



United States
Department of
Agriculture



Forest Service



United States
Department of
the Interior



Bureau of Land
Management

Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project

Interior Columbia Basin Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement

*Appendix 1 -
Scientific, Legal, and
Planning Background*

March 2000

Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Lead Agencies

*USDA Forest Service; Intermountain, Pacific Northwest, and Northern Regions
USDI Bureau of Land Management; Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington*

For further information contact:

*Susan Giannettino, Project Manager
304 N. 8th Street, Room 250
Boise, ID 83702
Telephone 208/334-1770;
Fax 208/334-1769*

*Geoff Middaugh, Deputy Project Manager
P.O. Box 2344
Walla Walla, WA 99362
Telephone 509/522-4033;
Fax 509/522-4025*

As the Nation's principal conservation agency, the Department of the Interior has responsibility for most of nationally owned public lands and natural resources. This includes fostering the wisest uses of our land and water resources, protecting our fish and wildlife, preserving the environmental and cultural values of our national parks and historical places, and providing for the enjoyment of life through outdoor recreation. The Department assesses our energy and mineral resources and works to assure that their development is in the best interest of all our people. The Department also has a major responsibility for American Indian reservation communities and for people who live in Island Territories under U.S. administration.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or 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, audio tape, 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 326-W, Whitten Building 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

ICBEMP Supplemental Draft EIS

Table of Contents Appendix I - Scientific, Legal, and Planning Background

<u>Introduction</u>	<u>1-4</u>
<u>Supporting Science</u>	<u>1-4</u>
Major Studies Prior to the ICBEMP	1-4
ICBEMP Science Team Publications	1-5
Scientific Framework	1-5
Scientific Assessment	1-5
Evaluation of Alternatives	1-6
Peer Review and Public Involvement	1-6
Additional Project Publications	1-6
<u>Legal Guidance</u>	<u>1-7</u>
<u>Planning Considerations</u>	<u>1-8</u>
Planning Levels	1-8
The Status of Planning	1-8
Requirements of BLM and Forest Service Planning Regulations	1-9
“Determination of Significance of Amendment” Under the National Forest Management Act	1-10
Suitable Timber Acres and Allowable Sale Quantity	1-10
Roadless Areas	1-10
Management Indicator Species	1-10
Public Involvement and Disclosure	1-11
Current Plans and Their Approval Dates	1-11
<u>Table I. Current Land Use Plans and Their Approval Dates</u>	<u>1-11</u>

Introduction

This appendix provides an overview of the major scientific studies that contributed to the development of the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP) Environmental Impact Statement. It also lists the major laws and executive orders that constitute the legal framework for planning and management of lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Forest Service. The third portion of this appendix includes a discussion of planning considerations that underlie planning efforts for the BLM and the Forest Service, and lists the land use plans currently in effect in the ICBEMP project area.

Supporting Science

Numerous scientific studies conducted prior to or separately from the ICBEMP laid the foundation for this project. Another set of reports was developed during the course of the project by the ICBEMP Science Advisory Group (formerly called the Science Integration Team) or by contracted specialists. A list of the major scientific publications and reports is provided here. A complete list of ICBEMP contract reports may be obtained from project offices in Walla Walla, Washington or Boise, Idaho. For a complete list of literature referenced in this EIS, see the Literature Cited section at the end of Volume 1.

Major Studies Prior to the ICBEMP

- ♦ **Spring 1993.** Richard Everett, Paul Hessburg, Mark Jensen and Bernard Bormann completed an “**Eastside Forest Ecosystem Health Assessment**,” commissioned by the U.S. Congress, which documented changes in eastside ecosystems and proposed an initial process for developing landscape prescriptions for management. This report, published in 1994 (Everett et al. 1994), focused largely on forest ecosystem health in six river basins.
- ♦ **September 1993.** The Eastside Forests Scientific Society Panel released an executive summary of the congressionally commissioned “**Interim**

Protection for Late-Successional Forests, Fisheries, and Watersheds for National Forests East of the Cascade Crest in Oregon and Washington.” The panel’s mandate was to broadly review the status of all eastside forests and their associated resources. The complete report was published in 1994 (Henjum et al. 1994).

- ♦ **November 1993.** A scientific workshop, **Assessing Forest Ecosystem Health in the Inland West**, was convened in Sun Valley, Idaho to assess the current state of scientific knowledge about the health of forests in the Inland West. The goal was for 35 participating scientists and managers to produce a current, accurate, credible synthesis of information, across disciplines, about forest ecosystem health. The full publication (Sampson and Adams 1994) contains an overview paper, five synthesis papers, and 16 individual scientific papers.
- ♦ **December 1993.** Jay O’Laughlin, Director of the Idaho Forest, Wildlife and Range Policy Analysis Group, and others published Report No. 11: “**Forest Health Conditions in Idaho.**” The report addresses how sustaining healthy forest ecosystems might proceed in Idaho.
- ♦ **March 1994.** An Environmental Assessment (EA) was issued for the **Implementation of Interim Strategies for Managing Anadromous Fish-producing Watersheds in Eastern Oregon and Washington, Idaho, and Portions of California, commonly known as “PACFISH”** (USDA Forest Service and USDI Bureau of Land Management 1994). The EA calls for the Forest Service and the BLM to implement interim direction for habitat management to conserve Pacific salmon, steelhead, and sea-run cutthroat trout throughout their range in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and California. The EA also said that the interim direction is to be followed by longer-term management direction to address anadromous fish habitat conservation in these states. The Decision Record/Decision Notice was signed February 24, 1995.
- ♦ **May 1994.** A draft environmental impact statement on **Rangeland Reform** was released, proposing changes in grazing regulations for all BLM- and Forest Service-administered lands. The provisions of this proposed rule were necessary to ensure proper administration of livestock grazing on public rangelands and bring about reform in rangeland management for the improvement, protection, and proper function of rangeland ecosystems. The Final EIS was issued in December 1994 (USDI Bureau of Land Management 1994b).

- ♦ **October 1994.** The **Western Forest Health Initiative** report was released (USDA Forest Service 1994). The team, established by then Forest Service Chief Jack Ward Thomas, was chartered to identify Forest Service priority activities to restore western forested ecosystem health. The report identified project priorities over the next 24 months for forest health, including reduction of catastrophic changes in key ecosystem structure, composition, and processes; restoration of critical ecosystem processes; and restoration of stressed sites.

ICBEMP Science Team Publications

The Science Integration Team (SIT) was composed of federal employees from the Forest Service, BLM, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), and U.S. Bureau of Mines. Contractors were brought in for specific tasks and assignments. SIT headquarters were located in Walla Walla, Washington, with detached analysis units in Missoula and Kalispell, Montana; Boise, Moscow, and Coeur d'Alene, Idaho; Portland and Corvallis, Oregon; Seattle, Spokane, and Wenatchee, Washington; and Reno and Las Vegas, Nevada. The SIT was organized around the functional groups of Landscape Ecology (physical and vegetative resources), Terrestrial Resources, Aquatic Resources, and Economics and Social Sciences. A staff of Geographic Information System (GIS) specialists supported the spatial (mapping) and data processing needs of the science staffs and EIS Team.

The SIT's purpose was to develop a Framework for Ecosystem Management, a Scientific Assessment of the Interior Columbia Basin, and a Science Evaluation of EIS Alternatives. Upon completion of these documents, the Science Integration Team was disbanded. A smaller core of scientists, many from the original team, were formed to provide support to the project. This group was called the Science Advisory Group (SAG). This group was directed to: assist with transfer of data and science findings to the administrative units; prepare scientific publications; complete analysis in support of the Supplemental Draft EIS, Final EIS, and Record of Decision; assist with developing methods to facilitate implementation; and provide integrated research efforts.

Scientific Framework

The *Framework for Ecosystem Management in the Interior Columbia Basin and Portions of the Klamath and Great Basins* (Haynes, Graham, and Quigley 1996) describes the principles and processes applicable for managing ecosystems in the interior Columbia River Basin at various geographic scales. The *Framework* also includes a discussion of how these principles and goals might be used to implement ecosystem management within a process of managing risks (with risks defined as activities or events that relate to the likelihood of not reaching desired goals). Focusing on lands administered by the Forest Service or BLM, the *Framework* provides broad concepts and analytical processes recommended for ecosystem analysis, planning, management, and monitoring. The EIS process is consistent with the principles in the *Framework*.

Scientific Assessment

The ICBEMP scientific assessment resulted in two major documents. *An Assessment of Ecosystem Components in the Interior Columbia Basin Including Portions of the Klamath and Great Basins* (referred to as *Assessment of Ecosystem Components*, Quigley and Arbelbide 1997) presents information gathered and brought forward as Staff Area Reports (or AEC) by five functional groups—Landscape Ecology, Terrestrial, Aquatics, Social, and Economics—through an examination of historical and current conditions and trends. *An Integrated Scientific Assessment for Ecosystem Management in the Interior Columbia Basin and Portions of the Klamath and Great Basins* (referred to as *Integrated Assessment*, Quigley, Haynes, and Graham 1996) integrated information identified in the staff area reports, and used integrity indices to examine the extent of ecological risk and departure from historical and potential vegetation conditions. It also discussed probable outcomes of management under various possible futures. Together, the two documents are referred to as the *Scientific Assessment*.

The *Scientific Assessment* drew on information from all lands within the basin, not just Forest Service or BLM lands. Understanding ecosystem components, structures, processes, and functions that operate at multiple geographic and temporal extents and providing context for decisions required that all lands be included in the *Scientific Assessment*. Because of

the broad level of data resolution used and the large geographic extent, the *Scientific Assessment* relied primarily on remote sensing or readily available information from third party sources. An effort was made to use as much as possible of the existing information concerning the past and present condition of the basin. To the extent feasible, the SIT relied on existing simulation models to project future conditions of the basin. Where existing models were not available, new models were constructed and simulations made to project future conditions or interpretations, and inferences were made from the information available and model results.

Evaluation of Alternatives

The *Evaluation of EIS Alternatives by the Science Integration Team* (Quigley, Lee, and Arbelbide 1997) analyzed the effects of implementing each alternative management strategy proposed in the Eastside and UCRB Draft EISs. Outcomes of each alternative were evaluated relative to maintaining and/or restoring forest and rangeland health and productivity; and to maintaining economic, social, and cultural systems (including tribal trust responsibilities).

The Science Advisory Group developed the *Evaluation of the Supplemental Draft EIS Alternatives by the Science Integration Group*. This Supplemental Draft EIS Evaluation, like the Draft EIS Evaluation, analyzed the effects and practicality of implementing each alternative, provided an estimate of the likely outcomes and cumulative effects from the alternatives, and was used to develop the effects analysis described in Chapter 4.

Peer Review and Public Involvement

The scientific documents developed by the Science Integration Team were subjected to peer review using a modified blind process. A science review board was formed, comprising six members and two co-chairs. Reviewers were chosen by the board from a list of knowledgeable scientists, land managers, and regulatory personnel without direction from the Science Team, ensuring an impartial but informed review process. Science products were received by the board co-chairs and forwarded to board members for assignment to outside reviewers. The review board sought diverse points of view and forwarded those views to the SIT without integration, attempts

at consensus, or accompanying advice. Specific charges of the review board included facilitating the review of scientific approaches and products of the Science Team, facilitating the review of products for practicality and management feasibility, and ensuring a broad peer review of products that included diverse opinions.

The public had access to the science collection process through open Science Integration Team meetings and workshops and access to written material. During the early phases of the project, regularly scheduled public meetings were held, during which each team gave an update, progress report, shared draft reports, and answered questions. Reports from contractors and other draft materials were made available to the public through a variety of means including printed draft reports, electronic library, and workshops. Data layers and maps were made available to the public when the data was stable and documented. A data release policy was adopted and several of the themes were made available during the planning phase. This process continued through preparation of the Supplemental Draft EIS.

Additional Project Publications

Other recent ICBEMP publications have contributed to the preparation of the Supplemental Draft EIS:

- ♦ *Source Habitats for Terrestrial Vertebrates of Focus on the Interior Columbia Basin: Broad-scale Trends and Management Implications* (Wisdom et al. in press) defines habitat requirements (source habitats) and assesses trends in these habitats for 91 species of terrestrial vertebrates in the interior Columbia River Basin. The report also summarizes knowledge about species-road relationships for each species and includes maps of source habitats in relation to road densities for four species of terrestrial carnivores.
- ♦ *Economic and Social Characteristics of Communities in the Interior Columbia Basin* (USDA Forest Service/USDI BLM 1998) contains an analysis of the economic and social conditions of communities in the project area and an estimate of the effects of UCRB/Eastside Draft EIS alternatives on communities that specialize in certain resource-based industries.

Legal Guidance

The following statutes and executive orders (as amended) constitute the major legal guidance for planning and management of lands administered by BLM and Forest Service. This list is not all inclusive but does represent the primary legal guidance considered in preparation of this EIS.

- Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (16 USC 32-10)
- American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (42 USC 1996)
- Animal Damage Control Act of 1931, as amended (7 USC 426-426b)
- Archaeological Resource Protection Act of 1979 (16 USC 470aa)
- Bald Eagle Protection Act (16 USC 668)
- Clean Air Act (42 USC 7401)
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (42 USC 9601)
- Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 USC 1531)
- Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 (42 USC 4371)
- Executive Order 11514, Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality, 1970
- Executive Order 11644, Use of Off-Road Vehicles on the Public Lands, 1972
- Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, 1977
- Executive Order 11989, Off-Road Vehicles on Public Lands, 1977
- Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands, 1977
- Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice, 1994
- Executive Order 13007, Protection of Sacred Sites, 1996
- Executive Order 13084, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, 1998
- Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA)
- Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996
- Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) (43 USC 1701)
- Federal Water Pollution Control Act/Clean Water Act (33 USC 1251)
- Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 USC 661)
- Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended (16 USC 1601)
- Geothermal Energy Act of 1980 (30 USC 1501)
- Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 USC 1001)
- Indian Education and Self Determination Act of 1975 (PL 93-638)
- Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 USC 4601-4)
- Materials Act of 1947 (30 USC 801)
- Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 USC 715)
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 USC 703)
- Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (Mineral Lands Leasing Act) (30 USC 181)
- Mining Act of 1872 (30 USC 26)
- Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970 (30 USC 21a)
- National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 USC 4321)
- National Forest Management Act (NFMA) (16 USC 1600)
- National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC 470)
- National Trail Systems Act (16 USC 1241)
- Native American Graves Repatriation Act of 1990 (25 USC 3001-3013)
- Recreation and Public Purposes Act (43 USC 869)
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (42 USC 6901)
- Safe Drinking Water Act (42 USC 300f)
- Secretarial Order 3206, Tribal Rights and the ESA, 1997
- Self Governance Act of 1994
- Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 (16 USC 2001)
- Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 USC 1201 et seq.)
- Taylor Grazing Act (43 USC 315)
- Wilderness Act of 1964 (16 USC 1131)
- Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 USC 1271)

Planning Considerations

Planning Levels

The major planning levels for the Forest Service and BLM range from national-level policy, to regional- or state- level guidance, to individual land use plans, to activity level plans (see box). Regional guides, broad-scale plans, and Forest Service or BLM land use plans are only part of a multiple-level decision-making framework.

Plans and guidance for both Forest Service- and BLM-administered lands are designed to be consistent with national-level agency policies and regulations. BLM plans at the (finer-scale) activity level are tiered to (broader-scale) resource management plans or management framework plans, which may be based on State Director guidance. Forest Service activity-level plans must be consistent with forest plans, which in turn are based on regional guides.

To comply with statutory obligations arising from the National Forest Management Act, Federal Land Policy and Management Act, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, and other environmental laws, site-specific environmental analysis of proposed activities are required prior to making an irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources. This is because it is virtually impossible to prepare a single Forest Service or BLM land use plan and associated EIS with enough specificity to identify and adequately analyze all activities requiring environmental analysis that could occur in the 10-year planning period.

When needed, larger-scale multi-regional plans may be developed to address issues that cross jurisdictional boundaries. Forest health and anadromous fish species viability are two such issues. When a large-scale plan is prepared for management of federal lands on a regional or multi-regional basis, a broad overview EIS, or *programmatic* EIS, such as the ICBEMP EIS, can provide a valuable and necessary analysis of the affected environment and potential cumulative effects of the reasonably foreseeable actions under that program or within that geographical area. One or more analyses of lesser scope or a site-specific EIS or analysis can be tiered to a programmatic EIS.

The nature of environmental impacts caused by a programmatic decision is different from the impacts from a site-specific decision, because adoption of a programmatic plan does not generate any on-the-ground environmental changes and does not dictate that any particular site-specific action causing environmental injury must occur. Therefore, the NEPA obligations for a programmatic EIS are more limited. The subsequent site-specific level of decision-making affects the environmental status-quo. Site-specific decisions are made by local managers (Forest Supervisors, District Managers, District Rangers, Area Managers), who are familiar with the issues presented and local conditions associated with the affected planning area and are charged with monitoring and evaluating the land use plan and proposing changes to it, as necessary, through amendment and revision.

The Status of Planning

During the late 1970s, 1980s, and early 1990s, the BLM and Forest Service released comprehensive land use plans and framework documents for individual national forests and grasslands and portions of BLM districts. A list of these plans and their effective dates for the project area are provided later in this appendix. These plans remain in effect until amended or revised. The Forest Service is required by the National Forest Management Act to revise forest plans at least every 10 to 15 years. BLM resource management plans (RMPs) are not revised on a set schedule. Rather, they are revised when monitoring and evaluation reveal that plan amendment is inadequate to keep the plan current with changing circumstances. Any forest plan, resource management plan, or management framework plan currently under revision is being coordinated with the ICBEMP planning process and EIS.

Decisions made by the Forest Service and BLM based on the ICBEMP EIS will amend all Forest Service regional guides and Forest Service and BLM land use plans (Forest Service Land and Resource Management Plans, BLM Management Framework Plans, and BLM Resource Management Plans) currently in effect in the ICBEMP project area. The selected alternative will become part of these plans and will guide project decision-making until replaced through subsequent amendment or revision.

For the purpose of the analysis and disclosure of environmental impacts, direction from the ICBEMP Record of Decision is assumed to be in place for approximately 10 years. Direction that applies to

Overview of Forest Service and BLM Planning Levels

The Forest Service and BLM have parallel planning levels that are similar, but not identical. Under the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, the Forest Service Chief prepares nationwide Renewable Resources Assessment and Program documents (36 CFR 219.4(b)). Under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, the BLM Director provides guidance, which includes national level policy, for the preparation of resource management plans (43 CFR 1610.1(a)).

The next planning level involves preparation of a regional guide for each Forest Service region to address “major issues and management concerns which need to be considered at the regional level” (36 CFR 219.8(a)). Somewhat parallel to this, the BLM State Director provides guidance for resource management plan preparation (43 CFR 1610.1(a)).

Next, individual national forest and BLM land use plans, and associated EISs, are prepared. For the Forest Service, these are known as *forest plans*, or “land and resource management plans for units of the National Forest System” (16 U.S.C. 1604(a); 36 CFR 219.10 to 219.27). For the BLM, “resource management plans [are] prepared and maintained on a resource area basis” (43 CFR 1610.1(b)). In parts of the ICBEMP project area, the BLM still has a few *management framework plans* in effect. These are the “previous generation” of land use plans, which are being replaced by *resource management plans*.

Finally, individual or activity-level projects are evaluated through an environmental impact statement, environmental assessment, or categorical exclusion, depending on the anticipated significance of environmental impact. The environmental document is approved only if it is consistent with applicable Forest Service or BLM land use plans and other applicable environmental standards (16 U.S.C. 1604(l) and 36 CFR 223.30; 43 CFR 1610.5-3). Examples of these activity-level projects include timber sales and recreation trails.

multiple administrative units (such as broad-scale objectives) will remain in place to guide future plan amendments and revisions. It is the intent of the agencies that subsequent plan amendments or revisions for individual administrative units will be designed to meet this broad-scale direction.

Requirements of BLM and Forest Service Planning Regulations

Planning criteria, a BLM and Forest Service regulatory requirement, were prepared to guide development of the ICBEMP EIS. In general, planning criteria are based upon applicable law; Executive Orders, regulations, agency policy; and the results of public participation and coordination with other federal, state,

county, and local governments and Indian tribes. In accordance with the criteria:

- ♦ This planning action was driven by the statement of purpose, described in Chapter 1.
- ♦ The alternatives described and analyzed in this process (except the no-action alternative [Alternative S1]) are responsive to the statement of need, and to the significant issues identified by the public, both described in Chapter 1.
- ♦ This planning action was based on data provided in the *Integrated Assessment* (Quigley, Haynes, and Graham 1996) and *Assessment of Ecosystem Components in the Interior Columbia Basin and Portions of the Klamath and Great Basins* (Quigley and Arbelbide 1997) and on other published, peer-reviewed scientific literature.
- ♦ The alternative management strategies described in Chapter 3 and analyzed in Chapter 4 are not

intended to be more detailed or specific than the *Scientific Assessment* and other appropriate literature mentioned previously in this appendix.

- ♦ The detail and specificity of the alternatives was limited to that necessary to address the statement of need and to the revised focus of the EIS, as described by the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior, in their October 8, 1998 letter to the Northwest Congressional delegation.

“Determination of Significance of Amendment” Under the National Forest Management Act

The scale of the *Scientific Assessment* and this EIS is broad enough that it is neither feasible nor appropriate to make fine-scale amendments to land use plans. Further, the alternatives are not specific to particular national forests or BLM districts.

In the usual forest planning situation, a Forest Supervisor determines the significant issues identified in scoping. For the ICBEMP planning process, the role of determining significant issues was assigned to the project managers early in the planning process under the supervision of an Executive Steering Committee (at that time, made up of Regional Foresters, BLM State Directors, and Forest Service Research Station Directors). The issues identified were neither appropriate nor suitable to address in the detail described in 36 CFR 219.12.(b)(k). Topics such as planning criteria, inventory data and information collection, analysis of management situation, and formulation of alternatives are controlled by the issues identified in scoping. This EIS accomplished all of the steps in the Forest Service’s significant amendment process as appropriate in estimating effects of alternatives, evaluation of alternatives, and selection of an alternative. The BLM has no similar process of determining significance of an amendment. The project managers followed the Northwest Forest Plan process; therefore, the reconciliation with individual plans will be accomplished at a later date.

The following paragraphs describe how the ICBEMP planning process accomplished many of the Forest Service’s significant amendment requirements.

Suitable Timber Acres and Allowable Sale Quantity

Figures for acres of suitable timber and allowable sale quantity in individual forest plans will be adjusted when the plans are revised. Until then, management activities must follow the goals, objectives, and standards from the ICBEMP EIS, as amended into the individual forest plans.

Roadless Areas

Current forest plans evaluate roadless areas. Wilderness Acts have been enacted for Oregon and Washington with “release” language for roadless areas. (“Release” language allows management activities in areas not designated by the Congress as wilderness.) The Congress has considered roadless areas in Idaho and Montana for designation as wilderness. The ICBEMP decision does not consider this issue again at this scale; however it may be considered during the land use plan revision processes.

The BLM has completed NEPA documentation on several wilderness study areas within the ICBEMP project area. Recommendations have been made through the Secretary of the Interior to Congress for release or designation of each of the study areas. Pending action by Congress, all these areas are being managed to protect wilderness values. The ICBEMP decision does not revisit this issue.

Management Indicator Species

The National Forest Management Act planning regulations require Forest Service planning efforts to establish and address “management indicator species” for the planning area. Management indicator species are those plant and/or animal species selected because their population changes are believed to indicate the effects of management activities. This requirement is not applicable to BLM. The designation of management indicator species was made for each existing Forest Service regional guide and Forest Service land use plan per 36 CFR 219.19(a). Decisions made through this effort will not change those designations. Upon future amendment or revision of existing Forest Service land use plans, management

indicator species lists will be adjusted, as appropriate, in response to local conditions and information.

Current Plans and Their Approval Dates

The Forest Service is required by the National Forest Management Act to revise forest plans every 10 to 15 years. The BLM, although not mandated by law to follow a particular revision timetable, generally revises plans on a similar schedule. Current plans in the project area for both agencies and their dates of approval are shown in Table 1, below.

Public Involvement and Disclosure

Public involvement and disclosure requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, and the National Forest Management Act have been met in this planning effort. See the Public Involvement section in Chapter 1, and Appendix 3 for further information.

Table 1. Current Land Use Plans and Their Approval Dates.

Land Use Plan	Approval Date
Forest Service	
Region 1	
Bitterroot Forest Plan	September 1987
Clearwater Forest Plan	September 1987
Deerlodge Forest Plan	September 1987
Flathead Forest Plan	January 1986
Helena Forest Plan	May 1986
Idaho Panhandle Forest Plan	September 1987
Kootenai Forest Plan	September 1987
Lolo Forest Plan	April 1986
Nez Perce Forest Plan	October 1987
Region 4	
Boise Forest Plan	April 1990
Caribou Forest Plan	September 1985
Challis Forest Plan	June 1987
Humboldt Forest Plan	August 1986
Payette Forest Plan	May 1988
Salmon Forest Plan	November 1988
Sawtooth Forest Plan	September 1987
Region 6	
Ochoco Forest Plan	August 1, 1989
Winema Forest Plan	September 19, 1990
Malheur Forest Plan	May 25, 1990
Deschutes Forest Plan	August 27, 1990
Newberry Crater National Volcanic Monument Plan	August 1, 1994
Fremont Forest Plan	May 12, 1989
Wallowa-Whitman Forest Plan	April 23, 1990
Hells Canyon National Recreation Area Plan	1984
Umatilla Forest Plan	June 11, 1990
Okanogan Forest Plan	December 29, 1989
Colville Forest Plan	December 29, 1988

Table 1. Current Land Use Plans and Their Approval Dates. (continued)

Land Use Plan	Approval Date
Bureau of Land Management	
Idaho	
Bennett Hills Management Framework Plan	July 1976
Big Desert Management Framework Plan	October 1981
Big Lost Management Framework Plan	December 1983
Bruneau Management Framework Plan	June 1983
Cascade Resource Management Plan	July 1988
Cassia Resource Management Plan	January 1985
Challis Resource Management Plan ¹	July 1999
Chief Joseph Management Framework Plan	November 1981
Emerald Empire Management Framework Plan	November 1981
Jarbridge Resource Management Plan	March 1987
Kuna Management Framework Plan	June 1983
Lemhi Resource Management Plan	April 1987
Little Lost Birch Creek Management Framework Plan	June 1981
Magic Management Framework Plan	June 1975
Malad Management Framework Plan	February 1981
Medicine Lodge Resource Management Plan	November 1985
Monument Resource Management Plan	April 1985
Owyhee Management Framework Plan	May 1981
Pocatello Resource Management Plan	January 1988
Sun Valley Management Framework Plan	December 1981
Timmerman Management Framework Plan	July 1976
Twin Falls Management Framework Plan	September 1982
Montana	
Garnet Resource Management Plan	April 1986
Oregon/Washington	
Two Rivers Resource Management Plan	June 6, 1986
Brothers/LaPine Resource Management Plan	1989
Warner Lakes Management Framework Plan	1982
Upper Klamath Basin Resource Management Plan	December 1995
Klamath Falls Resource Management Plan	May 22, 1995
High Desert Management Framework Plan	1982
John Day Resource Management Plan	August 28, 1985
Three Rivers Resource Management Plan	1992
Andrews Management Framework Plan	1982
Baker Resource Management Plan	July 12, 1989
Northern Malheur Management Framework Plan	1982
Spokane Resource Management Plan	December 1992

¹ Replaces the Challis Management Framework Plan, Ellis-Pahsimeroi Management Framework Plan, and Mackay Management Framework Plan.