

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND..... 1

DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS 1

PURPOSE AND NEED..... 2

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT..... 2

ISSUES..... 3

ALTERNATIVES 4

DECISION FRAMEWORK 4

CHAPTER 1 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION 7

1.1 BACKGROUND 7

1.2 DESIRED FUTURE CONDITION..... 8

1.3 PURPOSE AND NEED 10

1.4 PROPOSED ACTION 10

1.5 MANAGEMENT DIRECTION 12

 1.5.1 Regional Direction..... 13

 1.5.2 Local Direction..... 15

1.6 DECISION FRAMEWORK..... 17

1.7 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT 17

1.8 ISSUES 18

CHAPTER 2 ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION 23

2.1 INTRODUCTION 23

2.2 ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT..... 23

2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL 24

 2.3.1 Alternative 1 – No Action..... 24

 2.3.2 Alternative 2 – Proposed Action..... 25

 2.3.3 Alternative 3..... 30

 2.3.4 Elements Common to both Action Alternatives..... 32

2.4 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES 41

2.5 ALTERNATIVES NOT CONSIDERED IN DETAIL 55

2.6 ALTERNATIVE COMPARISON 58

CHAPTER 3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES..... 73

3.1 INTRODUCTION 73

3.2 HERBICIDES, ADJUVANTS, SURFACTANTS AND INERT INGREDIENTS 77

3.3 INVASIVE SPECIES AND TREATMENT EFFECTIVENESS 81

3.4 NATIVE VEGETATION AND BOTANICAL SPECIES OF LOCAL INTEREST 104

3.5 SOILS 152

3.6 WATER QUALITY 170

3.7 FISHERIES/AQUATICS 203

3.8 HUMAN HEALTH – WORKER AND PUBLIC EXPOSURE TO HERBICIDES 275

3.9 TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE SPECIES OF LOCAL INTEREST 282

3.10 ECONOMIC ANALYSIS 350

3.11 RANGE RESOURCES & GRAZING MANAGEMENT 354

3.12 CULTURAL RESOURCES..... 366

3.13 RECREATION AND SCENERY 368

3.14 CONGRESSIONALLY-DESIGNATED AREAS AND OTHER AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST..... 376

3.15 FOREST PLAN AMENDMENTS 385

3.16 OTHER DISCLOSURES 386

CHAPTER 4 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION 389

4.1 CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES 389

 4.1.2 Consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries)..... 389

 4.1.3 Consultation with Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)..... 389

 4.1.4 Consultation with Tribal Governments..... 389

 4.1.5 Consultation with State and County Noxious Weed Departments 390

4.2 PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS 390

4.3 DISTRIBUTION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT 392

INDEX 395

PROJECT GLOSSARY 397

PROJECT GLOSSARY 397

REFERENCES 411

Table of Tables

Table 1. Project Area Unit Acres and Invasive Plant Sites by Administrative Unit. See Section 3.3 for a characterization of the invasive plant sites across the Forests. 11

Table 2. Management Areas of the Deschutes and Ochoco NF and Crooked River National Grassland where Mapped Invasive Plant Sites or Project Area Units occur. 16

Table 3. Average acres treated annually by method under existing NEPA documents. 25

Table 4. Site Type Descriptions for Project Area Units. 27

Table 5. Treatment methods applied within project area units, Alt. 2. This information summarizes the treatments that may be applied within project area units. This is a simplification of the prescription, as the order, timing, and application method will vary by site. 29

Table 6. Summary of Treatment Methods Combinations that will occur across Project Area Units, Sorted by Site Type, Alt. 2..... 29

Table 7. Width of Aquatic Buffers applied in Alternative 3. Restrictions on Treatment Methods within these buffers are listed on previous page. 31

Table 8. Project Area Units and Mapped Invasive Plant Sites within Alternative 3 Aquatic Buffers. 31

Table 9. Invasive Plant Species inventoried and proposed for treatment on the Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests and Crooked River National Grassland. “X” indicates the location of inventoried site. *Acronyms are as follows:* BFR = Bend/Ft. Rock District; CRE = Crescent District; SIS = Sisters District; LOM = Lookout Mt. District; PAU = Paulina District. CRNG = Crooked River National Grassland. 32

Table 10. Invasive Plant Treatment Methods Approved for Use in the Region 6 Final Invasive Plant EIS and Considered in this EIS..... 33

Table 11. Biological Agents for Species Proposed for Biological Control. 35

Table 12. Approved Herbicides Highest and Lowest Application Rates (from pesticide use reports), and Typical Application Rates. 35

Table 13. Treatment prioritization strategy used annually to implement invasive plant treatments on the Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests and Crooked River National Grassland..... 37

Table 14. Proposed Amendment, Ochoco National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. 40

Table 15. Project Area Unit-Specific Project Design Features..... 51

Table 16. Minimum Buffers (ft) for Herbicide Applications used in Alternative 2. 52

Table 17. Minimum buffers (ft) for herbicide applications in Alternative 3 that can be used within 300 feet of water. No broadcast spraying would be allowed within buffers..... 53

Table 18. Comparison of Alternative Components 59

Table 19. Comparison of the Alternatives Based on How Each Responds to the Issues..... 60

Table 20. Risk Assessments for Herbicides and Surfactants Considered in this EIS 77

Table 21. Range of Invasive Plant Site Sizes. 83

Table 22. Number of invasive plant sites currently mapped and proposed for treatment within project area units on the Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests and Crooked River National Grassland. 83

Table 23. Number of sites and mapped acreages of invasive plants proposed for treatment on the Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests and Crooked River National Grassland. *Deschutes National Forest: BFR = Bend/Ft. Rock District; CRE = Crescent District; SIS = Sisters District. Ochoco National Forest: LOM = Lookout Mountain District; PAU = Paulina District. CRNG = Crooked River National Grassland. Note: A site may contain multiple species; therefore sites and acreages are not cumulative.* 83

Table 24. Top 5 priority Invasive plant species for each district of the Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests and on the Crooked River National Grassland (*as of August 2005*). 88

Table 25. Summary comparison of the alternatives..... 93

Table 26. Number of knapweed plants at four plots following a combination of chemical and manual treatments, Deschutes National Forest..... 93

Table 27. Herbicide acres and total herbicide usage on the Deschutes National Forest, 2000-2005 (Oregon Department of Agriculture 2005). 94

Table 28. Percent reduction in the amount of herbicide used at selected sites, 2000-2004, Deschutes National Forest. Data from Oregon Department of Agriculture (2005)...... 94

Table 29. Sensitive plant species documented (D) or suspected (S) to occur on the Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests and Crooked River National Grassland. 106

Table 30. Sensitive plant species that occur within Invasive Plant Project Area Units. 107

Table 31. Invasive plant threats to Sensitive plant species within Project Area Units. 108

Table 32. Survey & Manage Known Sites within Invasive Plant Project Area Units, Deschutes National Forest. S&M Category Codes: B = Rare species, manage all known sites; C = Uncommon species, manage high-priority sites; EE = equivalent effort surveys are needed. 117

Table 33. Evaluation of potential effects of proposed herbicides on currently known sensitive plant populations within Invasive Plant Project Area Units for Alternatives 2 and 3. Effects codes: NI = No Impact; MII = May Impact Individuals, But Will Not Likely Contribute To A Trend Towards Federal Listing or Loss of Viability to The Population or Species. See Appendix C of the Botany report for applicable PDFs for each species..... 134

Table 34. Evaluation of potential effects of proposed herbicides on known Survey & Manage plant populations within Invasive Plant Project Area Units for both Alternatives 2 and 3. Effects codes: NI = No Impact; MIIH = 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. 143

Table 35. Current Average Annual Net Acreage of Herbicide Application - NFS lands, Deschutes, Ochoco and Crooked River National Grassland. 156

Table 36. General Research Findings of Pertinent Herbicide Characteristics Pertinent to the Soil Resource. 160

Table 37. Watershed Table..... 170

Table 38. 303(d) Listed Streams on the Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests 173

Table 39. Mapped Invasive Plant Sites, Project Area Units, and Total Acres of Land within 100 feet of 303(d) Listed Stream Segments on National Forest System Lands. 177

Table 40. Municipal Watersheds 179

Table 41. Wellhead Protection Areas (within Project Area Units)..... 179

Table 42. Community Water Source/Recharge Areas (within Project Area Units)..... 180

Table 43. Potable Water at Ranger Stations, Guard Stations, & Government Housing 181

Table 44. Potable Water at Special Use Cabins/Lodges (Deschutes NF)..... 182

Table 45. Invasive Plants in Riparian Reserves, Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas (RHCAs), and within 100 feet of streams on National Forest System lands. 183

Table 46. Invasive Plant Sites and Project Area Units in and Adjacent to Lakes, Wetlands and Springs. 185

Table 47. Pebble Counts:..... 187

Table 48. 1998 Weed EA Treatment Areas compared to current Project Area Units. 189

Table 49. 1998 TAs within Hydrologic Areas of Concern with Chemical Treatments*..... 191

Table 50. Potable Water with Potential Chemical Treatments 192

Table 51. PAUs within Hydrologic Areas of Concern with Chemical Treatments 195

Table 52. Potable Water with Potential Chemical Treatments 197

Table 53. Conservation Recommendations from Biological Opinion and Corresponding Project Design Features..... 204

Table 54. Summary of Fish Species and their Status in the Planning Area..... 205

Table 55. Width of Riparian Reserves and Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas on the Ochoco and Deschutes National Forests..... 220

Table 56. Unit-Specific Project Design Features, Alternative 2 and 3..... 221

Table 57. Potential for increased concern for listed aquatic species when use of local environmental factors are likely to increase stream herbicide concentration predictions (USFS 2005)..... 224

Table 58. Potential for increase in aquatic species concerns over the SERA GLEAMS stream herbicide concentration predictions for three ecotypes similar to those in the current project area (USFS 2005d). 227

Table 59. Results of SERA worksheets for aquatic biota using first choice herbicides in selected subwatersheds..... 229

Table 60. Differences between GLEAMS model assumptions that cannot be modified and site-specific conditions for selected subwatersheds..... 230

Table 61. Description of subwatersheds where herbicide use is not of concern for perennial waterbodies, but existence of intermittent streams or listed fish species in the subwatershed pose a concern..... 234

Table 62. Acres of invasive plants that are proposed for treatment with herbicide within the 100 foot and 300 foot of intermittent streams, perennial streams, springs and lakes..... 235

Table 63. Watersheds and Subwatersheds where Effects of Invasive Plant Treatments are analyzed for TES Fisheries. Species in italics are proposed for reintroduction within the next five years. 239

Table 64. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for intermittent (Int.) streams by subwatershed and total acres and number of infested weed sites by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 242

Table 65. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and springs by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 242

Table 66. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for intermittent (Int.) streams by subwatershed and total acres and number of invasive plant sites by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 244

Table 67. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for intermittent (Int.) streams by subwatershed and total acres and number of invasive plant sites by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 245

Table 68. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and springs by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 246

Table 69. Acres and number of locations invasive plants occur within specified buffers for intermittent (Int.) streams by subwatershed and total acres and number of invasive plant sites by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 248

Table 70. Acres and number of locations invasive plants occur within specified buffers for perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and springs by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 248

Table 71. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for intermittent (Int.) streams by subwatershed and total acres and number of invasive plant sites by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 251

Table 72. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and springs by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 251

Table 73. Metolius River reed canary/ribbon grass infestations and other information collected during the 2006 survey..... 252

Table 74. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for intermittent (Int.) streams by subwatershed and total acres and number of invasive plant sites by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 256

Table 75. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and springs by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 256

Table 76. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for intermittent (Int.) streams by subwatershed and total acres and number of invasive plant sites by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 258

Table 77. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and springs by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 258

Table 78. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for intermittent (Int.) streams by subwatershed and total acres and number of invasive plant sites by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 260

Table 79. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and springs by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 260

Table 80. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for intermittent (Int.) streams by subwatershed and total acres and number of invasive plant sites by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 262

Table 81. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for intermittent (Int.) streams by subwatershed and total acres and number of invasive plant sites by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 263

Table 82. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and springs by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for chemical treatment. 264

Table 83. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for intermittent (Int.) streams by subwatershed and total acres and number of invasive plant sites by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 266

Table 84. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and springs by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 266

Table 85. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for intermittent (Int.) streams by subwatershed and total acres and number of invasive plant sites by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 269

Table 86. Acres and number of locations invasive plant sites occur within specified buffers for perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and springs by subwatershed. Results represent sites proposed for some form of chemical treatment. 269

Table 87. Reed Canary grass treatment areas proposed for mowing and then hand wick and spot spray application of aquatic glyphosate. The infested % length of shoreline is based on available reproductive habitat for that fish population. Values are for mapped invasive plant sites..... 270

Table 88. Subwatershed with waterbodies at higher risk of chemical contamination due to size of weed infestations and proximity to perennial water and fish bearing waterbodies. 271

Table 89. Some culturally-important plants in Central Oregon..... 278

Table 90. How Human Health Concerns are Addressed 280

Table 91. Federally listed or candidate species documented to occur on the Forests or Grassland..... 284

Table 92. Reproductive results and numbers of nestlings observed from bald eagle pairs or nests on the Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests from 1996 to 2005. Key on following page. 287

Table 93. Approximate numbers of bald eagle nest sites and roosts in the project area..... 289

Table 94. Disturbance distances for bald eagle within which adverse effects may occur, as specified by FWS office in Bend, Oregon. 289

Table 95. Wildlife species within the project area that are included on the Regional Forester’s Sensitive Animal List (July 2004). 292

Table 96. Mollusk survey results..... 305

Table 97. Deschutes and Ochoco National Forest Management Indicator Species..... 306

Table 98. Great gray owl survey areas, year surveys were conducted, and results. 309

Table 99. Species included in Bird Conservation Region’s 9 and 10..... 314

Table 100. Forest Habitats..... 317

Table 101. Shrub Steppe Habitats 318

Table 102. Riparian Habitats 319

Table 103. Unique Habitats 320

Table 104. Dry Forests 320

Table 105. Riparian 321

Table 106. Unique Habitats 322

Table 107. Effects Determinations on Federally Listed Species (All Alternatives)..... 330

Table 108. Summary of exposure scenario results showing the herbicides and NPE, scenario, and application rates that produce risk to sage grouse. Symbol meanings are as follows: -- estimated dose below the NOAEL; ★ estimated dose exceeds the NOAEL at both typical and highest application rates; ◆ estimated dose exceeds the NOAEL at only the highest application rates. N/A – data not available..... 334

Table 109. Summary of Effects to Forest Service Sensitive Species 342

Table 110. Cost of Treatment by Method..... 350

Table 111. Estimated Cost of Treating all Acres in First Year..... 351

Table 112. Pattern of herbicide to non-herbicide over time alternatives 2 and 3, if all 1,892 sites were treated beginning in 2007. Based on analysis done by the Olympic National Forest (USFS 2006). 352

Table 113. Assumptions for Worker Days per Treatment Area. 353

Table 114. Number of Jobs for First Year of Most Ambitious Treatment Scenario (all acres treated in first year)..... 353

Table 115. Grazing Allotments with Known Invasive Plant Populations on the Crooked River National Grassland. 355

Table 116. Grazing Allotments with Known Invasive Plant Populations on the Deschutes National Forest 356

Table 117. Grazing Allotments with Known Invasive Plant Populations on the Ochoco National Forest. 357

Table 118. Occupied Wild Horse Territories with Known Invasive Plant Populations on the Ochoco National Forest 359

Table 119. Cumulative Effects on Grazing and Range Management within the Project Area..... 365

Table 120. Deschutes National Forest. Based on GIS inventory invasive plant data and limited field checking. The invasive plant affected areas includes proximity to developed recreation sites along travel routes, allocated scenic and waterway corridors..... 371

Table 121. Ochoco National Forest (Lookout Mountain Ranger District and Paulina Ranger District)... 372

Table 122. Crooked River National Grassland..... 372

Table 123. Project Area Units Located within Wilderness, Deschutes & Ochoco National Forests..... 376

Table 124. Project Area Units within or Partially within Designated and Eligible Wild and Scenic River Corridors..... 378

Table 125. Outstandingly Remarkable Values for the Wild and Scenic Rivers on the Deschutes & Ochoco NFs and CRNG..... 379

Table 126. Research Natural Areas with Project Area Units Overlapping or Adjacent. 380

Table 127. Project Area Units within or Partially within Newberry National Volcanic Monument 381

Table 128. Project Area Units that overlap Inventoried Roadless Areas..... 382

Table of Figures

Figure 1. Representative Project Area Unit and Data from Project Area Summary Report, Appendix A of this EIS. 27

Figure 2. Acres of Project Area Units by Grouped Site Types. Disturbed areas, such as along roads, are the most common place to find invasive plants. 28

Figure 3. This picture shows how options for herbicide selection and application methods decrease in proximity to streams. 54

Figure 4. Layers of Caution Integrated Into Herbicide Use..... 79

Figure 5. Illustration of how herbicide droplet size can reduce the distance that the herbicide can drift. . 123

Figure 6. Trout Creek Turbidity and Suspended Sediment 187

Figure 7. Sites proposed to be scarified and burned prior to herbicide treatment in the Dry Paulina Subwatershed..... 273

Appendices

Appendix A – Table of Project Area Units with Species Present, Objectives, and Treatment

Appendix B – Common Control Measures

Appendix C – Management Direction and Compliance with Forest Plan

Appendix D – Herbicide Information and PDF Crosswalk

Appendix E – Revegetation Planning and Implementation; Excerpts from 2003 Draft Guidelines for Revegetation

Appendix F – Annual Implementation Guide Including Mandatory and Optional Forms

Appendix G – Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Prevention Practices

Appendix H – Additional Fisheries Information

