

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Summary	iii
Alternatives-Comparison Summary of Activities	v
Chapter 1 – Purpose and Need for Action	1
Changes between the DEIS and FEIS for Chapter 1	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Desired Future Conditions	8
1.3 Purpose and Need	8
1.4 Proposed Action	10
1.5 Management Direction	10
1.5.1 Regional Direction	11
1.5.2 Forest Direction	12
1.6 Decision Framework	13
1.7 Tribal Involvement	14
1.7.1 Introduction	14
1.7.2 Tribal Concerns	15
1.8 Public Involvement	16
1.8.1 Scoping	16
1.9 Issues	16
1.9.1 Human Health	17
1.9.2 Treatment Effectiveness:	17
1.9.3 Social and Economic	18
1.9.4 Nontarget Botanical Species and Wildlife	18
1.9.5 Soil, Water Quality, Aquatic Biota	19
1.9.6 NonSignificant Issues	19
1.10 What This Proposal Does Not Include	21
Chapter 2 – Alternatives	23
Changes between the DEIS and FEIS for Chapter 2	23
2.1 Introduction	23
2.2 Alternatives Considered in Detail	24
2.2.1 Proposed Action and Alternative Development Process	24
2.2.2 Alternative A - No Action	27
2.2.3 Alternative B - Proposed Action	28
2.2.4 Alternative C – No Broadcast Spraying in Riparian	86
2.2.5 Alternative D – No Aerial Spraying	87
2.3 Alternatives Not Considered in Detail	88
2.3.1 High Potential for Spread Areas or Priority 1 and 2 Species	88
2.3.2 Invasive Plants Managed through Natural Processes	88
2.3.3 No Herbicides	88
2.3.4 1994 Guidelines Applied Forestwide	89
2.3.5 Restricted Use – No Herbicides in Riparian or Special Areas	89
2.3.6 Deviations from Existing Approved Herbicide List	93
2.4 Alternatives Compared	93
Chapter 3 – Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences	97
Changes between the DEIS and FEIS for Section 3.1	97
3.1 Introduction	97
3.1.1 Project Area	97
3.1.2 Basis for Cumulative Effects Analysis	98

3.1.3 Incomplete and Unavailable Information.....	107
3.1.4 Life of the Project	109
3.1.5 Herbicide Risk Assessments	109
3.1.6 Climate Change.....	111
3.1.7 Treatment Strategy, Type, and Effectiveness Common to All Alternatives	113
3.2. Botany.....	127
3.2.1 Introduction.....	127
3.2.2 Affected Environment.....	128
3.2.3 Environmental Consequences	142
3.3 Terrestrial Wildlife	165
Changes between the Draft EIS and the Final EIS	165
3.3.1 Introduction.....	165
3.3.2 Affected Environment.....	165
3.3.3 Alternatives Analyzed.....	191
3.3.4 Environmental Consequences	193
3.3.5 Effects to Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive (TES) Species.....	212
3.3.6 Effects to Sensitive Species	216
3.3.7 Effects to Management Indicator Species.....	248
3.3.8 Effects to Other Species of Interest.....	259
3.4 Soil and Water	262
3.4.1 Introduction.....	262
3.4.2 Affected Environment.....	264
3.4.3 Environmental Consequences	279
3.5 Aquatic Organisms and Habitat.....	313
3.5.1 Introduction.....	313
3.5.2 Affected Environment.....	314
3.5.3 Environmental Consequences	342
3.6 Recreation Resources	366
3.6.1 Introduction.....	366
3.6.2 Affected Environment.....	366
3.6.3 Environmental Consequences	377
3.7 Effects of Herbicide Use on Workers and the Public	393
Changes between the Draft EIS and Final EIS	393
3.7.1 Introduction.....	393
3.7.2 Affected Environment.....	397
3.7.3 Environmental Consequences	398
3.8 Rangeland Resources.....	403
Changes between the Draft EIS and Final EIS	403
3.8.1 Introduction.....	403
3.8.2 Affected Environment.....	403
3.8.3 Environmental Consequences	406
3.9 Project Costs and Financial Efficiency.....	411
3.9.1 Introduction.....	411
3.9.2 Methodology	411
3.9.3 Affected Environment.....	413
3.9.4 Environmental Consequences	417
3.10 Heritage Resources	427
3.11 Impacts to Cultural Uses and Treaty Rights.	428
3.11.1 Introduction.....	428
3.11.2 Affected Environment.....	428
3.11.3 Environmental Consequences	429

3.12 Irreversible or Irretrievable Use of Resources	431
3.13 Effects of Short-term Uses and Maintenance of Long-term Productivity.....	431
3.14 Consistency with Forest Service Policies and Plans	431
3.15 Conflicts with Other Plans	432
3.16 Adverse Effects That Cannot Be Avoided	432
Chapter 4 – List of Preparers.....	433
4.1 List of Preparers	433
4.2 Consultation with Regulatory Agencies.....	434
4.3 Consultation with Tribes	434
4.4 Consultation with Counties.....	434
4.5 Consultation with Others.....	434
4.6 Glossary	437
4.7 References.....	453
4.8 Index.....	492
Chapter 5 – Response to Comments.....	495
5.1 Introduction.....	495
5.2 Copies of Federal and State Agency Letters Received	495
5.3 Processing and Evaluating Public Comments	507
5.4 FS Direction Relative to Comments and Responses (1909.15 Chapter 20).....	511
5.5 Responses to Comments	511
5.5.1 Comments and Responses by Topic.....	511

Table of Tables

Table 1-Number of Invasive Plant sites by species identified by District on the Wallowa-Whitman NF	3
Table 2-Acres of invasive plants by species and district	4
Table 3-Acres of treatment methods by Ranger District	29
Table 4-High, Typical, and Low Application Rates for Herbicides	47
Table 5-Common Control Measures Summary - Range of Effective Treatment Options and Site-Specific Considerations by Target Species	51
Table 6-Design features specific to the ten herbicides approved for use in Region 6, gross acres and percentage of known sites where each herbicide would be effective	58
Table 7-Herbicide Use Buffers in Feet -Perennial and Wet Intermittent Streams -Proposed Action	79
Table 8-Herbicide Use Buffers in Feet -Dry Intermittent Streams -Proposed Action	80
Table 9-Herbicide Use Buffers in Feet – Lakes and Wetlands	80
Table 10-Buffer widths required for aerial applications	81
Table 11-Comparing acres of proposed herbicide treatment for Alternative B and “Restricted Use” alternative	90
Table 12-Alternatives compared by activity	93
Table 13-Alternative comparison relative to significant issues	94
Table 14-Invasive weeds located on land adjacent to National Forest System lands	98
Table 15-Risk assessments for herbicides considered in this EIS	109
Table 16-Summary of the influence of various factors on spray drift	120
Table 17-Treatment type, method of application and acres proposed for treatment by alternative	122
Table 18-Herbicide formulations, invasive plant sites, total acres treated and treatment effectiveness by alternative	123

Table 19-Invasive plant species sites identified on each district within the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest	129
Table 20-Invasive plant species and acres by district	131
Table 21-Range of acreage of infested sites documented on the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest	133
Table 22-Potential vegetation groups on the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest's 2.3 million acres and their susceptibility to invasive plants	134
Table 23-Regional sensitive plant species for the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest	136
Table 24-Hells Canyon National Recreation Area - Threatened, Endangered or Proposed; Candidate, Sensitive, Endemic and Disjunct Species	138
Table 25-Invasive plant species treatment acres comparison between the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action Alternative, and additional action alternatives	149
Table 26-Number of SOLI within 100 feet of an invasive plant species site and proposed treatment by alternative	150
Table 27-Existing Vegetation Types In Proposed Aerial Treatment Sites	154
Table 28-SOLI determination statements by Alternative	161
Table 29-Federally listed or candidate species known to occur on the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest	168
Table 30-Lynx Habitat types and acres of invasive plants	169
Table 31-Suspected (S) or Documented (D) Wildlife of the Wallowa-Whitman NF on the Regional Forester's Sensitive Species List (July 2004)	171
Table 32-Bighorn sheep locations and the approximate number of acres of invasive plants	174
Table 33-Management Indicator Species and their associated habitat for the Wallowa-Whitman NF	186
Table 34-Elk Habitat affected by invasive plants	187
Table 35-Priority and Unique Habitats on the Forest and the associated Focal Species	191
Table 36-Treatment methods by alternative	192
Table 37-Wildlife Determination Summary	210
Table 38-Beneficial uses by basin for Oregon and Idaho	269
Table 39-Water quality impaired streams within the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest on the Oregon or Idaho 303(d) list that have invasive plant sites within 100 feet of the stream	270
Table 40-Invasive Plant Acres within 100 feet of lakes and reservoirs	273
Table 41-Infested acres proposed for treatment by watershed	275
Table 42-Herbicide Properties	280
Table 43-Potential surface erosion for 2 year storm with groundcover at 10, 30 and 50 percent	283
Table 44-Acres proposed for treatment by location and method by alternative	288
Table 45-Drift distance versus drop diameter	297
Table 46-Potential herbicide concentrations in water for different precipitation ranges and soil types	303
Table 47-Parameters used for model by location	307
Table 48-GLEAMS-Driver Model results for aerial sites	307
Table 49-Concentrations of herbicide in a small stream with a 300-foot buffer	308
Table 50-Concentrations of herbicide with additional buffer widths	309
Table 51-Additions to buffer widths under specified conditions (PDF-8)	309
Table 52-Watersheds with largest percent of proposed treatments	311
Table 53-5 th field watersheds proposed for treatment in the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest	315
Table 54-Threatened, Endangered and Proposed fish species and critical habitat	319
Table 55-Sensitive fish species	320
Table 56-Infested sights within 100 feet of listed fish	338
Table 57-Toxicity Indices for Listed Fish	344
Table 58-Hazard quotient values for acute exposure estimates for sensitive aquatic organisms broadcast spray scenarios	346
Table 59-Effects determination for herbicide treatment, nonherbicide treatment and EDRR	355
Table 60-MPI for Primary Constituent Elements Crosswalk	357

Table 61-Potential effects to commercially important fish species under the proposed action	364
Table 62-Wilderness areas and acres of invasive plants	369
Table 63-Wild and Scenic Rivers on the W-W National Forest and their outstandingly remarkable values	370
Table 64-Wild and Scenic Rivers, designation, and acres of invasive plants	373
Table 65-Ranger District, Developed Recreation Site Name, and Acres of Proposed Treatments	374
Table 66-Acres of invasive plants by recreation area	376
Table 67-Acres of proposed treatments in HCNRA	379
Table 68-Acres of proposed treatment by wilderness	380
Table 69-Aerial application information for Hells Canyon Wilderness	381
Table 70-Acres of proposed treatments by WSR name and designation	385
Table 71-Acres of proposed treatment by ranger district and site name	388
Table 72-Acres of proposed treatment by recreation area	392
Table 73-Herbicides and potential effectiveness	399
Table 74-Invasive weed acres presently identified within each allotment type	404
Table 75-Invasive species acres in Wallowa-Whitman National Forest grazing allotments	405
Table 76-Range improvements and fencelines with potential for invasive species spread on the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest	406
Table 77-Cumulative Effects on Grazing and Range Management within the project area	411
Table 78-Cost per acre of invasive species treatment methods (All costs are in 2006 dollars)	413
Table 79-Analysis Area Population by County, 2000 Census	414
Table 80-Race and Ethnicity by County, 2000 Census	415
Table 81-Analysis Area Population below Poverty Level by Race, 2000 Census	415
Table 82-Alternative A Estimated Acres by Treatment Method	417
Table 83-Discounted costs and years to contain or control of forestwide infestations under Alternative A in 2006 dollars (Shaded line represents the projected annual treatment level)	419
Table 84-Summary of Effects by Alternative	427
Table 85-List of respondents with identification numbers	508

Table of Figures

Figure 1 – Example Map of Proposed Invasive Plant Treatments	26
Figure 2 – Proposed invasive plant treatments for Baker Ranger District	31
Figure 3 – Proposed invasive plant treatments for Wallowa Valley Ranger District	33
Figure 4 – Proposed invasive plant treatments for HCNRA	35
Figure 5 – Proposed invasive plant treatments for Eagle Cap Ranger District	37
Figure 6 – Proposed invasive plant treatments for La Grande Ranger District	39
Figure 7 – Proposed invasive plant treatments for Pine Ranger District	41
Figure 8 – Proposed invasive plant treatments for Unity Ranger Station	43
Figure 9 – Proposed herbicide aerial application invasive plants treatments	45
Figure 10 – Potential percent of acres available for use per herbicide	60
Figure 11 – Illustration of how herbicide selection and application methods in the established buffer widths are more limited in Aquatic Influence Zones	81
Figure 12 – EDRR Herbicide Use Decision Tree Process	83
Figure 13 – Acres of invasive plants over time-treatment effectiveness	92
Figure 14 – Aerial application	117
Figure 15 – Droplet size and drift distance	118
Figure 16 – Comparison of estimated invasive plant spread between Alternatives A and B	125
Figure 17 – Starthistle on inaccessible site	127
Figure 18 – Proposed Aerial site otherwise inaccessible	154

Figure 19 – Example of spot treatment areas within RHCA, and broadcast treatment areas for diffuse knapweed on the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest.	156
Figure 20 – Contract worker spraying invasive plants in wilderness from a horsepack-mounted spray system	382

Volume II-Appendices

Appendix A – Forest Plan

Appendix B – Botany Resources

Appendix C – Wildlife Resources

Appendix D – Soil and Water Resources

Appendix E – Aquatic Resources

Appendix F – Aerial Modeling Results and Spray Guidelines

Appendix G – Adjuvants and Drift Reduction Agents

Appendix H – Social-Economics

List of Acronyms

APHIS	Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
ATV	All terrain vehicle
BA	Biological Assessment
BE	Biological Evaluation
BECA	Bald Eagle Consideration Area
BEMA	Bald Eagle Management Area
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BO	Biological Opinion
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CWA	Clean Water Act
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
DN	Decision Notice
DO	Dissolved oxygen
DPS	Distinct Population Segments
EA	Environmental Assessment
EEC	Expected exposure concentration
EDRR	Early detection rapid response
EFH	Essential fish habitat
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESU	Ecologically Sustainable Unit
FDA	Food and Drug Administration
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIFRA	Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act
FOSS	Federal OSHA Safety Standard
FS	Forest Service
FSH	Forest Service Handbook
FSM	Forest Service Manual
FWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
GIS	Geographical Information System
GLEAMS	Groundwater Loading Affects of Agricultural Management Systems
GPS	Global positioning system
HQ	Hazard quotient
HUC	Hydrologic Unit Codes
ICBEMP	Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project
IDT	Interdisciplinary Team
INFISH	Inland Native Fish Strategy
IWM	Integrated weed management
LAU	Lynx analysis units
LCAS	Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy
LOAEL	Lowest observed adverse effect level
LOC	Level of concern
LOP	Limited operating period
LRMP	Land and Resources Management Plan
LWD	Large Woody Debris
LWM	Large woody material
MIG	Minnesota IMPLAN Group
MIS	Management Indicator Species
MPI	Matrix of Pathways and Indicators
MSA	Magnuson Stevens Act
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NF	National Forest
NFMA	National Forest Management Act
NFS	National Forest System
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOA	Notice of Availability

NOAEL	No observed adverse effect level
NOEC	No observable effect concentration
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPE	Nonylphenol Polyethoxylate
NVUM	National Visitors Use Monitoring
ODA	Oregon Department of Agriculture
ODEQ	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
ODFW	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
OHV	Off-highway vehicles
OR	Oregon
ORV	Off-road vehicles
PA	Proposed Action
PACFISH	Pacific Native Fish Strategy
PCE	Primary Constituent Elements
PDF	Project design feature
PETS	Proposed Endangered Threatened and Sensitive
PNV	Present Net Value
PNW	Pacific Northwest
POEA	Polyoxyethylene alkylamine
PVG	Potential vegetation groups
R6	Forest Service Region Six
RHCA	Riparian Habitat Conservation Area
RM	River mile
RMO	Riparian management objective
ROD	Record of Decision
SERA	Syracuse Environmental Research Associates, Inc
SOLI	Species of local interest
SRI	Soils Resource Inventory
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TCP	trichloro-2-pyridinol
TDS	Total dissolved solids
TES	Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive
TMDL	Total maximum daily load
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USDI	United States Department of Interior
USFS	United States Forest Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
WDFW	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
WSDOA	Washington State Department of Agriculture
WQMP	Water Quality Management Plan
WSR	Wild and Scenic River

