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Record of Decision
For the Land and Resource Management Plan
Land Between The Lakes National Recreation Area

I. Introduction

This Record of Decision (ROD) documents my decision and rationale for approving the Land and Resources Management Plan (LRMP, or Area Plan) for the Land Between The Lakes (LBL) National Recreation Area (NRA). A previous management plan for LBL was developed by the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) and approved in 1994. This Area Plan satisfies the provisions of the Land Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998, which transferred the management of LBL from TVA to the Forest Service.

The Land Between the Lakes Protection Act directs the Forest Service to develop a land and resource management plan for LBL after it assumed management responsibility for the 170,000-acre area. According the Act (sec. 511(b)(2)), “The emphases in the management of the Recreation Area shall be – (a) to provide public recreational opportunities; (b) to conserve fish and wildlife and their habitat; and (c) to provide for diversity of native and desirable non-native plants, animals, opportunities for hunting and fishing, and environmental education.” During the transition period, the Forest Service was to manage and maintain LBL under the appropriate direction of TVA’s 1994 Natural Resources Management Plan (NRMP, or TVA’s 1994 Plan). Much of TVA’s 1994 Plan remained valid and has been incorporated into the Area Plan.

The Land Between The Lakes is located in Western Kentucky and Middle Tennessee, with approximately 60% of the lands lying in Kentucky. It is comprised of lands that are part of Lyon and Trigg counties in Kentucky, and Stewart County in Tennessee. It is bounded on the east by Lake Barkley, the impoundment of the Cumberland River; and on the west by Kentucky Lake, the impoundment of the Tennessee River. The Area’s northern boundary is an adjoining canal between the two lakes. The southern boundary runs roughly along US Highway 79 in Tennessee.

The area was known as the land “between the rivers” before being designated a national recreation area in 1963, and has a rich cultural history. It has been home to American Indians and for a time, the center of a once-thriving iron industry. Over the past two hundred years, a good portion of the land has been either intensively logged or cleared and privately farmed. It had some areas of open ‘barrens’ or grasslands, which existed prior to European settlement. The land was home to small towns, farmers and businesses and was the site of the earliest battles fought during the Civil War for control of the vital waterways running deep into Tennessee and Alabama. It has also been aggressively restored over time, and has gained a regional reputation for its abundance of wildlife and diversity of forest. Since establishment as an NRA, LBL has become one of the most
intensive and diverse federal recreation areas in the country and the center of a $600
million tourism industry.

This Area Plan is part of the long-range resource-planning framework established by the
Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resource Planning Act of 1974 (RPA); the
Government Performance Results Act of 1993 (GPRA); and the 2003 revision of the
United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service Strategic Plan. The
National Forest Management Act of 1976 (NFMA) requires all units in the National
Forest System (NFS) to develop Plans that direct resource management activities on the
unit. This was further stipulated in the LBL Protection Act as well. These plans are
designed to provide management direction on a 10- to 15-year cycle or as there is an
identified need to change the plan.

II. My Decision

I have selected Alternative Y from the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for
the Land and Resource Management Plan for the Land Between The Lakes National
Recreation Area. I have decided that this alternative does the best job of incorporating
the results of scientific analysis, and it responds to the concerns and desires expressed by
the American people, meeting all legal mandates and national policy, and meeting the
legislated mission of LBL. It has been only slightly changed from the preferred
alternative of the draft EIS issued in March 2004. By selecting this alternative, I am also
approving the Area Plan that describes in detail the strategic vision, goals, objectives,
standards, and suitable land uses and allocations for LBL.

My decision strikes a balance among the myriad demands expressed by the wide variety
of people affected by the management of LBL. It addresses people’s needs and desires
for this National Recreation Area. Although this decision is mine, it has been made using
the information and help of many others. Hundreds of comments were received during
the development of this Area Plan, beginning in June 2003. These comments helped
guide the LRMP planning team as they developed the final Area Plan. While the planning
effort for LBL was completed on an expedited timeline, I assure you that this decision
was not made in haste, but based upon the analysis and information cited herein.

This decision applies only to LBL lands and does not apply to any other federal, state, or
private lands, although the effects to these lands and the effects of my decision on lands
surrounding the forests have been considered.

A. Components of the Decision

The FEIS and the LRMP were developed according to the NFMA, its implementing
regulations at 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 219 (dated September 30, 1982 as
amended), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), and the Council of
Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations at 40 CFR 1500-1508. The FEIS discloses the
environmental consequences of the alternative management strategies and how they
respond to issues and concerns.
The Area Plan provides direction to assure coordination of multiple-uses (recreation and environmental education opportunities, forest health and management, air, soil and water quality, watershed, and wildlife) and sustained yield of products and services [16 USC 1604(e)]. It fulfills legislative requirements and addresses local, regional, and national issues. The FEIS discloses the environmental consequences of the alternative management strategies and how they respond to the issues. I have studied and considered the FEIS in order to make the following decisions:

1. Approval of the management direction and associated long-range goals and objectives for the next 10-15 years in order to provide for multiple use and sustained yield of the services and opportunities people demand from LBL, specifically outdoor recreation and environmental education, forest and open lands health and regeneration, air, water and soil quality, wildlife habitat, and resource sustainability. The Area Plan establishes this direction in Part 1. [36 CFR 219.11(b)]

2. Approval of the management prescription areas, which reflect specific land use, biological, physical, watershed, and social differences; and management prescriptions, which reflect a diversity of desired conditions and provide the specific information used to develop projects to implement the Area Plan. The Area Plan establishes management areas and describes twelve management prescriptions in Part 1 and displays them on the Area Plan prescription allocation map in Appendix VI. [36 CFR 219.11(c)]

3. Approval of the Area Plan standards, which serve as design criteria and sideboards for achieving the goals, objectives, and desired conditions and provide meaningful direction when implementing projects. The Area Plan contains standards that apply across LBL as well as those that apply to specific areas. [36 CFR 219.13 to 219.27]

4. Designation of lands suitable for different types of uses, including lands which are suitable for timber production; and identification of the maximum timber harvesting levels, or Allowable Sale Quantity (ASQ), consistent with ensuring a sustainable forest resource. The suitability of different lands for different uses on LBL is described by management prescriptions in Part 1 of the Area Plan. The ASQ is found in the Prospectus in Part 2 of the Area Plan. The Area Plan projects an ASQ of 9,860 thousand cubic feet for the next decade. [36 CFR 219.14 and 36 CFR 219.16]

5. Approval of monitoring and evaluation requirements needed to ensure that the plan direction is carried out, determine how well outputs and effects were predicted and help the NRA identify necessary future plan changes. These requirements are contained in Parts 1 and 2 and the Appendix of the Area Plan. [36 CFR 219.11(d)]
B. Rationale for the Decision

1. Introduction

The Area Plan is responsive to the Forest Service’s National Strategic Plan. The optimal implementation rate for the LRMP could require higher funding levels in some areas than those currently allocated; however, I believe the management direction changes envisioned in the LRMP can be implemented under current and even slightly lower budget levels. Progress toward desired conditions may be affected if significant budget shifts occur in the future.

This Plan meets our legal obligations to the people and environment that surrounds them. I want to make it clear that the Forest Service understands its special role in managing LBL as a unique regional feature, as well as a national treasure. We are respectful and appreciative of the former residents that were forced to move from the area so that LBL could be created to demonstrate how an area “of limited resources” could become a national model of multiple use management and an economic stimulus to this region of the country. The Selected Alternative maximizes the net public benefit for future generations to use and enjoy in terms of sustainable recreation and environmental education. These benefits are achieved through proven conservation measures that protect, maintain, improve, and restore the health of the forests and open lands; reduce risk from wildfire, insects, disease and other threats; provide wildlife habitat and sustainability; protect and restore unique vegetation and terrain; and provide diversity of recreational and environmental education opportunities that are the cornerstone of LBL’s legislated mission.

Through a variety of means and throughout the country, Americans have told the Forest Service that they desire the millions of acres of national forests, grasslands, and recreational areas to continue to be managed with a multiple-use philosophy. The Selected Alternative continues to provide a wide variety of uses and opportunities at LBL. I believe the LRMP is within the physical and biological capability of the land and that this alternative can be implemented without reducing that capability.

The following discussions summarize many important factors that I considered. They explain why I believe Alternative Y, as described in the FEIS, will maximize net public benefits when compared to the other alternatives.

The response of each alternative to the three issues was a major consideration in the decision to select Alternative Y. The reasons for choosing the selected alternative are discussed below, by issue. Chapter 3 of the FEIS describes in detail the effects of expected management actions on the various forest resources.
2. Responding to the Issues

**Issue #1: Recreation and Environmental Education**

The focus of this issue ties directly to the heart and mission of LBL’s existence, providing an optimum yield of recreation and environmental education while sustaining the natural resources. From the very beginning of federal ownership of lands between the rivers, both of these opportunities were determining factors in designating these public lands. As a national recreation area, LBL must balance the demands and needs of the approximately 2 million annual visitors with the environmental and ecological diversity needs of the wildlife and vegetation which draws so many of these visitors.

Much of the land that comprises LBL was transferred to federal ownership under Executive Order by then-President John F. Kennedy in 1963. In this Order, he directed that these lands be set aside as a demonstration area to show that sustainable, quality recreation and environmental education opportunities could co-exist with sound conservation and restoration practices. While some may argue over what is a proper use of public lands, no one can argue with the success, attraction and popularity of LBL and its impact on Western Kentucky and Middle Tennessee from a recreational and educational standpoint. Many of the surrounding communities are economically dependent on tourism in general and visitation at LBL specifically.

Key elements of this issue revolve around how to best manage and maintain the balance, distribution, volume, and appropriateness of the opportunities on LBL. Within these elements are further considerations for both motorized and non-motorized recreation, developed facilities, and dispersed opportunities for recreation and environmental education, and how to maintain visitor amenities or services without entering into competition with the surrounding communities. All of these facets were explored in reaching the decision on this issue.

Each alternative was evaluated as to the effect it would have on three important factors: whether or not it would support the mission of LBL to provide sustainable recreation and environmental education opportunities; how these opportunities would impact the environment and resource sustainability; and whether or not the results of implementing the alternative would support the anticipated future demand for these types of opportunities both within LBL and in the surrounding communities.

National recreation user studies show that the types of activities experiencing the most growth in terms of numbers of participants in the past ten years are the most popular types of opportunities seek on LBL. These include: bird and nature watching; backpacking or hiking; backcountry camping; horseback riding; mountain and tour biking; visiting nature centers and historical interpretive facilities; camping that offers varying levels of user services (electric, water and sewer hook-ups as well as primitive sites); and fishing and hunting opportunities. During the planning process, public comments and subsequent analyses indicated a need for change to accommodate these desires. Therefore, maintaining (Alternative W) or even reducing slightly (Alternative Z)
Alternatives Y and Z include Nature Watch Demonstration areas. The Nature Watch areas would provide two visible, measurable, and distinct areas in support of recreation and environmental education opportunities. The public has made clear its desire that LBL improve delivery of its legislated environmental education mission by creating areas that the public can observe and understand as the management techniques unfold, and monitor changes directly by comparison, as well as on the same site over time. Neither Alternative W nor Alternative X included provision of these demonstration areas.

The mission of LBL is clear and direct in relation to recreation and environmental education. We found through scoping that comments overwhelmingly called for the Forest Service to provide for diverse recreation and environmental educational opportunities while adhering closely to the mission of LBL. Reducing the availability of these amenities and opportunities to a significant degree would, therefore, be inconsistent with the mission of LBL. Of all the alternatives, Y provides the best approach by identifying that there is ample opportunity to consider consolidation of some facilities without impacting visitation, while also providing for a better future balance of developed and dispersed activities. This also fits with the legislated stipulation that LBL strive to be a “model of efficiency” as well. By comparison, Alternatives W and Z would not support this desired condition for LBL’s future, and would be less consistent with the stated mission of the Area to be both a recreation and environmental education destination and an economic stimulator of the surrounding region.

Alternative X supports the legislated mission by identifying the potential for more developed opportunities; however, this also creates expectations of higher funding levels in order to build and maintain these sites, which does not seem likely. It also does not respond well to the priority of the more dispersed, affordable and less formal recreational and environmental education activities that the public clearly desires. Furthermore, the analyses in support of Alternative X did not identify an obvious need for more developed facilities at this time.

**Issue #2: Vegetation Management**

Land Between The Lakes has approximately 157,000 acres of forested lands, or about 92% of the total acreage. The forest composition is predominantly oak-hickory. Other species found throughout LBL include beech, maple, poplar, box elder, elm, sycamore, birch and others. Most of the remaining acreage is in open lands, which are divided among grassy fields, wildlife-favoring croplands, and other dispersed forest openings. The landscape is mostly sloping, hilly terrain, with numerous perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral streams.

Under this issue, there are a number of concerns that have been raised as priorities by those involved in the planning process. Major concerns include: restoring fire to sustain
and restore fire-dependent communities, including open oak woodland on drier sites and oak forests on moister sites; restoring complex canopy structures in mature forests on moister sites, restoring old growth forests; maintaining open lands for habitat diversity; restoring native vegetation and function to riparian corridors, and controlling invasive non-native species.

The historical use of the forests on LBL, dating back to the pre-Civil War era, has left the forests without any significant acreage of old growth. Through management prescriptions within the Area Plan, the Forest Service has identified a strategy for restoring old growth over time. In the short term management efforts can create the canopy diversity typically found in old growth forests, to support wildlife associated with these conditions.

Impoundments of the two lakes around LBL have inundated the former bottomlands, wetlands, and open fields that once dotted the landscape. Current open lands were created in the most fertile flat lands remaining, some of which are within riparian corridors.

The presence of non-native invasive plants is a major concern to the Forest Service. Some of these non-native species have been identified in several areas of LBL. Left unchecked or uncontrolled they could easily dominate and overgrow native and desirable non-native species that support a wide ecologically diverse flora. This ecological diversity supports the desired recreational and environmental education opportunities as well as the wide range and spectrum of wildlife found across LBL.

In consideration of the nature and mission of LBL as a recreational and environmental demonstration area, the alternative that best addresses the issue of vegetation management and ecological diversity is Alternative Y. This alternative focuses on the current and potential uses of the forests and open lands in relation to the legislated mission of LBL. Alternative Y is innovative in several areas that support the national initiative for Healthy Forests and provides substantial benefits for recreation and environmental education opportunities, such as hiking, wildlife viewing, and interpretation. These measures, including restoring some traditional disturbance, also move the forests toward a more diversified composition in terms of forest types and structure, wildlife habitat diversity, and support for species viability.

Among the most innovative elements of this alternative are the Nature Watch and the Oak-Grassland Demonstration Areas. These areas also fulfill and support the demonstration function of LBL as a source of innovative management styles and approaches that can be used on other national public and private lands. Each of these prescriptions provides visible, measurable, and distinct outcomes that address important parts of this issue.

The Oak-Grassland Demonstration areas are designed to return some portions of LBL to historical conditions pre-dating European settlement of the area. From historical evidence and documentation, we know that much of the area was comprised of oak
woodlands: mature trees in low densities with grassland understory across rolling hilltops and upper slopes. Management tools necessary to develop these areas would be monitored and are expected to evolve over time. Oak-Grassland Demonstration areas also support the public’s demand for LBL to improve delivery of its legislated environmental education mission by creating areas that the public can observe and understand the management techniques as they unfold, and monitor changes directly by comparison, as well as on the same site over time. Neither Alternative W nor Alternative Z included provision of these demonstration areas.

The absence of active management for the vegetation on LBL, as analyzed under Alternative Z, could actually produce some results detrimental to the mission of LBL. The reduced diversity of habitats over time could greatly affect early-successional species including some neotropical migratory birds, as well as other desirable plant and animal species. The potential for forests to become more susceptible to insect, disease, and wildfire would increase. The resulting secondary impacts to tourism and visitation across LBL could result in impacts to the region as a tourist-based economy.

Vegetation management at LBL must support recreational, environmental education and overall multiple use objectives. Alternative Y strikes the best balance, and provides the most benefit for forest health, species viability, and the legislated mission of LBL.

**Issue #3: Special Designations**

The significance of Special Designations as an issue in this Area Plan stems from land allocation decisions carried over from the 1994 Plan and the legal requirements of NFMA. Under the 1994 Plan, TVA designated approximately 35,000 acres as Core Areas, to be managed under specific guidelines of the international biosphere program. These Core Areas are lands that are primarily affected by natural processes, have limited motorized access, and provide for more rustic experiences. Non-motorized activities and experiences are favored in these areas. Research opportunities are highlighted as ongoing comparisons with active management. The 1994 Plan identified but deferred the designation of an additional 7,000 acres for future consideration as Core Areas, anticipating an eventual total of 42,000 acres. These additions were to be found from within blocks of land totaling approximately 10,400 acres called “deferred areas.” These blocks were identified but never designated when the Forest Service assumed management of LBL in 1999. The determination left to be made in this Area Plan is which identified areas of deferred acres should be designated as Core Areas, and which should be allocated to other prescriptions.

In choosing Alternative Y, I have decided that the total amount of Core Area will remain at approximately 42,000 acres, the same as planned under the 1994 Plan. The areas listed in TVA’s 1994 Plan as “deferred” have been primarily changed to two allocations: Core Area lands or placed within a specific recreation and environmental education prescription. Alternative Y selects the additional Core Area acreage primarily from recreational areas that are currently managed with minimal disturbances. Historically, the management of the deferred areas has been kept to a minimum in order to support and
enhance the recreational and environmental education mission of LBL. Designating a portion of these deferred areas as Core Areas will result in little visible change to visitors and users.

By contrast, selecting the additional Core Area acreage from within general forest areas to Core Areas instead, as analyzed in Alternative X, would result in several small new blocks of Core Area surrounded by general forest areas with substantially different management prescriptions or treatments. Under Alternative Z, all of the deferred acreage (10,400 acres) would be converted to Core Area, about eight percent more than anticipated by the 1994 Plan.

This issue also encompasses the legally required evaluation of inventoried roadless areas that may exist within LBL for their potential as Wilderness. The Forest Service Handbook (FSH 1909.12, Chapter 4.19c and Chapter 7.2) identifies the factors to use in evaluating potential wilderness areas. The Regional Forester also issued guidance in 1995, 1997, and 2002 to provide regional consistency on interpreting this direction. The three steps to determining what lands to recommend for wilderness designation include:

1. Identifying and inventorying all roadless, undeveloped areas that satisfy the definition of wilderness found in section 2(c) of the 1964 Wilderness Act, including finding areas “of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition.” and that provide “outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation;”

2. Evaluating these areas to determine their “suitability” for wilderness recommendations, meeting tests of capability, availability, and need; and

3. During the development of the forest plan alternatives, analyzing the effects of recommending or not recommending the roadless areas for wilderness.

Following the steps outlined above, one area of LBL was analyzed in detail to determine if it met the roadless area inventory criteria. The area, known as the Devil’s Backbone, consists of approximately 5,340 acres and surrounds a smaller 160 acre Tennessee State Natural Area that contains regionally rare, native Short-leaf pine trees. After careful analysis of the data, the area was found to not meet the roadless inventory criteria. As a result, there are no inventoried roadless areas on LBL.

Alternative Y, therefore, best addresses the two primary concerns of this issue. This alternative designates some 7,000 acres of deferred areas as Core Areas, bringing the total acreage to approximately 42,000. The criteria used to select the specific parcels to be included considered the desire of the public for more dispersed and less facility based recreational and environmental educational opportunities.

Since there are no areas that meet the roadless area inventory criteria on LBL, Alternative Y best provides for this element of the issue by allocating the Devil’s Backbone area to a prescription that will favor non-motorized uses and less active management.
3. Environmentally Preferable Alternative

The Council on Environmental Quality has defined the “environmentally preferable” alternative as: the alternative that will promote the national environmental policy as expressed in NEPA Section 101. Ordinarily, this means the alternative that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment; it also means the alternative which best protects, preserves, and enhances historic, cultural, and natural resources.

Alternative Z has a number of environmentally sensitive aspects. It would: provide the most passive approach to vegetation management and reduce the impact of recreational use across LBL by decreasing developed recreational opportunities. Consequently, of all the alternatives considered in detail, it would have the fewest adverse human-induced effects on the biological and physical environment in the short term. However, it would also have the least amount of beneficial human-induced effects. Even though Alternative Z is physically and biologically preferable for the environment in the short-term, I believe this lack of active management would create significant long-term risk of insect and disease threats, and a loss of biological diversity over time. Alternative Y provides for a better balance of resource uses and maximizes the net public benefit while protecting the environment. It also more appropriately and directly supports the recreation and environmental education mission for LBL. It provides for thinnings to increase growth and vigor, and prescribed fire to maintain and restore fire-dependent and fire-associated vegetation and habitats. This alternative incorporates appropriate environmental safeguards to minimize potential adverse effects to the biological and physical environment. In the long term, the Selected Alternative provides more options and more positive benefits than Alternative Z.

4. Alternative with Highest Present Net Value

The purposes and principles of National Forest System Land and Resource Management Planning are spelled out in the first paragraph of NFMA: “…The resulting plans shall provide for multiple use and sustained yield of goods and services from the National Forest System in a way that maximizes long term net public benefits in an environmentally sound manner.” [36 CFR §219.1(a)] Net public benefits can be defined as the overall value to the Nation of all outputs (benefits) and positive effects, less all associated inputs (costs) and negative effects, whether they can be quantitatively valued or not.

A component of determining net public benefits is the Present Net Value (PNV), which is used to measure the economic efficiency of each alternative. A comparison of the alternatives’ PNVs is shown in Table 3-4.7H of the FEIS. As shown in the table, Alternative Y has the highest PNV of all the alternatives. Alternative X is only slightly lower. PNV includes market and those non-market values which can be assigned a price, either based on money the Forest Service actually receives for market goods like timber, or on estimated values from Forest Service research for intangible, non-market amenities like wildlife and recreation.
The Land Between The Lakes also provides areas of incredible beauty and solitude, clean water, abundant wildlife, and outstanding recreation opportunities -- all of which satisfy our spiritual needs. Since PNV does not include these important non-priced benefits, it was not the only criterion I used in my decision. Jobs contributed, labor income, qualitative factors for use, and passive use values were also considered in Section 3.4.7 of the FEIS.

I chose Alternative Y because it not only provide for today’s consumption and enjoyment, but for that of future generations as well.

5. Public Benefits

Traditionally in the Forest Service, local people working together with the local agency personnel determined values and benefits. Today when we ask folks what is important to them in working toward a desired condition for LBL, we hear from people all over the Nation and sometimes the world. Our supply and demand analyses still consider a market area that doesn’t extend too far from the national forest boundary where the majority of the impacts exist, but that does not mean we do not recognize that we have people from all over the world hiking and biking the trails, visiting our campsites, and frequenting the local communities that surround LBL. Citizens from all different points of view want us to quantify these effects. They believe that this will prove how important their favorite resource is, and thereby prove that their position is the right one. Due to the sheer abundance and variety of opinion in the United States, we in the Forest Service often find ourselves in the midst of controversy. With the passage of new laws and changing values, natural resource issues on public lands are growing more complex as demands for all these resources increase.

Our growing population, particularly in the Southeast United States, demands more. People want more “wild places” and healthy forests for recreation. We demand more lumber; desire more recreational vehicle hookups; use more oil and gas; seek more old growth forests; construct more electric transmission lines; require more clean water; and seek more trails of all kinds. We also need more beautiful places to escape the rush of the world. We have done our best to provide a balanced plan that will provide in a sustainable way, more of those things that LBL is uniquely able to supply in Western Kentucky and Middle Tennessee.

Based on the preceding discussions it is clear that Alternative Y does not have the least impact on the environment nor does it generate as many market valued commodities as other alternatives considered in the FEIS. However, I believe the alternative achieves a balance between the economic benefits and environmental issues and concerns voiced by the American people. I believe it will increase public benefits by moving LBL toward improved forest health through its emphasis on ecological diversity and through its special attention to providing a diverse range of recreation and environmental education opportunities. It also provides for a growth in visitation and the greatest economic
stimulation to the surrounding communities within the sustainability of LBL’s natural resources.

I am also confident that the management proposed in the Area Plan is within the physical and biological capability of the land and can be accomplished without reducing that capability.

C. Changes Between Draft and Final

More than 280 written comments were received, including email, on the DEIS and Draft Area Plan for the Land Between The Lakes National Recreation Area. In addition, a scientific review was conducted during the comment period. More than 20 well respected scientific professionals from regional, local and state agencies, and educational institutions participated. Many of these comments and contacts offered recommendations or requests for changes or improvements in the environmental analysis; identified changes or improvements to the alternatives; or suggested modifications to the goals, objectives, or standards. Comments received also identified the need for several minor improvements to the presentation of materials, such as extraneous information and the organization of the various elements of the Area Plan and EIS. As a result, editorial, missing information, duplication, and other inconsistencies were corrected in the final documents. Specific changes to Alternative Y and the environmental analysis beyond these types of corrections are highlighted in this section.

General Changes
In several areas of the FEIS, such as sections pertaining to management indicator species, viability analysis, and the socioeconomic analysis, additional information was added to clarify the analysis process used and the information used in comparing alternatives. Several sections identified in the draft as partially complete have been finished.

Management Area Prescriptions and Allocations
Several management area prescription names were modified based on public comments about need for more clarity. About 1,200 acres of land identified in the draft as General Forest was added to the Nature Watch prescription under Alternative Y to reflect increased opportunities for viewing, utilizing existing infrastructure, incorporating additional habitat types, and addressing concerns about hunting animals that may become tolerant of human presence.

Goals and Objectives
Feedback from the public was used to refine the goals and objectives, primarily by splitting out some key activities to provide clearer average annual objectives. Several objectives were added, primarily in Goal 5, to clarify desired conditions and expected levels of management activity, and the relationship of habitat conditions to objectives.

Standards
Feedback from the public and scientific community was used to refine the standards in the document and to clarify the sideboards by which activities may occur.
Old Growth
Old growth terminology and the use of old-growth guidance are clarified in the FEIS and the Area Plan.

Turkey Bay OHV Area
The policy change to convert the area from cross-country riding to designated trails only that was made in June 2004 has been incorporated into all alternatives. No land allocations or other resource programs were significantly affected by this policy change.

III. Public Involvement

One of the first commitments made in the beginning of this process was to develop and maintain a high level of public interest and involvement. The LBL staff employed innovative methods and avenues to relay information throughout the planning process. The LBL Advisory Board, which was formed to provide advice to the Forest Service on the public participation process, began to develop ideas and suggestions nearly two years before the planning process actually began. During this same time, the Forest Service began publication of a planning newsletter and solicited names for the Area Plan mailing list.

The Notice of Intent (NOI) “to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for an Area Plan for LBL” appeared in the Federal Register on June 4, 2003. At this same time, the Forest Service released for comment the LBL Planning Background Document (PBD) that assessed and made recommendations on the “need for change” to the 1994 LBL Natural Resources Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement. Subsequent scoping sessions, which involved small group discussions and innovative, forward-looking, “appreciative inquiry” group exercises, helped the staff begin to develop a picture of the public’s concerns and desires for the future of LBL and validated the findings of the PBD.

During the scoping period, the Forest Service continued to provide updates by mail, created and maintained a planning website with the latest news releases and public documents, and regularly added new contact names to the mailing list. Additional electronic messages and postcards were sent out just prior to release of the drafts to ensure that everyone was aware of the upcoming comment period and to offer the most convenient ways for the public to get the information, understand the process, and be involved.

On March 15, 2003, the Draft Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement were posted on the planning website to provide two additional weeks of public review as the actual public notice did not appear until March 26 when it appeared in the Federal Register and was published in the Paducah Sun, the newspaper of record. The Forest Service actively encouraged the public to participate in the comment process, which ran until June 30, 2004. Public Information sessions were conducted in communities on the four counties adjacent to LBL, with the main objectives of providing information and
guidance about the structure of the Draft documents, answering general questions, and emphasizing how the public could contribute their written comments to the Final Plan preparations.

During this time four additional information sessions were conducted in conjunction with LBL User Group meetings at three of the larger campgrounds and the Turkey Bay Off-Highway Vehicle Area. These sessions had similar objectives as the other sessions, with the added focus of dealing with questions and concerns that focused on those facilities and the potential impacts the Area Plan could have on those areas. The staff also continued to make presentations and hand out information about the planning process at various civic and other local group meetings. Comment cards, notices, and newsletters were posted prominently at all of the major facilities during the comment period.

Through content analysis, the Planning Team and LBL staffs were able to identify, quantify, validate, and respond to the comments assertions made throughout the process. I am thoroughly aware of all the information we gathered from the public, and I used it to help me in my choice of Alternative Y as the new Area Plan for LBL.

IV. Alternatives

A. Alternatives Considered But Eliminated From Detailed Study

Based upon public input, there were only three significant issues for this Area Plan from which four alternatives were fully developed. These alternatives provided a sufficient range of choices to evaluate the need for change. The process used to develop the four that were carried forward employed an innovative “building-block” approach.

In this approach, several narratives were developed as possible ways to address the three specific issues identified as needing changes from the 1994 Plan. Using public comments and staff analyses, a total of 12 separate blocks were drafted and then joined together in various combinations to form possible alternatives. During the process of combining these building blocks, those combinations that did not meet legal requirements, did not support the mission of LBL, or were outside the scope of the Forest Service to act upon, were eliminated from further consideration. A complete listing of those combinations which were not carried forward is contained in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. The four alternatives developed and analyzed in the FEIS are briefly discussed below.

B. Alternatives Considered in Detail

The key parts of each of the alternatives respond specifically to one of the three issues. This is due largely to the building block concept used to formulate the alternatives and in combination forms an overall emphasis or focus. The environmental effects for each alternative are discussed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS.
**Alternative W**

This alternative is required under NEPA and provides for no significant change from the current management of Recreation and Environmental Education facilities, areas, or opportunities. Similarly, it makes no significant change in the vegetation management of the forest or open lands across LBL. Current management options for all facilities, areas, and treatments remain the same. Individual project or program decisions would be guided by the parameters established in the 1994 Plan, as amended by the analysis under NFMA for this Area Plan.

Desired Condition: LBL would be managed to maintain approximately 89% oak-hickory forest cover. Prescriptions used in land allocations mirror those of the existing plan very closely. Core Areas remain at about 35,000 acres. Timber removals would be used to enhance habitat, improve forest health, or maintain scenic drives and the acreages of allowable timber harvest will remain about the same as shown in the 1994 Plan. Open lands management would appear unchanged except for areas of successional growth, and continuing efforts of warm season grass restoration. Environmental education opportunities would be primarily available at staffed, developed facilities, with some self-guided experiences. Campers might see minor improvements to highly developed campgrounds. Roads and trails would be maintained.

**Alternative X**

This alternative would give priority in management decisions toward highly developed facilities with very little increase in dispersed opportunities for both recreation and environmental education. Land allocations favor those prescriptions that support developed recreation opportunities.

Under this alternative, management guidance would provide for some new or improved developed recreation facilities, the possibility of reopening closed facilities, expansion of environmental education facilities and areas, and a slight increase in the number and types of trails and other dispersed recreation and environmental education opportunities. Existing developed facilities would be evaluated for improvements to provide a wider range of opportunities for environmental education and recreation at LBL. Dispersed opportunities in recreation and environmental education would focus on extending the offerings of the highly developed facilities.

Vegetation management would provide a wider range of forest types and compositions across LBL to support a variety of wildlife, ecological and recreational objectives and requirements. The acreages of allowable timber harvest would be kept at about the same levels as allowed in the 1994 Plan. Open lands and forested areas would be evaluated for realignment or redistribution of acreages based upon scientific analysis, to sustain overall forest health, support species viability, and provide wildlife habitats as necessary. Management direction for vegetation would be expanded to allow for a wider range of proven management techniques to be applied to the vegetation across LBL.
Concurrent with the implementation of these developments would be an evaluation of the fee structure for both recreation and environmental education. The quality and value of facilities and programs would be a significant determining factor in developing an equitable but sustainable fee structure. This would also factor in visitation, disadvantaged and underprivileged populations, and public demand for these experiences. Any increase in recreation and environmental education opportunities would require commensurate savings, efficiencies, or alternative procedures to stay within planned operating budgets.

**Desired Condition:** The focus would be on providing more facility-based experiences and amenities through staffed facilities designed to enhance visitor experiences in targeted recreational and educational activities. Visitation would be expected to increase, and uses would be intensified, but natural resources in heavy use areas would be hardened to withstand projected impacts. The forest would be managed to a healthy condition with reduced risk and damage from insects and diseases, invasive species, and wildfire. Vegetation management to achieve a healthy, primarily oak-hickory forest type and woodlands might be visible to visitors at LBL. Scenic views and vistas would be maintained and enhanced. Some fields might be managed for conversion to native warm and cool season grasses and herbs. Prescribed fire would be utilized on a larger landscape scale than has been used recently, to create suitable critical habitat for species of viability concern and associated communities.

**Alternative Y**

The focus of this alternative is to establish a more dispersed pattern of opportunities for recreation and environmental education. Land allocations favor those prescriptions that support dispersed opportunities. Under this alternative, the current array of environmental education facilities and highly developed recreation areas would be complemented by more forest-wide, lesser-developed, dispersed opportunities in both programs. Existing areas and facilities would be evaluated and identified for needed improvements, as well as the potential for realignment into other levels of recreational development and types of environmental education opportunities. The major facilities would remain open, but no new high-level facilities would be developed or reopened.

Within this alternative, total recreation and environmental education opportunities would not be decreased, and the mix of each would actually be enhanced through dispersion. Dispersed recreation opportunities would support and extend the reach and effectiveness of the environmental education programs and facilities by exposing more visitors to educational information and environmental awareness messages and themes. Environmental education components would be incorporated into natural resource management activities occurring across LBL.

Vegetation management under this alternative would provide for advancing the ecological diversity of LBL through a wide range of proven and appropriate management methods. While some of these methods were already stipulated under the 1994 Plan, several are not. In order to sustain the overall health of the forest, and for both wildlife habitat and an enriched recreation or environmental education opportunity, a broader
The range of acceptable vegetation management options would be necessary. The acres of allowable timber harvest would be kept at about the same levels as described in the 1994 Plan. Some management areas within LBL would be changed in order to sustain or create early successional growth, promote better open lands management and distribution, improve species viability and game species management, implement and promote reversion of some maintained open lands into young forest growth, and convert some cultivated lands to warm season grasses.

This alternative would include a concerted effort to reduce or realign the fee structure for recreation and environmental education to provide for an appropriate balance of opportunities and fiscal viability. Efforts to reduce fees would be tied to reductions in what the programs or facilities offer. Emphasis would be placed upon the quality and value of the programs and services offered, instead of simply reducing fees.

**Desired Condition:** Management activities would focus on providing more successful nature viewing opportunities for novice observers and opportunities for visitors to participate in a wider range of self-guided recreation and education activities. Areas may be redesigned or consolidated to allow for greater diversity of targeted activities, and more miles of loop trails might be created. Remote recreational opportunities would be provided in the Core Areas. Visitation is expected to slightly increase, and recreational use would be dispersed. Natural resources in heavy use areas would be hardened to withstand projected impacts and policies limit use well below sustainable levels. The forest would be managed to maintain a healthy condition with reduced risk and damage from insects and diseases, invasive species, and fires. Vegetation management to achieve a healthy, primarily oak-hickory forest type and woodlands might be visible to visitors at LBL. Scenic views and vistas would be maintained and enhanced. Some fields might be managed for conversion to native warm season grasses and forb species. Prescribed fire would be used on a larger landscape scale than has been used recently, to create suitable critical habitat for species of viability concern and associated communities.

**Alternative Z**

This alternative reflects the philosophy that, over time, less-managed, undeveloped and primitive areas would become very rare, and hence, more socially significant, particularly in this part of the country. In time, more and more people would be drawn to visit this “green” oasis. A local citizen’s group provided many key parts of this alternative. Land allocations favor those prescriptions that support dispersed opportunities and less active management.

The focus would be to decrease the highly developed recreation opportunities across LBL, as well as decrease active forest and vegetation management practices. Staff-led, facility-based environmental education activities would likewise be de-emphasized. No new developed areas would be permitted under this alternative, and few, if any, facilities or areas would be reopened. Existing facilities, services and amenities would be evaluated for potential decommissioning. Services such as rentals and outposts might be scaled back at developed campgrounds. This option would place forest-wide emphasis on non-facility based environmental education opportunities and activities supported by
the existing facilities and programs. An increase in the number of acres allocated to semi-primitive, non-motorized experiences is envisioned.

Vegetation management would be limited to those activities necessary to maintain road and utility rights-of-way, for the safety of visitors and staff, and for maintenance and access of developed facilities, roads, and trails. The forested and open lands of LBL would be allowed to develop, through natural progression, through the various growth stages with almost no management methods applied to these areas. Management activities that would be allowed would be restricted to maintenance of existing recreation, environmental education, and administrative areas that remain open.

Fees would be reduced or eliminated under this alternative commensurate with the decrease in both developed recreation and environmental education opportunities and facilities. The feasibility of reducing or eliminating fees and resulting operational changes would be dictated by the ability of the Forest Service to maintain and operate these facilities to provide a valued experience in a safe, sustainable manner.

**Desired Condition:** Management activities would be focused on providing more successful nature-viewing opportunities for novice observers with a focus on environmental education based much more on personal discovery and less on facility-based guided interpretation. Visitors to LBL would observe less noticeable active management by the Forest Service. More remote recreational opportunities would be the primary form of recreation, with fewer highly developed opportunities available. Quality “wilderness-type” experiences such as solitude and primitiveness would be provided. Many of the existing open lands would revert to forest, primarily in areas that are contiguous with large forest blocks. Forest cover types would continue to age toward old growth condition. Vegetative management and timber removal would be minimal and limited to needed activities for significant forest health and scenery management objectives. Other than critical habitats needed for Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, or Sensitive (PETS) species, wildlife habitat and associated communities would begin to adjust to that which is favored by the resulting ecosystems. Prescribed fire would be used to create conditions that mimic natural processes primarily in open lands and recreation areas but very little in forested landscapes.

**V. Findings Related to Other Laws and Authorities**

I have considered the statutes governing management of LBL, and I believe that this decision represents the best possible approach to both harmonizing and reconciling the current statutory duties of the Forest Service.

**Land Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998**

The LBL Protection Act (sec. 521) requires preparation of a land and resource management plan for the Recreation Area in conformity with the National Forest Management Act of 1976 and other applicable law.
Clean Air Standards

As discussed in the FEIS, Chapter 3, Physical Resources, Air Resources, all lands managed by LBL are currently in attainment with National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Compliance with air quality statutes is directed by law and in the LRMP, Parts 2 and 3.

Clean Water Act

The LRMP contains direction to ensure all projects comply with the requirements of the Clean Water Act. A watershed evaluation was completed to assess conditions and estimate the effects of management activities at LBL. The results of this assessment led to direction that is found in the LRMP, Parts 2 and 3. Analysis of sediment yields and cumulative effects for water quality and associated beneficial uses are discussed in the FEIS, Chapter 3, Physical Environment, Water Resources.

National Historic Preservation Act

In accordance with a Memorandum of Understanding with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, LRMPs are not undertakings under the National Historic Preservation Act. Consultation pursuant to Section 106 of the Act is not required at the LRMP level though contact with SHPO was made. As discussed in the Social/Economic Environment, Cultural Resource section of Chapter 3 of the FEIS, activities in the LRMP will be in compliance with the Act. Conformance with the Act and other direction is provided in Parts 2 and 3 of the LRMP. Additional direction is provided in FSM 2360.

Endangered Species Act

This decision is made with the benefit of extensive consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service on the LRMP and FEIS. The USFWS was a partner in completing species viability assessments and helping develop wildlife habitat objectives. They were provided advanced copies of the LRMP, FEIS, and the Biological Assessment (BA). Their recommendations were included in the final plan. The BA assessed effects to federally designated Proposed, Threatened or Endangered Species that occur or could occur at LBL. The USFWS concurred with the Forest Service's determination of effects in the BA that implementation of Alternative Y for the Area Plan is “not likely to adversely affect” federally-listed endangered or threatened species or their habitats. Further coordination with USFWS will be part of site-specific evaluations for project-level decisions.

Roadless Area Conservation Rule

There are no acres within the Land Between The Lakes National Recreation Area where the Roadless Area Conservation Rule applies.
Other Forest Service Decisions with Management Direction

There are no other area-wide Forest Service Records of Decision for LBL that have any impact on this Area Plan.

VI. Implementation

The direction in this Area Plan will become effective 30 days after the publication of the Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Final Environmental Impact Statement in the Federal Register.

1. Consistency

Under NFMA, “permits, contracts, and other instruments for the use and occupancy” of National Forest System lands are required to be “consistent” with the current Land and Resource Management Plan [16 U.S.C. 1604(i)]. In the Area Plan context, NFMA specifically qualifies the requirement in three ways: 1) these documents must be revised only “when necessary”, 2) these documents must be revised “as soon as practicable”, and 3) any revisions are “subject to valid existing rights.”

In developing this LRMP, implementing pre-existing decisions and the associated effects of that implementation were considered part of the baseline against which the alternatives were evaluated. Because these earlier decisions were considered in our effects analysis, their implementation is not in conflict with the LRMP.

Exercising my discretion under NFMA, I have determined that it is not “necessary” to apply the Area Plan’s standards retroactively, and I find that NFMA does not require revision of pre-existing use and occupancy authorizations. As soon as practicable after approval of the LRMP, the Area Supervisor shall ensure that, subject to valid existing rights, all outstanding and future permits, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other instruments for occupancy and use of affected lands are consistent with the LRMP. On a case-by-case basis, the Area Supervisor shall exercise his/her sound discretion in determining when such consistency is practicable.

“Use and occupancy” agreements include contracts for timber harvesting. Most timber sale decisions are implemented through a three-year contract. While a timber sale contract is a valid existing right, the terms of the contract allow modification. Therefore, modification of a timber contract under its terms would not violate the “valid existing right” provision. Nevertheless, I have decided not to modify any existing timber contracts solely due to the LRMP. As stated earlier, these contracts were considered part of the baseline against which the alternatives evaluated. The decision will be left to the Area Supervisor to determine whether to modify any decisions authorizing timber sales not currently under contract. Other classes of “use and occupancy” agreements will be reviewed to determine whether or when the Area Supervisor should exercise discretion to bring them into compliance with the LRMP.
2. Site-Specific Analysis

The Area Supervisor will accomplish many management activities to implement the LRMP. These activities are site-specific and may require analysis and disclosure of effects under NEPA prior to project implementation.

Forest plans are permissive in that they allow, but do not mandate, the occurrence of certain activities. Site-specific analysis of proposed activities will determine what can be accomplished. The outputs specified in the LRMP are estimates and projections based on available information, inventory data, and assumptions.

All activities, many of which are interdependent, may be affected by annual budgets. However, the goals, objectives, standards, management prescriptions, and monitoring questions described in the LRMP may not change unless the LRMP is amended.

3. Amendment and Revision

The LRMP will be amended or revised to adjust to changing circumstances. For example, the management goals, objectives, and standards stated for the Land Between The Lakes National Recreation Area in the Area Plan may, in the near future, be in need of updating or amending as a result of later assessments or analyses. The amendment process gives us the flexibility to adapt the decisions made today to the realities of tomorrow. We will provide opportunities for the public to be involved in future changes to the LRMP.

The LRMP is a dynamic instrument that can be changed with appropriate public involvement and analysis. Through the life of the LRMP, amendments may be needed to incorporate new information, new policy and direction, or changing values and resource conditions. Amendments will keep the LRMP current, relevant, and responsive to agency and public concerns. The LRMP also can be amended for specific projects if during project design it is determined that the best method of meeting goals and objectives conflicts with existing plan direction.

Amendments may be significant or non-significant. The Area Supervisor may implement non-significant amendments to the LRMP after appropriate public involvement and environmental analysis. The Regional Forester approves significant amendments.

4. Monitoring and Evaluation

The monitoring and evaluation program is the quality-control system for a LRMP. This program is described in Part 2, “Monitoring and Evaluation,” of the LRMP and in the Appendix. Monitoring and evaluation is emphasized in this Area Plan, and will provide us with information on the progress that we are making toward the area-wide goals and objectives. This information will be evaluated and used to update inventory data, to improve current and future mitigation measures, and to assess the need for amending or revising the LRMP. Evaluation of monitoring results is directly linked to the decision
maker’s ability to respond to changing conditions, emerging trends, public concerns, and new information and technology. No single monitoring item or parameter automatically triggers a change in LRMP direction. An interdisciplinary approach is used to evaluate information and decide what changes are needed.

Specific monitoring questions are identified and directly linked to LRMP goals, desired conditions, objectives, standards, and specific regulatory requirements. Not every goal, objective, and standard can be monitored. Relevancy to issues, compliance with legal and agency policy, scientific credibility, administrative feasibility, long- and short-term budget considerations, and impact on workforce all influence monitoring priorities.

Each monitoring question has one or more identified monitoring measures to aid in answering the question. These items are used to develop specific details, priorities, and budgeting that will be needed to answer the monitoring questions. The measures, methods of collection, and frequency are not part of my decision, and changes to these items will not require an amendment to the Area Plan.

Public participation is vital as we monitor our progress. We will work with partners and cooperators in developing and carrying out monitoring activities. Activities, findings, and results will be evaluated, and reports will be available for the public at least annually. The public may review the results and recommend changes based on monitoring findings.

VII. Appeal Information

This decision is subject to administrative review pursuant to 36 CFR 217. A written appeal of this decision must be filed in duplicate within 90 days of the date of the published legal notice. Appeals must be filed with:

USDA Forest Service
Attn: NFS-EMC Staff (Barbara Timberlake)
Stop Code 1104
1400 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20250-1104

Any notice of appeal must be fully consistent with 36 CRF 217.9 and include at a minimum:

- A statement that the document is a Notice of Appeal filed pursuant to 36 CFR part 217;
- The name, address, and telephone number of the appellant;
- Identification of the decision to which the appeal is being made;
- Identification of the decision in which the decision is contained, by title and subject, date of the decision, and name and title of the Deciding Officer;
- Identification of the specific portion of the decision to which appeal is made;
- The reasons for appeal, including issues of fact, law, regulation, or policy and, if applicable, specifically how the decision violates law, regulation, or policy;
- Identification of the specific change(s) in the decision that the appellant seeks.

Requests to stay implementation of the LRMP will not be granted [36 CFR 217.10(a)]. Final decisions on proposed projects will be made on a site-specific basis using
appropriate analysis and documentation and in compliance with NEPA. Project decisions may be subject to appeal at that time.

For questions concerning the appeal process, contact:
USDA Forest Service
Attention: Ecosystem Management Staff (Steve Segovia, 202-205-1066)
P.O. Box 96090
Washington, D.C. 20090-6090

For questions concerning the Land Between The Lakes National Recreation Area LRMP, contact:
William P. Lisowsky
Area Supervisor, Land Between The Lakes National Recreation Area
100 Van Morgan Drive
Golden Pond, KY 42211

Reviewers are encouraged to contact the Area Supervisor before submitting appeals to determine if misunderstandings or concerns can be clarified or resolved.

VIII. Approval

I am pleased to announce my decision and bring this phase of forest planning to completion. This Area Plan has been built upon a strong foundation of citizen collaboration and the best available science.

As we move forward we will carefully monitor our activities, the condition of the land, the goods and services produced, and the effectiveness of the resource protection measures included in this Area Plan. I anticipate implementation of the Area Plan will be conducted in the same spirit of partnership that has characterized this process. Working together we can meet the challenges, realize the opportunities, and achieve the goals and objectives of the Land Between The Lakes Land and Resource Management Plan.

12-01-04
Date

ROBERT T. JACOBS
Regional Forester
Southern Region
USDA Forest Service