

# State

DATE

SUBJECT

The above information is being furnished to you for your information.

After visiting the stream area in the WNE stream area, I have been very impressed with the quality of the stream and the surrounding area. I would like to submit the following information to you.

As you know, I spent considerable time in this area during the spring and summer of 1973. Hopefully, I have a point or two that may be of interest.

Of prime interest to me is the area south of the "Pop Point Sole Area"; that is, those waters, fresh, salt or intertidal, from the low lake outlet to the Minx Islands towards the sole area.

The first stream west and north of Pop Point (101-43-20) is a fair producer of pink and clam salmon. On September 13, 1973, I counted 1,000 specimens (approximately 10% chum) from I.T.2 to the barrier falls.

The intertidal flats about the Minx Islands were noted to support a large number of salmon (although of small size) when examining the stream area in May. In September fry were observed here with about 20 spawning pinks observed. The two streams that drain through this area are quite slow moving and sediments would likely settle into the channel rather than flush out. If logging debris were to enter this area, a situation similar to the stream west of the Minx Islands (101-43-23) might develop, where it was found that 2 to 6 inches of silt was standing on the stream bed.

I would hope some consideration be given to these areas. In addition, I would like to add the following after reading the draft:

1. Following the doctrine of multiple use, care should be used when using the term "sustainable forest"; all resource values should be considered and I am not sure if a watershed or stream can be sustainable in terms of salmon production.
2. I would like to see some explicit precautions be written that protecting areas due to their importance of outmigrating salmon fry. If recent hypothesis are correct a high degree of fry mortality occurs in this environment. Diminishing the quality of this area by changing cover (i.e. over banks) or the introduction of toxic materials may seriously interfere with maintaining the size runs we now have.
3. Points 7 and 8 on page 2 do not provide for the removal of logging debris that could wash into streams beyond the "head of the bank." These provisions only cover material actually in the stream during logging operations.

4. Point 14 on page 3 is not clear; what per cent of the roads are mainline, and how will other roads be "put to bed", and what types of recreation are considered here?
5. Point 19, page 3, log storage should not be allowed in Gnat Cove.
6. Spit Creek, due to its recorded history of being a high producer of salmon and the fact that it is currently important in a pink salmon transplant project, should not be subjected to any management practices that will allow temperatures to rise.
7. In no stream should habitat improvement projects be needed as result of harvesting timber. This is a "doom forecast" or "make-work" philosophy (page 26, last paragraph under "Fish").
8. In appendix B, no escapement figures are given for Spit Creek. This is a major producer in the sale area, and I feel this information should be included in such a report.

I must also agree with others in the Department who feel that individual reports written for the Draft Environmental Statement under the multiple discipline mode of study should be included verbatim.

WBD