

Draft  
Environmental Impact Statement

**Noxious and Invasive  
Weed Treatment Project**

**Gallatin National Forest**

July 2004

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation and marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's Target Center at 202-720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, office of Civil Rights, Room 325 W, Whitten Building, 14<sup>th</sup> and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice or TDD). USDA is an Equal Opportunity Provider and employer.

Noxious and Invasive Weed Control Project  
Draft EIS  
Gallatin National Forest  
Bozeman Montana

July 2004

Deciding Official: Rebecca Heath, Forest Supervisor  
For Further Information Contact:  
Susan LaMont, Project Team Leader  
Hebgen Lake Ranger District  
PO Box 520  
West Yellowstone MT 59758  
(406) 823-6976

ABSTRACT

The Gallatin National Forest is proposing to expand its current integrated invasive weed control program to include weed control treatment on 13,260 acres that are currently at risk to invasive weeds. The purpose and need of the project is to prevent and reduce loss of native plant communities associated with the spread of invasive plants. Specifically, the purposes of this project are to treat weeds within the Gallatin National Forest, and to reduce the impact of weeds on other resources.

Four alternatives have been developed to achieve these objectives. Alternative 1 Proposed Action - would expand the current weed program to treat 13,260 acres of weeds with herbicides (both aerial spray and ground treatments), mechanical, cultural and biological control methods. Alternative 2 No Herbicides - would combine mechanical, cultural and biological methods to treat 10,434 acres of weeds, but would not use herbicides. Alternative 3 No Change from Current Action - would continue to treat 1,162 acres with herbicides (ground application only), mechanical, cultural and biological control methods. Alternative 4 No Aerial Application - would treat 13,106 acres with herbicides (ground application only) in addition the mechanical, cultural and biological control methods. All alternatives include prevention and education as important tools for weed control.



# Noxious and Invasive Weed Control Environmental Impact Statement

## Table of Contents

### SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION-----	S - 1
PROJECT AREA-----	S - 1
PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION-----	S - 2
PROPOSED ACTION-----	S - 2
SCOPE OF THE DECISION-----	S - 5
SIGNIFICANT ISSUES-----	S - 7
ISSUES AND ALTERNATIVES NOT STUDIED IN DETAIL-----	S - 7
BRIEF DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVES-----	S - 8
ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERRED AND AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE-----	S - 10
SUMMARY COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES-----	S - 10

### CHAPTER I: PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

INTRODUCTION-----	1 - 1
DOCUMENT STRUCTURE-----	1 - 1
BACKGROUND-----	1 - 2
Invasive Weeds On The Forest-----	1 - 2
Ecological Impacts Of Invasive Plants-----	1 - 3
Integrated Weed Management-----	1 - 6
Choosing Management Techniques-----	1 - 7
Mechanical Treatment-----	1 - 7
Cultural Treatment-----	1 - 8
Range Management Consideration-----	1 - 9
Biological Treatment-----	1 - 10
Treatment with Herbicides-----	1 - 10
Weed Prevention-----	1 - 11
Monitoring-----	1 - 11
Comparison of Weed Management Methods-----	1 - 12
PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION-----	1 - 12
PROPOSED ACTION-----	1 - 13
Authorizing Acts-----	1 - 13
Permits Required-----	1 - 13
SCOPE OF THE ANALYSIS-----	1 - 14
Impacts-----	1 - 14
Alternatives-----	1 - 14
Connected, Cumulative And Similar Actions-----	1 - 14
SCOPE OF THE DECISION TO BE MADE-----	1 - 15
Geographic Scope-----	1 - 15
Temporal Scope-----	1 - 15
Decision Framework-----	1 - 15

## CHAPTER 2: ALTERNATIVES

INTRODUCTION-----	2 - 1
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT-----	2 - 1
ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS-----	2 - 1
ISSUES USED TO EVALUATE ALTERNATIVES-----	2 - 2
Key Issue 1: Potential Effects of Herbicides on Human Health-----	2 - 2
Key Issue 2: Potential Effects Of Aerial Application of Herbicides-----	2 - 2
Key Issue 3: Potential Effects of Herbicide on Aquatic Resources-----	2 - 2
Key Issue 4: Potential Effects of Herbicide on Wildlife-----	2 - 3
ISSUES AND ALTERNATIVES NOT STUDIED IN DETAIL-----	2 - 3
ISSUES AND ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL-----	2 - 4
ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL-----	2 - 4
Alternative 1 – Proposed Action-----	2 - 4
Alternative 2 – No Herbicide-----	2 - 10
Alternative 3 – No Action, No additional Weed Treatment.....	2 - 11
Alternative 4 - No Aerial Treatment-----	2 - 11
ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT APPROACH-----	2 - 11
ECONOMIC COMPARISON-----	2 - 14
FEATURES COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES-----	2 - 16
MONITORING-----	2 - 17
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MEASURES-----	2 - 17
SUMMARY COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES-----	2 - 22

## CHAPTER 3: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

INTRODUCTION-----	3 - 1
FOREST PLAN MANAGEMENT DIRECTION-----	3 - 1
AGENCY POLICY AND DIRECTION-----	3 - 2
LAWS AND REGULATIONS-----	3 - 2
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE-----	3 - 3
NATIVE AMERICAN TREATY RIGHTS-----	3 - 3
VEGETATION-----	3 - 3
SOILS AND GROUND WATER-----	3 - 13
WATER QUALITY, FISHERIES AND AMPHIBIANS-----	3 - 16
WILDLIFE-----	3 - 24
WILDERNESS AND INVENTORIED ROADLESS AREAS-----	3 - 36
WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS-----	3 - 42
NATURAL RESEARCH AREAS-----	3 - 44
RECREATION-----	3 - 45
HUMAN HEALTH-----	3 - 46

## CHAPTER 4: ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

INTRODUCTION-----	4 - 1
DIRECT AND INDIRECT EFFECTS-----	4 - 1
SHORT TERM USE VS. LONG TERM PRODUCTIVITY-----	4 - 1
IRREVERSIBLE / IRRETRIEVABLE-----	4 - 1
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE-----	4 - 1

ENERGY REQUIREMENT-----	4 - 1
ADVERSE EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED-----	4 - 2
CUMULATIVE EFFECT-----	4 - 2
VEGETATION-----	4 - 2
SOILS AND GROUND WATER-----	4 - 15
WATER QUALITY, FISHERIES, AND AMPHIBIANS-----	4 - 21
WILDLIFE-----	4 - 26
WILDERNESS AND INVENTORIED ROADLESS AREAS-----	4 - 49
WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS-----	4 - 56
RESEARC NATURAL AREAS-----	4 - 57
RECREATION-----	4 - 59
HUMAN HEALTH-----	4 - 61
POSSIBLE CONFLICT WITH OTHER PLANS AND POLICIES-----	4 - 76

## CHAPTER 5: CONSULTATION, REFERENCES AND GLOSSARIES

CONSULTATION-----	5 - 1
REFERENCES-----	5 - 2
LIST OF ACRONYMS-----	5 - 12
GLOSSARIES-----	5 - 13

### List of Tables

Table 1. Decision Tree for New Weed Locations.-----	S - 6
Table 2. Gallatin National Forest Weed Treatment Priority Rating System.-----	S - 9
Table 3. Treatment Acres for all Alternatives.-----	S - 9
Table 4. Summary of Potential Impacts Between Alternatives.-----	S - 11
Table 1-1. Compares the relative limitations, management effectiveness, and approximate costs of the weed management methods used in the analysis-----	1 - 12
Table 2-1. Gallatin National Forest Weed Treatment Priority Rating System-----	2 - 5
Table 2-2. Invasive Plant Species List as of 2004, the list will change as new plants are as a threat to the ecosystem-----	2 - 5
Table 2-3. Treatment Acres for all Alternatives-----	2 - 6
Table 2-4. EPA Registered Herbicides Available for Control Alternative 1 and 4, Alternative 3 only used 2,4-D and Picloram.-----	2 - 7
Table 2-5. Herbicide Application Rates and Timing-----	2 - 8
Table 2-6. Decision Tree for New Weed Locations.-----	2 - 13
Table 2-7. Estimated Cost Comparison-----	2 - 14
Table 2.8. Summary of Annual Direct Noxious Weed Control Acres by Method-----	2 - 15
Table 2.9. Relative Cost per Acre by Alternative-----	2 - 15
Table 2.10. Summary of Annual Direct Noxious Weed Control Acres by Method (Budget Driven)-----	2 - 15
Table 2-11. Environmental Protection Measures-----	2 - 18
Table 2-12. Picloram Treatment Acres Thresholds in Sensitive Watersheds.-----	2 - 21
Table 2-13. Summary of Potential Impacts Between Alternatives.-----	2 - 22
Table 3-1. Category 3, 2, and 1 Weed Acreage on the Gallatin National Forest (infested acres not gross).-----	3 - 5
Table 3-2. Category 4 Noxious Weed, Watch Species, and Invasive Species Acreage on the Gallatin National Forest.-----	3 - 6

Table 3-3. Biological control agents released on the Gallatin Forest. -----	3 - 7
Table 3-4. Weed Occurrence by Habitat Type on the Gallatin National Forest. -----	3 - 8
Table 3-5. Acres on the Gallatin at Risk to Invasive Weeds, without Disturbance -----	3 - 9
Table 3-6. Commonly Used Herbicides. -----	3 - 10
Table 3-7. Description of sensitive plant habitat. -----	3 - 11
Table 3-8. Risk classes for herbicide/groundwater aquifer contamination. -----	3 - 15
Table 3-9. Montana Water Quality Human Health Standards for Herbicides (micrograms/liter) ---	3 - 16
Table 3-10. Optimal habitat attributes, from Gallatin National Forest Plan implementation guidelines, for streams within the analysis area. -----	3 - 18
Table 3-11. Summary of Road density, Stream Buffers, Road Stream Intersections, and sensitive species. -----	3 - 19
Table 3-12. Common Gallatin National Forest land management activities and associated levels of impacts. -----	3 - 21
Table 3-13. Priority birds species for conservation occurring on habitats most at risk for weed infestations on the Gallatin National Forest, from the Draft Montana Bird Conservation Plan ----	3 - 32
Table 3-14. Toxicity of herbicides proposed for use on the Gallatin National Forest. -----	3 - 34
Table 3-15. Summary of area of land in Wilderenss and Roadless Designation. -----	3 - 38
Table 3-16. Summary of mapped weed population in the Absaroka-Beartooth. -----	3 - 39
Table 3-17. Summary of mapped weed population in the Lee Metcalf. -----	3 - 40
Table 3-18. Summary of mapped weed population in the Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn. -----	3 - 41
Table 3-19. Summary of mapped weed population in the Inventoried Roadless Area. -----	3 - 41
Table 3-20. Toxicity Categories for Various Types of Harmful, Acute Reactions. -----	3 - 49
Table 3-21. Human Hazards Based on Acute Toxicity Categories. -----	3 - 49
Table 3-22. Comparison of Harmful Chronic Effects. -----	3 - 49
Table 3-23. Effects of Drift Factors on Herbicide Drift. -----	3 - 51
Table 4-1. Alternative 1 Weed Treatment Range, Gallatin National Forest. -----	4 - 3
Table 4-2. Alternative 2 Weed Treatment Range, Gallatin National Forest. -----	4 - 4
Table 4-3. Alternative 3 Weed Treatment Range, Gallatin National Forest. -----	4 - 6
Table 4-4. Alternative 4 Weed Treatment Range, Gallatin National Forest. -----	4 - 6
Table 4-5. Determinations of effects of Alternative 1, 2, 3 and 4 to sensitive plant species. -----	4 - 13
Table 4-6. RAVE Risk Classes for the Entire Forest -----	4 - 15
Table 4-7. RAVE Risk Classes by Ranger District. -----	4 - 15
Table 4-8. Percentage of Existing Weed Area by Risk Class for the Forest. -----	4 - 16
Table 4-9. High RAVE Risk Class by HUC6 Watershed -----	4 - 16
Table 4-10. Gallatin National Forest watersheds (6 <sup>th</sup> code HUCs) that show some risk for exceeding 'safe' concentrations of picloram. -----	4 - 21
Table 4-11. Biological Evaluation Determination for Sensitive Species.-----	4 - 26
Table 4-12. Summary of the potential risk of toxic effects to wildlife resulting from herbicide use under each of the alternatives. -----	4 - 48
Table 4-13. Summary of the potential effects weed management alternatives on wildlife habitat under each of the alternatives. -----	4 - 48
Table 4-14. Summary of the potential disturbance and displacement effects on wildlife under each of the alternatives. -----	4 - 49
Table 4-15. Summary of acres by treatment type for Wilderness and Roadless areas.-----	4 - 51
Table 4-16. Comparison of Herbicide Toxicity. -----	4 - 64

### List of Figures

Figure 1-1, Project Area Map-----	1 – 17
Figure 2-1, Alternatives 1 and 4, Boulder River and Deer Creek Area-----	2 – 24

Figure 2-2, Alternative 2, Boulder River and Deer Creek Area	2 – 25
Figure 2-3, Alternative 3, Boulder River and Deer Creek Area	2 – 26
Figure 2-4, Alternatives 1 and 4, Crazy Mountain Area	2 – 27
Figure 2-5, Alternative 2, Crazy Mountain Area	2 – 28
Figure 2-6, Alternative 3, Crazy Mountain Area	2 – 29
Figure 2-7, Alternative 1, Bridger Mountain Area	2 – 30
Figure 2-8, Alternative 2, Bridger Mountain Area	2 – 31
Figure 2-9, Alternative 4, Bridger Mountain Area	2 – 32
Figure 2-10, Alternative 3, Bridger Mountain Area	2 – 33
Figure 2-11, Alternative 1, Gallatin Mountain Area	2 – 34
Figure 2-12, Alternative 2, Gallatin Mountain Area	2 – 35
Figure 2-13, Alternative 3, Gallatin Mountain Area	2 – 36
Figure 2-14, Alternative 4, Gallatin Mountain Area	2 – 37
Figure 2-15, Alternatives 1 and 4, East Side Paradise Valley Area	2 – 38
Figure 2-16, Alternative 2, East Side Paradise Valley Area	2 – 39
Figure 2-17, Alternative 3, East Side Paradise Valley Area	2 – 40
Figure 2-18, Alternative 1, Gardiner Area	2 – 41
Figure 2-19, Alternative 2, Gardiner Area	2 – 42
Figure 2-20, Alternative 3, Gardiner Area	2 – 43
Figure 2-21, Alternative 4, Gardiner Area	2 – 44
Figure 2-22, Alternatives 1, 2, 3 and 4, Cooke City Area	2 – 45
Figure 2-23, Alternative 1, Madison Range	2 – 46
Figure 2-24, Alternative 2, Madison Range	2 – 47
Figure 2-25, Alternative 3, Madison Range	2 – 48
Figure 2-26, Alternative 4, Madison Range	2 – 49
Figure 2-27, Alternative 1, Hebgen Lake Basin	2 – 50
Figure 2-28, Alternative 2, Hebgen Lake Basin	2 – 51
Figure 2-29, Alternative 3, Hebgen Lake Basin	2 – 52
Figure 2-30, Alternative 4, Hebgen Lake Basin	2 – 53

## Appendices

Appendix A – Best Management Practices for Invasive Weeds	A-1
Appendix B – Herbicide Safety Plan	B-1
Appendix C – Wilderness Minimum Tool Guidelines	C-1
Appendix D – Surface Water Quality	D-1
Appendix E – Ground Water Analysis	E-1
Appendix F – Biological Assessments	F-1