

Hillman, Brett - FS

From: Prout, Mark -FS
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 10:54 AM
To: Hillman, Brett - FS
Cc: Prout, Leighlan -FS; VanGorden, Keith D -FS
Subject: RE: SPD Review for Ameletus mayflies

Brett,

The wildlife biologists have been handling these species as part of the WL BE, rather than writing a separate BE for 2 aquatic species. But I did have a 5 year CCS agreement with UNH after Forest Plan revision to help us understand the how rare the species are on the WMNF. My recommendation to the bios was to assume the species were present in timber sale areas. UNH found the species at various sampling sites across the Forest, from just 1-3 square foot kick samples at any stream. So in other words, the species are globally rare, but locally abundant. It would be much more difficult to prove the species is not present than to prove it is present so we just assume it is. But you are correct, *A. tertius* likes the larger streams/rivers, while *brownie* likes the smaller brooks. However I believe the dam removal project does also impact a small unnamed brook which we could assume *brownie* is present.

We have taken the position that minimizing sedimentation through use of BMP's and design features during project implementation is sufficient to protect the species. While we could lose individuals at the local project site, given the broad appearance of the mayflies across the Forest (with such minimal sampling) it would seem remote to have an adverse effect on the stream population. I would look at other project BE's to cite the appropriate language to say this, as I do not write BE's. But I do feel it would take high levels of chronic long term sedimentation to have an impact as we have so few activities occurring at the same time in a drainage. I was hoping to remove the species from R9 list with some pre- post- timber sampling but I have found that I personally can only ID to genus. We would need more expertise to process samples, which I was hoping to avoid.

Dam removal is a bit different than a timber sale activities, but I am pretty sure DES dam removal experts will have a sediment management plan. There will certainly be some short term disturbance at the local stream sites, comparable to a stream crossing construction project.

Let me know if we need to talk further on this.

Mark



Mark Prout
Fisheries Biologist
Forest Service
White Mountain National Forest

p: 603-536-6224
mark.prout@usda.gov

71 White Mountain Dr.
Campton, NH 03223

www.fs.fed.us



Caring for the land and serving people

From: Hillman, Brett - FS
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 9:56 AM
To: Prout, Leighlan -FS <lprout@fs.fed.us>; Prout, Mark -FS <mprout@fs.fed.us>
Cc: VanGorden, Keith D -FS <kdvangorden@fs.fed.us>
Subject: SPD Review for Ameletus mayflies

Hey guys,

How do we handle the two *Ameletus* mayflies on our RFSS list during the review of small projects? Are they considered wildlife resources or fisheries resources? Are they Mark's responsibility or mine?

The project I'm reviewing is the South Branch Gale River Dam removal. It doesn't look like the streams have ever been surveyed for mayflies. I think it's a third order stream where the dam is located, so *A. tertius* is probably more likely to be here than *A. brownii*. Do we typically just assume presence if the habitat seems decent on paper?



Brett Hillman
Wildlife Biologist

Forest Service
White Mountain National Forest, Pemigewasset Ranger District

p: 603-536-6127

f: 603-536-3685

brett.hillman@usda.gov

71 White Mountain Drive
Campton, NH 03223

www.fs.fed.us



Caring for the land and serving people