

## Invasive Species

Sierra Club/Alliance for the Wild Rockies  
The Lands Council

**Objectors contend the revised LMP is promoting increased motor vehicle access which will increase the spread of noxious weeds. The LMP contains no direction to rein in weed spread. The impacts on other key resources from the out-of-control weed spread are not analyzed or disclosed in the FEIS.**

### **Response:**

I see no ‘red flags’ after reviewing the objections and the content of the planning documents. Although there seems to be a concern by the objectors that our actions are driving the spread of invasive species (at least plants), they don’t adequately make a case for problems they raise in the Colville’s plan. The spread of invasive species, including regulated noxious weeds, certainly can be directly correlated with disturbances and human activities on the landscape; including roadways, trails, development, energy transmission corridors, and a variety of management activities, but the Colville does address this. It is well documented that risk of accidental spread of invasive plants can be exacerbated by increasing motorized vehicle activities in certain areas that may be conducive to invasive plant establishment and spread. The Forest has taken this risk into account, and the plan documents reference adherence to direction in the invasive species management policy (FSM 2900) and associated regional invasive species management direction, including language for invasive plant/noxious weed prevention, and other invasive species management activities to address invasions that may result from various pathways and vectors.

As an example of where the risk has been taken into account and translated into planned actions, in Volume 1 of the FEIS, the Colville indicates that their analysis within the Pacific Northwest Region Invasive Plant Program Preventing and Managing Invasive Plants Final Environmental Impact Statement (USDA Forest Service 2005a) remains valid, and along with national policy provides the basis for management direction under all action alternatives. In all action alternatives, this management direction would be updated to reduce redundancy and provide better consistency with national policy. In addition, the focus on invasive plants has been broadened to include other invasive taxa (animals, pathogens, aquatic species) and pesticide use guidance has been clarified. Management direction for invasive species and pesticide use has been updated in the revised plan for clarity in response to public comments and regional review. I find this, and other material throughout the planning documents related to invasive species prevention and control adequate to address any of the concerns/objections. References to policy requirements and program direction at the regional and national levels indicates that the Colville will be able to monitor effectiveness monitoring of their invasive species management activities, and better integrate the work across various programs, as raised by the objectors.

### **POSSIBLE INSTRUCTIONS (if any):**

Check plan documents to tighten-up language related to integration aspects of invasive species management within across program areas where applicable, supplemental to what the Colville references in regional and national policy.

