

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION 1
 BACKGROUND..... 1
 DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS 1
 PURPOSE AND NEED..... 2
 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT..... 2
 ISSUES..... 3
 ALTERNATIVES 3
 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 Policy and Forest Plan Direction..... 13
 1.6 DECISION FRAMEWORK..... 18
 1.7 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT 18
 1.8 ISSUES 19

CHAPTER 2 ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION 23

2.1 INTRODUCTION 23
 2.2 ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT 24
 2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL 24
 2.3.1 Alternative 1 – No Action..... 24
 2.3.2 Alternative 2 – Proposed Action..... 26
 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 56
 2.6 ALTERNATIVE COMPARISON 60

CHAPTER 3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES..... 74

3.1 INTRODUCTION 74
 3.2 HERBICIDES, ADJUVANTS, SURFACTANTS AND INERT INGREDIENTS..... 78
 3.3 INVASIVE SPECIES AND TREATMENT EFFECTIVENESS 84
 3.4 NATIVE VEGETATION AND BOTANICAL SPECIES OF LOCAL INTEREST 107
 3.5 SOILS 155
 3.6 WATER QUALITY..... 173
 3.7 FISHERIES AND AQUATIC ORGANISMS 205
 3.8 HUMAN HEALTH – WORKER AND PUBLIC EXPOSURE TO HERBICIDES 249
 3.9 TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE SPECIES OF LOCAL INTEREST 256
 General Effects of Invasive Plant Treatment 302
 3.10 ECONOMIC ANALYSIS 342
 3.11 RANGE RESOURCES & GRAZING MANAGEMENT 347
 3.12 HERITAGE RESOURCES 360
 3.13 RECREATION AND SCENERY 363
 3.14 CONGRESSIONALLY-DESIGNATED AREAS AND OTHER AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST..... 371
 3.15 FOREST PLAN AMENDMENTS 380
 3.16 OTHER DISCLOSURES 381

CHAPTER 4 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION 386

4.1 CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES 386

 4.1.2 Consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries)..... 386

 4.1.3 Consultation with Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)..... 386

 4.1.4 Consultation with Tribal Governments..... 386

 4.1.5 Consultation with State and County Noxious Weed Departments 387

4.2 PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS 387

4.3 DISTRIBUTION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT 390

INDEX 393

PROJECT GLOSSARY 395

PROJECT GLOSSARY 395

REFERENCES 409

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

The Forest Plan Management Areas are listed in the following table. 16

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. 17

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

Table 4. Site Type Descriptions for Project Area Units (PAUs). 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; PAUL = 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. These treatments are frequently used in combination as required by integrated invasive plant management (see Appendix B). 33

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

Table 12. Approved Herbicides Highest and Lowest and Typical Application Rates. The “typical application rate” is the rate used in each of the Risk Assessments, and is usually based on an overall average of the amount of product used in all Forest Service applications in 2001. The “highest application rate” is the highest Forest Service application rate reported in 2001. 36

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. 41

Table 15. Project Area Unit-Specific Project Design Features for Fisheries..... 52

Table 16. Minimum Buffers (ft) for Herbicide Applications used in Alternative 2. 53

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 and no herbicide would be allowed within 10 feet of buffers..... 54

Table 18. Comparison of Alternative Components 60

Table 19. Comparison of the Alternatives Based on How Each Responds to the Issues. This is a summary of information presented in detail in Chapter 3. 62

Table 20. Risk Assessments for Herbicides and Surfactants Considered in this EIS 79

Table 21. Range of Invasive Plant Site Sizes. 86

Table 22. Number of invasive plant sites currently mapped and proposed for treatment within PAUs on the Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests and Crooked River National Grassland. 86

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; PAUL = Paulina District. CRNG = Crooked River National Grassland. Note: A site may contain multiple species; therefore sites and acreages are not cumulative.* 86

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*). 91

Table 25. Summary comparison of the alternatives..... 96

Table 26. Number of knapweed plants at four plots following a combination of herbicide and manual treatments, Deschutes National Forest..... 97

Table 27. Herbicide acres and total herbicide usage on the Deschutes National Forest, 2000-2005 (Oregon Department of Agriculture 2005). 97

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)..... 97

Table 29. Sensitive plant species documented (D) or suspected (S) to occur on the Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests and Crooked River National Grassland. 109

Table 30. Sensitive plant species that occur within Invasive Plant PAUs. 110

Table 31. Invasive plant threats to Sensitive plant species within PAUs. 111

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..... 120

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; 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. See Appendix C of the Botany report for applicable PDFs for each species. Note: PDFs would minimize or eliminate effects to Sensitive plants; an effects determination of MIIH is due to remaining uncertainty because the herbicide could cause some damage if it were to unintentionally come into contact with an individual plant. 137

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. 146

Table 35. Current Average Annual Net Acreage of Herbicide Application - NFS lands, Deschutes, Ochoco and Crooked River National Grassland. 160

Table 36. General Research Findings of Pertinent Herbicide Characteristics Pertinent to the Soil Resource. 163

Table 37. 2004/2006 Oregon State 303(d) Listed Streams on the Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests, with Listing Parameter 174

Table 38. Mapped Invasive Plant Sites, Project Area Units, and Total Acres of Land within 100 feet of 2002 303(d) Listed Stream Segments on National Forest System Lands. 179

Table 39. Municipal Watersheds with invasive plant Project Area Units (PAUs) 181

Table 40. Wellhead Protection Areas (WPAs) Overlapping with Invasive Plant Project Area Units 181

Table 41. Community Water Source/Recharge Areas (within Project Area Units)..... 182

Table 42. Potable Water at Ranger Stations, Guard Stations, & Government Housing 183

Table 43. Potable Water at Special Use Cabins/Lodges (Deschutes NF)..... 184

Table 44. Watersheds at least partially within the range of the Northwest Forest Plan, and amount of invasive plants present. 185

Table 45. Acres of Invasive Plant Sites (Inv.) and Project Area Units (PAU) in Riparian Reserves, Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas (RHCA), and within 100 feet of streams on National Forest System lands..... 186

Table 46. Acres of Invasive Plant Sites and Project Area Units (PAU) in and Adjacent to Lakes (including reservoirs and ponds), Wetlands, and Springs. 189

Table 47. 1998 Weed EA Treatment Areas compared to current Project Area Units. 191

Table 48. 1998 TAs within Hydrologic Areas of Concern with Herbicide Treatments* 192

Table 49. Potable Water areas with Potential Herbicide Treatments 193

Table 50. PAUs within Hydrologic Areas of Concern with Herbicide Treatments..... 196

Table 51. WPAs and Water Source Areas with Potential Herbicide Treatments 198

Table 52. Summary of Fish Species and their Status in the Planning Area..... 206

Table 53. Width of Riparian Reserves and Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas on the Ochoco and Deschutes National Forests..... 221

Table 54. Conservation Recommendations from Biological Opinion and Corresponding Project Design Features..... 222

Table 55. Unit-Specific Project Design Features, Alternative 2 and 3..... 223

Table 56. Potential for increased concern for listed aquatic species when use of local..... 227 environmental factors are likely to increase stream herbicide concentration predictions (USFS 2005d)... 227

Table 57. Results of WCR model outcomes for aquatic biota using 1st choice herbicides in selected subwatersheds. Only central hazard quotients are displayed for peak EEC values. Results are for typical herbicide application rates unless otherwise noted. Hazard quotients for sensitive fish, macroinvertebrates, macrophytes and algae were used if available. Hazard quotients of 1.0 were not exceeded for any organism. 230

Table 58. Conceptual differences between WCR model assumptions that can not be modified and on the ground conditions for selected subwatersheds in the previous table. This shows potential influence on Hazard Quotient outcomes based on generalized hydrology, vegetation, topography and herbicide application method..... 231

Table 59. 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. 236

Table 60. 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..... 237

Table 61. Watersheds and Subwatersheds where Effects of Invasive Plant Treatments are analyzed for Threatened Fisheries. Species in italics are proposed for reintroduction within the next five years. 241

Table 62. Subwatersheds showing the areas where the potential effects to federally listed or Region 6 Sensitive fish species are analyzed (including those to be re-introduced within the next five years).243

Table 63. Reed canarygrass 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..... 245

Table 64. Subwatershed with waterbodies at higher risk of herbicide contamination due to size of weed infestations and proximity to perennial water and fish bearing waterbodies. 246

Table 65. Some culturally-important plants in Central Oregon..... 252

Table 66. How Human Health Concerns are Addressed 254

Table 67. Federally listed or candidate species potentially within the project area..... 258

Table 68. Disturbance and disruption distances for nesting spotted owls. 262

Table 69. Wildlife species within the project area that are included on the Regional Forester’s Sensitive Animal List (July 2004)..... 262

Table 70. 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. 264

Table 71. Approximate numbers of bald eagle nest sites and roosts in the project area..... 267

Table 72. Disturbance distances for bald eagle within which adverse effects may occur, as specified by FWS office in Bend, Oregon. 267

Table 73. Mollusk survey results..... 281

Table 74. Deschutes and Ochoco National Forest Management Indicator Species..... 282

Table 75. Great gray owl survey areas, year surveys were conducted, and results. 284

Table 76. Species included in Bird Conservation Region’s 9 and 10..... 289

Table 77. Forest Habitats..... 292

Table 78. Shrub Steppe Habitats 293

Table 79. Riparian Habitats 294

Table 80. Unique Habitats 295

Table 81. Dry Forests 296

Table 82. Riparian 297

Table 83. Unique Habitats 297

Table 84. Toxicity indices for birds used in the effects analysis. Indices represent the most sensitive endpoint from the most sensitive species for which adequate data are available. 311

Table 85. Toxicity indices for mammals used in the effects analysis. Indices represent the most sensitive endpoint from the most sensitive species for which adequate data are available. 313

Table 86. Effects Determinations on Federally Listed Species (All Alternatives) 320

Table 87. 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..... 325

Table 88. Summary of Effects to Forest Service Sensitive Species 334

Table 89. Cost of Treatment by Method..... 343

Table 90. Estimated Cost of Treating all Acres in First Year..... 343

Table 91. 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)..... 344

Table 92. Assumptions for Worker Days per Treatment Area. 345

Table 93. Number of Jobs for First Year of Most Ambitious Treatment Scenario (all acres treated in first year)..... 345

Table 94. Grazing Allotments with Known Invasive Plant Populations on the Crooked River National Grassland. 349

Table 95. Grazing Allotments with Known Invasive Plant Populations on the Deschutes National Forest 349

Table 96. Grazing Allotments with Known Invasive Plant Populations on the Ochoco National Forest.. 351

Table 97. Occupied Wild Horse Territories with Known Invasive Plant Populations on the Ochoco National Forest 353

Table 98. Cumulative Effects on Grazing and Range Management within the Project Area..... 359

Table 99. 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..... 366

Table 100. Ochoco National Forest (Lookout Mountain Ranger District and Paulina Ranger District)... 367

Table 101. Crooked River National Grassland..... 367

Table 102. Project Area Units Located within Wilderness, Deschutes & Ochoco National Forests..... 371

Table 103. Project Area Units within or Partially within Designated and Eligible Wild and Scenic River Corridors..... 373

Table 104. Outstandingly Remarkable Values for the Wild and Scenic Rivers on the Deschutes & Ochoco NFs and CRNG..... 374

Table 105. Research Natural Areas with Project Area Units Overlapping or Adjacent. 375

Table 106. Project Area Units within or Partially within Newberry National Volcanic Monument 376

Table 107. Project Area Units that overlap Inventoried Roadless Areas..... 377

Table of Figures

Figure 1. Vicinity of Project 9

Figure 2. Representative Project Area Unit and Data from Project Area Summary Report, Appendix A of this EIS. 27

Figure 3. 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 4. This picture shows how options for herbicide selection and application methods decrease in proximity to streams. 55

Figure 5. Layers of Caution Integrated Into Herbicide Use..... 82

Figure 6. Illustration of how herbicide droplet size can reduce the distance that the herbicide can drift (USFS 2006c). 126

Figure 7. Photo on left is diverse native vegetation on the Metolius River. Photo on right shows an area where ribbongrass has created a monoculture, displacing the native vegetation. 204

Figure 8. Sites proposed to be scarified and burned prior to herbicide treatment in the Dry Paulina Subwatershed..... 248

Appendices

- Appendix A** – Table of Project Area Units with Species Present, Objectives, and Treatment
- Appendix B** – Treatment Options and 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** – Fisheries Tabular Data and Analysis by Watershed
- Appendix I** – Response to Comments on the Draft EIS
- Appendix J** – Watershed Information
- Appendix K** – Inventory and Monitoring Framework