

## Appendix A – Issue Tracking Sheet

Issues were considered by the Interdisciplinary Team and characterized as key issues or other issues. Key issues are listed in Chapter 1 of the analysis, and other issues are listed below. The following tracking sheet shows where in the Environmental Impact Statement the other issues were addressed or why a particular issue was not addressed.

Issue Statement	Source(s) of Issue	Response
<p>-Concerned about healthy functioning wetland plant communities.</p> <p>-Need to address the effects of grazing on all plant associations present in the area.</p>	Douglas Finch, Boise, Idaho, 2/9/1999, letter	Discussed in Aquatic and Botanical Resources sections in Chapter 3
<p>-A full discussion of the “historic use” is particularly relevant and should be addressed in the plan.</p> <p>-Tribal concerns should be presented in the Draft document.</p> <p>-What is the effect of grazing on archaeological and paleontological resources?</p> <p>-Are there provisions for changes in the level of grazing based on climatological/ environmental factors, such as drought, etc.?</p> <p>-What are the relating factors of grazing to fire suppression/control?</p> <p>-Are there wildlife/domestic livestock interactions with reference to any diseases?</p>	Ken Fitch, New York, NY, 3/1999, letter	<p>Addressed in the Range Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Tribal concerns addressed in Specifically Required Disclosure section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Joseph Canyon Inventoried Roadless Section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Adaptive management strategies addressed in Alternatives, Chapter 2</p> <p>Addressed in Botanical Resources and Wildlife Resources sections, Chapter 3</p> <p>No interactions are known between cattle, horses, and wild ungulates</p>
<p>-We urge you to consider the effects of livestock use on the roadless values that exist there.</p> <p>-Improvements of “resource conditions” must be quantified and given perspective.</p> <p>-There should be a grassland rehabilitation, or livestock-exclusion alternative.</p> <p>-The EIS must examine the past effects of livestock grazing and thoroughly examine the benefits of changing livestock use and practices, including the exclusion of livestock</p>	Ric Bailey, Executive Director, HCPC, 3/25/1999, letter	<p>Addressed in Specially Designated Areas section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Range Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Alternatives, Chapter 2</p> <p>Purpose and Need for Action addressed in Chapter 1. Effects of authorizing livestock grazing in conjunction with</p>

Issue Statement	Source(s) of Issue	Response
<p>temporarily or permanently, to restore ecosystem function.</p> <p>-An alternative could include a proposal for buy-out of existing permittees.</p> <p>-We urge that full, detailed extent of monitoring be displayed in the EIS.</p> <p>-A primary consideration in this analysis should be the suitability of this area for livestock use.</p> <p>-The impacts of livestock on the natural fire patterns of this area should receive serious consideration.</p> <p>-The impacts of livestock on microbiotic crusts must be fully examined.</p> <p>-The role of livestock in facilitating the spread of noxious weeds and inhibiting the land's natural ability to resist them must be examined.</p> <p>-The Columbia Basin bunchgrass communities are unique. Any remnants of these that could be restored should be examined in this regional context.</p> <p>-The EIS must provide special management direction for the stream, and for the corridor of land that is included within the designated portion of Joseph Creek Wild and Scenic River.</p>		<p>effects of historic grazing addressed in Chapter 3</p> <p>Covered by analysis of Alternative 1</p> <p>Addressed in Monitoring, Chapter 2</p> <p>Addressed in the Range Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Botanical and Wildlife Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in the Aquatic Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Range, Botanical, and Wildlife Resources sections, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Research Natural Areas in Specially Designated Areas section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Specially Designated Areas section, Chapter 3</p>
<p>-If this grazing allotment were to be vacated with so much standing dead grass, combined with the heavy timber and growing understory of lodgepole pine, there would be a catastrophic forest fire.</p> <p>-If grazing were to be eliminated on our Davis Creek Allotment, we would not be able to continue to make our livelihood by raising cattle.</p>	<p>J. Wesley Patton and Rowena Patton (land owners), 4/8/1999, letter</p>	<p>Addressed in Specifically Required Disclosures section, Chapter 3 for Alternative 1</p>
<p>-The proposed EIS should consider the need for predator control to protect livestock, human health and safety, and natural resources.</p>	<p>David E. Williams, State Director, USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, 5/24/2000, letter</p>	<p>Coyote and bear control is authorized through APHIS-ADC. Wolf control is specifically excluded from livestock operations by the State of Oregon Endangered Species Act and Wolf Management Plan.</p>

Issue Statement	Source(s) of Issue	Response
<p>-Characterizations of the condition of the range and trends in that condition should be supported by current data.</p> <p>-The DEIS should address and provide data on the effects of livestock grazing on riparian conditions, soil productivity, threatened and endangered species, and big game winter range.</p> <p>-The DEIS should address noxious weeds and provide current, reviewable data on the extent of exotic undesirable plant invasion, the current rate of spread of these plants, and the effects of livestock grazing on their establishment and spread.</p> <p>-The DEIS should address how grazing intensities will be adjusted in response to moderate or severe drought.</p> <p>-The DEIS should estimate the amount of forage that needs to be left on the ground for ground nesting birds.</p> <p>-The DEIS should identify all known areas in which there are conflicts between grazing and other uses, such as big game, anglers, wilderness and wild and scenic values.</p> <p>-The DEIS should identify measures that would be implemented to monitor the effects of grazing.</p>	<p>Robert P. Davison, Northwest Field Representative, Wildlife Management Institute, 5/28/2000, letter</p>	<p>Addressed in the Range Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Botanical Resources, Aquatic, and Wildlife Resources sections, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Range Resource section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Adaptive management strategies addressed in Alternatives, Chapter 2</p> <p>Ground nesting birds discussed in Wildlife Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Chapter 3</p> <p>Monitoring protocol addressed in Alternatives, Chapter 2</p>
<p>-What specific sensitive, threatened, and endangered plant and animal species are known to exist in the Joseph Creek Watershed and more specifically within the AMP project area?</p> <p>-Are surveys conducted yearly for sensitive, threatened, and endangered species in the Joseph Creek Watershed?</p> <p>-Does this watershed have ecology plots?</p> <p>-Does the Wallowa Valley Ranger District have data on the species types, population sizes and locations and trends of native plants in the allotment areas?</p> <p>-Does the Wallowa Valley Ranger District have data on the species types, population</p>	<p>Lisa Dix, Ecosystem Defense Coordinator, HCPC, 4/3/2002, letter</p>	<p>Addressed in Botanical, Aquatics, and Wildlife Resources sections, Chapter 3</p> <p>Surveys are conducted as needed for site-specific proposals such as the JCRA.</p> <p>Yes, refer to Range Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Botanical and range condition inventories have gathered this data, and the information was used in the JCRAA.</p> <p>Botanical and range condition inventories have gathered this</p>

Issue Statement	Source(s) of Issue	Response
<p>sizes and locations and trends of invasive species?</p> <p>-What MIS exist in the watershed?</p> <p>-How many cow/calf pairs exist in the allotments? How many permittees?</p> <p>-Did the FS make a formal determination that the allotment lands are “suitable” for livestock grazing?</p> <p>-Please describe the differences between past and present livestock numbers.</p> <p>-Have pastures, allotments or any areas within the planning area ever been rested from livestock grazing?</p> <p>-Can the District provide data on forage levels, forage health, and competition between livestock and wildlife?</p> <p>-What, if any, livestock restoration work has been done on the allotments?</p> <p>-What are the riparian conditions in the allotments?</p> <p>-What surveys have been conducted for microbiotic crusts? How have the surveys been applied/or how are they being figured into the allotment planning process?</p> <p>-Is there any fencing within the allotment? Is there riparian fencing, and are pastures separated by fences.</p>		<p>data, and the information was used in the JCRAA.</p> <p>Addressed in the Wildlife Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Described in the Alternatives, Chapter 2</p> <p>Addressed in the Range Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Alternatives Considered but not Analyzed in Detail, Chapter 2</p> <p>Addressed in Alternatives, Chapter 2</p> <p>Addressed in Range and Wildlife Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Aquatics and Wildlife Resources sections, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Aquatics Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Aquatics Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Activities Common to Alternatives 2 and 3, Chapter 3</p>
<p>-The EIS must adequately explain the current conditions of the project area.</p> <p>-Concerned with watershed conditions, disturbance levels and trends; range conditions; riparian conditions; water quality; fish populations and habitat; wildlife habitat; monitoring; and soils.</p> <p>-Would like to see an option that is consistent with CTUIR’s fish restoration plan.</p>	<p>Michael Farrow, Director, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Department of Natural Resources, 11/4/2002, letter</p>	<p>Existing conditions addressed in Chapter 3</p> <p>All addressed in analysis</p> <p>Information regarding the impacts on fisheries from</p>

Issue Statement	Source(s) of Issue	Response
<p>-Expect that subsistence and environmental values will be evaluated on an equal footing with economic values.</p> <p>-The analysis of effects must also be analyzed for consistency with treaty rights, rebuilding efforts, regional goals and policies, and legal mandates.</p> <p>-CTUIR is especially concerned with effects on anadromous fish habitats.</p> <p>-CTUIR urges the Forest Service to protect cultural resources and access rights to the Forests to maintain and exercise treaty rights.</p> <p>-Ensure that all potential impacts from the preferred alternative on Threatened, Endangered, or Sensitive fish species will be fully analyzed and considered.</p> <p>-The areas of highest concerns should be those with a PFC rating of “not properly functioning” and Oregon State Water Quality Standard 303(d) listed streams.</p> <p>-The agency should consider the need to maintain riparian conditions that are currently functioning properly.</p> <p>-The Forest Service should evaluate the conditions of soils and microbiotic crusts.</p> <p>-The Forest Service must satisfy the National Forest Management Act’s requirement of determining the suitability and capability of national forest lands for forage and production, and for providing habitat for management indicator species.</p>		<p>Alternatives 2 and 3 is provided in Aquatics Resources section, Chapter 3. Finding on consistency would be within the purview of the CTUIR. Please advise</p> <p>Refer to Economics analysis, in Specifically Required Disclosures, Chapter 3</p> <p>Refer to Specifically Required Disclosures, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Aquatic Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Specifically Required Disclosures, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Aquatic Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in the Range Resources section, Chapter 3</p>
<p>-Concerned with quality of fisheries habitat, especially bull trout.</p> <p>-Concerned with effects on lands within ‘Wildland Project’ and protection of their status.</p>	<p>Ryan Shaffer, Ecosystem Defense Director, Alliance for the Wild Rockies, 8/28/2002, telephone conversation.</p>	<p>Addressed in Aquatic Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Specially Designated Areas, Chapter 3</p>

Issue Statement	Source(s) of Issue	Response
<p>-It is required that management of the allotments that effect the Joseph Creek corridor are in compliance with the comprehensive river management plan developed pursuant to the WSRA.</p> <p>-If grazing trends are damaging the corridor's outstandingly remarkable values, then significant considerations should be given to alternatives that do not allow grazing within the Joseph Creek Wild and Scenic River corridor.</p> <p>-The DEIS should have a clear assessment of the effects of the allotments on water quality and fisheries.</p> <p>-The DEIS and impacts of the proposed action should support a number of key hydrological factors. Including management indicator species; key riparian vegetation; riparian habitat improvements activities; rate of recovery in riparian areas; non-stream associated riparian areas; Oregon State Water Quality standards; stream bank stability and fish capability.</p> <p>-Joseph Creek is below state standards for high summer temperature and sedimentation.</p> <p>-The Forest Service is required, pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA, to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to determine whether federally permitted grazing activities may affect listed species.</p> <p>-The Forest Service should work towards setting clear standards that dictate when livestock must be moved off a particular allotment or pasture. Such as forage utilization; stream bank stability; and shrub use.</p>	<p>Joe Serres, Co-Director, Friends of Living Oregon Waters, 3/3/2003, letter</p>	<p>Addressed in the Specially Designated Areas section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Alternatives, Chapter 2</p> <p>Addressed in Aquatic Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Aquatic Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Addressed in Aquatic Resources section, Chapter 3</p> <p>Process has been initiated and concurrence with USFWS and NOAA – Fisheries has been received. Both agencies will be kept informed as to changes that occur between the DEIS and FEIS</p> <p>Refer to Issue 2 with respect to use of the Meadow Segment of Swamp Creek. All streams are subject to utilization standards for forage and shrub utilization and for streambank stability – refer to Activities Common to Alternatives 2 and 3, Chapter 2</p>
<p>Analysis should address Nez Perce Tribe treaty rights for pasturing of horses</p>	<p>Scott Althouse, Jack Yearout, Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries 10/22/02 Meeting with Meg Mitchell, District Ranger</p>	<p>Refer to adaptive management features associated with Alternative 3 as compared to Alternatives 1 and 2 (Issue 5) and Specifically Required Disclosures, Chapter 3</p>

