



2843 NW Lolo Drive, Ste. 200 | Bend, OR 97703

Phone (541) 647-2930

www.colw.org

March 6, 2023

Via Electronic Mail

Regional Forester, Objection Reviewing Officer
Pacific Northwest Region, USDA Forest Service
Attn: 1570 Appeals and Objections
PO Box 3623, Portland, OR 97208-3623
objections-pnw-regional-office@usda.gov

Re: Klone Vegetation Management Project Pre-Decisional Administrative Review

Dear Reviewing Officer:

In accordance with 36 CFR 218, Subpart A and B, Central Oregon LandWatch (“LandWatch”) submits the following objection regarding the Draft Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact for the Klone Vegetation Management Project.

LandWatch is an Oregon non-profit, public interest organization with over 700 members. Its offices are located in Bend, Oregon. LandWatch’s mission is to defend and plan for Central Oregon’s livable future, and it has advocated for the preservation of natural resources in Central Oregon for over 30 years. LandWatch actively participates in Forest Service proceedings and decisions concerning the management of public lands in Central Oregon. Its members and supporters live in Central Oregon, including on lands adjoining the Bend-Fort Rock Ranger District, and regularly enjoy the public lands and resources in the project area for educational, recreational, spiritual, and scientific activities.

LandWatch’s objection to the Klone Vegetation Management Project centers on the proposed action’s impacts to mule deer and their habitat within the project area. As discussed in further detail in the objection points below, mule deer in Central Oregon and across the state have been experiencing significant declines for decades. Over the past 10 years, the Paulina Wildlife Management Unit mule deer population—which directly overlaps the project area—is estimated to have declined by an alarming 62%. The proposed project would drastically impact mule deer habitat in the project area, further stressing a population in crisis.

To justify the proposed LRMP amendment and impacts to mule deer habitat, the FS is relying on the project’s “overall purpose...to improve forest resilience against large scale disturbance events such as high intensity wildfire.” However, the FS’ analysis fails to demonstrate there is a need to

drastically reduce hiding cover across the project area. The Final EA shows that the Klone project area has a predominantly low integrated hazard rating (i.e. the probability that an area will burn and at what intensity), where “most of the project footprint is in the low / lowest integrated hazard categories.”

The FS’ proposed actions are particularly concerning due to the impact the project will have on a years-long effort to establish wildlife crossings and safe passage for mule deer along Highway 97. The Highway 97 wildlife crossing projects are the first dedicated wildlife crossing structures in Oregon and represent a significant public investment in our region’s mule deer and their habitat, and particularly so for the Paulina Wildlife Management Unit population.

Objector Name and Contact Information (Address and Phone):

Central Oregon LandWatch
Attn: Jeremy Austin, Wildlands & Water Program Manager
2843 NW Lolo Drive, Suite 200
Bend, OR 97703
541-649-2930

Name of Proposed Project:

Klone Vegetation Management Project

Name and Title of Responsible Official:

Holly Jewkes
Forest Supervisor, Deschutes National Forest

National Forest and Ranger District:

Deschutes National Forest, Bend-Fort Rock Ranger District

Project Aspects and Specific Issues Addressed by the Objections:

See “Specific Issues and Supporting Reasoning” section below for addition information.

- I. Purpose and Need
- II. Inadequate Range of Alternatives
- III. Treatments in Mule Deer Habitat
 - a. Failure to comply with requirements for a Forest Plan amendment (36 CFR § 219.13(b))
 - i. The Forest Service failed to include necessary information in the initial notice for the plan amendment
 - ii. The Forest Service failed to analyze whether mule deer are a species of conservation concern
 1. The plan amendment substantially lessens protection for mule deer
 2. Mule deer are potential Species of Conservation Concern
 - b. Impacts to hiding cover and forage habitat in high probability migration corridors
 - c. Impacts to hiding cover and forage habitat in the project area
 - d. Impacts to wildlife crossings
- IV. Road Density and Travel Management

Demonstration of a Connection Between Central Oregon LandWatch’s Comments and its Objections:

LandWatch commented during both the scoping and Draft EA comment periods on concerns related to this objection, including the need to conduct a plan amendment, the range of alternatives, impacts to mule deer habitat, and road density and travel management issues. Select examples of these comments are provided below.

SCOPING COMMENT EXAMPLES

“The Proposed Action needs to identify travel corridors biologically effective to allow safe movement of mule deer across the landscape.” Scoping comments at 2

“The effects of the Project’s significant thinning, mechanical shrub treatment, prescribed fire activity, and impacts to wildlife as described in these comments will likely have a “significant environmental effect” and require an EIS pursuant to 36 CFR 220.6(c).” Scoping comments at 2

“These activities will cumulatively impact the shrub component such as bitterbrush, Ceanothus species, and manzanita. At a young age these shrub species are important mule deer food sources while at later stages they can be used for hiding cover. These multiple treatments will strongly impact food and cover components.” Scoping comments at 3

“The Scoping Notice’s Purpose and Need section states that “project purposes include providing corridors for mule deer [...]” and that “[t]here is a need to maintain cover for migrating mule deer.” LandWatch agrees that these purposes and needs related to mule deer are valid, especially in light of recent population trends as reported by ODFW. We disagree that the way to address these purposes and needs is through a weakening of Forest Plan hiding area standards for mule deer. We request the EIS include a project alternative that does not require a Forest Plan amendment, and instead affirmatively increases hiding cover in the Project area to make progress towards increasing mule deer populations.” Scoping comments at 4

“Travel corridors and the need to maintain cover for deer were only addressed in the Scoping Notice Purpose and Need. The proposed action does not address or identify any travel corridors for mule deer and instead the proposed action treatments eliminate deer forage and cover. Project design for each alternative needs to include designation of biologically sound travel corridors that meet or exceed the LRMP S&G’s by including hiding and security habitat.” Scoping comments at 5

“The Project proposes significant thinning, mechanical shrub treatment, and prescribed fire activity along US Highway 97 where there are several existing and planned highway under- and overcrossings for wildlife.” Scoping comments at 5

“It is critical that the viability of this East-West corridor along Vandever Road and the ODOT underpass be protected. Cover and forage immediately near this and other over- and under-crossings must be maintained, as well as much broader areas of high-quality forage and cover habitat surrounding these corridors, which are crucial to their effectiveness for wildlife movement and migration.” Scoping comments at 5

“The Scoping Notice maps show thinning, mechanical shrub treatment, and prescribed fire units in the area on both sides of Highway 97 that would be used by deer and elk to access the ODOT underpass and the newly-protected wildlife corridor along Vandever Road associated with Caldera Destination Resort. Those units should not only be dropped but any roads or motorized trails in the area should be closed.” Scoping comments at 5

“What are the cumulative impacts of all of these projects, each of which includes significant thinning, mowing, brushing, and burning of cover and forage, on migration of mule deer and other wildlife using the area?” Scoping comments at 5

“When the roads analyses are done for this project, the District needs to include *all* roads, including ML 1-5, public user-created roads and trails, public used decommissioned and temporary roads, and any additional roads and trails within the Project area. As the Scoping Document states, there have been many roads that have neither been effectively closed nor maintained in compliance with previous road closures. The road density standard according to the Forest Plan is no open road densities greater than 2.5 miles per square mile in summer range (WL-53, p.4-58 and TS-12, p. 4-73).” Scoping comments at 9

“The Scoping Notice states that the project area was previously treated in the Lava Cast project, and that it is sandwiched between the recent Rocket project to the north and the Ogden project to the south. Other similar landscape-wide projects have also been approved and implemented throughout the District, including to the west across Highway 97. Other Forest actions, including the Cabin Butte project, are planned to be implemented in the near future. What are the landscape-wide environmental impacts of so many vegetation projects, including many tens of thousands of acres of commercial timber harvest, over the course of a 15-year period? For example, how have populations and distribution of mule deer responded to these cumulative impacts? Over the last 15 years of multiple treatments throughout the area, how has total forage and cover vegetation for mule deer changed throughout the Bend-Ft. Rock District as a result of so many recent vegetation projects? This and many other cumulative impact questions for both

biotic and abiotic conditions should be thoroughly analyzed and disclosed in an EIS.” Scoping comments at 9

“Specifically, we request Project alternatives that propose higher basal area retention, only non-commercial thinning, no Forest Plan amendment, and an alternative that furthers the Forest Plan WL- 54 goals to increase cover habitat for mule deer to more than 30%.” Scoping comments at 10

DRAFT EA COMMENT EXAMPLES

“Central Oregon LandWatch is concerned about the amount of treatment occurring in sensitive species habitat across the project, and urges the Project to leave more forage and cover.” EA comments at 2

“Similarly, in addition to obliterating unauthorized roads and trails, LandWatch urges the Project to include more road decommissioning and to build fewer temporary roads to meet its goal of rehabilitating the forest areas impacted by roads and overuse—there should also be a clear plan for a timeline of building and closing these roads.” EA comments at 2

“All Project alternatives harm mule deer hiding and thermal coverage and forage habitat.” EA comments at 2

“However, nowhere in the EA are these specific coverage or forage areas identified, nor is a specific amount or location of retained land around wildlife corridors and the Highway 97 undercrossings identified. While the project design criteria in Appendix A identify goals for wildlife retention areas, the Project should identify a concrete plan based on the best available science that shows how mule deer will have adequate habitat to survive and flourish.” EA Comments at 3

“The Project, in all forms, would lead to “potential long-term loss of hiding cover and browse in areas of high probability migration, especially in the wildland urban interface.” EA comments at 3

“We therefore carry over many of the points in our Scoping Comment on the treatment of mule deer travel corridors, especially in regard to US Highway 97 wildlife migration.” EA comments at 3

“Cover and forage immediately near this and other over- and undercrossings must be maintained, as well as much broader areas of high-quality forage and cover habitat surrounding these corridors, which are crucial to their effectiveness for wildlife movement and migration. Even

though this point was raised in scoping, and the Project seeks to protect mule deer in the area on both sides of Highway 97 that would be used by deer and elk to access the ODOT underpass and the newly-protected wildlife corridor along Vandeventer Road associated with Caldera Destination Resort, Alternative Two and Three do not reflect these protections.” EA comments at 4

“These activities will cumulatively impact the shrub component such as bitterbrush, *Ceanothus* species, and manzanita. At a young age these shrub species are important mule deer food sources while at later stages they can be used for hiding cover. These multiple, overlapping treatments will strongly impact food and cover components.” EA comments at 4

“LandWatch is still concerned, however, with the amount of prescribed fire and mechanical shrub treatment in this alternative, and has overall concerns about the amount of treatments across the entire Project landscape under both alternatives 2 and 3.” EA at 4

“Instead, EA Table 109 shows the vast number of acres of hiding cover impacted by eight different forest service treatments, which would lower mule deer cover in the Project from 36% to 19% in alternative 2 and to 21% in alternative 3. The Project seeks to amend the Forest Plan to allow for these reductions—Central Oregon Landwatch does not think it’s appropriate to make this amendment—especially with such stark evidence of mule deer population crashes.” EA comments at 5

“Central Oregon LandWatch strongly disagrees with the parts of the Project that degrade mule deer habitat for this stated purpose of protecting the landscape from “large disturbance events.” This extends to arguments for thinning to protect against insect infestation— according to the Project EA, insects have been a *minor* disturbance type on the Deschutes National Forest from 1990 to 2011, and have affected roughly 0.02 percent of the forested area annually.” EA comments at 5

“In conclusion, we repeat what we stated in our scoping letter—a project that proclaims to implement provisions to help mule deer should be designed to increase cover, migration habitat, and promote safe Highway crossings for the benefit of declining mule deer populations. This could occur through larger retention areas where no treatments occur across summer range, and through surveys and analysis of key corridors and patches needed for increased thermal cover across units. We also believe the EA should include a specific plan to connect migration and summer range corridors to the ODOT Highway 97 under and over crossings that go into more detail than provided in the design criteria—LandWatch wants to see concrete connectivity plans to establish more of this range, to create buffers leading up to and around the Highway 97 under and over crossings, and to create a Project alternative that does *not* require an amendment to the NWF Plan to reduce mule deer cover below 30%.” EA comments at 5

“This is problematic for the cumulative effects on other projects and efforts to restore elk habitat just outside of the project area—as the EA addressed, the Ryan Ranch Key Elk Area is just NW of the Project area, and the ODOT Highway 97 undercrossings facilitate crucial West-East movement from the Ranch to the summer and winter range.” EA comments at 6

“Central Oregon LandWatch has certain issues with the methods used to calculate the pre and post-treatment road densities. The density is measured by “open” roads, but as is acknowledged by the very purpose and need of this Project, an administrative designation of “open” is not what determines the existence or use of roads within the Project area.” EA comments at 11

“Alternatives 2 and 3 propose the closure of 117 miles of roads in the project area, which reduces the density below 2.5m/m²—but how is the District ensuring these closures will be more successful than in past projects, or than what is currently on the ground now—and therefore, how accurate is this post-implementation density?” EA comments at 11

“LandWatch questions why the EA, in its environmental consequences section to the road density treatments used in alternatives 2 and 3, only uses Maintenance level 2-5 open roads and trails when measuring road density, and does not include Maintenance level 1 roads and a full account of unauthorized roads.⁴⁹As discussed, these roads are still accessible to the public, can still be accessed by the Forest Service, and thus do not serve the WL-54 objectives of protecting mule deer habitat, nor do they help protect other sensitive species habitat from fragmentation.” EA comments at 11

“The District must provide a true and accurate accounting of road densities in the project area that includes roads that are physically open on the ground (ML 1 roads and temporary roads) and not just roads that are “administratively” open pursuant to the Travel Management Rule and Motor Vehicle Use Maps (ML 2-5 roads)—a failure to accurately inventory and assess road densities on the ground in the project area runs afoul of NEPA’s requirement to disclose baseline environmental conditions.” EA comments at 11

“Further, to actually meet the Project need and purpose of reducing road density, more roads should be decommissioned as opposed to just closed.” EA comments at 12

“Central Oregon Landwatch believes that due to the large project size and range of species impacted, the Bend- Fort Rock Ranger District should have conducted an EIS, not an EA.” EA comments at 12

Suggested Remedies that would Solve the Objection:

LandWatch asks the U.S. Forest Service to adopt and incorporate the following changes to the proposed project.

- Conduct an Environmental Impact Statement or revise the Environmental Assessment to consider a reasonable range of viable alternatives, including at least one alternative that does not amend the Deschutes National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan
- Conduct an Environmental Impact Statement or revise the Environmental Assessment to include the proper CFR § 219.13(b) procedures, analysis and plan components, in order to provide appropriate mule deer habitat protections
- Retain 30% cover in high probability migration corridors
- Where mule deer cover is below 30% in high probability migration corridors, do not reduce cover further and develop a restoration plan to restore hiding cover to 30%
- Significantly increase the miles of road decommissioning through road obliteration to meet Species of Conservation Concern specific plan component objectives in areas where 30% hiding cover isn't currently present and cannot be restored or promoted
- Retain and promote 50% hiding cover in at least a .5-mile radius from existing and planned wildlife crossings along Highway 97 near mileposts 154, 156, and 157
- Recalculate road densities based on whether ML 1-5 roads, temporary roads, and illegal user-created roads within the project area are physically open or closed to public motorized use
- Incorporate additional measures to physically prevent public use of closed and decommissioned roads

Request for Meeting to Discuss Resolution:

LandWatch requests a meeting to discuss the issues raised in this objection and potential resolutions.

Specific Issues and Supporting Reasoning

I. PURPOSE AND NEED

The Final Environmental Assessment (“FEA” or “Final EA”) purpose and need for action includes “providing corridors for mule deer adjacent to the wildlife crossings.”¹ The FEA goes on to describe the need to “[m]aintain cover for migrating mule deer in relation to the wildlife crossings being constructed as part of the Oregon Department of Transportation U.S. Highway 97 Widening Project (USDA FS 1990a, pages 4-2 and 4-58 to 4-59).”²

However, the FEA fails to articulate a rational connection between the facts found and the conclusion made. *Mtr. Vehicle Mfrs. Ass’n v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983) (The agency must “articulate a satisfactory explanation for its action including a rational connection between the facts found and the choice made.”)

The Forest Service’s (“FS”) proposed actions within the Klone project area will significantly impact mule deer habitat, including the cover for migrating mule deer using wildlife crossings along Highway 97. Particularly relevant here are findings from the Deschutes Collaborative Forest Partnership’s (“DCFP”) 10-Year Monitoring Report related to forest restoration treatments and their impacts to deer and elk habitat. In that report, the DCFP states that “[p]ost-treatment monitoring data show that deer hiding and thermal cover have declined on DCFP project areas, particularly on the Sisters Area Fuels Reduction (SAFR), Melvin Butte, and West Bend projects. Similarly, elk habitat has been significantly decreased in the Ryan Ranch Key Elk Habitat Area on the West Bend project. These findings were not unexpected but, combined with recent research showing dramatic declines in mule deer populations in Central Oregon, they may make elk and deer habitat a higher priority for the DCFP in coming years.”³ While the Klone Project falls outside the DCFP geographic area of interest, the 10-year monitoring report’s findings about the impacts of fuel-centric forest management on mule deer habitat on the Deschutes National Forest (“DNF”) are particularly relevant to meeting the Klone Project’s purpose and need.

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (“ODFW”), the state agency whose mission is to “protect and enhance Oregon’s fish and wildlife and their habitats for use and enjoyment by present and future generations,” recommended in their comments on the Draft EA to retain at least 50% cover in areas adjacent to the wildlife crossing structures. ODFW also requested retaining more than twice the hiding cover in high probability deer migration corridors than what

¹ Klone Final EA p 3

² Klone Final EA p 4

³ Caligiuri, P., Dean, A., Ferriell, J., Fisher, M., Gregg, M., Gritzner, J., Turner, L. 2020. Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project: A Decade of Learning, 10-Year Monitoring Report. Retrieved from Bend, OR p 7

is proposed in the FEA, to support an important mule deer migration corridor,⁴ including those deer that successfully utilize the Highway 97 wildlife crossings.

The proposed reduction in cover near the highway crossing structures, and within high probability migration corridors, would dramatically impact the years-long effort to establish wildlife crossings and safe passage for mule deer along Highway 97. As stated by the FS in the EA “[i]t is expected... that hiding cover would be deficient in these stands with fuels treatments for at least 20-30 years after the initial logging”⁵ and there is “potential long-term loss of hiding cover and browse in areas of high probability migration, especially in the wildland urban interface.”⁶ The Highway 97 crossing projects are the first dedicated crossing structures in Oregon and represent a significant public investment in our region’s mule deer and their habitat, and particularly for the Paulina Wildlife Management Unit’s population. To date, millions of dollars have been invested in project development and implementation, in addition to significant in-kind contributions from academic institutions, conservation partners and the public to ensure these projects are a success.

The project will drastically reduce and/or eliminate mule deer hiding and thermal cover for the next several decades, jeopardizing the viability of the mule deer population in the project area and the public’s investment in the Highway 97 wildlife crossings. These facts fail to support the choice made.

SUGGESTED REMEDIES

- Retain and promote 50% hiding cover in at least a .5-mile radius from existing and planned wildlife crossings along Highway 97 near mileposts 154, 156, and 157
- Retain 30% cover in high probability migration corridors
- Where mule deer cover is below 30% in high probability migration corridors, do not reduce cover further and develop a restoration plan to restore hiding cover to 30%

II. INADEQUATE RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES

NEPA requires federal agencies to “study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action.” 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(E). “[C]onsideration of alternatives is critical to the goals of NEPA even where a proposed action does not trigger the EIS process.” *Bob Marshall Alliance v. Hodel*, 852 F.2d 1223, 1228–29 (9th Cir. 1988).

⁴ [Coe, P.K., Nielson, R.M., Jackson, D.H., Cupples, J.B., Seidel, N.E., Johnson, B.K., Gregory, S.C., Bjornstrom, G.A., Larkins, A.N. and Speten, D.A., 2015. Identifying migration corridors of mule deer threatened by highway development. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 39\(2\), pp.256-267.](#)

⁵ Klone Final EA 2023, p 235

⁶ Klone Final EA 2023, Table 64: Findings summary table for all Management Indicator Species, Birds of Conservation Concern, and Landbird Focal Species, p 136

Courts have consistently described that an agency's failure to consider a reasonable alternative is fatal to its NEPA analysis. "The existence of a viable, but unexamined alternative renders an environmental impact statement inadequate." *W. Watersheds Proj. v. Abbey*, 719 F.3d 1035, 1050 (9th Cir. 2013) (quoting *Westlands Water Dist. v. US. Dep't of Interior*, 376 F.3d 853, 868 (9th Cir. 2004)). Viable alternatives are feasible, meet the stated goals of the project, or are reasonably related to the purposes of the project. *See W. Watersheds Proj.*, 719 F.3d at 1052 ("Feasible alternatives should be considered in detail."). Similarly, where an agency considered only a no-action alternative along with "two virtually identical alternatives," the agency "failed to consider an adequate range of alternatives." *Muckleshoot Indian Tribe*, 177 F.3d at 813.

Here, the FS essentially considered only an action alternative and a no action alternative with regard to mule deer hiding cover. Although NEPA "does not impose a numerical floor on alternatives to be considered," an environmental review that considers only two reasonable alternatives will rarely satisfy the statute's "hard look" standard. *Native Ecosystems Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 428 F.3d 1233 (9th Cir. 2005) (consideration of only a preferred alternative and a no-action alternative in an EA was acceptable under the unique facts of that case).

In this instance, considering the stated purposes and goals of the proposed project to maintain cover for migrating mule deer, the all-or-nothing approach presented by the FS with regard to a plan amendment to lower mule deer hiding cover cannot be considered reasonable. The two action alternatives both require a plan amendment to reduce hiding cover for mule deer within the project area and are almost identical in acres treated across the project area (*See* Table 136 in the Final EA, which shows the vast number of acres of hiding cover impacted by FS treatments, lowering mule deer cover in the Project area from 36% to 19% in alternative 2 and to 21% in alternative 3).⁷ Here, the FS failed to consider the viable alternative of not conducting a plan amendment to lower mule deer hiding cover, an alternative that is reasonably related to the purposes of the project. This is especially true given that the areas with moderate and high hazard categories (e.g. fire risk) are in the south central and southeast part of the project, and largely do not overlap with the high use areas for mule deer.⁸ Further, there is no alternative that considered retaining cover at or above the DNF Land and Resource Management Plan ("LRMP") standard and guideline ("S&G") WL-54-Vegetation Management for Deer within high probability migration corridors; critically important areas to mule deer and the success of the Highway 97 crossing structures.

In sum, the FS' consideration of only one no-action alternative and one action alternative for managing mule deer cover under the LRMP WL-54 does not satisfy NEPA's bare minimum requirement for a reasonable discussion of all viable alternatives.

⁷ Klone Final EA p 237

⁸ Klone Final EA 2023, p 66

SUGGESTED REMEDIES

- Conduct an Environmental Impact Statement or revise the Environmental Assessment to consider a reasonable range of viable alternatives, including at least one action alternative that does not amend the Deschutes National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.

III. TREATMENTS IN MULE DEER HABITAT

a. Failure to comply with requirements for a Forest Plan amendment (36 CFR § 219.13(b))

The FS failed to comply with 36 CFR § 219.13(b) to amend the DNF LRMP S&G WL-54-Vegetation Management for Deer. WL-54 is part of forest-wide S&Gs for mule deer in the DNF LRMP, stating that big game hiding cover in summer range must be “present over at least 30 percent of National Forest System land in each implementation unit.”⁹ The amendment to the LRMP seeks to reduce hiding cover below 30% in the Klone project area for the Sugar Pine Butte-Little Deschutes River Subwatershed implementation unit.¹⁰

A plan amendment to a management unit of the DNF LRMP—even if it’s a project-specific—must comply with 36 CFR § 219.13(b).¹¹ In the Klone project planning process, the FS failed to apply CFR § 219.13(b)(1)-(6) to its proposed plan amendment. We ask that the FS revise the Final EA to include the proper CFR § 219.13(b) procedures, analysis and plan components, in order to provide appropriate mule deer habitat protections.

i. The Forest Service failed to include necessary information in the initial notice for the plan amendment

CFR § 219.13(b)(2) requires:

The responsible official must include information in the initial notice for the amendment ([§ 219.16\(a\)\(1\)](#)) about which substantive requirements of [§§ 219.8](#) through [219.11](#) are likely to be directly related to the amendment ([§ 219.13\(b\)\(5\)](#)).¹²

⁹ Klone Final EA 2023, p 8; DNF LRMP, Mule Deer Outside of Deer Management Area 7 (Summer Range), Vegetation Management for Deer, WL-54 ([Forest Plan 4-58](#))

¹⁰ Klone Final EA 2023, p 8;

¹¹ [36 C.F.R. § 219.13\(a\)](#), Plan amendment and administrative changes, (a) plan amendment. “...a plan amendment is required to add, modify, or remove one or more plan components, or to change how or where one or more plan components apply to all or part of the plan area (including management areas or geographic areas)”

¹² [36 C.F.R. § 219.13\(b\)\(2\)](#)

As discussed in section ii below, the Klone project plan amendment directly relates to the substantive requirements of § 219.9, as the amendment seeks to reduce mule deer summer range cover below the minimum requirement, directly impacting already declining mule deer populations in the Klone project area. The FS failed to include which substantive requirements of § 219.9 were likely to be directly related to the WL-54 plan amendment in its initial plan notice. Therefore, the FS did not comply with this section of the regulation.

ii. The Forest Service failed to analyze whether mule deer are a species of conservation concern

The Responsible Official (“RO”) for the Klone project should have determined whether mule deer are a potential species of conservation concern (“SCC”). The analysis conducted for mule deer in the Final EA is under the management indicator species section, which is replicated in the Biological Evaluation and Wildlife Report. The analysis in these sections failed to identify the necessity of a 219.13(b)(6) analysis of mule deer as a potential species of conservation concern (SCC). Under § 219.13(b)(6), the FS’s proposed plan amendment triggers a set of procedures and classifications where the RO shall:

For an amendment to a plan developed or revised under a prior planning regulation, if species of conservation concern (SCC) have not been identified for the plan area and if scoping or NEPA effects analysis for the proposed amendment reveals substantial adverse impacts to a specific species, **or if the proposed amendment would substantially lessen protections for a specific species**, the responsible official **must determine whether such species is a potential SCC**, and if so, **apply section [§ 219.9\(b\)](#)** with respect to that species as if it were an SCC.¹³

(emphasis added). In the Klone project, the proposed plan amendment would reduce hiding cover below 30% for National Forest lands within the Sugar Pine Butte-Little Deschutes River Subwatershed implementation unit, substantially lessening protections for mule deer. Section (1) below lays out how this amendment substantially lessens mule deer protection, and section (2) below shows how mule deer are a potential SCC. The Forest Service must conduct and document this analysis in a Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) or at the very least, a revised EA, and then walk through section [§ 219.9\(b\)\(1\)](#) to create plan components to create plan-specific protection for mule deer and their habitat in the Klone project area, that go much further than current Project Design Criteria.

LandWatch has continually stated its concerns about and opposition to the Forest Plan amendment through the NEPA process. Including that “Landwatch does not think it’s

¹³ [36 C.F.R. § 219.13\(b\)\(6\)](#)

appropriate to make this amendment—especially with such stark evidence of mule deer population crashes” that “[a]ll Project alternatives harm mule deer hiding and thermal coverage and forage habitat” and that the FS must “create a Project alternative that does *not* require an amendment to the [forest] Plan to reduce mule deer cover below 30%.” Yet, the FS has persisted in proposing a plan amendment.

1. The plan amendment substantially lessens protection for mule deer

There is ample evidence that the proposed amendment would substantially lessen protections for mule deer. The FS and state agencies have been on alert about mule deer decline for over a decade, with ODFW initiating a specific Oregon Mule Deer Initiative (“MDI”) process to address factors that impact mule deer and contribute to their decline. The MDI restoration projects that took place in Oregon from 2015-2019 unfortunately had little impact on mule deer population decline. Two of the conclusions from the MDI studies were that recovery of mule deer at a landscape scale will take time, and that mule deer suffer from disturbance management, among other factors like drought and climate change.¹⁴ The proposed plan amendment will exacerbate both of these problems by conducting extensive “disturbance management” activities that will significantly reduce the availability of essential forage species, hiding and thermal cover, and essential migration corridors in the project area for decades to come. This is in direct contradiction to the MDI’s restoration and recovery goals.

In the Klone project area, the overall hiding cover would be reduced to 21% cover throughout the project area, and down to just 13% cover in high probability migration corridors—both of which are significantly below the DNF LRMP’s 30% *minimum* standard for summer range cover.¹⁵ The reduction would occur through very heavy treatments—in scale, in the number of treatments, and in combining different treatments—which together have long term consequences for mule deer habitat in the project area. The plan proposes 844 acres of understory logging, 751 acres of mowing/ mastication, 637 acres of underburning, 475 acres of mow/burn, 798 acres of pile/burn, and 205 acres of pile/creep, and 444 acres of treatments in kipukas.¹⁶ The amount and combination of these treatments greatly degrades mule deer habitat, even as the Paulina Wildlife Management Unit population numbers struggle. As the Final EA states “[t]his loss of hiding cover within the project area would increase the potential for disturbance to deer from vehicles and other motorized use, poaching, and predation.”¹⁷

¹⁴ [Oregon Mule Deer Initiative](#), Five Year Summary 2015-2019, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, p i

¹⁵ Klone Final EA 2023, 2.2.3. Forest Plan Amendment, p 18: “Under alternative 2 the hiding cover across the Klone project area would be at 19 percent as opposed to 21 percent in alternative 3;” Klone Draft Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact, p 7: “Implementation of alternative 3 will treat around 1,270 acres (44%) of hiding cover within high probability migration corridors, dropping hiding cover to 13 percent”

¹⁶ Klone Final EA 2023, *Table 134. Summary of activities affecting habitat in mapped mule deer hiding cover by alternative*, p 234

¹⁷ Klone Final EA 2023, p 234

Further, the proposed treatments result in not just a temporary harm (in order to meet disturbance management goals), but rather a long-term loss of cover that impacts the viability of the mule deer population in the project area. The Final EA concedes that the combination of treatments double or triple the habitat recovery time for hiding cover than if just one treatment type was applied. The EA states “[i]t is expected... that hiding cover would be deficient in these stands with fuels treatments for at least 20-30 years after the initial logging.”¹⁸ Further, the Final EA states there is “potential long-term loss of hiding cover and browse in areas of high probability migration, especially in the wildland urban interface.”¹⁹ ODFW’s biologists, in commenting on the Draft EA, called the reduction of cover “a drastic loss of habitat functionality.”²⁰

The Final EA concludes that despite these losses, there is a “small negative impact, continued viability [of mule deer] is expected across the DNF.” This viability analysis, however, is the wrong scale for the SCC analysis, which must look at impacts and solutions *within the plan area*, not forest-wide. Further, under NEPA the agency has a duty to disclose and consider *site-specific* impacts. See *Anderson v. Evans*, 314 F.3d 1006 (9th Cir. 2002); cf. *Pac. Coast Fed’n of Fishermen’s Ass’ns v. NMFS*, 265 F.3d 1028, 1037 (9th Cir. 2001) (agency cannot “minimize” impacts by simply adopting a scale of analysis so broad that it marginalizes the site-specific impact of the activity on ecosystem health). The loss of habitat and habitat functionality, and the duration of this loss allowed through the plan amendment, substantially lessen protections for mule deer.

2. Mule deer are potential Species of Conservation Concern

As the proposed plan amendment would substantially lessens protections for mule deer, the Klone project RO must assess whether mule deer are a potential Species of Conservation Concern (“SCC”). The FS failed to document the completion of an SCC analysis in the Final EA or elsewhere. If the FS had completed the analysis, as discussed below, the FS would have concluded that mule deer qualify as an SCC.

SCCs are defined as:

a species, other than federally recognized threatened, endangered, proposed, or candidate species, that is known to occur in the plan area and for which the regional forester has determined that the **best available scientific information**

¹⁸ Klone Final EA 2023, p 235

¹⁹ Klone Final EA 2023, Table 64: Findings summary table for all Management Indicator Species, Birds of Conservation Concern, and Landbird Focal Species, p 136

²⁰ Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, “Re: Klone Project #57735,” comments on the Klone Vegetation Management Project (Project) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA), Dec. 9, 2021

indicates substantial concern about the species' capability to persist over the long-term in the plan area.²¹

(emphasis added). The data from the Final EA, the Wildlife Report, and ODFW clearly show that there is a substantial concern about mule deer's ability to persist over the long term in the plan area. The Paulina Wildlife Management Unit is within the DNF's jurisdiction, directly overlapping the project area (see attachment A). As LandWatch stated in our comments on the Draft EA, ODFW's mule deer population management objective ("MO") for the Paulina Wildlife Management Unit is 16,500 individuals, yet in 2016, the population was estimated to be 8,216, and by 2018 had dropped to 5,918, less than 36% of the MO.²² In ODFW's comments on the Draft EA, the state's biologists reported that between 2018-2021, the Paulina herd is estimated to have declined by 30%, equating to roughly a 10% decline in the population every year. The latest estimate for the Paulina Unit—an estimate that is recorded by ODFW every 3 years—was just 4097 individuals, 25% of the 16,500 population MO. This is an astounding 62% decline in the population in less than 10 years (see Figure 1).

Paulina Wildlife Management Unit 35 Mule Deer Population Estimates										
Year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Population Estimate	10700	7920	8126	8126	7262	5918	5918	5918	4097	4097

Figure 1. Paulina Wildlife Management Unit 35 mule deer population estimates between 2013 and 2022.

Further, ODFW did an analysis of ~500 collared deer and found that 65 percent of the project area has medium-high or high probability of mule deer migration.²³ Lowering cover to 13% in known migration areas for 20-30 years would have a significant impact on the mule deer population's ability to successfully disperse and migrate, further impacting persistence over the long term.

The Final EA states "the conservation status based on the NatureServe ranking indicate the mule deer is secure globally, nationally, and state-wide (USDA FS 2012I)." However, it then acknowledges that "the overall trend for mule deer populations for the state of Oregon and the

²¹ [36 CFR § 219.9\(c\)](#), *Species of conservation concern*.

²² https://www.dfw.state.or.us/resources/hunting/big_game/controlled_hunts/docs/hunt_statistics/19/M; Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, "Re: Klone Project #57735," comments on the Klone Vegetation Management Project (Project) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA), Dec. 9, 2021

²³ Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, "Re: Klone Project #57735," comments on the Klone Vegetation Management Project (Project) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA), Dec. 9, 2021

Deschutes National Forest has been declining and is currently below management objectives (M.O.)” and that “[h]abitat loss, disturbance, poaching, predation, disease and roadkill are contributing factors.”²⁴ The FS addresses that mule deer populations in the DNF are far from secure. Indeed, at the subwatershed and project level—the scale that is applicable for this SCC analysis—the Paulina herd is at just 25% of ODFW’s M.O. for the unit and has declined 62% over the past 10 years.

Further, regarding the applicability of NatureServe for the analysis, ODFW stated in their comments on the Draft EA that “[t]his species-wide characterization is not as applicable or useful as considering the population status of the mule deer herd that use the Project area. The 2021 winter population estimate for mule deer in the Paulina Wildlife Management Unit (where the Project is located) is 25% of the management objective and has declined 30% since 2018. More specifically, that component of the Paulina mule deer population that migrates through, or spends the summer in, the project area is also declining.”

The best available science for the SCC analysis is not the national NatureServe numbers, but rather the local, Paulina Wildlife Management Unit 35 population numbers for the project area. The best available scientific information indicates substantial concern about this mule deer population’s ability to persist over the long-term in the Klone project area, especially when considering the dramatic decline in the population over the past decade. The FS’ proposed plan amendment to reduce cover in the project area would significantly impact key habitat components for the next 20-30 years, spelling disaster for the Paulina population.

As such, mule deer are a potential SCC; the RO is therefore required to apply [§ 219.9\(b\)\(1\)](#) with respect to mule deer. The [§ 219.9\(b\)\(1\)](#) analysis would provide species-specific plan components to maintain a viable population of mule deer within the plan area, applying more explicit and stringent mule deer protections than the current Project Design Criteria.²⁵

b. Impacts to hiding cover and forage habitat in high probability migration corridors

LandWatch carries over its comments submitted on the Klone Project Draft EA, as the Final EA continues to propose impactful treatments in mule deer migration corridors.

Figure 27 in the Final EA shows the location of “no treatment” zones throughout the Klone project area—these zones leave more cover for mule deer, but are almost entirely outside of the mule deer migration corridor and connectivity areas.²⁶ Within the migration corridor areas, the

²⁴ Klone Final EA 2023, p 229

²⁵ 36 CFR [§ 219.9\(b\)\(1\)](#), *Additional, species-specific plan components*.

²⁶ Klone Wildlife Report 2023, Figure 27. High Probability Deer Migration Corridors and Areas of No Treatment in Alternative 3, p 204

FS states that “fuels treatments (which will impact deer browse) are proposed on 85% of this migration corridor in Alternative 2 and 81% in Alternative 3.”²⁷ The Final EA makes clear that all of these treatments will still occur in conjunction with one another and will have impacts 20-30 years into the future.²⁸

The FS acknowledges the harmful impact these treatments will have on mule deer, stating “that reductions in forage and cover availability from underburning may negatively affect migrating mule deer, especially during spring,” and further that “efforts should be taken to minimize burning large, continuous areas along migration routes and avoid burning adjacent areas during the same year.”²⁹ This type of discretionary language is carried into the project’s mule deer Project Design Criteria (“PDCs”), with language like “efforts should be taken” and other discretionary qualifiers for PDCs.³⁰ The Final EA does not provide adequate protections and/or cover in migration corridors; the protections on scale, combination, and timing of treatments should be phrased as requirements—e.g. the project will NOT burn “large, continuous areas along migration routes” and MUST “avoid burning adjacent areas during the same year,” among other requirements. This is especially true since the Final EA states that 81-85% of migration corridors would be treated under the two action alternatives—by definition these are “large, continuous areas along migration routes.”

Additionally, as stated in the Klone Project Biological Evaluation and Wildlife Report, “mule deer are traditional in their migration routes and follow the same path closely each year.”³¹ The treatments stated above, the reduction of cover below 30%, and the timescale of these impacts will therefore not only harm deer with reduced cover and forage, but will also heavily interfere with traditional migration routes. The result of these actions in migration corridors will seriously harm mule deer viability. The Final EA must be revised to provide a better balance of forest service values, by increasing required cover in migration areas, and creating more explicit project design criteria to protect cover and forage in migration corridors.

c. Impacts to hiding cover and forage habitat in the project area

LandWatch carries over its comments submitted on the Klone Project Draft EA, as the Final EA proposed no major changes related to the impacts on mule deer hiding cover across the project area. The Klone Wildlife Report states:

The proposed project effects wildlife habitat mostly through removing complexity in the overstory and understory, the loss of dead wood habitat, and loss of and

²⁷ Klone Wildlife Report 2023, p 204

²⁸ Klone Final EA 2023, p 235

²⁹ Klone Wildlife Report, p 204, citing: Eckrich et al. (2019)

³⁰ Klone Final EA 2023, p 401-404

³¹ Klone Wildlife Report, p 203, citing: Monteith et al. 2011, Sawyer and Kauffman 2011; Lendrum et al. 2013

changes to ground vegetation structure (loss of shrub habitat with replacement by grasses and forbs)... The most notable effects from this project may occur through 1) the reduction of deer hiding cover within summer range, primarily through understory treatments, prescribed burning and mowing...³²

The Final EA places the overall project area cover post treatments at 21%, well below the DNF LRMP requirement of 30% retained cover.³³ While the Final EA claims this habitat harm is justified to protect the forest from large-scale fire—a claim not supported by the FS’ analysis—LandWatch does not believe this is an accurate balance of values for the project area. As stated above, the project area has a predominantly low integrated hazard risk (e.g. the probability that an area will burn and at what intensity), with 70% of the project area in the low and lowest integrated hazard category and only 3.3% of the project in the highest hazard category, and only 7.7% is in the high category. Further, the areas found to be in moderate and high hazard categories are located in the south central and south east part of the project and largely **do not** overlap with the high use mule deer project areas.³⁴

Additionally, a study of the location of fires compared to location of forest management projects showed the probability of high severity and high-moderate severity fires affecting treated areas in their window of effectiveness was very low, concluding that in “92-98% of treated areas, fuel treatment impacts on watershed processes are not likely to be counterbalanced by a reduction in higher-severity fire.”³⁵ Therefore, the justification that fuels reduction treatments must happen at the expense of mule deer habitat, and particularly mule deer hiding cover and forage habitat, does not hold up for this project.

While LandWatch understands this project overlaps with a large WUI boundary, the current struggle of the Paulina herd must be accounted for in the project planning process and outcomes. The FS must go back to the drawing board to explicitly outline less aggressive treatments in high probability corridors and other key habitats, that better align “no treatment” areas with high use mule deer areas.

d. Impacts to wildlife crossings

As discussed earlier in this objection, the Final EA must protect more mule deer hiding cover and habitat around the Highway 97 wildlife crossings. Figure 51—High Probability Deer Migration Corridors and Areas of No Treatment in Alternative 3—in the Final EA shows almost no areas of “no treatment” around 2 of the 3 wildlife crossings, and zero “no treatment” areas

³² Klone Final EA, p 76

³³ Klone Final EA 2023, 2.2.3. Forest Plan Amendment, p 18: “Under alternative 2 the hiding cover across the Klone project area would be at 19 percent as opposed to 21 percent in alternative 3

³⁴ Klone Final EA 2023, p 66

³⁵ Rhodes, Jonathan & Baker, William. (2008). Fire Probability, Fuel Treatment Effectiveness and Ecological Tradeoffs in Western U.S. Public Forests. The Open Forest Science Journal. 1. 10.2174/1874398600801010001, p 3

around the third.³⁶ In ODFW’s comments on the Draft EA, the state’s biologists recommended managing for 50% cover within a ½ mile radius of wildlife crossings. Yet the FS failed to disclose any percent cover objectives near or within a fixed radius of the crossing structures. In the PDC, the FS does discuss “wildlife retention areas,” places where the FS would maintain a minimum of 2-acre retention areas on each side of crossings to provide security for animals moving towards and away from these structures.³⁷ Yet, the FEA then goes on to say that the “final locations and size of retention areas will be field verified,” failing to provide any assurances that proposed retention areas will be ecologically relevant.³⁸

As discussed at length earlier in this objection, the FS’ proposed actions will significantly impact the years-long effort to establish wildlife crossings and safe passage for mule deer along Highway 97, a project that represents a significant public investment in our region’s mule deer and their habitat, and particularly for the Paulina Wildlife Management Unit’s population. At a minimum, the FS must provide clear management prescriptions—including percent cover and retention area acreage—for areas adjacent to the wildlife crossing structures to facilitate wildlife movement. Not only is this critical to meeting the project’s purpose and need, but it’s also essential to the long-term viability of the Paulina Unit mule deer population.

SUGGESTED REMEDIES

- Conduct an Environmental Impact Statement or revise the Environmental Assessment to include the proper CFR § 219.13(b) procedures, analysis and plan components, in order to provide appropriate mule deer habitat protections
- Retain 30% cover in high probability migration corridors
- Where mule deer cover is below 30% in high probability migration corridors, do not reduce cover further and develop a restoration plan to restore hiding cover to 30%
- Significantly increase the miles of road decommissioning through road obliteration to meet Species of Conservation Concern specific plan component objectives in areas where 30% hiding cover isn’t currently present and cannot be restored or promoted
- Retain and promote 50% hiding cover in at least a .5-mile radius from existing and planned wildlife crossings along Highway 97 near mileposts 154, 156, and 157

IV. ROAD DENSITY AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

The project purpose and need states there are too many roads in the project area, many of which are unauthorized roads. Currently, there are approximately 224.51 miles of mapped roads, 186 miles of open National Forest System roads and 60.9 miles of mapped unauthorized roads and

³⁶ Klone Final EA 2023, Figure 51. High Probability Deer Migration Corridors and Areas of No Treatment in Alternative 3, p 51

³⁷ Klone Final EA 2023, p 402

³⁸ Klone Final EA 2023, p. 403

trails.³⁹ Including both open National Forest System roads and mapped unauthorized roads, the existing road density is 4.16 m/m²—with just ML 2-5 roads constructed by the Forest Service, the road density is still high, at 3.69 m/m².⁴⁰

To identify an appropriate road density throughout the forest and the project area, the DNF Forest-Wide Travel Analysis Report uses the National Forest Transportation System to identify opportunities “to meet current and future management objectives, and to provide information that allows integration of *ecological*, social, and economic concerns into future decisions.”⁴¹ Under Travel Management Rule 36 CFR 212.5(b)(1), the Forest Service, here the Bend- Fort Rock Ranger District, works with these reports to “incorporate a science-based roads analysis at the appropriate scale... to identify the Forest’s *minimum road system* needed for safe and efficient travel and for the administration, utilization, *and protection* of National Forest System lands.”⁴² Part of these protections include a road system that “minimizes adverse environmental impacts associated with road construction, reconstruction, decommissioning, and maintenance.”⁴³ The road system must also provide access for project management, public use, and firefighting needs.⁴⁴

While not a legal requirement, the road density set out in WL-53 Standard and Guidelines for Mule Deer Summer Range, 2.5 m/m², is the target density across the project area, per the TS-12 standards and guidelines. TS-12 states: “If not included in the management area direction, the deer summer range guideline of 2.5 miles per square mile, as an average over the entire implementation unit, is assumed. Guideline densities will be used as thresholds for a further evaluation and will not serve as the basis for assessing conformance with the Forest Plan.”⁴⁵ The FS does assume this 2.5 m/m² density in its Travel Analysis, to evaluate road densities in relation to the needs and sensitivity of site-specific wildlife habitats and population.⁴⁶

LandWatch appreciates that the FS recognizes the importance of addressing the road density issue, and proposes to close 113 miles of roads, which would lower the road density of the project area below the mule deer summer range standard, to 2.4 m/m².⁴⁷ However, LandWatch is concerned with the methods used to calculate the pre and post-treatment road densities. The USFS must provide a true and accurate accounting of road densities in the project area that includes roads that are physically open on the ground (ML 1 roads, temporary roads, and illegal

³⁹ Klone Final EA p 80

⁴⁰ Klone Final EA p 80, Table 45; Travel Analysis for the Klone EA Project, Bend-Fort Rock Ranger District, DNF July 2021, p 6

⁴¹ USDA FS 2015b; Klone EA p 3

⁴² Klone Draft EA p 3; Travel Management Rule, 36 CFR 212.5(b)(1): Identification of road system; (36 CFR part 219); (§ 212.1)

⁴³ Travel Management Rule, 36 CFR 212.5(b)(1): Identification of road system; (36 CFR part 219); (§ 212.1)

⁴⁴ Draft EA Page 9; Travel Management Rule 36 CFR 212.5(b)(1)

⁴⁵ Klone Final EA p 8; Land and Resource Management Plan, DNF: WL-53, p.4-58 and TS-12, p. 4-73

⁴⁶ Id. Klone EA Travel Analysis, p 14

⁴⁷ Klone Final EA p 80, Table 49

user-created roads) and not just roads that are “administratively” open pursuant to the Travel Management Rule and Motor Vehicle Use Maps (ML 2-5 roads).

Unfortunately, many of the ML 1 “closed” roads on the forest are not in fact closed and are being driven by members of the public. As stated in the Draft EA “many of the maintenance level 1 roads do not have functional barriers to public use.”⁴⁸ Additionally, the Klone project proposes to address the ineffective closure of roads following completion of the 2006 Lava Cast Project, where roads that were supposed to be closed are still regularly used by the public.⁴⁹

The FS also acknowledges that many of the unauthorized roads were not mapped as part of the Travel Analysis, further highlighting the FS’ inaccurate road density baseline.⁵⁰ These unmapped unauthorized roads, in combination with ML 1 roads, make the actual road density in the project area much higher.

The issues related to road density are particularly important here given the significant impacts the proposed actions would have on wildlife habitat in the project area, especially mule deer. As stated in the Final EA, “loss of hiding cover within the project area would increase the potential for disturbance to deer from vehicles and other motorized use, poaching, and predation.”⁵¹

The FS must provide a true and accurate accounting of road densities in the project area that includes all roads that are physically open on the ground (e.g. ML 1 roads, temporary roads, unauthorized roads) and not just roads that are “administratively” open pursuant to the Travel Management Rule and Motor Vehicle Use Maps (ML 2-5 roads)—a failure to accurately inventory and assess road densities on the ground in the project area runs afoul of NEPA’s requirement to disclose baseline environmental conditions.

SUGGESTED REMEDIES

- recalculate road densities based on whether ML 1-5 roads, temporary roads, and illegal user-created roads within the project area are physically open or closed to public motorized use
- incorporate additional measures to physically prevent public use of closed roads.

⁴⁸ Klone Final EA p 79

⁴⁹ Klone Final EA p 8

⁵⁰ Klone EA 80

⁵¹ Klone Final EA 2023, p 234

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jeremy Austin', with a stylized, cursive script.

Jeremy Austin
Wild Lands & Water Program Manager
Central Oregon LandWatch
2843 NW Lolo Dr. Ste. 200, Bend, OR 97703
(541) 647-2930 | jeremy@colw.org

Cc: Ben Gordon
Executive Director
Central Oregon LandWatch
Ben@colw.org

Kristen Sabo
Environmental Planner and Attorney
Central Oregon LandWatch
kristen@colw.org

Attachments (as stated)