

Level 1 Riparian Habitat Assessments

Lakelse Watershed Restoration Project

Prepared for
Lakelse WRP Steering Committee
Terrace, BC

Prepared by



Pacific Cascade Consultants Ltd.

Terrace, BC

June 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4. RIPARIAN HABITAT ASSESSMENTS	1
4.1 Introduction.....	1
4.2 Methods.....	1
4.2.1 Assessing Riparian Productivity	1
4.2.2 Assessing Mature Riparian Habitat Removal	2
4.2.3 Assessing Impact to Riparian Habitat.....	2
4.2.4 Future Riparian Habitat Assessments	2
4.3 Level 1 Riparian Habitat Assessments	3
4.3.1 Summary of Level 1 Riparian Habitat Assessments	3
4.3.2 Alwyn Creek	4
4.3.2.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	4
4.3.3 Andalus Creek	4
4.3.3.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	5
4.3.4 Boot Lake Creek.....	5
4.3.4.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	5
4.3.5 Clearwater Creek.....	6
4.3.5.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	6
4.3.6 Coldwater Creek.....	6
4.3.6.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	7
4.3.7 Eel Creek.....	7
4.3.7.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	8
4.3.8 Ena Creek.....	8
4.3.8.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	8
4.3.9 End Creek.....	9
4.3.9.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	9
4.3.10 Furlong Creek.....	10
4.3.10.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	10
4.3.11 Granite Creek	10
4.3.11.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	11
4.3.12 Hatchery Creek.....	11
4.3.12.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	11
4.3.13 Herman Creek	12
4.3.13.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	12
4.3.14 Johnstone Creek	13
4.3.14.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	13
4.3.15 Junction Creek.....	14
4.3.15.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	14
4.3.16 Lakelse Lake	14
4.3.16.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	15
4.3.17 Lakelse River.....	15
4.3.17.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	15
4.3.18 Mink Creek	16
4.3.18.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	16
4.3.19 Powerline Creek	16
4.3.19.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	17
4.3.20 Schulbuckhand Creek (Scully Creek).....	17
4.3.20.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	18
4.3.21 Sockeye Creek	18
4.3.21.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	19
4.3.22 White Creek.....	19
4.3.22.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	19
4.3.23 Williams Creek.....	20
4.3.23.1 Future Assessment Requirements.....	21

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4-1. Ratings of riparian productivity.	1
Table 4-2. Ratings of mature riparian habitat removal.	2
Table 4-3. Riparian habitat impact matrix.	2
Table 4-4. Summary of riparian habitat impacts in the Lakelse watershed.	3
Table 4-5. Alwyn Creek riparian habitat assessments.	4
Table 4-6. Alwyn Creek future assessment costs.	4
Table 4-7. Andalus Creek riparian habitat assessments.	5
Table 4-8. Andalus Creek future assessment costs.	5
Table 4-9. Boot Lake Creek riparian habitat assessments.	5
Table 4-10. Clearwater Creek riparian habitat assessments.	6
Table 4-11. Clearwater future assessment costs.	6
Table 4-12. Coldwater Creek riparian habitat assessments.	7
Table 4-13. Coldwater Creek future assessment costs.	7
Table 4-14. Eel Creek riparian habitat assessments.	7
Table 4-15. Eel Creek future assessment costs.	8
Table 4-16. Ena Creek riparian habitat assessments.	8
Table 4-17. Ena Creek future assessment costs.	9
Table 4-18. End Creek riparian habitat assessments.	9
Table 4-19. End Creek future assessment costs.	9
Table 4-20. Furlong Creek riparian habitat assessments.	10
Table 4-21. Furlong Creek future assessment costs.	10
Table 4-22. Granite Creek riparian habitat assessments.	11
Table 4-23. Granite Creek future assessment costs.	11
Table 4-24. Hatchery Creek riparian habitat assessments.	11
Table 4-25. Hatchery Creek future assessment costs.	12
Table 4-26. Herman Creek riparian habitat assessments.	12
Table 4-27. Herman Creek future assessment costs.	13
Table 4-28. Johnstone Creek riparian habitat assessments.	13
Table 4-29. Johnstone Creek future assessment costs.	14
Table 4-30. Junction Creek riparian habitat assessments.	14
Table 4-31. Lakelse Lake riparian habitat assessments.	14
Table 4-32. Lakelse River riparian habitat assessments.	15
Table 4-33. Lakelse River future assessment costs.	15
Table 4-34. Mink Creek riparian habitat assessments.	16
Table 4-35. Mink Creek future assessment costs.	16
Table 4-36. Powerline Creek riparian habitat assessments.	17
Table 4-37. Powerline Creek future assessment costs.	17
Table 4-38. Schulbuckhand Creek riparian habitat assessments.	18
Table 4-39. Schulbuckhand Creek future assessment costs.	18
Table 4-40. Sockeye Creek riparian habitat assessments.	18
Table 4-41. Sockeye Creek future assessment costs.	19
Table 4-42. White Creek riparian habitat assessments.	19
Table 4-43. White Creek future assessment costs.	20
Table 4-44. Williams Creek riparian habitat assessments.	20
Table 4-45. Williams Creek future assessment costs.	21

4. RIPARIAN HABITAT ASSESSMENTS

4.1 Introduction

Riparian habitat assessments were carried out in conjunction with fisheries and road assessments of the Lakelse watershed. The purpose of the riparian assessments was to determine the impact of forest harvesting on the mature forest characteristics important to many fish and wildlife species.

Riparian areas adjacent to rivers, streams, lakes and wetlands are important habitats for both fish and wildlife for many reasons. Riparian vegetation provides a number of elements critical to fish such as stream bank stability, input of large organic debris, and nutrients in the form of leaves and insects that fall from the vegetation. Another crucial role that streamside vegetation plays in maintaining healthy fish habitat is providing thermal cover from solar radiation. This thermal protection then affects the temperature and dissolved oxygen content of fish streams. Riparian habitat is also used by a wide variety of wildlife for feeding, resting, raising young, seeking shelter from weather or predators and movement. Large trees originating from rich and moist riparian soils provide areas of snow interception. This is important for wintering ungulates, as well as for denning, resting and nesting sites for species such as wolverine, bears, eagles, owls and woodpeckers. The edges caused by watercourses, along with the rich soils and high moisture content, contribute to increased biodiversity by providing a wide range of plant species that wildlife feed on. Timber harvesting in riparian habitats causes the mature forest characteristics important to many species of fish and wildlife to be lost until the stand reforms these structures. If harvesting is extensive enough, species dependent on these mature forest characteristics may be displaced for years.

The purpose of the riparian assessments is to determine, at a reconnaissance level, the impact of forest harvesting on riparian habitats and identify potential areas where further assessments should be undertaken. It is hoped that rehabilitation and reconstruction work can be undertaken within heavily impacted riparian habitats to speed up the process of establishing mature forest characteristics.

4.2 Methods

Riparian assessments were carried out by reviewing low-level aerial photograph mosaics, forest cover maps and 1:50,000 topographic mapping of the Lakelse watershed. The assessments considered the riparian productivity and the impact to the riparian habitat due to removal of mature or old-growth forests. The overall impact to the riparian habitat was determined by combining the rating for riparian productivity and loss of mature riparian habitat characteristics.

4.2.1 Assessing Riparian Productivity

Riparian productivity was rated from low to very high based on the vegetation, riparian habitat complexity, and potential fish and wildlife use. Habitats with low vegetative cover were rated lower than those riparian habitats that were made up of wetland and forested habitat complexes.

The table below outlines the ratings and rationale used in the assessment.

Table 4-1. Ratings of riparian productivity.

Code	Productivity	Description
L	low	Narrow V-shaped valleys with braided, active gravel channels; mixed conifer, deciduous and shrubs, sparse vegetation coverage, mostly shrubs or young trees.
M	moderate	V-shaped valley with mixed conifer, deciduous and shrubs, moderate vegetation coverage, mostly mature conifers with some deciduous and shrubs.
H	high	Wide, valley-bottoms with wetland and forest complexes; braided stream channels with well established stands of conifers and riparian vegetation.
VH	very high	Very wide floodplain habitats with wetland and forest complexes; oxbows and meandering stream patterns with well established stands of conifers and other riparian vegetation.

4.2.2 Assessing Mature Riparian Habitat Removal

Damage to riparian habitat was assessed based on the amount of harvesting that has occurred of the riparian habitat, the age of the harvesting, the type of regeneration and the potential effects on fish and wildlife use. The ratings ranged from nil to high impacts. Areas that had not been harvested and were under the influence of natural disturbance patterns were rated nil. Riparian habitats that had over 70% of the riparian forests removed were rated as high impact.

The table below summarizes the ratings and rationale used in this assessment.

Table 4-2. Ratings of mature riparian habitat removal.

Code	Damage	Description
N	nil	No removal, natural disturbance regime occurring.
L	low	Less than 20% riparian forests removed, natural regeneration well established. Little management required to return habitat to mature forest conditions within 20 years.
M	moderate	More than 20% but less than 70% riparian forests removed, regeneration poor. Requires some management to return to mature forest conditions within 20-40 years.
H	high	More than 70% riparian forests removed, regeneration very poor or non-climax species. Requires extensive management to return to mature forest conditions within 40 years.

4.2.3 Assessing Impact to Riparian Habitat

Assessing the overall impact to riparian habitat was based on assessing the riparian productivity and the mature habitat removal due to forest harvesting or road building.

The table below outlines the matrix used in this assessment. Habitat with high riparian productivity and high levels of habitat removal have a very high impact rating. Areas with only medium productivity but high levels of habitat removal are assessed as a high impact rating. Riparian productivity that is high or very high combines with medium levels of habitat removal to give high impact ratings as well. As seen in the next section of this report, high and very high impact levels are those which are important in determining further assessment criteria.

Table 4-3. Riparian habitat impact matrix.

Mature Riparian Habitat Removal	Riparian Productivity			
	L	M	H	VH
N	N	N	N	N
L	L	L	M	M
M	L	M	H	H
H	M	H	VH	VH

N= nil, L=low, M=moderate, H=high, VH=very high

4.2.4 Future Riparian Habitat Assessments

Those drainages that were rated as having a high or very high impact to riparian habitat should be assessed for the opportunities for stand management or habitat enhancement activities. In general, the assessments would look at the structure of the existing stand and determine how closely the stand mimics mature and old-growth forest conditions (e.g. amount of coarse woody debris, percent canopy closure, snag density, age, size and distribution of tree species, etc.). The second part of the assessment would be to determine the appropriate stand management or habitat enhancement activities that could be used to bring about mature or old-growth stand structure attributes in as short a time-frame as possible.

Prior to any field assessment of these riparian areas, a thorough check of Repap British Columbia Inc., Skeena Sawmills and Ministry of Forest silviculture information system files should be undertaken to determine the status of the areas. Current status, previous silviculture treatments, stand tending prescriptions and planned silviculture activities should be assessed to ensure that a complete description of the area is obtained.

Approximate costs for future assessments of riparian areas are given for those reaches rated very high, and high. Increased efficiencies could be realized in planning, manpower and equipment usage if the upslope and/or fisheries level 2 assessments or restoration activities are carried out at the same time.

4.3 Level 1 Riparian Habitat Assessments

4.3.1 Summary of Level 1 Riparian Habitat Assessments

Overall, 63 reaches within the Lakelse watershed were rated for impacts to riparian habitat. Of those reaches 24% were rated as having very high impacts to the riparian habitats adjacent to them. High riparian impact ratings were given to 32% of the reaches, 22% were given moderate impact ratings, 6% low impact ratings and 16% had no impacts. The majority of the reaches were impacted in the late 1950s and early 1960s by forest harvesting within the riparian habitats. A significant number of reaches were impacted in the 1970's and early 1980's, with a number of reaches impacted in the late 1980's and a few in 1992 and 1993. The table below summarizes the riparian habitat impacts within the Lakelse watershed.

Table 4-4. Summary of riparian habitat impacts in the Lakelse watershed.

Stream Name	Riparian Habitat Impacts					Total Reaches
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Nil	
Alwyn Creek	R3	R2	R1			3
Alwyn Creek North Trib.	R1					1
Alwyn Creek South Trib.	R1					1
Andalas Creek		R1				1
Boot Lake Creek			R1			1
Clearwater Creek		R1, R2				2
Clearwater South Trib.		R1				1
Coldwater Creek			R1	R2	R3	3
Coldwater Creek Trib. #1		R1				1
Coldwater Creek Trib. #1A		R1				1
Coldwater Creek Trib. #1B	R1					1
Eel Creek	R1					1
Ena Creek	R1					1
Ena Creek Trib. #1			R1			1
Ena Creek Trib. #2			R1			1
End Creek		R1				1
Furlong Creek		R1	R2			2
Granite Creek	R1					1
Hatchery Creek		R1		R2		2
Herman Creek	R1					1
Johnstone Creek			R1, R2			2
Johnstone Creek Trib. #1		R1				1
Johnstone Creek Trib. #2	R1					1
Junction Creek			R1			1
Lakelse Lake (E. & W. Sides)		R1				1
Lakelse Lake (N. & S. Sides)			R2			1
Lakelse River		R1	R2			2
Mink Creek North Trib.	R1, R2					2
Mink Creek South Trib.		R1				1
Powerline Creek		R1				1
Schulbuckhand Creek	R1	R2	R3, R4			4
Sockeye Creek		R1, R2				2
White Creek	R1, R2			R3		3
White Creek Trib.		R1				1
Williams Creek	R1		R2, R3		R4 - R9	9
Williams Creek Trib #1		R1		R2		2
Williams Creek Trib #2					R1, R2	2
Totals	15	20	14	4	10	63