



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service

Pacific Northwest
Research Station



United States
Department of the
Interior

**Bureau of Land
Management**

General Technical
Report

PNW-GTR-382

September 1996



Integrated Scientific Assessment for Ecosystem Management in the Interior Columbia Basin And Portions of the Klamath and Great Basins



United States
Department of
Agriculture



Forest Service



United States
Department
of the Interior



Bureau of Land
Management



Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project

This is not a NEPA decision document



Integrated Scientific Assessment for Ecosystem Management in the Interior Columbia Basin

And Portions of the Klamath and Great Basins

Thomas M. Quigley, Richard W. Haynes,
and Russell T. Graham
Technical Editors

Thomas M. Quigley is a range scientist at the Pacific Northwest Research Station, Walla Walla, WA 99362;
Richard W. Haynes is a research forester at the Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR 97208;
Russell T. Graham is a research forester at the Intermountain Research Station, Moscow, ID 83843.

September 1996
United States Department of Agriculture
Forest Service
Pacific Northwest Research Station
Portland, Oregon

Abstract

Quigley, Thomas M.; Haynes, Richard W.; Graham, Russell T., tech. eds. 1996. Integrated scientific assessment for ecosystem management in the interior Columbia basin and portions of the Klamath and Great Basins. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-382. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 303 p. (Quigley, Thomas M., tech. ed. The Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project: Scientific Assessment.)

The Integrated Scientific Assessment for Ecosystem Management for the Interior Columbia Basin links landscape, aquatic, terrestrial, social, and economic characterizations to describe biophysical and social systems. Integration was achieved through a framework built around six goals for ecosystem management and three different views of the future. These goals are: maintain evolutionary and ecological processes; manage for multiple ecological domains and evolutionary timeframes; maintain viable populations of native and desired non-native species; encourage social and economic resiliency; manage for places with definable values; and, manage to maintain a variety of ecosystem goods, services, and conditions that society wants. Ratings of relative ecological integrity and socioeconomic resiliency were used to make broad statements about ecosystem conditions in the Basin. Currently in the Basin high integrity and resiliency are found on 16 and 20 percent of the area, respectively. Low integrity and resiliency are found on 60 and 68 percent of the area. Different approaches to management can alter the risks to the assets of people living in the Basin and to the ecosystem itself. Continuation of current management leads to increasing risks while management approaches focusing on reserves or restoration result in trends that mostly stabilize or reduce risks. Even where ecological integrity is projected to improve with the application of active management, population increases and the pressures of expanding demands on resources may cause increasing trends in risk.

Keywords: Ecosystem assessment, management and goals; ecological integrity; socioeconomic resiliency; risk management

Preface

This document summarizes much of the work of the Science Integration Team (SIT) of the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP). The background investigations that underlie this report are described in three other documents. The first is a *Framework for Ecosystem Management* (Haynes and others 1996); the second is the compilation of detailed reports from each science team staff, referred to as the *Assessment of Ecosystem Components* (Quigley and Arbelbide 1996); and, the third document is the *Evaluation of the Environmental Impact Statement Alternatives by the Science Integration Team* (Quigley and others 1996b). These reports supply the detailed information used by the Science Integration Team to assemble the integrated assessment.

The specific content of this Integrated Assessment was written primarily by Thomas M. Quigley, Richard W. Haynes, Russell T. Graham, James R. Sedell, Danny C. Lee, Bruce G. Marcot, Paul F. Hessburg, Steven F. McCool, Bruce E. Reiman, Wendel J. Hann, James A. Burchfield, Michael G. Karl, Amy L. Horne, Thomas P. Frost, John F. Lehmkuhl, Iris Goodman, and Christopher E. DeForest.

All members of the Science Integration Team participated in the discussions and contributed to the writing of two early versions of this report. Christopher E. DeForest helped write the final Current Status section. Three subsequent drafts were written by the technical editors based on review comments of the earlier drafts and intensive work by several groups of SIT members who developed concepts related to and estimates of integrity, resiliency, and risk ratings. James R. Sedell, Danny C. Lee, Paul F. Hessburg, Bruce E. Reiman, Mark E. Jensen, Kenneth C. Brewer, Bradley G. Smith, J.L. Jones, and Wendel J. Hann developed the ecological integrity elements and the forest and range clusters. The material related to composite ecological integrity was developed by James R. Sedell, Danny C. Lee, Richard S. Holthausen, Bruce G. Marcot, Wendel J. Hann, J.L. Jones, and Thomas M. Quigley. Richard W. Haynes, Amy L. Horne, and James A. Burchfield developed measures of socioeconomic resiliency. Richard W. Haynes, Wendel J. Hann, and Thomas M. Quigley developed the risk ratings for ecological integrity and risk to human assets from conditions in wildlands.

Content concerning American Indian Tribes originated from SIT Social Science Staff and the Tribal Liaison Group of the Project (specifically, Richard Hanes, Mary Keith, and Ralph Perkins). Content concerning management options originated from the Project's EIS Teams under the leadership of Jeff Blackwood, Steve Mealey, and Pat Geehan. Literally hundreds of individuals contributed to this product. We are certain to have failed in recognizing everyone's contribution. We apologize for any oversights.

The SIT Members Making Specific Contributions to This Document Include:

Aquatics:	James R. Sedell, Danny C. Lee, Bruce E. Reiman, Kristine M. Lee, Lynn Decker, Russell F. Thurow, Jack E. Williams
Economics:	Richard W. Haynes, Amy L. Horne, Nicholas E. Reyna
Landscape Ecology:	Wendel J. Hann, Paul F. Hessburg, Mark E. Jensen, Iris Goodman, Thomas P. Frost, Carl L. Almquist, J.L. Jones, Kenneth C. Brewer, Bradley G. Smith
Social Science:	Steven F. McCool, James A. Burchfield, Jon S. Bumstead, Steven J. Galliano, Stewart D. Allen, Richard C. Hanes
Terrestrial Ecology:	Bruce G. Marcot, John F. Lehmkuhl, Michael G. Karl, Richard S. Holthausen, Martin G. Raphael
Spatial Analysis:	Rebecca A. Gravenmier

SCIENCE INTEGRATION TEAM MEMBERS



Team Leaders

Arbelbide, Sylvia J., Geologist

USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Minerals Area Management Director, San Francisco, CA.

Graham, Russell T., Research Forester

USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Moscow, ID.

***Quigley, Thomas M.**, Range Scientist

USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project, Walla Walla, WA.

Aquatics

Decker, Lynn, Regional Fisheries Program Leader

USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Regional Office, San Francisco, CA.

***Lee, Danny C.**, Research Biologist

USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Boise, ID.

Lee, Kristine M., Fisheries/Aquatic Ecology Program Leader

USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Region, Regional Office, Ogden, UT.

Rieman, Bruce E., Research Fisheries Biologist

USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, Forest Science Laboratory, Boise, ID.

***Sedell, James R.**, Principal Research Ecologist

USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Corvallis, OR.

Thurrow, Russell E., Fisheries Research Scientist

USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Boise, ID.

***Williams, Jack E.**, Science Advisor

USDI, Bureau of Land Management, Columbia Northwest Technical Assistance Network, Boise, ID.

Economics

- *Haynes, Richard W.**, Research Forester
USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Portland, OR.
- *Horne, Amy L.**, Research Forester
USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Portland, OR.
- Reyna, Nicholas E.**, Forest Economist
USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project, Walla Walla, WA.

Landscape Ecology

- Almquist, Carl L.**, Geologist
USDI Bureau of Mines, Western Field Operations Center, Spokane, WA.
- Borman, Michael**, Range Ecologist
USDI National Biological Service, Forest and Rangeland Ecosystem Science Center, Corvallis, OR.
- Brewer, Kenneth C.**, Landscape Ecologist
USDA Forest Service, Northern Region, Flathead National Forest, Hungry Horse Ranger District, Hungry Horse, MT.
- Frost, Thomas P.**, Research Geologist
USDI Geological Survey, Western Mineral Resources Branch, Spokane, WA.
- Goodman, Iris**, Research/Landscape Hydrologist
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Landscape Characterization Research and Development, Las Vegas, NV.
- *Hann, Wendel J.**, Landscape Ecologist
USDA Forest Service, Northern Region, Regional Office, Missoula, MT.
- *Hessburg, Paul E.**, Research Plant Pathologist/Entomologist
USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Wenatchee, WA.
- *Jensen, Mark, E.**, Landscape Ecologist
USDA Forest Service, Regional Office, Missoula, MT.
- Jones, J.L.**, Wildlife Biologist
USDA Forest Service, Northern Region, Beaverhead National Forest, Wisdom Ranger District, Wisdom, MT.
- Karl, Michael G.**, Rangeland Management Specialist-Ecologist
USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project, Walla Walla, WA.
- Keane, Robert E.**, Research Ecologist
USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Lab, Missoula, MT.

Leonard, Stephen G., Range Specialist
USDI, Bureau of Land Management, Resource Division, Reno, NV.

Smith, Bradley G., Quantitative Community Ecologist
USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Deschutes National Forest, Silviculture Laboratory,
Bend, OR.

Social

Bumstead, Jon S., Social Scientist
USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem
Management Project, Walla Walla, WA.

***Burchfield, James A.**, Sociologist
USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem
Management Project, Walla Walla, WA.

Galliano, Steven J., Landscape Architect
USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem
Management Project, Walla Walla, WA.

Hanes, Richard C., Anthropologist
USDI, Bureau of Land Management, Eugene, OR.

***McCool, Steven F.**, Social Scientist
USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem
Management Project, Walla Walla, WA.

Spatial

Gravenmier, Rebecca A., Natural Resource Specialist/GIS
USDI, Bureau of Land Management, Oregon State Office, Portland, OR.

Steffenson, John R., GIS Specialist
USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Regional Office, Portland, OR.

Wilson, Andrew E., GIS Specialist
USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Regional Office, Portland, OR.

Terrestrial

Croft, Lisa K., Plant Ecologist
USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Ochoco National Forest, Prineville Ranger District,
Prineville, OR.

Hickenbottom, Randal J., Wildlife Biologist
USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Regional Office, Portland, OR.

***Holthausen, Richard S.**, Wildlife Ecologist
USDA Forest Service, Washington Office, Fish, Wildlife and Rare Plants Staff, Terrestrial Habitat
Ecology Leader, Corvallis, OR.

***Lehmkuhl, John F.**, Wildlife Ecologist

USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Forestry Sciences Laboratory,
Wenatchee, WA.

***Marcot, Bruce G.**, Wildlife Ecologist

USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Ecological Framework for Management
Program, Portland, OR.

Naney, Robert H., Wildlife Biologist

USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Okanogan National Forest, Supervisor's Office,
Okanogan, WA.

Nelson, Kurt, Supervisory Forester/Branch Chief

USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Region, Payette National Forest, Resource Ecology Branch,
McCall, ID.

Niwa, Christine G., Research Entomologist

USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Corvallis, OR.

Raphael, Martin G., Research Wildlife Biologist

USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Olympia, WA.

Saab, Victoria A., Research Wildlife Biologist

USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, Forestry Sciences Lab, Boise, ID.

* = Lead science responsibilities

TABLE OF CONTENTS



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	11
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	17
Ecosystem Management Mandate	17
Assessments	19
The Basin	19
Science Team	22
Basin Assessment Objectives	22
Assessment Process	24
CHAPTER 2. ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT	27
Ecosystem Management Goals	29
Goal 1. Maintain evolutionary and ecological processes	30
Goal 2. Manage with an understanding of multiple ecological domains and evolutionary timeframes	32
Goal 3. Maintain viable populations of native and desired non-native species	33
Goal 4. Encourage social and economic resiliency	35
Goal 5. Manage for places with definable values	36
Goal 6. Manage to maintain the mix of ecosystem goods, functions, and conditions that society wants	37
Ecosystem Management Concepts	39
Treatment of risk and uncertainty	39
Risk management	39
Scales	41
Land classifications	44
Biophysical template	45

CHAPTER 3. CURRENT STATUS OF THE BASIN	47
Overview	47
Context	52
Land area	52
Population	53
Recreation	53
Forestry	54
Range	56
Threatened and endangered species	57
Water supply	59
Energy	59
Environmental initiatives	60
Current Status of the Basin	60
Landscape ecology	60
Aquatic/riparian	68
Terrestrial	74
Economics	76
Social	86
CHAPTER 4. ECOSYSTEM INTEGRITY: ECOLOGICAL INTEGRITY AND SOCIOECONOMIC RESILIENCY	95
Ecological Integrity Ratings	96
Forestland and Rangeland Integrity	97
Forestland integrity	97
Rangeland integrity	97
Hydrologic Integrity	100
Aquatic Integrity	103
Terrestrial Community Types	105
Forest and Rangeland Cluster Descriptions	105
Forest Cluster 1	108
Forest Cluster 2	108
Forest Cluster 3	115
Forest Cluster 4	115
Forest Cluster 5	116
Forest Cluster 6	116

Rangeland Cluster 1	117
Rangeland Cluster 2	119
Rangeland Cluster 3	119
Rangeland Cluster 4	120
Rangeland Cluster 5	121
Rangeland Cluster 6	123
Composite Ecological Integrity	123
Social and Economic Resiliency	124
Economic Resiliency	124
Social Resiliency	125
Risks to Social and Economic Resiliency	127
Social and Economic Clusters	127
Developing a Measure of Socioeconomic Resiliency	128
Risks Associated with the People-Wildland Interaction	130
Discussion of Ecosystem Integrity	134
CHAPTER 5. THE FUTURE OF THE BASIN: ECOLOGICAL INTEGRITY AND SOCIOECONOMIC RESILIENCY CONDITIONS AND TRENDS	137
Future Management Options	138
Option 1	138
Option 2	138
Option 3	140
Differences among options	140
Resource-Specific Outcomes	142
Landscape ecology	142
Terrestrial ecology	144
Social	145
Aquatic ecology	146
Economics	148
Methods for Assessing Future Integrity	149
Trends in ecological integrity	149
Population density	153
Risks to ecological integrity and people and their assets	155
Discussion of Management Options and Ecosystem Integrity	157

CHAPTER 6. POLICY QUESTIONS, EFFECTS OF SPECIFIC POLICY ACTIONS, AND PROCESS QUESTIONS	163
Policy Questions	163
Effects of Specific Policy Actions	172
Process Questions	173
CHAPTER 7. EMERGING MANAGEMENT ISSUES AND SCIENCE GAPS	177
Management Issues	177
Science Gaps	179
Biophysical Science and Information Gaps	179
Socioeconomic Science and Information Gaps	179
Gaps in Scientific Methods	180
Emerging Science Issues	180
CHAPTER 8. FINDINGS	181
Overall Findings	181
Landscape Ecology Findings	181
Terrestrial Ecology Findings	182
Aquatic Ecology Findings	183
Social Findings	183
Economic Findings	183
Geographic Information Findings	183
Findings for Selected Issues	183
Findings From the Future Management Options	185
CHAPTER 9. LESSONS LEARNED	187
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	188
REFERENCES	189
APPENDIX A	199
APPENDIX B	215
APPENDIX C	231
APPENDIX D	287
APPENDIX E	297
LIST OF ACRONYMS	303
METRIC CONVERSIONS	303

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1—Attributes and characteristics typically associated with broad resolution, regional assessments.	41
Table 2—Attributes and characteristics typically associated with mid-resolution, sub-regional assessments.	42
Table 3—Attributes and characteristics typically associated with fine resolution, landscape assessments.	42
Table 4—Ownership of lands within the Basin assessment area.	48
Table 5—Land ownership, by Ecological Reporting Unit for the Basin assessment area.	51
Table 6—Summary of potential vegetation groups within the Basin.	52
Table 7—Population, population growth rate, forest area, and forest area per capita, 1990.	55
Table 8—Areas of timberland in the United States by type of ownership and sections, 1992.	57
Table 9—Counts or estimates of total species biota of the Basin assessment area, estimated total U.S. species, and global diversity of organisms.	58
Table 10—National and Basin federally-listed threatened and endangered plant and animal species.	59
Table 11—Fire regime severity/frequency classes within the Basin Assessment area.	62
Table 12—Historical and occupied range and habitat status for key salmonids within the Basin Assessment area.	73
Table 13—Percent of predicted unroaded (<0.1km/km ²) area in subwatersheds (~8,000 ha in size) with key salmonid species strongholds.	74
Table 14— Current economic indicators for the United States, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington; totals, metropolitan and non-metropolitan counties, current and percent change since previous year or decade.	77
Table 15—Employment in economic sectors of United States, the Basin, and Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) regions for 1995; asterisks indicate values above the national average.	81
Table 16—Net economic value (willingness to pay) of current recreation activities on FS-BLM lands, by ecological reporting unit (ERU).	87
Table 17—Changes of broadscale terrestrial communities between historical and current periods within the Basin assessment area.	106
Table 18—Examples of species associated with specific community types.	107
Table 19—Percent of subbasins within each Forest Cluster having a net departure in terrestrial community type from 75 percent range of the historic 400 year simulation run.	107
Table 20—Percent of subbasins with range clusters having a net departure, reduction (-) and increase (+), in 400 year simulation run.	108
Table 21—Summary of Characteristics of Forest Clusters.	109

Table 22—Summary of characteristics of Range Clusters.	110
Table 23—Forest and Rangeland Clusters - primary characteristics, risks to ecological integrity, and opportunities to address risks to integrity.	113
Table 24—Selected landscape ecology related outcomes shown by future management options.	143
Table 25—Terrestrial communities for the current situation and management options (year 100) for FS/BLM administered lands.	144
Table 26—Societal acceptability for several variables considered important by the public compared for each management option.	145
Table 27—Scenic integrity classes for the current situation and management options (year 10) for FS- and BLM-administered lands.	146
Table 28—Predicted road density classes for the current situation and management options (year 100) for FS- and BLM-administered lands.	147
Table 29—Number of key salmonids or endemic rare or sensitive fish species for which the management options would conserve strong populations, prevent further declines or rebuild depressed populations.	147
Table 30—Selected elements relating the aquatic conservation strategies of each option to their effectiveness in maintaining and protecting aquatic ecosystem function.	148
Table 31—Selected economic measures for each of the management options.	148

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1—Topography of the assessment area.	18
Figure 2—Each step of the General Planning Model for ecosystem management has several parts. Because the model is iterative, external or internal influences can initiate any step in the process and the process never ends.	20
Figure 3a & 3b—Ecosystem organization can be viewed as a hierarchy. Each level of the hierarchy has both time frames and spatial extents. A vegetation hierarchy is shown in 3a and a social hierarchy is shown in 3b.	21
Figure 4—Ecological Reporting Units were used to differentiate the characterizations within the Basin.	23
Figure 5—An example of hydrologic hierarchy from subwatersheds to subbasins.	25
Figure 6a—Example of partitioning risk to ecological integrity across multiple geographic extents.	40
Figure 6b—An example of cumulative risks to ecological integrity at multiple geographic extents. Ovoids A, B, and C represent analysis and decision levels that address risks associated with those levels.	40
Figure 7—Typologies of land classifications.	44
Figure 8—Major land ownerships within the Basin.	49
Figure 9—Percentage of Ecological Reporting Unit area by land ownership.	50
Figure 10—Historic and projected softwood timber harvest in the United States and in the Basin, 1952-2040.	55
Figure 11—Comparison of historic and current selected landscape elements.	61
Figure 12—Changes in Basin fire regimes from historic to current by severity class.	63
Figure 13—Changes in Basin fire regimes from historic to current by frequency class.	64
Figure 14—Fire Severity for FS- and BLM-administered Forested Potential Vegetation Groups.	65
Figure 15—Predicted road density classes.	66
Figure 16—An example of road density categories for subwatersheds within the Basin.	67
Figure 17—Current number of key salmonid species present within the Basin.	69
Figure 18—Historic number of key salmonid species present within the Basin	70
Figure 19—Number of key salmonid species within strongholds.	71
Figure 20—The location of aquatic strongholds in relation to areas of very low road densities.	72
Figure 21—Proportion of subwatersheds supporting strong populations of key salmonids by road density class and land ownership.	73
Figure 22—Location of centers of endemism and rarity and of centers of biodiversity (for plants and animals).	78
Figure 23—Location of hotspots for rarity/endemism and biodiversity.	79

Figure 24—Recreation opportunities and metropolitan areas account for higher rates of population growth by county.	80
Figure 25—Economic subregions as defined by the Bureau of Economic Analysis.	83
Figure 26_The location of isolated timber-dependent communities within each BEA area.	85
Figure 27—Per acre market basket value of selected goods and services from FS- and BLM-administered lands.	86
Figure 28—Mine and deposit status are shown for the Basin. Adapted from Bookstrom and others (1996), figures 2-6.	88
Figure 29—Reliance on timber harvested from FS- and BLM-administered lands.	89
Figure 30—Reliance on forage from FS- and BLM-administered lands.	90
Figure 31—Landscape themes assigned to regions within the Basin.	92
Figure 32—Current scenic integrity predicted across the Basin.	93
Figure 33—Forest integrity was rated for those 112 subbasins that had 20 percent of their area in forest PVGs.	98
Figure 34—Range integrity was rated for those 86 subbasins that had 20 percent of their area in range PVGs.	99
Figure 35—Hydrologic integrity was rated for the 112 subbasins that had forest PVGs.	101
Figure 36—Hydrologic integrity was rated for the 86 subbasins that had range PVGs.	102
Figure 37—Aquatic integrity was rated for the 164 subbasins.	104
Figure 38—Subbasins grouped into six Forest Clusters.	111
Figure 39—Subbasins grouped into six Range Clusters.	112
Figure 40—Composite ecological integrity ratings synthesized the forest, rangeland, forest and rangeland hydrologic, and aquatic component integrity ratings.	122
Figure 41a—Percent of the Basin by composite ecological integrity.	124
Figure 41b—Percent of FS- and BLM-administered land by composite ecological integrity rating.	124
Figure 42—The economic diversity of each county was used to develop economic resiliency ratings.	126
Figure 43—Socioeconomic resiliency ratings are the sum of ratings for economic resiliency, population density, and lifestyle diversity.	129
Figure 44—Societal risk of human-ecological interaction: percent of the Basin with low, moderate, high, or very high risk associated with the management of human ecological interactions.	131
Figure 45—Level of risk associated with the management of human ecological interactions on FS-and BLM-administered lands.	133

Figure 46—FS/BLM risk of human-ecological interaction: percent of FS- and BLM-administered land with very high, high, moderate, and low risk associated with the management of human ecological interactions.	134
Figure 47—Percentage of the Basin by ecological integrity and socioeconomic resiliency ratings.	135
Figure 48—Proposed reserves on FS- and BLM-administered lands in Management Option 3.	141
Figure 49—Long-term trends in ecological integrity for FS- and BLM-administered lands: Management Option 1.	150
Figure 50—Long-term trends in ecological integrity for FS- and BLM-administered lands: Management Option 2.	151
Figure 51—Long-term trends in ecological integrity for FS- and BLM-administered lands: Management Option 3.	152
Figure 52—Trends in composite ecological integrity projected by Management Option.	153
Figure 53—Distribution of population density categories by area and population of 1994 and 2040.	154
Figure 54—Trends in economic resiliency by area for Management Options 2 and 3.	155
Figure 55—Long-term trends in risk of human ecological interaction BLM-administered lands only: Management Option 1.	158
Figure 56—Long-term trends in risk of human ecological interaction BLM-administered lands only: Management Option 2.	159
Figure 57—Long-term trends in risk of human ecological interaction BLM-administered lands only: Management Option 3.	160

LIST OF PHOTOS

Photos 1a and 1b—This Blue Mountain photo pair shows the change in stream, meadow, and riparian conditions between 1919 and 1992. Notice the forests in the background are more densely stocked.	28
Photo 2—The area called the Seven Devils has both cultural and recreational significance.	36
Photo 3—Forest Service employee examining a log deck with a purchaser. FS- and BLM-administered lands accounted for 46 percent of harvest in the Basin in 1991.	37
Photo 4— American Indian picking huckleberries in an area of traditional cultural significance.	38
Photo 5. Roads provide access for a wide array of uses including cold water fishing.	54
Photo 6—Production of aggregates is a common mining activity on FS- BLM-administered lands.	84
Photo 7—This young mixed forest stand of western redcedar, western hemlock, and western white pine in northern Idaho illustrates characteristics of a moist forest cluster.	115
Photo 8a and 8b. The expansion of western juniper into sagebrush-grass is evident in this photo pair showing 1920 to 1956 change resulting from grazing and fire exclusion. The photo pair typifies changes commonly found in the juniper woodland rangeland cluster.	118
Photo 9—This photo illustrates characteristics of a moderate integrity, dry forest rangeland cluster. Livestock use on FS- and BLM-administered lands is common within the Basin.	121
Photo 10—The separation of towns and cities from the forest land and rangeland is becoming less as this central Oregon community scene demonstrates.	130
Photo 11—The expansion of human habitation into the wildland setting introduces risks from fire and other disturbances. This complicates the FS- and BLM-management of these risks.	132
Photos 12a and 12b—One management tool considered in the dry forested vegetation types that addresses the role of fire in these ecosystems.	139
Photo 13—Small rural communities have traditionally been closely linked to the flow of commodities from FS- and BLM-administered lands.	156
Photos 14a and 14b—Due to wide-spread infestation of white pine blister rust (<i>Cronartium ribicola</i>), white pine and whitebark pine have decreased in moist and cold forest vegetation types in the Basin. These photos show before and after effects of blister rust on forest stands dominated by western white pine.	182

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



In July 1993, as part of his plan for ecosystem management in the Pacific Northwest, President Clinton directed the Forest Service to “develop a scientifically sound and ecosystem-based strategy for management of Eastside forests.” To accomplish this, the Chief of the Forest Service and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management jointly established the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP). The overall assignment of the ICBEMP Science Integration Team (SIT) is to develop a scientific framework, to conduct detailed functional assessments, and to generate an integrated assessment. This document is the *Integrated Scientific Assessment for Ecosystem Management for the Interior Columbia Basin* and addresses one of the three primary assignments. This integrative assessment links landscape, aquatic, terrestrial, social, and economic characterizations to describe biophysical and social systems. Integration was achieved through the use of a framework built around six goals for ecosystem management and three different views of the future.

This assessment addresses the interior Columbia Basin east of the Cascade crest and those portions of the Klamath and Great Basins within Oregon with emphasis on land administered by the Forest Service (FS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The total area includes more than 145 million acres (58 million ha) of which 76 million acres (30 million ha) are administered by the FS and BLM. Within the assessment area, the Klamath Basin comprises more than 4 million acres (1 million ha) and the Great Basin comprises more than 10 million acres (4 million ha).

In the last century, major changes have occurred in vegetation patterns, fish and wildlife distributions, processes of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, and human communities in the assessment area (the Basin). Some changes have permanently converted lands and ecosystems to something other than what was there before European influence. Fire regimes have changed in both frequency and severity; large, high intensity fires have begun to shape the landscapes. Extensive road networks have been constructed, increasing sediment production and transport, fragmenting wildlife habitat, but also increasing access for recreation users, management activities, and commodity production. Exotic plants have been introduced to the Basin and have spread widely, especially in the range ecosystems. Introduced fish and wildlife species, some highly valued, have left a legacy of wide-ranging non-native species that compete with, prey upon, or have replaced native species.

Changes in human uses of the Basin, as well as changes in values, have affected ecosystems and their management. Social change has been dramatic as scattered populations of American Indian tribes have given way to the European immigrants working farms, mines, mills, and ranches; to a diverse mix of ethnic backgrounds; and to the urban and rural dwellers of today. Human social and political institutions operate with greater variability and on shorter timeframes than most ecological processes. Local, regional, and national interests disagree about the costs and benefits of commodity extraction from the public lands, relative to other economic activity and ecosystem outputs.

Today, Federal land management in the Northwest is under scrutiny from more varied interests, each using Congressional, judicial, and administrative powers to gain advantage. Issues include protection of unique ecosystems and species, management of riparian areas and old forests, and experimentation with methods of forest and rangeland management. Proposed management strategies strive to retain processes and features important to ecosystem function and to mimic natural disturbance regimes. Tribal governments are concerned about culturally and economically significant resources. Other stakeholders are concerned about the availability of commodities from Federal lands and the protection of private property rights. Those with environmental interests express concern about the conditions in the forest, rangeland, and aquatic systems and particularly wildlife species in these systems. Issues arise from conflicting values, and often involve more than one spatial extent or timeframe. Therefore, issues play a major role in defining analysis boundaries, types of assessments, and data collection. The ICBEMP was initiated to address many of these issues as they relate to public land management.

In its broadest terms, management of ecosystem integrity is composed of two parts: maintaining ecological integrity, and maintaining the resiliency of social and economic systems. Ecological integrity is defined as the degree to which all ecological components and their interactions are represented and functioning. Resiliency is defined as the degree to which systems adapt to change.

Ecological integrity and socioeconomic resiliency are rooted in scientific concepts that reflect human values, including the normative purpose of maintaining the integrity of a combined natural and cultural ecosystem. These end-states may include some that are judged by management and the public as being “normal and good” but that may not be pristine or naturally whole. In this sense, the integrity of ecosystems is more an expression of environmental policy than scientific theory. We acknowledge that many resource managers may be reluctant to include societal issues and values in the definition (and evaluation) of ecosystem integrity. However, since

maintaining the integrity of ecosystems is a management goal, it, by definition, needs to reflect the values of both managers and users.

We assume that goals that fulfill the purpose of ecosystem management are: maintain evolutionary and ecological processes; manage with an understanding of multiple ecological domains and evolutionary timeframes; maintain viable populations of native and desired non-native species; encourage social and economic resiliency; manage for places with definable values; and, manage to maintain a variety of ecosystem goods, functions, and conditions that society wants.

Ecological Integrity and Socioeconomic Resiliency

Ratings of ecological integrity and socioeconomic resiliency are used together to make general statements about ecosystem conditions in the Basin. Currently high ecological integrity and high socioeconomic resiliency are found on 16 and 20 percent of the area in the Basin. Low integrity and resiliency are found on 60 and 68 percent of the area. The ecological integrity ratings are relative estimates of the degree to which ecosystem functions and processes are present and operating. A low rating does not, in and of itself, imply low productivity or declining conditions; much of the area rated as low ecological integrity included lands used for agricultural and grazing uses. Finally, 84 percent of the area with high integrity is on FS- and BLM-administered lands while 39 percent of the area rated as low is on FS- and BLM-administered lands.

The results for socioeconomic resiliency are somewhat deceptive. While 63 percent of the area within the Basin is rated as having low resiliency, 67 percent of the people of the Basin live in areas with high resiliency. In terms of where people live, only 17 percent of the population lives in areas of low resiliency. One should not assume that those who live in areas of low resiliency experience low economic or social well-being, just as one should not assume that those living in areas of high resiliency experience high economic or social well-being. Rather, people living in areas with low resiliency are in areas that have a low level of adaptability to change.

A few areas like Flathead County, Montana, and Chelan and western Yakima Counties, Washington, have both high ecological integrity and socioeconomic resiliency. These areas would likely accommodate and respond to ecological or economic disruptions better than other areas in the Basin. Those areas with medium ecological integrity and medium or high resiliency include Hood River and Deschutes Counties, Oregon; Missoula County, Montana; Asotin County, Washington; and, Nez Perce County, Idaho. Areas of medium or high socioeconomic resiliency and low ecological integrity are dominated by the metropolitan counties and major transportation corridors. Although areas with high socioeconomic resiliency are more likely to be in areas of low ecological integrity, it is not always true. Likewise, although areas with high ecological integrity are generally associated with areas of low socioeconomic resiliency, it is not always true. These relations are not necessarily cause and effect either.

There are several areas where human pressures may pose risks to high ecological integrity. The Basin is fortunate in that some of the highest ecological integrity for both forest and rangelands is in large contiguous blocks in areas of low current and projected human population density. The greatest opportunities for restoration activities by Federal land management agencies are on FS- and BLM-administered lands in those areas with moderate or low ecological integrity. There are opportunities in systems exhibiting moderate integrity because they are resilient and provide for ecological restoration.

Future trends in integrity and resiliency were estimated for three views of the future. These different futures display the effects of broad management actions on biophysical and social ecosystem components. Three options were used to describe a set of possible futures and their consequences: continuation of current management, management emphasizing restoration, and management centered on a reserve system. The focus was on potential responses to an array of possible management activities and future events. Projected trends in ecological integrity for the three options are stable or improving in the restoration management option; mostly stable or improving but with a small area trending downward

in the reserve option; and the majority of the FS- and BLM-administered land in the Basin is trending downward in integrity for the continuation of the current management option.

In terms of the risks to both the assets of people living in the Basin and to the ecosystem itself, we found that continuation of current management will lead to increasing risks. Both the reserve option and the restoration option resulted in trends that mostly stabilized or reduced risks. Developing strategies that actively manage risks where the interaction of people and ecological integrity are projected to increase risks will likely become more important. Even where ecological integrity is projected to improve with the application of active management, population increases and the pressures of expanding demands on resources cause increasing trends in risk. While these different management options explored for FS- and BLM-administered lands do not, in themselves, influence population growth, the ecosystems and the ability to manage change are greatly influenced by human populations. By the year 2040, the population may double and 80 percent of the population will likely live in relatively urbanized environments. Those areas most likely to experience increased risk owing to increasing human populations are northern Idaho and northwest Montana; the areas surrounding Spokane and Wenatchee, Washington; Deschutes County, Oregon; the area north of Boise, Idaho; and the area between the Flathead and Lolo National Forests in Montana.

We found that proactive approaches to ecosystem management within an adaptive framework would lead to higher ecological integrity and social and economic resiliency within the Basin. This approach would recognize the dynamic nature of the interior ecosystems, their current ecological status, and the human demands on interior ecosystems. Finally, these management options show that long-term sustainability of resources and environments, resiliency of social and economic systems, and meeting socially desired resource conditions cannot be predicted without continually assessing and monitoring results of management activities and adjusting management activities accordingly.

Characterizing Current Conditions and Trends

The characterization of historical (early 1800s) and current conditions within the Basin resulted in these highlighted findings:

1. There has been a 27 percent decline in multi-layer and 60 percent decline in single-layer old-forest structures from historical levels, predominantly in ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir forest types.
2. Aquatic biodiversity has declined through local extirpations, extinctions, and introduction of exotic fish species, and the threat to riparian plants and animals has increased.
3. Some watershed disturbances, both natural and human induced, have caused and continue to cause risks to ecological integrity, especially owing to isolation and fragmentation of fish habitat.
4. The threat of severe lethal fires has increased by nearly 20 percent, predominantly in the dry and moist forest types.
5. Rangeland health and diversity have declined because of exotic species introductions, historical grazing, changing fire regimes, agricultural conversion of native shrublands and herblands, and woodland expansion in areas that were once native shrublands and herblands.
6. Human communities and economies of the Basin have changed and continue to change rapidly although the rates of change are not uniform.

On FS- and BLM-administered lands, continuing to manage vegetation (for example, harvest, thin, and prescribe burns) at historical levels and managing individual stands is unlikely to reverse trends in vegetation conditions. In the last 100 years, fire suppression hazards and costs, fire intensity, and firefighter fatalities have doubled; insect, disease, and fire susceptibility have increased by 60 percent; blister rust has decreased western white pine and whitebark pine in moist and cold forested vegetation types; native grasslands have decreased

by 70 percent; native shrublands have decreased by 30 percent; large residual trees and snags have decreased by 20 percent; and, old forest structures have decreased 27 to 60 percent depending on vegetation type. The greatest changes in landscape patterns and processes have been in roaded areas historically managed with intensive treatments.

Overall, we found that there is a limited scientific understanding of the current status of most individual species and their specific ecology within the Basin. Numerous species may play key ecological functions in maintaining ecosystem diversity, productivity, and sustainability. At present, there are many species of plants (including invertebrates and vertebrates) that might be in jeopardy of population declines or local extirpation owing to changes in their native habitats and environments. We also found that federally designated threatened, endangered, and candidate species of all taxonomic groups occur in the Basin.

There are 264 species within the Basin with Federal listing status under the Endangered Species Act of 1970 of which 27 are threatened or endangered. Habitat conditions for nearly all species were found to be more favorable historically. Continuing current management approaches would result in more species of potential concern than would management emphasizing restoration or reserves. Management options aimed at restoring ecosystems are projected to result in only moderate improvements in habitat. Current management practices will likely result in more species with habitat declines. The overall likelihood of extirpation has increased from historic to current times and is projected to continue increasing under current management; fewer extirpations are likely if a restoration approach is used. Species that are likely in decline are associated with habitat components that are declining, specifically old forest structures, native shrublands, and native grasslands. Habitat degradation is more pronounced at lower-elevation watersheds. Core areas remain for rebuilding and maintaining quality habitat for native terrestrial species. We identified centers of species concentration, centers of biodiversity, and hot spots of species rarity and endemism within the Basin.

Salmonid species have experienced declines in habitat, abundance, and life histories. Population strongholds for the key salmonids ranges from less than 1 percent to 32 percent of the occupied range of the species. The occupied area ranges from 28 percent to 85 percent of the historic range. Declines for anadromous species have been the greatest—even if habitat conditions stabilize, fragmentation, isolation, and off-site hazards put remaining populations at risk. Habitat degradation is greatest in lower-elevation watersheds, which include private lands. Though much of the native ecosystem has been altered, the core pieces remain for rebuilding and maintaining functioning native aquatic systems. Rehabilitating depressed populations of anadromous salmonids cannot rely on habitat improvement alone but requires a concerted effort to address causes of mortality in all life stages. These include freshwater spawning and rearing, juvenile migration, ocean survival, and adult migration.

Social and economic conditions within the Basin have changed considerably over the last several decades. People and communities within the Basin are undergoing rapid change. Social resiliency varies; drier climates are generally associated with lower resiliency, such as dry herblands and shrublands associated with ranching and agricultural communities. Communities that have experienced recent economic or social disruptions are generally more resilient. Human attachment to places are important in determining the acceptability of management actions. Overall scenic quality within the Basin is high and is projected to remain high.

Overall, Basin economies are experiencing growth, especially in metropolitan and recreation counties. Regional economies are diverse and have high resiliency, but resiliency varies by size of the economic sectors. FS and BLM activities account for 13 percent of the regional economies of the Basin. The importance of FS and BLM activities varies within the Basin; such activities are of the most importance in eastern Oregon. Recreation is highly valued as a regional, national, and international resource. At current growth rates, recreation use will double in the next 31 years.

At the Basin level, consistent databases to support assessments and planning are scarce. An interagency approach could greatly improve the quality of information, and support continuing assessments that are part of the adaptive management process.

Findings Related to General Issues Within the Basin

Accessibility—We found a great deal of ambiguity about the amount of roads required to satisfy public needs. Issues include the ecological consequences of roading, and the effects (both good and bad) on different kinds of public recreation. Many people oppose extensive road closures, but at the same time support improving habitats and reducing erosion. Management strategies include reducing road densities and redesigning and improving maintenance of road networks.

Communities—Communities are more complex than labels such as “timber dependent” make them out to be. Most communities in the Basin have mixed economies and their vitality is linked to factors broader than resource flows from FS- and BLM-administered lands. In the Basin, both communities and economies associated with agricultural or ranching operations are less resilient than other community types.

Fire—It is not possible to “fireproof” ecosystems in the Basin, but the potential of severe fire can be reduced by proactive land management. In terms of social and economic outcomes, the greatest potential management concerns are likely to be in the rural/urban wildland interface. Severe fires do put human communities and ecological integrity at risk. Management treatments aimed at reducing severe fire are not without risk to ecological integrity and to communities, pointing to the need for an integrated approach to risk management.

Fish—The identification of aquatic strongholds, areas of high fish community integrity, and other aquatic information provides a basis for the conservation and restoration of aquatic ecosystems.

It also provides a basis for building effective strategies that can simultaneously benefit terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems. This strategy could include protection of high-integrity areas and restoration of areas with lower integrity.

Forest health—We found that forested ecosystems have become more susceptible to severe fire and outbreaks of insects and diseases. Reducing these risks and hazards involves maintaining forest cover and structure within a range consistent with long-term disturbance processes.

Rangeland health—Rangeland ecosystems have been affected by historical overgrazing, woody species encroachment, changes in fire regimes, and exotic species invasion. Integrated weed management strategies, use of prescribed fire, and managing the season and intensity of grazing use can result in improved rangeland health. Grazing strategies with specific objectives for riparian areas within aquatic strongholds and with habitats identified for threatened and endangered species would address many of the concerns of rangeland health related to species diversity.

Managing risk to ecological integrity—We found that the management of risks to ecological integrity involves maintenance of high integrity and enhancement of areas with low integrity. We found that an integrated approach will be necessary because risks to integrity arise from many sources (hydrologic, forest, rangeland, and aquatic as well as economic and social). Reducing risks from one source may increase risks to another ecological component. The strategy for risk management will need to be both integrated and adaptive.

Restoration—We found that there are substantial opportunities to restore and improve ecological integrity on forest and rangeland areas with 74 percent of the FS- and BLM-administered lands in low or moderate integrity. There are opportunities to restore landscape patterns, improve connectivity in aquatic and terrestrial habitats, restore vegetation

cover types and structure, and restore hydrologic functions within subbasins. There are opportunities to restore these patterns, structures, and vegetation types to be more consistent with those occurring under long-term disturbance processes. We found that opportunities exist, albeit at a different scale, for restoration in virtually every subbasin in the Basin.

Salvage—We found that salvage activities could contribute to the achievement of long-term ecological integrity by emphasizing prevention of insect and disease outbreaks rather than focussing on the removal of large recently dead trees. Such an approach would include removing smaller living trees as part of the overall management regime and emphasizing stand structure and composition at the watershed level, rather than managing at the stand level. Low risks to ecological integrity would exist from treating currently roaded areas, where companion efforts might include reducing adverse effects associated with roads. Such approaches can be consistent with attainment of economic objectives for salvage activities.

Special forest products—We found an increasing potential for conflicts between recreational, cultural, subsistence collection, and the growing commercial collection of products such as huckleberries, mushrooms, and firewood on Federal lands. Land management strategies will be complicated by the localized commercial and cultural importance of these products.

Timber—An ecosystem-based approach to timber harvest places greater emphasis on outcomes in areas treated than on volumes of timber extracted (that is, a focus on area rather than volume regulation). The implication is that the volumes and mix of species removed can become a by-product of achieving goals of stand structure and landscape patterns. Under this approach, volumes may be more variable than under past forest management approaches.