

## Issue Characterization Worksheet - Upper Crooked River

(Source: Appendix F - Upper Crooked River Prototype Subbasin Review)

Issue Considered \_\_\_\_\_

Your Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date Completed \_\_\_\_\_

Data/Information Sources for this  
Characterization \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Attach (or include below) a brief narrative that addresses the following questions. Please keep the narrative focused on conditions, not causes. (Please use WordPerfect, if possible)

1. What do the ICBEMP documents (Component Assessment, DEIS, Integrated Risk Analysis, etc.) say about broad-scale findings and conditions related to this issue in the UCR Subbasin? (Please include the document and page number therein referenced).
2. What do other information sources say about current conditions in the UCR Subbasin related to this issue? What are the patterns in place?
3. To what degree (if any), and in general terms, where is component condition different than that expressed as desired in the ICBEMP documents?
4. What are the implications (if any) of the above for the Basin? For other subbasins?
5. What are the data gaps you found? What do you feel should be done (if anything) to resolve these gaps?
6. What are the opinions of your assigned collaborators concerning this issue? Do they have information that differs from the above?
7. Based on the above, and your general knowledge of the area, what do you feel is the overall condition status, and the risks and opportunities in this subbasin for the ecosystem component(s) related to this issue? Where are the general areas where these risks and opportunities seem most apparent? Any specific recommendations regarding this?

Attach maps (8 ½ X 11" sized) that portray/support that described above.

When completed, please submit this package to John Swanson, who will route as necessary and store the product in the UCR SBR administrative record.

## **Example Write-up Using Characterization Worksheet (Excerpted from Upper Crooked River Prototype Subbasin Review)**

### **Issue: Plants of tribal interest and cultural importance**

Lead: Lisa Croft

#### Data/Info Sources:

- ICBEMP Analysis of Vascular Plants (1997) Croft, et. al.
- Brigitte Whipple, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, Personal Communication, 1998

#### Data Gaps:

The location of culturally significant species has not been tracked on federal, state or private land within the UCR Subbasin. Nor have potential habitat or sites associated with gathering activities been identified.

#### What ICBEMP Says About this Issue:

DEIS Vol. 1: p. 2-221, addresses the issue of continued harvestability of culturally significant species

DEIS p. 2-225, table 2-30, lists some culturally significant species population trends

DEIS p.4-103, 4-202, list of culturally significant plant species

DEIS Standards and Guides include: p. 3-163-164 TI-S3, TI-O3, TI-S6, S8, S9 which address insuring continued harvestability standards and collaboration with Tribes.

#### Implications (if any) of the above for the Basin? For other subbasins?

This area contains significant tribal plant resources and these proposed standards, guides and objectives should be considered in any future project planning and prioritization of projects.

#### Collaborators concerns/ information:

The Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs are concerned about continued harvestability of all plants that they use. This area is a traditional gathering area and contains many resources.

#### Characterization:

The Upper Crooked River Subbasin is rich in tribal plant resources. They are found in a diverse array of habitats, ranging from scabs and open, shallow soil flats, which are a major source habitat for root crops, to wet meadows and at the periphery of these habitats and in the forest and juniper woodlands.

The UCR Subbasin is a traditional gathering areas. For this analysis, the plant list found in Croft et. al. (1997) was used as a starting point, then sorted by which species occur in this area. A cultural plant potential habitat map was generated using the GIS potential vegetation layer and then sorting the vegetation types into one of four groups; meadow, scab, forest, and juniper woodland. Each of the plants species was then associated with one of these groups. A report was generated that showed number of acres of each of these groups in each watershed and then this information was used to determine which watershed had the greatest potential for cultural plants in terms of diversity of species and habitat and number of species from the plant list that could potentially occur there.

Based on what is known from traditional use of this area, both currently and historically, and from this analysis, it is apparent that this may be one of the most important areas on public lands for gathering of traditional plants.

This table shows number of acres of potential habitat for culturally significant plants by vegetation group within each watershed.

watershed/ Veg group	Bear	Camp	Deep	Horse Heaven	Howard Johnson	Lower N. F. Cr.	Middle Crooked	Upper N.F. Crooked
forest	12,546	8,147	40,225	15,221	26,664	14,741	45,824	40,611
meadow	195	1,454	1,662	385	11,337	132	598	8,306
scab	23,138	50,443	13,456	881	6,775	23,953	60,372	19,334
woodland/ juniper	93,051	52,943	36	16,171	65	6,173	139,027	283

The Middle Fork Crooked has the most diversity of habitat per species associated with that vegetation grouping. While the Upper Crooked and Deep watersheds are high in meadow and forest habitats while Camp and Bear are high in scab and woodland juniper habitat.

An additional factor for determining the importance of an area for traditional use is the ease of access to the site. The location and number of roads in a watershed was taken into account in this analysis.