

Final Environmental Impact Statement

for the Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman National Forests Land Management Plans

Summary



For information, contact one of the three following national forests:

Malheur National Forest
431 Patterson Bridge Rd.
P.O. Box 909
John Day, OR 97845
phone: (541) 575-3000

Umatilla National Forest
72510 Coyote Road
Pendleton, OR 97801
phone: (541) 278-3716

Wallowa-Whitman National Forest
1550 Dewey Ave., Suite A
Baker City, OR 97814
phone: (541) 523-1214

Website: <http://www.fs.usda.gov/goto/BlueMtnsPlanRevision>

Introduction

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, prepared a Final Environmental Impact Statement in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (1969), and other relevant Federal and State laws and regulations to disclose the environmental consequences that could result from the proposed action of revising the land management plans for the Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman National Forests and alternatives to the proposed action. The Final Environmental Impact Statement incorporates changes made as a result of public comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Proposed Action

The proposed action is for the Forest Service to revise the individual 1990 Forest Plans for the Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman (Blue Mountains) National Forests. The plan components of each Forest Plan will include desired conditions, objectives, standards, guidelines, suitable uses and activities, management area designations, and monitoring elements.

Purpose and Need

The purpose and need in the Final Environmental Impact Statement is unchanged from the 2014 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Economic, social, and ecological conditions have changed since each of the 1990 Forest Plans were developed. The Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman National Forests are revising their 1990 Forest Plans to:

- Meet the requirements of the National Forest Management Act of 1976;
- Address changed conditions and provide consistent management direction (as appropriate) across the three National Forests;
- Incorporate changes in law, regulation, and policy; and
- Use best available scientific information.

In particular, the Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision Interdisciplinary Team (Team) addressed the following purposes in the revised Forest Plans to:

1. More adequately protect and restore terrestrial plant and animal species and their habitats.
2. More adequately protect and restore watersheds and aquatic habitats.
3. Address management of fuels and fire risk.
4. Address climate change.
5. Recognize the interdependency of social and economic components with national forest management.

Each of these items is described in detail in Volume 1: The Final Environmental Impact Statement, The Purpose and Need section.

Public Involvement

Information has been shared between the Forest Service and our many stakeholders using the Iterative NEPA (iNEPA) process¹. A brief review of the process includes when the Team began by providing a variety of opportunities for people to learn about the Forest Plans Revision and encouraged their participation in the planning process. The Team provided informational products including factsheets, newsletters, open letters, presentation slides, and annotated maps.

Information was shared electronically via the project website² and through other modes of communication including email, hardcopy mail, news releases, news media interviews, public conference calls, webinars, and public meetings. Additionally, Forest Service officials held or attended public meetings in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. During in-person meetings, staff provided verbal, visual and written information about progress for the Forest Plans. Live meetings and conference calls allowed participants to ask questions and hear answers in real time. Individuals and organizations sought further clarification via emails, letters, and phone calls.

The Forest Service published a Notice of Intent to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement in the Federal Register on March 29, 2010 (FR, Vol. 75, No. 59). The notice asked for written public comment by May 25, 2010. During the scoping comment period, the Forest Service held additional public meetings in several locations in Oregon and Washington. In response, the Forest Service received 4,174 total responses to the request for comment, which included 110 comment letters and 4,025 organized form letters. Following the scoping period, the Forest Service held alternative-development meetings with a variety of organizations: advisory committees, collaborative groups, counties, industry representatives, and interest groups. Based on public and stakeholder input, and recommendations of resource specialists, the Forest Service then designed and analyzed six alternatives in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Alternative D was largely the result of county input and is described below.

In February 2014, the Forest Service released the Blue Mountains Proposed Revised Land Management Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement. More than 1,100 letters with over 4,300 comments were received in response. From March through June 2014, another 14 public meetings and a webinar were hosted to provide more information, explain the formal public comment process, answer questions, and listen to public input. Notes taken are available at the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest Supervisors Office at 1550 Dewey Avenue, Suite A, Baker City, Oregon 97814.

Following a 120-day extended formal comment period in 2014, the Forest Service worked with public and stakeholders to identify three topics for further discussion: (1) pace and scale of restoration, (2) access and wilderness, and (3) livestock grazing. From June 2015 through February 2016, the Forest Service scheduled a series of 24 public listening sessions. The recorded notes from these sessions are also available in the project record available at the above noted website or address.

¹ **Iterative NEPA (iNEPA):** An approach used by Forest Service practitioners to reflect incremental stages in which proposed actions and alternatives are improved throughout the NEPA process with stakeholders in order to meet diverse interests. The iNEPA process can maximize agency and stakeholders' time and efforts and provide for a more meaningful decision-making process, rather than only provide for input at comment periods during draft and final environmental impact statements. Stakeholders are encouraged to dialogue about issues and differences and generate necessary environmental, social, and economic analyses while alternatives are explored and modified throughout the process. The intent is to focus on a deliberative public process and appropriate disclosure outlined in Section 102 of NEPA to promote the Act's purposes.

² <https://www.fs.usda.gov/goto/BlueMountainsPlanRevision>

Following a careful review and evaluation of substantive comments received from the public, county, Tribes, and other stakeholders in response to the 2014 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, including the public listening sessions, Alternative E was then modified to form two more alternatives (Alternative E-Modified and Alternative E-Modified Departure). The development for these two alternatives included collaboration and communication with cooperating federal, state, and local agencies and governments, and Native American Tribal representatives.

Involvement with Native American Tribes and Federal, State, and Local Agencies and Governments

Tribes. The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation and the Nez Perce Tribe have been consistently engaged in the planning process. The Forest Service has met its consultation requirements with qualified and interested Tribes at the government-to-government and staff-to-staff levels. Tribal officials have been invited to participate in Forest Plan development since the beginning of the planning effort. As part of the planning process, forest supervisors, staff, and Team members met with tribal staff, committees, and leadership, as well as tribal members who attended public meetings. The Team carefully considered and addressed the formal comments submitted by the Tribes. The Tribes have also been afforded opportunities to review and comment on draft documents during their development as part of the iterative NEPA process. Forest Service officials continue to meet regularly with tribal staff and officials to consult on national forest programs of work, which have included updates on the forest plan revision effort since 2004. Further, Forest Service officials reviewed relevant tribal planning and land-use policies, in accordance with 36 CFR 219.7(c) of the 1982 Planning Rule, and found no inconsistencies with the revised Forest Plans.

States. The Planning Area for the revised Forest Plans includes parts of Oregon and Washington State and a small portion of Idaho located within the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area. State agencies with interests in the revised Forest Plans include, but are not limited to, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Department of Forestry, and Washington Department of Natural Resources. Forest supervisors and members of the Team worked with State officials during the development of the revised Forest Plans and carefully considered the formal comments submitted by the States in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Team is and will continue to work with the States through the iterative NEPA process to address States concerns. Additionally, Forest Service officials reviewed relevant state planning and land-use policies, in accordance with 36 CFR 219.7(c) of the 1982 Planning Rule, and found no inconsistencies with the revised Forest Plans.

Counties. Since beginning the plan revision process, the Forest Service has been working with interested counties in the Blue Mountains. The counties provided valuable early input on the development of the proposed action and public engagement process. County officials met frequently with the Forest Service during the pre-scoping, scoping, and alternative-development phases of the project, including public meetings in which county representatives actively participated. During the alternative-development phase, several counties signed memoranda of understanding conferring “cooperating agency” status in the NEPA process. In that capacity, the counties provided information and assisted with the development of alternatives (specifically Alternative D). The following counties maintain current memoranda of understanding:

- Oregon counties – Grant, Harney, Morrow, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa, Wheeler
- Washington counties – Asotin, Columbia, Garfield, Walla Walla

Individual counties that submitted formal comment letters in response to the 2014 Draft Environmental Impact Statement include: Baker, Columbia, Grant, Harney, Morrow, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa, and Wheeler. The Eastern Oregon Counties Association, consisting of 11 county governments, also submitted a consolidated formal comment letter. Comments addressed issues related to the pace and scale of restoration, timber volumes, access, grazing, the social and economic analysis, wilderness, and a host of other comments on the preferred alternative which in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement was Alternative E. Letters from the counties can be found in the Final Environmental Impact Statement in Volume 3, Chapter 4. The Forest Service has addressed these comments in the Response to Concern Statements (Volume 4, Appendix C in the Final Environmental Impact Statement).

Since the release of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in 2014, forest supervisors and Team members also met, upon request, with individual counties that were not cooperating agencies as well as county natural resource advisory committees to better understand their concerns.

As part of the planning process, Forest Service officials reviewed relevant county planning and land-use policies, in accordance with 36 CFR 219.7(c) of the 1982 Planning Rule. The results of this review can be found in the Government Planning and Land-Use Policies section of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (Volume 3, Chapter 4).

Federal Agencies. A number of Federal agencies have interests within, or adjacent to, the Planning Area. These agencies include, but are not limited to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, Environmental Protection Agency, and Bureau of Land Management. The Team carefully considered and addressed the formal comments submitted by other Federal agencies in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Forest Service also worked with Federal officials during the development of the modified alternatives. For example, under the Endangered Species Act, the Forest Service is required to engage in a formal consultation process with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Moreover, the Forest Service reviewed the relevant planning and land-use policies of other Federal agencies to ensure consistency and compliance with the revised Forest Plans. The three National Forests will continue to operate in accordance with existing federal law, regulation, and policy.

Changes between the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements

Changes occurred between the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements. The changes were largely the result of input received from public in comment letters responding to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that was released by the Forest Service in 2014. The iterative NEPA process that was used to gather information began with Forest Service management, planning and interdisciplinary staff, and ultimately included other federal and state agencies, Tribes, county commissioners and/or their representatives, and other stakeholders and public (i.e., permittees, academics, etc.). After acknowledging all comments in more than 1,000 letters received from the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the Team then began making changes. Processes to make changes included: (1) identifying substantive comments, (2) following law, regulation, and policy, (3) holding multiple meetings with appropriate entities, and (4) carefully considering concerns brought forth.

Among the changes are the following, which involve more than one resource:

- **Modification of Alternative E into Three Separate Alternatives.** Alternative E was modified to form two additional alternatives: Alternative E-Modified and Alternative E-Modified Departure. The separations and the differences that went into each modified alternative were directly related to the considerable amount of collaboration, coordination, and communication that transpired between the Forest Service, its stakeholders and public after the release of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Development of the modified alternatives began with substantive comments selected from more than 1,000 letters received in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. More about how the alternatives were specifically modified is explained in the section below entitled “Alternatives.”
- **Modifying previous versions of the Regional Aquatic and Riparian Conservation Strategy (2008 Regional ARCS) into the Blue Mountains Aquatic and Riparian Conservation Strategy (2018 Blue Mountains ARCS).** This conservation strategy is now Appendix A to each Forest Plan. The strategies in the 2018 Blue Mountains ARCS apply only to the two modified alternatives: Alternative E-Modified and Alternative E-Modified Departure. PACFISH and INFISH still apply to Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, and the 2008 Regional ARCS would provide guidance for each of the remaining alternatives. Compared to the 2008 Regional ARCS, the 2018 Blue Mountains ARCS adds some standards and guidelines, and changes some existing guidelines to standards and vice versa. Modifications to this document have occurred into the spring of 2018 using the iterative NEPA process (i.e., working with stakeholders such as the Washington and Oregon Departments of Fish and Wildlife, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, cooperating Counties, and the Umatilla and Nez Perce Tribes).

The following resources were also modified between draft and final. Resource categories are listed alphabetically:

- **Access:** Substantive information was gathered during the iterative NEPA process on access in different management areas, resulting in changes in access to Management Areas 1B, 3A, 3B, and 4A for the modified alternatives. The modifications provide opportunity for increased motor vehicle use compared to the preferred Alternative E within the 2014 draft Forest Plan for the three National Forests. Conversely, the changes may slightly reduce the opportunity for nonmotorized experiences across the three National Forests.
- **Air Quality:** A standard was added for air quality to ensure that planned (prescribed) burning will be conducted in compliance with established State smoke management plans in Oregon and Washington. Additionally, the baseline for air quality related values (AQRVs) and trends were added to the Air Quality Section as it pertains to the protection of Class I areas.
- **Aquatics:** Fish distribution and population information for the selected surrogate species was reviewed and updated. Other changes include:
 - ♦ Assumptions and data underlying the aquatic species model protection scores were reviewed, updated and recalibrated as were calculations for numbers of priority, key and all watersheds improved over 10 and 20 years, resulting in updated and expanded tables for improved watershed conditions.
 - ♦ The final key and priority watershed lists were updated and are provided in Volume 3, Appendix A.

- **Economic and Social Wellbeing** has been updated to 2014 socio-economics data to consider values, attitudes, and beliefs and better address social aspects of the plan revision. Public comments are better considered throughout the social and economic analysis to make connections between the revised Plans' actions and the challenges faced by communities in the three socio-economic impact zones. Additionally, the entire cumulative effects analysis section was rewritten.
- **Forest Vegetation, Timber Resources and Wildland Fire** was in one section in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. In response to public comments about organization and clarity, that section was separated into four different sections in the Final Environmental Impact Statement: Forest Vegetation, Timber and Forest Products, Insects and Diseases, and Wildland Fire and Fuels Treatments.
- **Geology, Mining, Minerals and Energy:** Within the Plans for each of the three National Forests:
 - ♦ Leasable minerals and locatable materials guidelines were modified concerning federally listed and sensitive species.
 - ♦ Multiple guidelines were developed under the Special Uses Section (3.3.3) in each of the Plans to better address uses for potential wind energy. Wind energy analyses were improved.
 - ♦ A standard was developed that provides information regarding forest transportation system's roads and mineral activity.
 - ♦ A standard was developed to provide guidance for vertebrate fossils.

Within the Final Environmental Impact Statement, discussion of mineral resources has been updated to provide additional background description of the geology of the area, as well as for potential development of leasable minerals, which includes oil and natural gas. It also describes the process requirements for development of oil and natural gas.

The section on "Geothermal Resources" has been updated to better describe the distribution, occurrence, and potential for development of geothermal resources.

The description of locatable minerals has been revised in response to public comment to describe the types of mineral deposits and the areas where they are known to occur.

- **Grazing:** Changes made to grazing were primarily based on numerous concerns by commenters from the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and during public meetings regarding the desire for vacant allotments to be in the analysis of suitable acres for livestock grazing as well as historic animal unit months. Riparian grazing guidelines were finalized in late 2017, after using the iterative NEPA process between several cooperating counties, the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries and Forest Service.
- **The Hells Canyon National Recreation Area:** An analysis of the cumulative effects of implementing the 2003 Comprehensive Management Plan for the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area was incorporated.
- **Recreation:** An additional forest-wide guideline was developed for each of the three National Forest Plans to provide additional management direction for recreation-related projects to maintain consistency with mapped classes and setting descriptions in the

recreation opportunity spectrum. Other changes in Recreation for each of the three National Forest Plans include:

- ♦ The forestwide Goal 2.5 (Roads and Trails Access) desired condition was modified to recognize the opportunity to provide connectivity between Forest Service recreation sites, and to connect these sites with adjacent communities through pathways, trails, bike lanes, and waterways, and to provide loop-riding opportunities.
- ♦ Additional material was included in each Plan recognizing the importance of aviation and backcountry airstrips as a recreational use and administrative infrastructure.
- **Soils:** Additional background and context information was provided regarding methodology of soils data use and assumptions. Discussions of landform instability was added to the analysis and to the standards and guidelines for each of the three National Forest Plans.
- **Special Areas:** Additional background sections were included in the MA 2G Nationally Designated Trail description section for the Oregon and Nez Perce National Historic Trails. Two additional Standards were developed and included in each of the three National Forest Plans, Part 3 – Design Criteria, that afford additional protections and management direction for the trails.

Additional management area guidelines were developed for those management areas that previously did not have design criteria including Geologic Areas, Historical Areas, Scenic Byways and All-American Roads, Nationally Designated Trails, Scenic Areas, and Developed Sites and Administrative Areas. Alternative E-Modified and E-Modified Departure retain special area allocations for the majority of the special areas. Special area changes resulted from additional internal review, new designations resulting from ongoing project implementation, inclusion of updated allocations, and refined mapping.

- **Timber Harvest and Forested Vegetation** - Concerns were noted by commenters, in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, over what was perceived as insufficient timber volume estimates for allowable sale quantity and timber sale program quantity. In response to these comments, the methodology behind the calculation of the estimated timber yields used to calculate these volumes was improved. As a result, the timber volumes reported in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement have been revised in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. In addition: 1) past levels of timber volumes sold for the three National Forests have been updated from 2007 to 2016; 2) Tables presenting the long-term sustained yield, allowable sale quantity, and timber sale program quantity values were also revised. The purpose was to more clearly compare and relate allowable sale quantity to long-term sustained yield for a given alternative, and to show what portion of the timber sale program quantity volume was contributed by harvesting on lands suitable for timber production and what portion is estimated to come from other lands. Other Final Environmental Impact Statement changes include:
 - ♦ **Vegetation condition and departure** from desired conditions were re-calculated. Forest vegetation is separated into the three dominant forest potential vegetation groups (dry forest, cold forest, and moist forest), and then divided into four management strata (general forest, wilderness, roadless, and reserve).
 - ♦ **Key Indicators:** The second, third, and fourth indicators for monitoring timber harvests has been changed to be consistent with the descriptions in the Final Environment Impact Statement. The description of harvesting effects that was contained within the Timber and Forest Products Section of the Draft Environmental

Impact Statement was moved to the “Ecological Resilience” section of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. This was done to improve clarity and readability.

- **Tribal and Treaty Resources:** A forest-wide standard was developed for the modified alternatives to expressly direct each of the three National Forest’s staff to use consultation processes established with American Indian tribal governments. Other changes regarding Tribal and Treaty Resources include:
 - ♦ A Federal Trust Responsibilities and Tribal Rights and Interests Section was developed and included in each of the three National Forests Plan’s, Part 2 – Strategy, under the Management Focus section.
 - ♦ Additional statements were developed for inclusion in each goal statement that highlights the integration of culturally significant foods and other resources for each of the three National Forest’s ecological, social, and economic goals.
 - ♦ Additional resource types were added to each of the three National Forest’s Plans Cultural Resources Section to include resources considered in the National Environmental Policy Act and section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. These additional resource types include “properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to American Indian Tribes.” This includes text within the Heritage Program Section which states:
 - To recognize the need for appropriate use and maintenance of historic facilities.
 - The need for identifying resource types including traditional cultural properties, cultural landscapes, sacred sites, and other culturally significant areas by Tribes and local communities.
 - The resource types considered in Management Area 2E (Historical Areas) were expanded to include both archaeological sites and districts.
 - Emphasize that existing preservation and management plans for these resources are carried forward in the revised forest plan.
 - The forest-wide guideline for cultural resources was changed to a standard.
- **Watersheds:** Revised vegetation data presented in the Watershed and Forest Vegetation sections were incorporated into the “Watershed Function, Water Quality, and Water Uses” analyses. Other changes regarding watersheds include:
 - ♦ **Reanalysis of Watershed, Riparian and Stream Channel Conditions:** The revised vegetation data is incorporated into the assessment of hillslope, or terrestrial conditions within all watersheds, priority watersheds, and in key and priority watersheds combined. The reserve stratum is used as a surrogate for the condition of forested riparian areas. Detail has been added to the description of methods for determining watershed conditions. Data for livestock use, road miles, watershed areas, and road density have all been updated.
 - ♦ **The list of key and priority watersheds** has been updated since the Draft Environmental Impact Statement was released with additions for the Malheur National Forest and identification of watersheds selected as priorities for restoration under the Watershed Condition Framework.

- ♦ **Adjustments to Watersheds Analyzed:** Watershed size for analysis changed between the Draft and Final Environmental Impact analysis from 250 acres to those closest to or greater than 500 acres.
- ♦ Watersheds located within the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area are not included in this analysis except in the discussion of cumulative effects.
- ♦ **Discussion of Hydrology and Stream Channel Conditions:** In response to public comment, discussions of hydrology and streamflow characteristics, channel morphology, and stream channel conditions have been added to the Affected Environment section and details have been added to the discussion of cumulative effects to hydrology, riparian habitats, and stream channel conditions.
- ♦ **Discussion of Climate Change:** The climate change discussion has been expanded to describe expected and potential changes in hydrology, watersheds, riparian habitats, and stream channel morphology and incorporate information from the Blue Mountains Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment.
- **Wilderness:** Numerous comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement promoted a closer review of each recommended wilderness area. As a result of the reviews, the following changes occurred:
 - ♦ MA 1B acreage decreased by approximately 24 percent compared to Alternative E for the three National Forests combined.
 - ♦ Guidelines for MA 1B were changed to a Standard.
 - ♦ Two additional Guidelines have been added: 1) to provide for mechanized use (i.e., bicycling) and 2) to provide guidance for motorized used in recommended wilderness.
 - ♦ Suitability rating for winter motor vehicle use in Management Area 1B was changed from suitable to unsuitable in Alternative E-Modified and Alternative E-Modified Departure.
- **Wildlife:** Rocky Mountain elk standard RME-1S and guidelines RME-2G and RME-3G were created or modified for the two modified alternatives. These plan components, along with Forest Plan objectives, are intended to improve elk habitat and security across the three National Forests and are responsive to comments requesting improved protection for Rocky Mountain Elk. Wildlife corridors were removed from both of the modified alternatives, and wildlife security will be addressed in the future on a project-by-project basis. Bighorn sheep guideline BHS-5S was modified to clarify that source habitat, specifically relating to recreational pack goat use, as being occupied bighorn sheep habitat.

We also received many comments about the length, clarity, organization, and readability of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As a result, the following changes have been made in the Final Environmental Impact Statement:

- Methodology information has been moved from the appendices and placed within the applicable resource sections. Additional and updated best available science and analysis has been added where appropriate.
- Changes made to each resource analysis section between the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements are described in each resource analysis section.

- Explanations of methods and rationale, where requested from commenters, have been added, as well as removing repetitious material.
- Additionally, more definitions have been added to the glossary, and many footnotes were added for quick references.
- Most acronyms were eliminated by including entire terms.

Significant Issues

Six issues, deemed significant for the purpose of the Final Environmental Impact Statement, are listed below. They led to the development of multiple programmatic strategies (or alternatives) for revising each of the Forest Plans. A summary of these alternatives, as well as analysis of the environmental consequences they pose, are the focus of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

- Access
- Economic and Social Well-being
- Livestock Grazing and Grazing Land Vegetation
- Old Forest
- Recommended Additions to the National Wilderness Preservation System
- Ecological Resilience

Alternatives

From the six issues identified above, six original alternatives were developed and presented in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement released in 2014. From comment letters received in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, using consultation, collaboration, coordination, and communication, two other modified alternatives were developed based on Alternative E, thus now totaling to eight alternatives being offered for consideration in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. The following section provides a brief description of each alternative.

Alternative A: No Action (Current Forest Plan)

The No Action alternative reflects current management direction under the existing 1990 Forest Plans, as amended and implemented. It provides the basis for comparing the existing condition to the Proposed Action and the alternatives.

Access: The management areas remain unchanged in Alternative A. There would be no additions to the backcountry areas, no additional wildlife corridors or recommended additions to wilderness. Within the Malheur National Forest, the forest-wide open road density standard varies by management area from 1.5 to 3.2 miles per square mile, and off-route motor vehicle travel is authorized unless otherwise restricted. Within the Umatilla National Forest, the open road density desired condition is 2.0 miles per square mile, and motor vehicle use is limited to designated routes. Within the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, the open road density guideline is 2.5 miles per square mile for general forest and 1.5 miles per square mile for summer and winter elk range management area, and off-route motor vehicle travel is authorized unless otherwise restricted.

Socio-Economics: The predicted annual timber volume sold for the Blue Mountains national forests for Alternative A is 79 million board feet. This would support about 608 jobs and \$35

million in wages associated with timber harvest, primary wood products manufacturing, and associated industries. Based upon the current number of grazing permits, 242,800 cattle and sheep animal unit months are projected. This would support about 895 jobs and generate about \$15.4 million in wages. Recreation within the Blue Mountains national forests is estimated to be 574,000 visits annually. Expenditures by the visitors including local residents support about 176 jobs with \$4.6 million in wages.

Grazing: Animal unit months have diminished since 1990 due to the Federal listing of fish species per the Endangered Species Act and PACFISH/INFISH amendments to the 1990 Forest Plans. The more restrictive management direction for livestock grazing in riparian areas resulted in reduced seasons of use or livestock numbers. Within the Blue Mountains national forests, 187,000 acres are suitable for sheep grazing, and 1,889,000 acres are suitable for cattle grazing. Progress toward achieving desired conditions for rangeland vegetation and livestock grazing would be slow to moderate. Animal unit months for cattle are 224,000 and sheep 18,800.

Old Forest: Designated old forest management areas are not suitable for timber production per management direction in the 1990 Forest Plans. The single exception is timber harvest in managed old forest stands within the Umatilla National Forest, but only for enhancing wildlife habitat. The 1990 Forest Plans include standards for snag retention and green tree replacement that provide management direction for retention of some old forest characteristics outside of designated old forest stands. Harvest of trees 21 inches diameter or larger is severely limited.

Wilderness: Under Alternative A, no areas would be recommended for addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Ecological Resilience: Under Alternative A, continuing current management is anticipated to result in minor improvements to ecological resiliency. The vegetation departure index value for the dry upland forest potential vegetation group at year 50 would improve to a small degree over existing conditions, and the number of subwatersheds anticipated to be improved are few.

Alternative B – The Modified Proposed Action

Alternative B emphasizes restoring landscape functions and processes to create resilient landscapes that are adaptable to climate change. Management allocations would become more consistent between the three National Forests. Alternative B would emphasize a combination of active management and natural processes to restore landscapes on the three National Forests. Based on a series of public meetings and coordination between 2003 and 2010 with various interest groups, and Tribal, local and State governments and Federal agencies, several needs for revising the 1990 Forest Plans were identified and contributed to the development of this alternative.

Access: Alternative B allocates areas for recommended wilderness area (MA 1B), which would be rated suitable for over-snow motor vehicle use. This alternative would also designate both nonmotorized (MA 3A) and motorized (MA 3B) backcountry management areas. Both summer and winter motor vehicle use would be considered unsuitable in nonmotorized areas (MA 3A). This alternative would not designate any wildlife corridor (MA 3C). The desired condition for open motor vehicle route density in motorized backcountry management areas would have a desired condition of 1.5 miles per square mile. General Forest (MA 4A) management would have an open route density of 2.4 miles per square mile. Winter elk habitat would have a desired condition of 1.5 miles per square mile. Road maintenance for Alternative B would be similar to Alternative A.

Socio-Economics: The predicted annual timber volume sold for the Blue Mountains national forests for Alternative B is approximately 112 million board feet. This timber volume sold would

support about 874 jobs and \$50.1 million in wages associated with timber harvest, primary wood products manufacturing, and associated industries. This is more than projected for Alternative A. Alternative B provides slightly less grazing capacity than Alternative A with an expected 239,600 cattle and sheep animal unit months. This level of animal unit months would support about 854 jobs that would generate about \$15.1 million in wages. Recreation within the Blue Mountains national forests is estimated to be at 574,000 visits annually. Expenditures by the visitors support about 176 jobs with \$4.6 million in wages.

Grazing: Acres suitable for cattle grazing would be slightly higher (2,076,000 acres) and lower (151,000 acres) for sheep than Alternative A, which is a combined about 2 million acres. The amount of animal unit months for cattle would be slightly higher (225,000) and sheep lower (14,600) compared to Alternative A. Animal unit months for grazing sheep would be slightly reduced compared to Alternative A to lessen the risk of disease transmission from domestic sheep to bighorn sheep.

Old Forest: Under Alternative B, the Forest Plans would not include old forest management areas. The management of old forest would be guided by the desired conditions, such as forested structural stages, stand density, and species composition. Vegetation treatments, both timber harvest and the use of wildland fire, are designed to improve resilience to disturbance while making progress toward a greater abundance of old forest stands. Alternative B includes a guideline (OF-1G) that would emphasize retaining trees 21 inches diameter and larger, with some exceptions.

Wilderness: Alternative B proposes to recommend 13,400 acres for preliminary administratively recommended additions to the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Ecological Resilience: For Alternative B, the levels of annual forested vegetation active restoration activities proposed to restore ecological resilience would be similar to Alternative A. All ecological key indicators values for Alternative B are similar to Alternative A.

Alternative C

Alternative C varies from Alternative B by emphasizing the role of natural processes in forest restoration (also referred to as passive restoration). When compared to the other alternatives, less timber would be harvested, more area would be allocated for nonmotorized recreation, and more area would be allocated to recommended wilderness areas.

Access: Nonmotorized uses would be emphasized in this alternative. Wildlife Corridor (MA 3C) is proposed, as are backcountry nonmotorized (MA 3A) and recommended wilderness areas (MA 1B). No National Forest System lands would be designated as motorized backcountry (MA 3B). This alternative designates the most recommended wilderness area (MA 1B), approximately 500,000 acres, which would not be suited for over-snow motor vehicle use. Alternative C would provide the least amount of area considered generally suitable for motor vehicle use in summer and in winter and represents a reduction compared to Alternative B. Alternative C would provide the greatest amount of area rated suitable only for nonmotorized summer use and represents an increase compared to Alternative B. Road maintenance projections are the lowest for Alternative C and represent approximately one-fourth the amount of Alternative B.

Socio-Economics: The predicted annual timber volume sold for the Blue Mountains national forests for Alternative C is approximately 41 million board feet, the smallest projection among all of the alternatives. This would support about 318 jobs and \$18.2 million in wages associated with timber harvest, primary wood products manufacturing, and associated industries. Domestic livestock grazing would be reduced to 95,900 animal unit months, which would support about 339

jobs and generate about \$6 million in wages. Recreation within the Blue Mountains national forests is estimated at 574,000 visits annually. Expenditures by the visitors support about 176 jobs with \$4.6 million in wages.

Grazing: The area that would be suitable for cattle grazing and sheep grazing would be reduced to approximately 785,000 acres, and 90,000 acres, respectively, the least amount of area among alternatives. For cattle grazing, these decreases would result from the classification of riparian areas and subwatersheds with habitat for listed fish species as generally unsuitable for cattle grazing. For sheep grazing, the decrease would result from the classification of subwatersheds within the maximum foray distance for bighorn sheep rams as generally unsuitable for sheep grazing. Because of the decrease in the land area suitable for livestock grazing, the fewest estimated cattle and sheep animal unit months are projected under Alternative C. Animal unit months for cattle would be 90,000 and sheep 5,900.

Old Forest: 390,900 acres would be allocated to MA 4C Old Forest. Only trees 8 inches diameter or less would be authorized for timber harvest in this management area. This alternative would include a standard that would strictly prohibit the harvesting of trees 21 inches diameter and larger, both within and outside of old forest. Under Alternative C, the proportion of old forest structure within all potential vegetation groups at year 50 would be the same as for Alternative B, ranging from 21 to 31 percent National Forest. However, the percentage of the dry upland forest in the old forest single story stage would be lower than projected for all other alternatives due to less aggressive forest management strategies, 10 percent for the Malheur National Forest, 11 percent for the Umatilla National Forest, and 7 percent for the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest.

Wilderness: Approximately 505,000 acres would be a preliminary administratively recommended additions to the National Wilderness Preservation System, the largest projection of the alternatives.

Ecological Resilience: Alternative C is designed to emphasize the role of natural processes in restoration of ecological resilience. Forested vegetation mechanical restoration treatments and forage use intensity would be the lowest among all other alternatives. With the exception of Alternative D, roads treatments would be greater than other alternatives, almost double the miles compared to Alternative B. Alternative C would improve the most miles of riparian areas, double the number estimated for Alternative B. The greatest amount of subwatersheds would be improved, but the vegetation departure score at year 50 for the dry upland forests would improve the least among alternatives.

Alternative D

Alternative D, developed in coordination with the cooperating counties, would increase active management of forest and range vegetation to maximize the outputs of goods and services, while meeting minimum requirements to conserve other resources such as soils and water quality. It projects the second highest volumes for timber harvest and would emphasize active management using mechanical treatments to restore the forested landscape while also responding to requests to increase public motor vehicle access. This alternative proposes the smallest riparian management area.

Access: This alternative does not designate any Wildlife Corridor (MA 3C), backcountry nonmotorized (MA 3A) or recommended wilderness areas (MA 1B) that would be unsuitable for motorized use. It designates backcountry motorized (MA 3B), which is suitable for both summer and winter motor vehicle use. It also emphasizes retaining areas that are generally suitable for motor vehicle use, resulting in more area suitable for summer and winter motor vehicle use than

proposed by other alternatives. It would provide the most amount of area considered generally suitable for motor vehicle use in summer and in winter and represents an increase compared to Alternative B. It would provide the least amount of area rated suitable only for nonmotorized summer use and represents a decrease compared to Alternative B. Road maintenance projections are the highest for Alternative D, primarily because more roads would be open for motor vehicle use and would be maintained.

Socio-Economics: The projected annual timber volume sold for the Blue Mountains national forests for Alternative D is approximately 353 million board feet. This would support about 2,765 jobs and \$158.4 million in wages associated with timber harvest, primary wood products manufacturing, and associated industries. This is the largest projection among the alternatives. The estimated 245,800 cattle and sheep animal unit months are slightly more than Alternative A. Domestic livestock grazing would support about 889 jobs and generate about \$15.6 million in wages. Recreation within the Blue Mountains national forests is estimated at 574,000 visits annually. Expenditures by visitors would support about 176 jobs with \$4.6 million in wages.

Grazing: The amount of animal unit months for cattle (229,000) would be slightly higher than the other plan revision alternatives. The area that would be suitable for cattle grazing would be increased to approximately 1,922,000 acres and 168,000 acres for sheep, the most area among alternatives. Projected animal unit months for grazing sheep would be fewer (16,800) than current levels to reduce the risk of disease transmission from domestic sheep to bighorn sheep.

Old Forest: Alternative D, as with Alternatives B, E, E-Modified, E-Modified-Departure, and F, would not include the designation of old forest management areas. Vegetation treatments would be designed to improve resilience to disturbances while making progress toward a greater abundance of old forest stands and would emphasize mechanical treatments rather than wildland fire use (planned or unplanned ignitions). The proportion of the landscape projected for old forest structural stages in all potential vegetation groups at year 50 would be 20 percent for the Malheur National Forest, 26 percent for the Umatilla National Forest, and 30 percent for the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest. These projections are slightly lower compared to Alternative B. Within the dry upland forest potential vegetation groups, the proportion of the forestland projected for year 50 would be 11 percent for the Malheur National Forest, 14 percent for the Umatilla National Forest, and 16 percent for the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, slightly higher compared to Alternative B.

Wilderness: Alternative D would not allocate areas to preliminary administratively recommended wilderness areas (Management Area 1B).

Ecological Resilience: A more aggressive approach is pursued to restoring the ecological resilience of forested vegetation through active management to maximize economic return to the local economy. Forested vegetation mechanical restoration treatments would be intermediate compared to the other alternatives. Forage use intensity would be a few percent higher than Alternative B. Road treatments under Alternative D would be highest compared to other alternatives. The amount of subwatersheds that would be improved are higher than Alternative B. The vegetation departure index value projected for the dry upland forest potential vegetation group at year 50 improves compared to Alternative B.

Alternative E

Alternative E would use vegetation management and aquatic and wildlife habitat treatments to increase the scale of restoration activities, while emphasizing the potential benefits to water quality and watershed condition. Alternative E responds to public concerns and questions regarding the

environmental effects of accelerating efforts to improve ecological resilience. While similar in many regards to Alternative B, Alternative E would increase objectives for both the number and extent of restoration projects that would be undertaken on the three National Forests. Objectives for riparian and aquatic habitat improvement activities and road maintenance proposals to improve aquatic conditions within key and priority watersheds would be significantly greater than proposed in Alternative B.

Access: The approach to managing access would be similar to Alternative B, with a few exceptions. This alternative identifies preliminary administratively recommended wilderness areas (MA 1B), which would allow for the use of over-snow motor vehicle use in winter. Alternative E designates a small amount of wildlife corridor (MA 3C), linking high quality, unroaded wildlife habitats which would allow the suitable use of motor vehicle use in summer and winter on designated routes. This alternative would also identify both nonmotorized (MA 3A) and motorized (MA 3B) backcountry management areas. Both summer and winter motor vehicle use would be considered unsuitable in nonmotorized areas (MA 3A). The desired conditions for this alternative propose to reduce road-related sedimentation by reducing road density and reducing the hydrologic connectivity of the road system; that is, disconnecting the roadbeds from stream systems. Alternative E would provide an intermediate amount of area considered generally suitable for motor vehicle use in summer and winter and represents a slight increase compared to Alternative B for the Malheur National Forest for winter vehicle use, and a slight decrease compared to Alternative B for the both the Umatilla and Wallowa-Whitman National Forests. Alternative E would provide an intermediate amount of area rated suitable only for nonmotorized summer use and represents an increase compared to Alternative B. Road maintenance for Alternative E would be slightly more but similar to Alternative B.

Socio-Economics: The projected annual timber volume sold for the Blue Mountains national forests is approximately 203 million board feet, significantly more than projected for Alternative B. This level of timber volume sold would support about 1,585 jobs and about \$90.7 million in wages associated with timber harvest, primary wood products manufacturing, and associated industries. The projected 239,800 cattle and sheep animal unit months are similar to projections for Alternative B, and would support about 865 jobs and generate about \$15.2 million in wages. Recreation within the Blue Mountains national forests is estimated at 574,000 visits annually. Expenditures by the visitors support about 176 jobs with \$4.6 million in wages.

Grazing: The area that would be suitable for cattle grazing (1,889,000 acres) and projected animal unit months (224,000) would not change from current levels, and would be within 1 percent of the values for Alternative B. The area that would be suitable for sheep grazing (168,000 acres) would reduce about 10 percent from current levels but is about 10 percent more than Alternative B. To reduce the risk of disease transmission from domestic sheep to bighorn sheep, projected animal unit months for grazing sheep (15,800) would be about 16 percent lower than current levels and approximately 8 percent more than the values for Alternative B.

Old Forest: Alternative E does not include the designation of old forest management areas, similar to other plan revision alternatives except Alternative C. Under Alternative E, the proportion of the landscape in old forest structural stages for all potential vegetation groups projected at year 50 is 30 percent for the Malheur National Forest, 27 percent for the Umatilla National Forest, and 21 percent for the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest. Within the dry upland forest potential vegetation groups, the proportion of the old forest single-story stage at year 50 would be 16 percent for the Malheur National Forest, 15 percent for the Umatilla National Forest, and 11 percent for the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest. These values are nearly identical to the values for Alternative

B. Vegetation treatments would emphasize both mechanical treatments and wildland fire use (planned and unplanned ignitions).

Wilderness: Approximately 90,800 acres would be allocated to MA 1B (preliminary administratively recommended wilderness areas) under Alternative E.

Ecological Resilience: For Alternative E, the total acres of projected forested vegetation mechanical restoration treatments would be third highest among alternatives, about 30 percent more than the value for Alternative B. Objectives for road treatments (miles) and improved riparian areas (miles) are greater than objectives for Alternative B. Forage use intensity would be the same as for Alternative B. The number of subwatersheds that would be improved would be slightly higher than for Alternative B. The dry forest fire regime condition class departure score would improve by 8 points for the Malheur National Forest, 6 points for the Umatilla National Forest, and 7 points for the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, substantially more compared to Alternative B. Alternative E would further be expected to result in increased ecological resiliency in the dry upland forest potential vegetation groups because fuel composition, fire frequency, severity, pattern, and other associated disturbances would more closely resemble the historic range of variability.

Alternative E-Modified (Preferred Alternative)

Alternative E-Modified was developed in response to comments received from the public, State and local governments, Tribes, and other Federal agencies to the draft Revised Plan (Alternative E in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement). Alternative E-Modified emphasizes active restoration through vegetation management, and it incorporates the 2018 Blue Mountains Aquatic and Riparian Conservation Strategy. This strategy would promote improvements to aquatic and terrestrial wildlife habitats while increasing management flexibility.

Access: The approach to managing access in Alternative E-Modified would be similar to Alternative B. Alternative E-Modified would identify both nonmotorized (MA 3A) and motorized (MA 3B) backcountry management areas. Both summer and winter motor vehicle use would be considered unsuitable in nonmotorized areas (MA 3A). This alternative differs from Alternative A by moving away from road densities in general forest (MA 4A) to focus instead on elk security and on roads resulting in the greatest impacts to fish and aquatic ecosystems on the landscape. In this alternative, the desired condition would focus on hydrologically disconnecting the roadbed from the stream system with a focus on watersheds with threatened and/or endangered aquatic fish species. Alternative E-Modified would provide an intermediate amount of area considered generally suitable for motor vehicle use in summer and in winter and represents similar values, with a slight decrease, compared to Alternative B. Alternative E-Modified would provide an intermediate amount of area rated suitable only for nonmotorized summer use and represents an increase compared to Alternative B. Road maintenance for Alternative E-Modified would be slightly more but similar to Alternative B.

Socio-Economics: The predicted annual timber volume sold for the Blue Mountains national forests for Alternative E-Modified is approximately 205 million board feet, similar to Alternative E, more than projected for Alternative A, but less than projected for Alternative D. This level of timber volume sold would support about 1,593 jobs and \$91.2 million in labor income associated with timber harvest, primary wood products manufacturing, and associated industries. The projected 294,400 cattle and sheep animal unit months are similar to projections for Alternative B, and would support about 1,083 jobs and generate about \$18.7 million in wages. Recreation within

the Blue Mountains national forests is estimated at 574,000 visits annually. Expenditures by recreation visitors would support about 176 jobs with \$4.6 million in wages.

Grazing: Alternative E-Modified would use the levels from the 2013 permitted animal unit months for both cattle and sheep grazing on active allotments. In addition, this alternative would include all of the vacant allotments in the suitable land base. There would be increases in suitable acres for livestock grazing and the percent of National Forest System land in active grazing for the Malheur and Wallowa-Whitman, but not for the Umatilla since there are no vacant allotments, and historic animal unit months would be analyzed for all vacant allotments. The area that would be suitable for cattle grazing (2,128,600 acres) and projected animal unit months (272,500) is the highest among all alternatives. Projected animal unit months for grazing sheep (21,900) would be higher than current levels, and approximately 50 percent higher than the value for Alternative B; however, suitable acres for sheep grazing would be 168,000, consistent with alternatives D and E.

Old Forest: Old forest management under Alternative E-Modified is similar to Alternative E, but has higher projections for vegetation management designed to improve old forest characteristics, particularly in the dry upland old forest, single-story potential vegetation type. Within the dry upland forest potential vegetation groups, the proportion of forest in the old forest single-story type would be about 24 percent higher than Alternative E and about a 67 percent higher compared to Alternative B. This would be due to emphasizing treatments in overstocked dry upland forests resulting in more open stand densities. Under Alternative E-Modified, the proportion of the landscape in old forest structural stages in all potential vegetation groups improves over Alternative B, but to a lesser degree than for the dry upland forest type.

Wilderness: Alternative E-Modified would allocate approximately 70,500 acres to MA 1B (preliminary administratively recommended wilderness areas), which is about 20,000 fewer acres than would be allocated under Alternative E, but 57,000 acres more than for Alternative B.

Ecological Resilience: For Alternative E-Modified, projected forested vegetation restoration treatments would increase slightly compared to Alternative E, but are still significantly higher than for Alternative B. Anticipated miles of road treatments is the same as under Alternated E but miles of riparian areas improved is 5 percent lower than Alternative E. Both these indicator values are significantly higher than Alternative B. Forage use intensity is higher than Alternatives B and E. The number of subwatersheds that would be improved is higher than Alternative E, and the same as Alternative B. The improvement in the dry forest vegetation departure index score would be slightly better compared to Alternative E, and significantly better compared to Alternative B.

Alternative E-Modified Departure

Plan components for Alternative E-Modified Departure are identical to those for Alternative E-Modified except for objectives that increase the pace and scale of restoration over the next 20 years. The National Forest Management Act limits the allowable sale quantity to a volume that can be harvested annually “in perpetuity,” which is known as a “nondeclining even-flow.” The intent of nondeclining flow is to prevent higher than sustainable harvest levels in one decade from resulting in lower harvest levels in future decades, which is especially important for communities where a consistent supply of wood products from national forests contributes to and helps maintain the stability of the local economy.

Access: Alternative E-Modified Departure responds to this issue the same as Alternative E-Modified.

Socio-Economics: The predicted annual timber volume sold for the Blue Mountains national forests for Alternative E-Modified Departure is approximately 326 million board feet, more than projected for Alternative A but less than projected for Alternative D. This level of harvest would support about 2,514 jobs and about \$144.2 million in wages associated with timber harvest, primary wood products manufacturing, and associated industries. The projected 294,400 cattle and sheep animal unit months would support about 1,083 jobs and generate about \$18.7 million in wages. Recreation within the Blue Mountains national forests is estimated at 574,000 visits annually. Expenditures by recreation visitors would support about 176 jobs with \$4.6 million in wages.

Grazing: Alternative E-Modified Departure responds to this issue the same as Alternative E-Modified.

Old Forest: Old forest management under Alternative E-Modified Departure is similar to Alternative E-Modified, but has higher projections for vegetation management designed to improve old forest characteristics, particularly in the dry upland old forest, single-story potential vegetation type. The percent of dry upland old forest single story at year 50 would increase by one percentage point compared to Alternative E-Modified. The percent of the landscape in old forest structural stages in all potential vegetation groups would be the same as Alternative E-Modified.

Wilderness: Alternative E-Modified Departure responds to this issue the same as Alternative E-Modified.

Ecological Resilience: For Alternative E-Modified Departure, forested vegetation restoration treatments are projected to increase by approximately 30 percent compared to Alternative E. Road treatments (miles), improved riparian areas (miles), and forage use intensity would all be the same as for Alternative E-Modified. The number of subwatersheds that would be improved is slightly more than projected for Alternative E-Modified. The improvement in the dry forest vegetation departure index score would be similar to Alternative E-Modified. Alternative E-Modified Departure would be expected to result in increased ecological resiliency in the dry upland forest potential vegetation groups because fuel composition, fire frequency, severity, pattern, and other associated disturbances would more closely resemble the historic range of variability.

Alternative F

The management emphasis for Alternative F is the same as stated for Alternative E – to use vegetation management and aquatic and wildlife habitat treatments to increase the scale of restoration activities, while emphasizing the potential benefits to water quality and watershed condition. However, management objectives for active restoration, while greater than proposals made for Alternative B, would be less than the proposals for Alternative E. Both riparian and aquatic habitat improvement activities and road maintenance proposals for aquatic restoration within key and priority watersheds are significantly greater than the Alternative B proposals. The budget assumptions for vegetation treatments would be the same as proposed for Alternative B. Alternative F proposes the same desired conditions and management areas as Alternative B and Alternative E.

Access: The same proposals made for Alternative E are made for Alternative F.

Socio-Economics: The predicted annual timber volume sold for the Blue Mountains national forests for Alternative F is approximately 146 million board feet. This would support about 1,148 jobs and \$65.8 million in wages associated with timber harvest, primary wood products manufacturing, and associated industries. This is more than is projected for Alternative B but less

than projected for Alternative E. The projected 239,800 cattle and sheep animal unit months would support about 865 jobs that would generate about \$15.2 million in wages including estimates for unpaid or family labor contributions. Recreation within the Blue Mountains national forests is estimated at 574,000 visits annually. Expenditures by forest visitors support about 176 jobs with \$4.6 million in wages.

Grazing: The same proposals made for Alternative E are made for Alternative F.

Old Forest: This alternative proposes the same amount of acres treated in old forest as for Alternative E, which is higher compared to Alternative B. Under Alternative F, the proportion of the landscape in old forest structural stages in all potential vegetation groups at year 50 would be 30 percent for the Malheur National Forest, 27 percent for the Umatilla National Forest, and 21 percent for the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest. Within the dry upland forest potential vegetation group, the proportion of dry upland old forest single story at year 50 would be 12 percent for the Malheur National Forest, 13 percent for the Umatilla National Forest, and 9 percent for the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest.

Wilderness: The same proposals made for Alternative E are made for Alternative F.

Ecological Resilience: Values for all key indicators fall in the middle range among the alternatives.

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at http://www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint_filing_cust.html and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov.

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer and lender.

Accessibility: We make every effort to create documents that are accessible to individuals of all abilities; however, limitations with our word processing programs may prevent some parts of this document from being readable by computer-assisted reading devices. If you need assistance with any part of this document, please contact the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest at (541) 523-1264.