for the project to minimize compaction of soils by limiting equipment to designated travel-ways (e.g., existing roads, bike trails that are under construction) as approved by the Forest Service .	Both	No
Soil-7	Along machine-excavated bike trails within 200 feet of streams on all bike trails, and along decommissioned roads and other restoration projects, exposed mineral soil not included in the bike trail tread would be mulched with certified weed-free Woodstraw or equivalent at a rate to achieve 70% ground cover or mulched with a certified weed-free straw, and seeded with approved seed at a	Construction	Yes – implementation and effectiveness

	predetermined rate. Application rates would be validated and verified in the field to ensure that mulch application is not too sparse or too excessive(See also Veg-12). Mulched areas would be monitored annually to evaluate the need for additional mulch and/or seed.		
Soil-8	As described in the SWPCP/Construction Plan, temporary erosion and sediment control measures (e.g., plastic sheeting, mulching) would be in place over soil stockpile areas or disturbed soil areas associated with restoration projects prior to any rain event (as defined by when the National Weather Service, or other accepted source, predicts a 50% or higher chance of measurable precipitation for the local area).	Construction	Yes - implementation
Soil-9	The bike park staff (RLK employees) would patrol the park on a daily basis to ensure that re-vegetated areas are not disturbed, or to remedy disturbance to re-vegetated areas (see also Soil-5). Project areas with any ground disturbance would be surveyed annually to ensure success of re-vegetation efforts. If seeding or other re-vegetation efforts are not successful in re-vegetating disturbed areas, the Forest Service Permit Administrator or his/her designee would be contacted and a site-specific, alternative re-vegetation solution would be developed.	Operations	Yes – implementation and effectiveness.
Soil-10	In cleared areas, topsoil would be carefully removed and stockpiled for placement onto the cleared area outside of the trail tread width. During construction, topsoil would be carefully stored using approved erosion and sediment control methods. Additional measures (e.g., plastic covering) to cover exposed soils would occur during inclement weather. Excess topsoil from trail construction may be hauled to other construction/restoration sites for placement (see Soil-8).	Construction	Yes - implementation
Soil-11	The Northwest Avalanche Center rain gauge currently at Timberline would be accessible and monitored by RLK and the Forest Service via the internet. Earth-disturbing operations (construction and/or bike park operations) would be suspended if there is	Both	Yes - The Forest Service and RLK would collect and maintain the data in order to correlate onsite conditions with

	more than 1inch of rain in a 24-hour period and/or the Bull Run River above the reservoirs exceeds 200 cubic feet per second (suggesting a rise in base flows in the watershed). Operations would remain suspended until the Bull Run River drops below 200 cubic feet per second and there is less than 1 inch of rain in a 24-hour period or onsite conditions are dry enough to allow operation. Prior to suspending all bike park operations, the Forest Service Permit Administrator may decide to close certain trails, or portions of trails, to allow continued operation of the bike park in locations where trail conditions are dry enough for operation and there is no risk of sediment delivery to the stream system. (See also Soil-5).		the rainfall data for previous years.
Soil-12	Stockpile areas, temporary roads, and other areas where soil compaction has occurred from this project would be ripped or scarified prior to the start of re-vegetation.	Construction	No
Soil-13	Construction activities for the season would be suspended if soil moisture is recharged and stream flows rise above baseflow levels and are predicted to stay above baseflow levels (i.e., 200 cfs in the Bull Run River, upstream of the reservoirs) and/or if onsite conditions warrant closure of the park. (See also Soil-11).	Construction	Yes - implementation
	Vegetation (Veg)		
Veg-1	All mountain bike trails have been designed to avoid the cutting of trees with a diameter at breast height (DBH) greater than 6" to reduce impacts to upland forest and riparian reserves. No whitebark pine would be cut. Bike park trails would be routed around large trees and, where possible, around the roots of larger trees to prevent damage to tree roots. (See also Soil-3). RLK (bike park staff) would monitor the bike park trails weekly to assess damage to tree roots.	Construction	Yes – effectiveness monitoring would inform Adaptive Management
Veg-2	The final trail alignment and proposed clearing limits (disturbance prism) for bike park trails would be reviewed in the field and approved by the Forest Service Permit Administrator or his/her designee before construction can begin.	Construction	No
Veg-3	If any new populations of special-status plant	Construction	No

	species are encountered during the construction process, work would be suspended in that area until the Forest Service Permit Administrator or his/her designee is consulted.		
Veg-4	Clean equipment either: a) prior to arrival on MHNF, to prevent the introduction of invasive plant seed or other vegetative propagules (e.g., stem and root fragments). The contract administrator or project activity coordinator would inspect all project equipment before it is allowed to operate at the project site. The equipment should be free of soil clumps and vegetative matter or other debris that could contain or hold seeds or other vegetative propagules. Cleaning of the equipment would include pressure washing and should be done outside of the National Forest boundary; or B) a self-contained heavy equipment cleaning station may be set up at the project site, for cleaning the equipment thoroughly in order to remove soil clumps and vegetative matter or other debris that could contain or hold weed seeds.	Construction	Yes – implementation
Veg-5	If gravel, soil, or wood is imported from outside the project area, it should be determined to be from a source approved by the Forest Service Permit Administrator or his/her designee to determine if the soil, gravel, or wood is free of invasive species.	Construction	No
Veg-6	Project areas with any ground disturbance or vehicular traffic would be surveyed annually by the Forest Service and RLK, during the time of year when invasive non-native plants, including noxious weeds, are identifiable. Long-term control would include removal of any invasive non-native plant species and reporting of their presence and exact location, when found, to the Forest Service Permit Administrator or his/her designee, will consult with the MHNF Forest botanist.	Both	Yes
Veg-7	Avoid daylighting the trail by protecting overstory vegetation and defining the limits of the bike trails with vegetation, wood, rocks, or other native materials (see Veg-2).	Both	No
Veg-8	Aggressively treat invasive plants by manual control or with herbicides. The Forest Service Permit Administrator will consult	Operations	No

	with the MHNF botanist on which method works best for which species.		
Veg-9	Bike park staff (RLK employees) would monitor trail conditions throughout the hours of operation on a daily basis to ensure that unauthorized trails or terrain features are not created by riders.	Operations	Yes
Veg-10	RLK would prepare a Plant Salvage Plan in conjunction with the Forest Service. The plan would be approved by the Forest Service prior to construction. The plan would identify methods (outlined in the botany specialist report) and locations for the salvage of whole plants from proposed trails in advance of trail construction. The plan would also identify transplant locations for re-planting once construction is completed (e.g., areas along trails where excavated material has been sidecast, in restoration projects, or in sparsely vegetated areas in adjacent ski runs).	Construction	No
Veg-11	Vegetation transplanting would be carried out as described in the section "Plant Propagation & Restoration" in the botany specialist report. (see also Veg-10).	Construction	No
Veg-12	As described in the Plant Salvage Plan (See Veg-10), collect seed from native plants in the special-use permit area and propagate seedlings from this seed in a nursery for restoration of disturbed areas in subsequent years. Directly sow collected seed in disturbed areas for those species for which this method is effective. Consult with Mt. Hood National Forest botanist for details.	Construction	No
Veg-13	Use only native plant materials (seed, transplants, seedlings, divisions, cuttings) collected locally on the Mt. Hood National Forest. If supplies of locally collected native seed (e.g., mountain brome, blue wildrye grass) are low and erosion control or restoration of disturbed areas is urgent, use annual ryegrass (*Lolium perenne* ssp. *multiflorum*), which is a non-persistent, non-native grass species, or a mix of native species mixed with annual ryegrass.	Construction	No
Veg-14	Use GPS and photopoints to provide an accurate and informative assessment of the impact of mountain bike riders on trails in	Both	Monitoring Plan – RLK and Forest Service would

	the mountain bike park. Repeating the assessment at regular intervals (e.g., annually) can identify problems (e.g., trail widening, excessive soil disturbance, vegetation trampling, informal trails), document informal trails, and determine where re-vegetation or other remedies are needed. Include this information in the Annual Monitoring Report (see Mon-2).		establish photo-points in first Monitoring Plan.
Veg-15	As specified in the Signage Plan, through signage, educate riders about the environmental consequences of unauthorized trail development, about the benefits of low-impact riding practices (e.g., avoiding skidding on the trail, riding within established trail corridors, avoiding impacts to vegetation) and about invasive non-native plants and the potential for the transport of invasive plant seed or vegetative propagules on mountain bikers (e.g., tires, wheels, spokes, frame, pedals, shoes, clothing). Educate riders that dirt and mud on their clothes and shoes from riding elsewhere before coming to the Timberline downhill mountain bike park could harbor and spread invasive plant seed or propagules.	Operations	No
Veg-16	RLK would provide a cleaning station for mountain bikes near the proposed skills park in the Wy'East parking lot area and require that all riders coming to the bike park for the first time from riding elsewhere (outside the park) clean their bikes of mud, dirt, and other debris, which could harbor invasive plant seeds or propagules.	Operations	No
Veg-17	Open the mountain bike park each summer only after trails are snow-free and soils are not saturated. Snow drifts may be removed from the trails when the surrounding ground is snow-free, provided no earth or vegetation disturbance takes place. Notify the Forest Service before opening the bike park trails to the public.	Operations	No
Veg-18	Regulate access to trails and the skills park by use of physical barriers (e.g., boulders, fences, logs, vegetation).	Operations	No
Veg-19	Patrol for trash and clean up trash along trails and elsewhere in the mountain bike park.	Operations	No
Veg-20	Salvage plants currently occupying the	Construction	No

	proposed skills park and proposed bike park trails and transplant them in and around the historic Timberline Lodge. (See also Veg-11).		
Veg-21	Confine soil disturbance around the skills park using entrances and barriers. Prevent soil disturbance and trampling/denudation of vegetation around and outside the skills park.	Operations	No
	Wildlife (Wild)		
Wild-1	A review of proposed hazard tree removal along the bike trails would be conducted by RLK and a Forest Service Permit Administrator prior to implementation. Hazard trees that must be felled would remain on site for habitat purposes. For example, if a tree is felled across a trail, cut out a section of the log to allow riders to proceed along the trail, but leave the rest of the log in place for the ecological/ecosystem functions it provides and to confine riders to the trail.	Both	No
Wild-2	If any nest, den, or reproductive sites of vertebrate species are discovered along a mountain bike trail, a Forest Service Permit Administrator or his/her designee would be consulted and measures to ensure reproductive success at the site would be negotiated. Factors such as rarity, likelihood of disruption or reproductive failure, and timing would be considered.	Both	No
Wild-3	Mountain bike park operations would be limited to daytime use only (i.e., from one hour after sunrise to one hour before sunset) to minimize disturbance to nocturnal wildlife.	Both	No
	Watershed Resources (WS)		
WS-1	Prior to construction, the Forest Service Permit Administrator and Forest Service specialists (watershed and/or fisheries) would walk the flagged trails with RLK to examine each proposed stream crossing and to determine the appropriate crossing type. Bridge length would span the distance 1.5 times bankfull width and no piers would be placed within this width. For higher-elevation, ephemeral streams, the Forest Service and RLK would apply the following criteria for placement of crossing structure	Construction	No

	(in order of most impactful to least): 1 – Use out-sloped ford, contoured native material and/or rock-fortified for all ephemeral channels with low-gradient approach (3-5%) 2 – Bridge all intermittent and perennial channels, and ephemeral channels with steep approach (>5%).		
WS-2	No mountain bike trails would cross jurisdictional wetlands.	Construction	No
WS-3	Bike park patrol staff (RLK employees) would review the trails each day to locate wet soil areas or mud puddles. If the problem persists, the area would be crossed, if necessary, using a combination of raised mineral soil causeways, raised wooden boardwalks, rock armoring and/or other appropriate measures.	Operations	Yes
WS-4	A Construction Plan and Stormwater Pollution Control Plan (SWPCP) would be prepared for each year of construction to guide decision-making by contractors, RLK staff, and Forest Service staff during construction.	Construction	No
WS-5	A spill prevention and response plan would be developed and included in the Construction Plan/SWPCP. No fuels or construction machinery would be stored within riparian reserves.	Construction	No
WS-6	Deleted		
WS-7	Banked turns in bike trails would generally be in-sloped to drain toward the uphill into a sediment trap or into a pipe under the tread that discharges to a sediment trap with an armored outlet.	Construction	No
WS-8	Sediment traps would be rock-fortified. Drainage pipes would be located at least three inches from the bottom of sediment traps to allow for sediment to settle out. Sediment basins would be sized to accommodate a minimum of two significant rain events (e.g., 1" in 24 hours) before maintenance is needed. The outlets of sediment traps would not release water directly to any water bodies.	Both	No
WS-9	During sediment trap maintenance, sediment	Operations	No

	that is cleaned out of sediment traps would be returned to the mountain bike trails.		
WS-10	The skills park would include perimeter drainage diversion structures, drainage ditches, and a sediment basin to capture silt.	Both	Yes - implementation –the silt trap would be monitored for maintenance (i.e., muck out).
WS-11	During construction activities, a PDC coordinator would be assigned by RLK and assigned the following duties, to be documented in the SWPCP/Construction Plan: 1.) Oversee the implementation of the soil and water protection design criteria; 2.) Conduct or oversee daily site inspections to ensure effectiveness of soil and water protection design criteria; 3.) Oversee the maintenance of structural soil and water protection design criteria; 4.) Ensure that any changes to the construction site plans are addressed by coordinating with the Forest Service aquatics staff and insuring that any new soil and water protection design criteria are implemented; 5.) Coordinate job site activities with the RLK Project Manager, the Forest Service Project Coordinator, agency representatives, and contractors. (See also Veg-6)	Construction	No
WS-12	Prior to construction, a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit with an associated Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) would be obtained if required under current regulations. The permit would be included in the SWPCP/ Construction Plan.	Construction	No
WS-13	An erosion control plan would be included in the SWPCP/ Construction Plan and approved by the Forest Service prior to earth-disturbing activities and the plan would be revised annually to minimize erosion.	Construction	No
WS-14	Redundant erosion protection (such as two rows of silt fence, straw bales, and/or more permanent structures such as logs) would be provided between streams and restoration	Construction	No

	areas close to stream channels, as described in the Construction Plan.		
WS-15	No, staging areas, spoils piles, or other construction-related materials would be staged or stored within riparian reserves.	Construction	No
WS-16	Stream turbidity would be monitored during construction in a manner that allows for evaluation of the effects of the project on turbidity (e.g., monitoring above and below construction, paired stream monitoring). If an increase in turbidity occurs as a result of project operations that exceeds 10 Nephelometric Turbidy Units (NTU's) for a period exceeding 30 minutes, operations would cease until a plan has been developed and approved to address the cause of increased turbidity. Operations would cease immediately if turbidity is over 100 NTU's and would not resume until a plan has been developed and approved to address the cause of increased turbidity.	Construction	No
WS-17	A water quality monitoring plan, including pebble counts, would be included in the SWPCP/Construction Plan and would be updated annually assessing project activities. At a minimum, Still Creek and West Fork Salmon River would be monitored in the vicinity of the project.	Both	Yes
WS-18	Cross-sections and channel profiles would be taken at proposed channel crossings prior to construction and for two years after construction. After time after two years, after any 5-year occurrence interval storm, measure the cross-sections and channel profiles. This would help establish the project's effect on channel stability and morphology	Both	Yes