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Abstract: This Final Environmental Impact Statement describes alternatives, including a "No Action" alternative for management of National Forest Rangeland Resources on the Uinta National Forest. Alternatives range from no change from past management practices, which in some instances have resulted in less than favorable ecological conditions on National Forest Rangelands and riparian resources, to managing these resources to achieve the "Potential Natural Community" in terms of vegetative cover types and condition. The environmental consequences of all alternatives considered in detail are displayed. The alternative selected for implementation will become an amendment to the Uinta National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources is a cooperating agency in the preparation of this Final Environmental Impact Statement.
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SUMMARY

This Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) compares three alternative ways of managing rangeland resources on the Uinta National Forest. The FEIS addresses public issues, describes a range of alternative management options, and displays the social, economic, and environmental consequences of alternatives considered in detail. This document is also intended to serve environmental review requirements in compliance with Executive Orders 11988-Floodplain Management, and 11990-Protection of Wetlands. The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources is a cooperating agency in the preparation of this FEIS.

During the initial public scoping, it was recommended that an Executive Committee be formed to represent a variety of interests concerned with management of National Forest rangeland resources. A six-person committee was established, consisting of Tom Bingham, Farm Bureau; Roger Banner, Utah State University Cooperative Extension Service; Robert Nelson, Utah Wildlife Leadership Coalition; Rodney John, Regional Supervisor, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources; Jerran Flinders; Professor, Range and Wildlife, Brigham Young University; and Alma Winward, Regional Ecologist, Intermountain Region, U.S. Forest Service. TJ’s committee has contributed many hours assisting the Interdisciplinary Team (ID Team) by reviewing various sections of the FEIS and providing guidance in the development and completion of this document. This Executive Committee supports the concepts presented in this FEIS.

PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

The purpose of this FEIS is to compare and evaluate alternative ways of managing rangelands and riparian resources on the Uinta National Forest, as directed under the National Forest Management Act. The FEIS within the scope of the Uinta National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) completed in 1984, and will be an amendment to the Forest Plan. This FEIS responds to public issues, management concerns, and management opportunities identified during the planning process. This FEIS better describes and will help achieve the planned future of rangeland resources (Desired Future Condition) as identified by the Forest Plan (Pages 3-159 and 160).

This FEIS discloses significant physical, biological, economic, and social effects of the Proposed Action on the human environment, and presents a range of alternatives for future management. The issues, concerns, and opportunities (ICO’s) identified through the public involvement process are addressed. The analysis process portrayed is tiered to the Forest Plan and the Forest Plan Environmental Impact Statement, and will be implemented as an amendment to the Forest Plan.

Follow-up studies and allotment inspections conducted since the Forest Plan was implemented have shown the original outputs predicted in Animal Unit Months (AUM’s) were too high and cannot be reached without causing resource damage on some allotments. Range management plans emphasized three-unit rest-rotation grazing systems. Planned unit grazing systems were developed for many allotments on the Forest. Experience indicated it is difficult to manage sheep under a three-unit, rest system if the allotment acreage is limited. It is difficult to contain sheep in the first unit until seed ripe time in the second unit without grazing over the first unit more than once. Desired range health was not being achieved on many sheep allotments as predicted in the Forest Plan. For the most part, three-unit rest-rotation systems worked fairly well on cattle allotments where adequate riding and herding was provided by the permittees. As would be expected, there
were more riparian conflicts with cattle than sheep, and desired range health was not being achieved on some riparian areas as predicted in the Forest Plan.

The general public recognizes livestock grazing as an important component of the many uses on the Uinta National Forest. The same public is concerned that rangeland health in some areas needs improvement. To meet Forest Plan objectives and public expectations, a better job of management must be accomplished. To accomplish this end, additional standards and guidelines have been developed that will guide the way livestock will be grazed on the Forest. When the FEIS Record of Decision (ROD) is signed, the new management direction (standards and guidelines) described in the FEIS will become part of each existing term grazing permit on the Forest.

Individual projects, including allotment management plans, will be analyzed and documented with Environmental Assessments or additional Environmental Impact Studies tied to the amended Forest Plan, or they will be exempted from documentation through Categorical Exclusion.

ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

The FEIS outlines the range of alternatives considered that provide ways to reasonably address significant IOO's.

Resource capability, existing use and development options, opportunities, user costs, and social/economic impacts were compared while analyzing the alternatives.

ALTERNATIVE A - NO ACTION-CURRENT MANAGEMENT/EARLY TO MID-SERAL VEGETATIVE COMMUNITY TYPES

Alternative A emphasizes continuing to provide the level of opportunities available during the past 10 years. The rangeland resource of the Uinta National Forest would continue to be managed under the direction provided in the Forest Plan. It is the "No Action Alternative" required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

All resources would be managed as outlined in the standards and guidelines of the Forest Plan (pages 3-55 through 3-108 and 4-3 through 4-19).

ALTERNATIVE B - WATERSHED/RIPARIAN EMPHASIS/MID- TO LATE-SERAL VEGETATIVE COMMUNITY TYPES EXCEPT RIPARIAN CLASS I/LATE- TO PNC VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE)

Alternative B emphasizes improvement of watershed and riparian conditions. The major emphasis of this alternative is renewable resources within the multiple use management mandate. Resource management would improve fish and wildlife habitat through changes in vegetation management, streambank stabilization, revegetation of riparian areas and important watershed areas, improvements in water quality, and rehabilitation of critical big game winter range and upland areas.

The Forest-wide standards and guidelines developed in conjunction with this process will ensure that the identified desired future condition of National Forest rangeland resources is achieved.

ALTERNATIVE C - MANAGE FOR POTENTIAL NATURAL COMMUNITY

This alternative would manage for the potential natural community (vegetative type) on all rangelands on the Uinta National Forest. Grazing as well as many recreational activities would be substantially reduced in an effort to promote late seral type vegetation across the Forest. Range rehabilitative practices would include reductions in numbers of permitted livestock, riparian management fences, and fencing of spring sources and ponds. Big game numbers would have to be reduced, and they would have to be kept at an artificially low level.

Developed recreational sites and most dispersed camping activities would be eliminated from riparian habitats.

Due to the issues identified in this FEIS process and the impact this level of management would have on all other resources, this alternative was eliminated from further study.

ALTERNATIVE D - RECREATION EMPHASIS

Riparian Value Class I streams would not be grazed. These are the drainage bottoms that contain major recreation developments, are preferred for all types of dispersed recreation activities, and may contain major travel routes. Major travel routes not located within drainage bottoms also would be closed to grazing. Control measures that do not completely exclude livestock would not be acceptable. Such drainage areas might include: American Fork Canyon, Hobble Creek, Lower Payson Canyon, Sautqaui Canyon, Lower Salt Creek, Lower Nebo Creek, Diamond Fork, Daniels Canyon, West Fork of the Duchesne River, South Fork of the Provo River, Wolf Creek, Mill Hollow, and Lower Current Creek. Main travel routes which may be included within Value Class I stream areas along some segments of the roads include: Nebo Scenic Loop, Cascade Scenic Drive, Alpine Scenic Loop, Wolf Creek Highway, and the Arterial Travel Route.

Alternative D emphasizes values of prime recreational valley bottoms located throughout the Forest. Conflicts between recreationists and livestock would largely be eliminated by the removal of livestock from these areas.

In most cases, the entire drainage would not need to be closed. Allotment Management Plans and annual permittee instructions would delineate areas closed to grazing. An example might be: Current Creek - no grazing permitted from the Current Creek Reservoir to the Forest Boundary. Major travel routes such as the Nebo Loop Highway would be fenced where needed to control livestock, similar to the Westside Strawberry Road.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

A detailed description of the affected environment for the Uinta National Forest can be found in the FEIS for the Forest Plan (pages 3-1 -56).

Eighty-five percent of the Uinta National Forest is located in Utah and Wasatch Counties. The remaining 15 percent is located in Juab, Tooele, and Sanpete Counties.
Approximately 90 percent of the Forest's users reside in the corridor between Ogden to the north and Nephi to the south. Use generally is concentrated on developed and dispersed recreation facilities and on scenic drives in and around the Forest.

Livestock grazing has occurred on the Uinta National Forest since the original Forest reserves were set aside in 1897. Sheep and cattle are permitted to graze the Uinta National Forest. Efforts have been made over the past 30 years to assign sheep grazing to the steeper terrain and cattle to less rugged areas.

Permittees who graze livestock on the Forest are dependent upon Forest rangelands for rounding out their livestock operations.

Uinta National Forest System Lands range from high western deserts at Vernon, to lofty mountains such as Mt. Nebo. Mountain valleys and meadows intersperse the area, broken by moderate to steep mountain slopes and ridges.

Plant communities on the Forest are diverse in both type and structure. Plant communities vary from those requiring as little as 10 to as much as 60 inches of annual precipitation. Range analyses completed during the 1960's and 1970's on existing livestock allotments indicate there were 936,521 acres included in livestock allotments. Eleven major plant communities were identified in various range surveys; i.e., grassland, dry meadow, wet meadow, tall-forb, sagebrush, mountain shrub, conifer, alpine tundra, pinyon-juniper and aspen (Forest Plan page 3-48 and 49). The diversity of vegetation provides habitat for big and small game animals, upland game birds, waterfowl, songbirds, raptors, and reptiles.

Most of the big game winter range located along the Wasatch Front was not inventoried with range analysis procedures, because there was no livestock grazing on these areas. Big game winter range includes 122,662 acres, of which approximately 20 percent is grazed by livestock. Implementation of Alternative B would have little effect upon livestock grazing on big game winter ranges.

Four critical watershed/ grazing areas were identified in this FEIS. These four areas may include several of the 11 vegetation communities. Big game winter range, for instance, may include sagebrush, mountain shrubs, and pinyon-juniper plant communities. Big game winter range is by far the largest acreage of the four critical areas discussed in this FEIS. Riparian areas include an estimated 10,000 acres scattered throughout the Forest in wet and dry meadows and areas along most streams. Ridgetops may include any of the 11 vegetation communities, depending upon the particular area being examined. Critical ridgetop areas are defined as sheep bed grounds, generally less than 1 acre in size. In some cases, they are more extensive—up to 100 acres. Currently, the critical ridgetop areas are characterized by large areas of bare soil with cluster twarrow, small rabbitbrush, or other "least desirable" plant species dominating the sites. Forest specialists estimate there are approximately 7,000 acres in this critical type.

Aspen communities play an important role in providing habitat for a variety of wildlife species, and they add vegetative diversity to the Forest ecosystem. These communities are also important sources of forage and shade for livestock.

Aspen/tall-forb communities (including tall-forb communities not occurring as aspen understory) and aspen with other than a forb understory that are in unsatisfactory condition, occupy approximately 198,000 acres, on an estimated 24 percent of the total aspen area.

Approximately 240,000 acres, or 29 percent of the total area included in all of the allotments, represent the four critical areas.

The remaining rangeland, approximately 596,531 acres, includes all 11 types to some degree, and is in fair, good, and excellent condition, or an ecological status of low-mid to late-seral. These rangelands will be referred to as "Uplands".

There are approximately 265 miles of fishable streams and 17,633 surface acres of lakes and reservoirs on the Forest (when Strawberry Reservoir is filled). These streams and lakes support a variety of riparian habitats. Aquatic resources include a number of important fish and invertebrate species. Fishing and hunting activity for approximately 274,000 wild life and fish user days (WFUD'S) annually (25 percent of total WFUD'S for the Forest). Many Forest users enjoy hunting for game, while an increasing number of recreationalists enjoy viewing, identifying, and photographing wildlife.

The carrying capacity of suitable winter range on and near the National Forest has decreased in past years, because of heavy use by big game and livestock, urbanization, and increased road and highway vehicle use. Concentrated use (over utilization of preferred browse and forf species) on winter range by wildlife has resulted in a reduction in the availability of suitable forage for big game. This is due to vegetative type changes from preferred forage and browse species to less desirable invaders and early seral stage plants. It is currently estimated that the Uinta National Forest contains 122,662 acres of important big game winter range. Less than 20 percent of this total acreage is grazed by livestock.

Fishing is the second most popular wildlife-related recreational activity on the Forest. Sport fishing is increasing at a faster rate than any other consumptive wildlife use. Few streams on the Uinta National Forest are producing an optimum number of catchable fish, although most streams originate in watersheds that are in relatively good hydrological condition.

Riparian areas and ecosystems are important habitat components on the Uinta National Forest. Riparian zones frequently have more ecotone edges and strata in a comparatively smaller area than do surrounding areas. They produce habitat for a larger number of species, reflecting a diversity of plant species and community structure. Wildlife species use riparian zones more than any other type of habitat. These are the most critical wildlife habitats on the Forest. Riparian zones also provide livestock forage, timber, recreation, water, and aesthetic values. They function as living filters to remove sediment and debris from surface runoff, provide a stabilizing influence for shorelines and stream channels, and have an insulating effect which helps to maintain desirable stream temperatures.

All of the Uinta National Forest serves as an important watershed, producing approximately 596,000 acre-feet of water annually to streamflows, and supplying a large, but unmeasured quantity of underground aquifers. Water for most communities adjacent to the Forest is secured wholly or in part from Forest springs. Drought conditions, coupled with increasing urban development and associated demand along the Wasatch Front, are taxing these water supplies.

Current management efforts are directed towards improvement of watershed conditions and protection of water sources for on-site use. Recent emphasis has been placed on stabilization of watersheds, streambanks, low standard roads, and closure of non-system Forest roads.
The decision to withdraw the acquired Strawberry Valley Lands from livestock grazing, at least on a temporary basis, and to emphasize wildlife/fisheries values on those lands is evaluated in the Strawberry Valley Management Area FEIS. This FEIS also amends the Forest Plan and provides direction for management of these acquired lands. The rationale for this decision is presented in the FEIS and the Record of Decision dated August 1, 1990.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Alternative A would result in continued implementation of the current Forest Plan and associated standards and guidelines. Emphasis would be on continuing to provide the level of opportunities already made available during the past 7 years.

Under current Forest Plan direction (the No-Action Alternative), vegetative treatment and livestock management systems are utilized to maintain or improve forage outputs for livestock and wildlife, and to improve watershed conditions. No direction was given for the allocation of forage between livestock and wildlife.

The Forest Plan gives direction to develop and implement plans or projects for the improvement or restoration of floodplains, wetlands, and riparian habitat in less than satisfactory condition. However, specific guidance for management of these areas has not been available. Although the direction provided may eventually lead to correction of existing problems, improvement would be much slower than under Alternative B. The level of improvement achieved would be less under the No-Action Alternative than under Alternative B. Under Alternative D, where livestock would be removed from Value Class I streams, the rate of improvement would be achieved to the degree the standards and guidelines are implemented where people cause the impacts. Improvement on other areas would be similar to Alternative B.

Threatened, endangered, and sensitive (TES) species would be managed comparably under all alternatives. Specific direction concerning management of TES species is presented in the Forest Plan.

Under Alternative D emphasis would be given to management indicator species (MIS) and native vertebrate species by pursuing a desired future of late-ecological status. Emphasis also would be given to improving habitat for TES species through pursuing a desired future of late-ecological status.

Recreation use on the Forest has more than doubled since the Forest Plan was approved in 1984. Impacts and accelerated deterioration is most obvious in riparian areas. In some instances, off-road vehicle use and recreation activity along riparian areas are major causes of damage. The Forest Plan provides direction to manage off-road vehicle use to protect the Forest environment and associated resources. The Forest Plan does not provide specific direction for management of recreation along streams. Riparian standards and guidelines will supplement the Forest Plan in management of riparian resources. Though some progress has been made, existing standards and guidelines have not been fully implemented, nor are they specific enough to result in the desired improvement. The best opportunity for change would occur under implementation of Alternative B.

Rangeland resources would be managed to achieve mid- to late-seral community vegetative types. Management decisions would emphasize watershed, riparian habitat, and wildlife/fisheries values.

The Forest-wide standards and guidelines developed in this process would ensure that the identified future condition of Forest rangeland resources would be achieved.

More stringent protection of riparian areas, big game winter ranges, and aspen community types would reduce conflicts between big game and other wildlife species, as well as with recreational uses.

A riparian value classification system developed to properly manage, protect, or enhance riparian-dependent resource values would result in Forest riparian areas returning to mid- to late-seral or PNC ecological status.

Alternative B would give more emphasis to the correction of problems in riparian areas and important watersheds, as well as hasten the recovery of riparian vegetation, reduce erosion, and improve wildlife habitat, livestock forage, and water quality.

Efforts to manage and improve big game winter ranges would be expanded over current efforts under existing Forest Plan direction. Management strategies would be geared towards improvement of apparent trend over any given 5-year period on rangelands below mid-seral ecological status.

FOREST-WIDE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

The development of Forest-wide standards and guidelines for use in amending the Forest Plan relative to rangeland resources applies specifically to Alternative B. General direction and standards and guidelines apply to four identified "critical" areas on the Uinta National Forest: (1) Riparian, (2) big game winter range, (3) overgrazed ridgetops and open slopes, and (4) aspen types. They are rangeland areas of concern identified from public scoping and Interdisciplinary Team review. The remaining rangeland, approximately 596,531 acres, includes all 11 vegetation types to some degree, and is in fair, good, and excellent condition, or an ecological status of low-mid-to-late-seral. These rangelands will be referred to as (5) "Uplands" in this document.

Specific vegetation utilization and soil stability guidelines are presented in a step-by-step procedure in Appendix I. Further guidance can be obtained from the Intermountain Region's "Integrated Riparian Evaluation Guide."
CHAPTER I - PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

The purpose of the FEIS is to disclose and compare the significant physical, biological, economical, and social effects on the human environment of the Proposed Action and a range of alternatives. Issues, concerns, and opportunities (ICO's) identified through the scoping and public involvement process are also addressed. The analysis process described herein is tied to the Forest Plan, and the FEIS and is intended to amend the Forest Plan (Pages 1-1 through 1-8).

The need for action originated with a national public issue that: “Livestock grazing permits should not be issued or renewed until Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (FLRMP) direction is incorporated into the permits and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) direction is followed.” Briefly, that would require cessation of livestock grazing on many grazing allotments while a NEPA analysis is completed, including public involvement and NEPA documentation. Following dialogue with interested publics, Forest Service direction evolved to a compromise position where: “Livestock would continue to graze when permits were issued or renewed. Permits would include FLRMP standards and guidelines - also a permit clause identifying the date when site-specific allotment management plans and NEPA compliance would be completed.”

The need for action was necessary because of the divergence between existing vegetative health (ecological status) and the desired vegetative health (ecosystem status) on specific, identified rangelands on the Forest. AUM goals in the Forest Plan will not be achieved. Stated FLRMP AUM goals are not achievable within the FLRMP constraint of satisfactory ecological condition. Future AUM goals from this amendment to the Forest Plan will be the level the grazing resource is capable of sustaining, while at the same time meeting the desired future condition (desired ecological status) defined herein. Specific AUM goals cannot be predicted, because levels of acceptable use are dependent upon grazing management practices, use by wildlife, drought, use by recreationists, etc. Needed adjustments in permitted use, either animal numbers or days of grazing use, will occur when allotment management plans and NEPA are complete as scheduled in the Range Action Plan included in this amendment.

The proposed alternatives are intended to respond to Forest ICO's and the growing demand for wildlife and recreation opportunities as well as improved watershed conditions on the Uinta National Forest.

The proposed action should guide management activities and establish management standards and guidelines for achieving an identified desired future condition for rangelands on the Uinta National Forest. It will describe resource management practices, levels of rangeland resource utilization, and the availability and suitability of National Forest System Lands for rangeland resource management.

Specifically, the goal of this process is to:

1. Develop and implement a Uinta National Forest rangeland improvement action plan (Appendix 2-1), including priorities and guidance for updating allotment management plans.

2. Ensure that all rangeland management on the Uinta National Forest is consistent with management direction and standards and guidelines developed in this process and made a part of the current approved Forest Plan by amendment.

Chapter 1-I
Livestock has been displaced from suitable range due to developed recreational facilities and other Forest Service developments.

Some areas along roads and trails are grazed excessively, because of a lack of forage or a lack of proper livestock management.

Riparian areas (stream bottoms) are often heavily impacted by livestock. Areas are grazed heavily, and livestock manure and disturbance makes recreation activities unpleasant.

Livestock on roads and trails sometimes interferes with travel by the recreationist (backpacking, hiking, driving for pleasure, and horseback riding.)

4. ECONOMICS

The economic well being of the local livestock industry is dependent upon a continual source of available range on Federally-owned and administered lands.

5. RIPARIAN/WATERSHED

Unsatisfactory ecological condition of many riparian habitats, wetlands, and floodplains is contributing to degraded water quality. Increased silt and sediment entering streams, instability of streambanks, and a lack of suitable riparian vegetation are having negative effects on fisheries, wildlife habitat, and associated resources.

6. MANAGEMENT

DFC's, management prescriptions, and standards and guidelines currently identified in the Forest Plan for rangeland management are inadequate and do not provide a common understanding of management direction.

Approved allotment management plans and grazing permits need to reflect appropriate standards and guidelines for achieving the DFC for National Forest rangeland resources.

Many rangeland resource problems currently facing the Forest Service are directly attributable to a lack of commitment on the part of the Forest Service to ensure that grazing practices are consistent with approved allotment management plans, and to a lack of commitment on the part of the permittee to adhere to approved management plans and acceptable grazing practices.

Whilegame management is not the jurisdictional responsibility of the Forest Service, yet elk populations continue to increase to the point that they also contribute to some rangeland resource problems.

CHAPTER II - ALTERNATIVES AND COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

This chapter is comprised of three parts: (1) A description of the process used to formulate the alternatives, (2) a description of the alternatives considered but eliminated from detailed study, and (3) a description of each alternative considered in detail.

1. THE PROCESS USED TO FORMULATE THE ALTERNATIVES

The objectives of the proposed project, and the ICO's identified were used to formulate the alternatives, including mitigation measures, management constraints, and monitoring requirements.

The Forest Service solicited issues and concerns from the public and other Government agencies regarding management of rangeland resources on the Uinta National Forest. Public notice of the proposal was published in the Federal Register, Vol. 56, No. 78, April 23, 1991. Two informal meetings were held with special interest groups—the first on January 29, 1991, with individuals representing the livestock industry, and the second on February 13, 1991, with individuals representing the conservation interests. In addition, approximately 200 formal letters and scoping statements were mailed to various groups and individuals. Input received from these various meetings and contacts was then analyzed in relation to the Forest's management situation and the DFC outlined in the Forest Plan. An ID Team of resource specialists then used this information to develop an array of alternatives. An Executive Board was organized to review draft information developed by the ID Team and offer suggestions to the Forest Supervisor.

2. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED, BUT NOT IN DETAIL

Alternative C - Manage for Potential Natural Community

This alternative would manage for the potential natural community (vegetative type) on all rangelands on the Uinta National Forest. Grazing as well as many recreational activities would be substantially reduced in an effort to promote late-serial type vegetation across the Forest. Range rehabilitative practices would include reductions in numbers of permitted livestock, riparian management fences, and fencing of spring sources and ponds. Big game numbers would have to be reduced, and they would have to be kept at an artificially low level.

Developed recreational sites and most dispersed camping activities would be eliminated from riparian habitats.

Due to the issues identified in this FEIS process and the impact this level of management would have on all other resources, this alternative was eliminated from further study. Achieving potential natural vegetative communities across the Uinta Forest would not be possible under legal mandate contained in several Acts of Congress such as, the Multiple-Use and Sustained Yield Act, the National Forest Management Act, the Resources Planning Act, etc.
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL

Alternative A - No Action – Current Management/Early to Mid-Seral Vegetative Community Types

Alternative A emphasizes continuing to provide the level of opportunities actually made available during the past 10 years. The rangeland resource of the Uinta National Forest would continue to be managed under the direction provided in the Forest Plan. It is the "No-Action Alternative" required by NEPA. There would continue to be a divergence between existing ecological status and desired ecological status.

All resources would be managed as outlined in the standards and guidelines of the Forest Plan (Pages 3-55 thru 3-158 and 4-3 thru 4-19). Specific standards and guidelines would not be provided.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Forest Plan should be consulted for a more detailed analysis of management direction resulting from the implementation of the goals and objectives, standards and guidelines, and management prescriptions.

Alternative B - Watershed/Riparian Emphasis/Mid-to-Late Seral Vegetative Community Types except Riparian Class 1/Late to PNC Vegetative Communities

Alternative B emphasizes improvement of watershed and riparian conditions. The major emphasis of this alternative is on renewable resources within the multiple-use management mandate. Resource management would improve fish and wildlife habitat and livestock forage production through improved grazing systems, streambank stabilization, revegetation of riparian areas and important watersheds, improvements in water quality, and rehabilitation of critical big game winter range and upland areas.

Management decisions would emphasize healthy vegetation and soil resources and would, thereby, improve impacted watershed, riparian habitat, and wildlife/fisheries resources. Sustainability of all multiple-use values would be emphasized.

Properly managed livestock grazing would be permitted within limits established by Forest-wide standards and guidelines developed in conjunction with this process. Sheep and cattle would be grazed under planned rest prescriptions according to site-specific grazing management standards and guidelines developed in approved allotment management plans.

The Forest-wide standards and guidelines developed within this process would ensure that the identified DFC of National Forest rangeland resources is achieved. They would guide development or revision of grazing AMP’s. AMP’s may include site-specific refinements or deviations from the standards and guidelines where necessary to achieve desired ecological goals.

Habitat would be capable of supporting big game population levels agreed upon with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources. Emphasis would be placed on maintaining wildlife security while improving critical big game winter range and increasing vegetative diversity. Livestock/big game controversies would be resolved using established interagency and public hearing processes. Vegetative management would focus on achieving the desired vegetative community by managing and controlling all uses and impacts, including recreationists. Big game herd unit management plans would include maximum population levels as a safeguard against rapidly expanding numbers and associated vegetative impacts resulting from decisions that could be based on politics and not biology or vegetative resource sustainability.

All management indicator species and native vertebrate species would be managed above minimum viable population levels.

Fisheries habitat in drainages containing resident trout would be managed at an existing or improved capability to produce fish. Stream fishing opportunities for resident trout would increase at various rates, depending upon the Riparian Value Class where the stream exists.

Habitat for TES species would be managed at or above existing levels (refer to pages 3-50 and 3-51, wildlife goal No. 13 in the FLRMP). A biological assessment for T&E Species and a biological evaluation for sensitive species is included in Appendix Nos. 3 and 4.

Grazing intensity would vary by location of the grazing resource and the standards and guidelines governing use of forage in that particular area. TES plants and anion-11’s would be protected. Management of rangeland resources would be directed towards improving unsatisfactory conditions or maintaining satisfactory conditions. The protection of riparian-dependent resources would be emphasized in all range management activities.

Watersheds would be managed to maintain soil productivity to keep soil erosion to a minimum, and to reduce excessive increases in streamflow.

State of Utah Water Quality Standards would be followed for all activities. Best management practices would be applied in all alternatives to limit non-point water pollution.

Within the framework of planned rest livestock grazing systems, part of the land is "rested" (not grazed) by livestock yearlong. Forest visitors who do not want to encounter livestock can select the “rested” areas for their visits. Wildlife often prefer the rested lands also.

ALTERNATIVE D - RECREATION EMPHASIS

Alternative D emphasizes values of prime recreation valley bottoms located throughout the Forest. Conflicts between recreationists and livestock would largely be eliminated by the removal of livestock from these areas. In most cases, the entire drainage would not need to be closed. Lower portions of the drainage where recreation interest is high would be closed.

Many of the Riparian Value Class I streams would not be grazed. These streams are in the drainage bottoms that contain major recreation developments, and are sought out for all types of dispersed recreation activities. They often contain major travel routes. Major travel routes not located within drainage bottoms would also be closed to grazing. Control measures that do not completely exclude livestock would not be acceptable. Drainages that might be included are American Fork Canyon, Hobble Creek, Lower Payson Canyon, Santisquin Canyon, Lower Salt Creek, Lower Nebo Creek, Diamond Fork, Daniels Canyon, West Fork of the Duchesne River, South Fork of the Provo River, Wolf Creek, Mill Hollow, and Lower Corrao Creek. Main travel routes which may be included within Value Class I stream areas...
along segments of the roads include: Nebo Scenic Loop, Cascade Scenic Drive, Alpine Scenic Loop, Wolf Creek Highway, and the Arterial Travel Route.

Allotment Management Plans and Annual Permittee Instructions would delineate areas closed to grazing. An example might be: Currant Creek, no grazing permitted from Currant Creek Reservoir to the Forest boundary. Major travel routes, such as the Nebo Loop Scenic Highway, would be fenced similar to the Westside Strawberry Road.

Recreation valley bottoms would be managed within the limits established by the riparian value classification for Class I streams.

Management decisions would emphasize watershed, riparian habitat, and wildlife/fisheries and recreation values over other resource uses.

Properly managed livestock grazing would be permitted within limits established by Forest-wide standards and guidelines developed in conjunction with this process. All sheep and cattle allotments would be grazed under planned rest grazing systems according to site-specific grazing management standards and guidelines developed in approved AMP’s.

The Forest-wide standards and guidelines developed within this process would ensure that the identified DFC: Late Ecological status of National Forest rangeland resources is achieved. They would guide development or revision of grazing AMP’s.

Domestic livestock grazing would not be permitted during big game rifle hunts. (All allotments would close approximately September 30.)

Habitat would be capable of supporting big game population levels agreed upon with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources. Emphasis would be placed on maintaining wildlife security while improving critical big game winter range and increasing vegetative diversity. Livestock grazing would only be permitted on big game winter ranges where and when benefits to big game winter range would occur. Some scheduled spring grazing would occur to reduce competition of grasses with preferred shrubs on deer winter range.

Emphasis would be given to management indicator species and native vertebrate species by pursuing a desired future of Late Ecological status.

Fisheries habitat in drainages containing resident trout would be managed at an existing or improved capability to produce fish. Stream fishing opportunities for resident trout would increase at various rates, depending upon the Riparian Value Class I where the stream exists.

Emphasis would be given to improving habitat for TES species through pursuing a desired future of Late Ecological status.

Domestic livestock grazing would not be permitted within wilderness.

Grazing intensity would vary by location of the grazing resource and the standards and guidelines governing use of forage in that particular area. Management of rangeland resources would be directed towards improving unsatisfactory conditions to Late Ecological status or maintaining those rangelands that had reached Late Ecological status. The protection of riparian-dependent resources would be emphasized in all management activities including the control of recreation uses which could damage these areas.

Watersheds would be managed to maintain soil productivity, to keep soil erosion to a minimum, and to reduce excessive increases in streamflow.

State of Utah Water Quality Standards would be followed for all activities. Best management practices would be applied in all alternatives to limit non-point water pollution.

4. FOREST-WIDE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

The development of Forest-wide standards and guidelines for use in amending the Forest Plan relative to rangeland resources applies specifically to Alternatives B and D. General direction and standards and guidelines apply to four identified “critical” areas on the Uinta National Forest: (1) Riparian, (2) big game winter range, (3) overgrazed ridgetops and open slopes, and (4) aspen types. They are rangeland areas of concern identified from public scoping and ID Team review. The remaining rangeland, approximately 596,231 acres, includes many vegetative types that are in fair, good, and excellent condition or an ecological status of low-mid- to late-seral. These rangelands will be referred to as (5) “Uplands.” All five areas are described in the following tables.

Specific vegetation utilization and soil stability guidelines are presented in a step-by-step procedure in Appendix I. Further guidance can be obtained from the Intermountain Region’s “Integrated Riparian Evaluation Guide.”

Individual projects, including allotment management plans, will be analyzed and documented by use of Environmental Assessments or additional Environmental Impact Studies tied to the amended Forest Plan, or they will be exempted from documentation through Categorical Exclusion.

When the FEIS Record of Decision (ROD) for this amendment is signed, the new management direction including standards and guidelines described in this FEIS will become a part of each existing term grazing permit on the Forest without further action.
### ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVE A</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE B</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE C</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>Watershed/</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riparian</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;G/Forest Plan</td>
<td>Adds Riparian</td>
<td>Riparian</td>
<td>Riparian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>DFC = MS+</td>
<td>Class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DFC MS&amp;LS</td>
<td></td>
<td>DFC = LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Class III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DFC = MS+</td>
<td></td>
<td>DFC = MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgetop S&amp;G</td>
<td>Ridgetop S&amp;G</td>
<td>Ridgetop S&amp;G</td>
<td>Ridgetop S&amp;G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFC = ES+</td>
<td>DFC = MS+</td>
<td>DFC = MS+</td>
<td>DFC = MS+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;G</td>
<td>S&amp;G</td>
<td>S&amp;G</td>
<td>S&amp;G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFC = ES+</td>
<td>DFC = MS+</td>
<td>DFC = MS+</td>
<td>DFC = MS+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uplands S&amp;G</td>
<td>Uplands S&amp;G</td>
<td>Uplands S&amp;G</td>
<td>Uplands S&amp;G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFC = MS+</td>
<td>DFC = MS+</td>
<td>DFC = MS+</td>
<td>DFC = MS+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Range</td>
<td>Winter Range</td>
<td>Winter Range</td>
<td>Winter Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;G</td>
<td>S&amp;G</td>
<td>S&amp;G</td>
<td>S&amp;G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFC = ES+</td>
<td>DFC = MS+</td>
<td>DFC = MS+</td>
<td>DFC = MS+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;E</td>
<td>T&amp;E</td>
<td>T&amp;E</td>
<td>T&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All S. Range</td>
<td>All S. Range</td>
<td>All S. Range</td>
<td>All S. Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazed</td>
<td>Grazed Added</td>
<td>Not Grazed</td>
<td>Not Grazed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S&amp;G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts</td>
<td>Conflicts</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Reduces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People/L. Stock</td>
<td>People/L. Stock</td>
<td>Conflicts</td>
<td>Conflict by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disp. Areas</td>
<td>Disp. Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not grazing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People/Stream-</td>
<td>People/Stream-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Class I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td>Riparian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degradation in</td>
<td>Degradation in</td>
<td></td>
<td>Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campgrounds</td>
<td>Campgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Streambank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S&amp;G Attempts</td>
<td></td>
<td>degradation in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to reduce</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflicts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SYMBOLS
- Alter = Alternative
- S&G = Standards and Guidelines
- DFC = Desired Future Condition
- MS = Mid Seal
- LS = Late Seal
- ES = Late Seal
- DOM = Domestic Livestock
- GRAZ = Grazing
- T&E = Threatened & Endangered Species
- L.Stock = Livestock
- Disp = Dispersed

Chapter II.6
### Riparian Ecosystem
**Forest-Wide Standards & Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Activities</th>
<th>General Direction</th>
<th>Standards &amp; Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riparian</td>
<td>Protect or enhance riparian vegetation, stream channel stability and water quality on livestock allotments: Protect streambanks by the use of gravel crossings, tree debris barriers, corridor fencing, riparian pasture management, additional rest periods, improving livestock distribution by increased herding and riding efforts, and developing additional water sites outside of the riparian ecosystem. Manage riparian zones to the desired future condition for each stream value class as stated in the standards and guidelines. Design range and wildlife habitat improvement projects and silvicultural prescriptions in riparian areas to benefit riparian-area dependent resources. Give priority to range, wildlife habitat, and watershed improvement projects that will rehabilitate riparian areas that cannot be restored in a timely manner by other management techniques. Capitalize on opportunities to resolve and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by flood plains and to preserve, enhance, and manage the natural and beneficial values of wetlands. Avoid channel changes whenever feasible. Utilize ID Team inputs to assure that necessary stream alteration is carried out in accordance with prescribed specifications to meet established performance. Preserve the natural aquatic environment, or minimize adverse effects of any activity carried out in riparian areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Management Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design and construct facilities to harmonize with the natural environment when possible (bridges, culverts, and stream protection facilities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider total scenic value when evaluation dictates need for a road paralleling a stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock grazing will be managed to assure maintenance of the vigor and regenerative capacity of the riparian plant communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide healthy, self-perpetuating riparian communities, meet water quality standards, provide habitat for viable populations wildlife and fish, and provide stable stream channels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All riparian area-dependent resources will be maintained or enhanced; preferential consideration will be given in cases of unsolved conflicts where riparian-dependent resources clearly out-weigh other considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization or trampling of preferred (key) species will not exceed the amounts specified in the allotment management plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water resource improvement projects will be designed to improve and maintain the quality of water and soil resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important and distinctive values of riparian areas will be recognized when considering and implementing management activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RIPARIAN ECOSYSTEM
### FOREST-WIDE STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manage plant diversity to improve fish and wildlife habitat, maintain viable populations of all known native species, and meet population objectives as determined by indicator species.</td>
<td>Maintain or restore the inherent biological, physical, and esthetic values of riparian ecosystems.</td>
<td>Important and distinctive values of riparian areas will be recognized when considering and implementing management activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or improve productive streams, lakes, and riparian areas.</td>
<td>Manage municipal watersheds to protect water quality.</td>
<td>Protect or rehabilitate riparian areas to improve their value for all resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or improve current soil productivity by rehabilitating treatable areas that have watershed problems.</td>
<td>Maintain or improve productive streams, lakes, and riparian areas.</td>
<td>When determining stream priorities for rehabilitation and management, the Uinta NF Stream Fish Habitat/Riparian Rating System (Mills 1988) will be used as one source of information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RIPARIAN ECOSYSTEM
### FOREST-WIDE STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>All standards and guidelines listed for soil, water, and range management apply to riparian areas.</td>
<td>See Standards &amp; Guidelines - Uplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repeated grazing use (two or three times) during the grazing season will not be allowed. Implement planned rest and acre requirements and guidelines.</td>
<td>See Standards &amp; Guidelines - Uplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider riparian pasture management after grazing prescriptions (3-unit rest rotation or equivalent system) that have been followed through two grazing cycles have failed to bring about an upward trend (meaning units grazed and rested as scheduled).</td>
<td>See riparian table - Appendix 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish use criteria for each grazing allotment/unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish standards and guidelines for three riparian value classes on the Uinta NF.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riparian areas within grazing allotments that are in very early and early ecological status and very poor and poor soil stability will be improved by implementing improved management prescriptions in the Allotment Management Plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New livestock water developments will be out of riparian areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove existing (inventoried) water developments out of riparian areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilization or trampling of preferred (key) species will not exceed the amounts specified in the allotment management plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>GENERAL DIRECTION</td>
<td>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stubble height/percent utilization standards that are site and species specific will be included in AMP's.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Standards &amp; Guidelines - Uplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing prescriptions will allow sufficient rest that trampled areas and damaged streambanks are allowed to recover from grazing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Achieve vegetation filtering of surface water flowing into tributary streams for at least 90% of the stream lengths using grass and other riparian vegetation. Refer to riparian tables for ecological status and stability requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid trailing livestock back and forth through riparian areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Maintain at least 90% of potential ground cover within all riparian areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Value Riparian Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Achieve vegetation filtering of surface water flowing into tributary streams for at least 80% of the stream lengths using grass and other riparian vegetation. Refer to riparian tables for ecological status and stability requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Value Riparian Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Maintain at least 80% of potential ground cover within all riparian areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Value Riparian Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Achieve vegetation filtering of surface water flowing into tributary streams for at least 70% of the stream lengths using grass and other riparian vegetation. Refer to riparian tables for ecological status and stability requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>GENERAL DIRECTION</td>
<td>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implement or continue at least a 3-unit planned rest grazing system on riparian areas that have not reached the desired ecological status. Other planned rest systems or deferred systems may be used on riparian grazed by sheep if it has reached the desired ecological status and it can be assured that the desired ecological status can be maintained through controls on the amount and timing of grazing impact. See Standards &amp; Guidelines - Uplands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Soil and Water

Locate salt grounds outside of riparian areas.

Close or relocate livestock driveways that follow riparian bottoms.

Locate sheep bed grounds out of riparian areas.

Where channel changes are necessary, natural channel velocities shall not be increased in the affected stream channel. If drop structures are necessary, they shall be designed to allow for fish passage and sediment transport where needed.

If water velocities are increased by placing of a bridge or culvert, or other activity precluding established fish movement upstream, suitable facilities shall be installed to allow for unrestricted fish passage.

Limit construction and other activities affecting stream channels to those periods when such activities will have least detrimental effect on the aquatic environment unless emergency situations deem otherwise.

-Maintain at least 80% potential ground cover within all riparian areas.
-Browse utilization in riparian areas. See riparian tables, Appendix 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No material from construction activities will be cast into the high mean water line.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aquatic mitigation measures shall be taken if construction or other activities will adversely affect water temperatures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Streamsid vegetation shall be maintained if feasible, or if destroyed, shall be replaced to provide for the need of the aquatic environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When channel changes are unavoidable, new channels shall be completed—including scour and erosion protection—before turning water into them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In road construction, maintenance, and other earth-moving activities, the toe of overcast materials shall be placed above the mean high water line. If encroachment on the stream occurs, construction methods and structural barriers shall be used to prevent fill material from entering the stream channel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On hillsides and near channel crossings, road drainages shall discharge where sediment can settle before runoff reaches a stream channel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid construction during wet seasons or other undesirable runoff periods, to minimize sedimentation directly into streams. If construction is essential during such periods, sedimentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES | GENERAL DIRECTION | STANDARDS & GUIDELINES
--- | --- | ---
damage will be minimized by installing debris basins or using other methods to trap sediment. |  |  
Revegetation of riparian areas impacted by soil-disturbing activities can be done with appropriate exotic or native species. |  |  
Channels impacted by various activities that have been altered, may be reshaped prior to revegetation activities. |  |  
Altered streambanks shall, whenever feasible, have slopes that are not barriers to recreation use. |  |  
Culverts, bridges, and other facilities shall be designed to pass or protect against floods which may be reasonably expected to occur during the lifetime of the facility. |  |  
Culverts or bridges or hardened fords shall be required on temporary roads associated with timber harvesting or other activities, at all points where it is necessary to cross stream courses. |  |  
When channel changes or alterations are the best alternative, mitigation measures shall be taken to restore the aquatic to as near natural condition as feasible. For example, where vegetation is destroyed it will be replanted. Where water flows could move rechannelled bank materials, bank stabilization measures such as rock rip rap or juniper placement may be necessary. | - Where floodplains or basins are used for recreation, streams should not be channelized to protect recreation structures from flooding. |  
- Where channelization is done, the impacted areas shall be shaped and revegetated in a manner compatible with the natural stream dynamics. |  
- No soil shall be used to cover temporary bridges.
### RIPARIAN ECOSYSTEM
#### FOREST-WIDE STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Engineering           | Construction or maintenance equipment service areas shall be located and treated to prevent gas, oil, or other contaminants from washing or leaching into streams.  
Water collection systems installed to protect roads or facilities shall be designed to turn water onto slopes or into natural channels, and will not exceed the safe capacity of the slopes or channels.  
Transport of sediment from disturbed areas shall be minimized by flocculation ponding, vegetative barrier strips, or other means.  
Roadway sections parallel and contiguous to stream channels shall be designed, constructed, and maintained to minimize concentrating surface runoff from the roadbed and slopes. Provide special design features as appropriate; ie. slope drains, insloping, crowning, berms, or other facilities.  
All culverts shall be bedded and back filled in accordance with approved engineering practices.  
Riprap or other erosion protection materials should be sufficient in size and placed in such a manner as to withstand peak flows comparable to a 25-year flood, except where associated with major bridges which are designed for passage of a 100-year flood.  
Riprap or other protection materials shall extend below the bed of the stream, sufficient to protect against scour, and to a height sufficient to protect against the predicted or recorded 25- or 50-year flood occurrence, as appropriate. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIPRAPIAN MATERIAL</td>
<td>Riprap material shall be of a quality that will not deteriorate during the length of time it is needed.</td>
<td>No equipment shall be operated in stream courses unless approved by the land manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINERAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>Riprap and other erosion protection material shall be placed in such a manner as to prevent any downstream erosion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREST-WIDE STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</td>
<td>Flushing or desilting basins, ponds, and reservoirs into streams is prohibited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILDLIFE</td>
<td>Borrow material from stream channels may be removed when not detrimental to water quality, fisheries, or channel hydraulics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unless needed to improve channel hydraulics or aquatic habitat, materials will not be removed from channels within or contiguous to established recreation areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A mineral evaluation by a qualified geologist, mining engineer, or mineral specialist will be required prior to approving mining operating plans in key riparian areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wash water from gravel-crushing operations shall be treated. The level of turbidity of discharged water cannot exceed the turbidity at normal flow of the stream into which it is released.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use stabilizing facilities that harmonize with visual settings and maintain or improve wildlife or fish habitat requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timber</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delineate and evaluate riparian habitat areas prior to implementing activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide fish passage at all crossings of known fish habitat by meeting requirements for fish passage and adhering to guidelines specified in &quot;Fish Migration and Fish Passage&quot; a practical guide to solving fish passage problems, USDA Forest Service, Region 5 September, 1977.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain beaver populations within their habitat capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log landings will not be located adjacent to stream channels or on areas where surface water runoff will discharge directly into the channel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide adequate supervision to assure that equipment used in riparian areas causes minimal impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logging, construction and maintenance activities shall be conducted to prevent debris from entering stream channels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trees shall not be felled into streams, lakes, or bogs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BIG GAME WINTER RANGE
**FOREST-WIDE STANDARDS & GUIDELINES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Diversity on National Forests                  | Improve vegetative diversity on winter ranges.  
  -Priority areas for treatment:  
  *Foothill ranges on Wasatch Front  
  *Pinyon-juniper stands  
  *Wildfire areas.  
  Give priority to control of OHV use and unauthorized minerals removal along the Wasatch Front winter range.  
  Give emphasis to acquisition and improvement of big game winter ranges on lands of other ownership within and adjacent to the exterior National Forest boundary. Do so within the economic and social constraints of local communities.  
  Enforce Forest Travel Plan to prevent damage to vegetation and soils and eliminate harassment of livestock and big game.  
  Projects to improve these lands will include scarification and direct seeding of shrubs into cheatgrass areas, chaining and seeding of pinyon-juniper sites, broadcast burning, transplanting of shrubs and other selected methods as determined by an ID Team.  
  Determine those areas suitable for physical restoration and develop an action program for improvement of these lands. | -Limit visual impacts to those that can be mitigated within 5 years.  
-Surface disturbances shall receive prompt revegetation efforts utilizing species desirable for wintering big game.  
-Maintain adequate big game hiding cover as determined on a project basis.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Visual Resource Minerals and Travel Management  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Lands                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Wildlife Resource Range Management             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Wildlife Habitat Improvement                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Range Resource Maintenance                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
### BIG GAME WINTER RANGE
#### FOREST-WIDE STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gear management towards improvement of apparent trend over a 5-year period on ranges below mid-seral ecological status.</td>
<td>- Where trend in ecological status is down, away from DFC, management changes will be initiated to reverse the trend. Work with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources to reduce wintering big game populations where needed to successfully restore desired vegetative conditions and determine levels at which populations should be retained to maintain restored conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate monitoring of range trend with DWR - USFS - BLM Interagency Big Game Range Trend Study Program.</td>
<td>- Initiate noxious weed control on dalmatian toadflax, and jointed goatgrass, and continue program for control of musk thistle and dyers weed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerate noxious weed control programs on winter ranges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percent of Current Growth Utilization of Shrubs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Veg. Types</th>
<th>Sat Cond</th>
<th>Unsat Cond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mountainbrush</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagebrush</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitterbrush</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Mahogany</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliffrose</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourwing Saltbrush</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limit utilization on established, more desirable shrubs, (big sagebrush, bitterbrush, mountain mahogany, cliffrose, and fourwing saltbrush) to 60% of current year's growth. Species selected for utilization measurement will include those shrubs which can be expected to survive in substantial numbers and not as isolated specimen.
### OVERGRAZED RIDGETOPS AND OPEN SLOPES
### FOREST-WIDE STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity on National Forests</td>
<td>Improve vegetative diversity on all upland range.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority areas for treatment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Sheep bedgrounds generally &lt;1 acre in size.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Bare soil areas where tarweed, yellowbrush or other least</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Slopes where community type loss is imminent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources</td>
<td>Reestablish mid- to late seral vegetation on degraded community types.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Resources Management and Habitat Improvement</td>
<td>Manage for needs of indicator species or indicator habitats as identified in the Forest Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain or improve cover and forage for game and non-game species of wildlife.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Resources Management</td>
<td>Manage for mid-seral or higher ecological status.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjust herbivore numbers and season of use to attain vegetation diversity objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish and maintain vegetation consisting of a mixture of native species or proven introduc. species which will enhance revegetation efforts. Accomplish this by planting, maintaining, and manipulating vegetation through mechanical and non-mechanical methods such as herbicide application, prescribed fire, seeding, scarifying, trampling, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERGRAZED RIDGETOPS AND OPEN SLOPES  
FOREST-WIDE STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement allowable use guidelines to provide for the improvement of unsatisfactory rangeland conditions utilizing a planned rest grazing system. On allotments where ridgetops meet mid-seral or higher range health goals (satisfactory condition), deferred grazing systems may be used on sheep allotments if maintenance of the desired ecological status (range health) can be assured.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Standards &amp; Guidelines for Rest Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue noxious weed control program through biological, mechanical, and herbicide treatment methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allowable Use Guidelines Under Rest Rotation Grazing System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments will contain sufficient suitable range that a 3-unit planned rest system can be operational. Where this does not exist, consolidate allotments to enhance operations and improve vegetative conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit use of traditional bedgrounds and salting areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNSAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAT = Satisfactory Condition (Mid-seral or above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--Sheep will graze through foraging areas only once and will not return to the same area at a later date during the same grazing season.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ASPEN ECOSYSTEM
### FOREST-WIDE STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Priority areas for aspen treatment:</td>
<td>- Maintain big game security cover next to aspen viewing areas and along arterial and collector roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Big game winter/transitional range</td>
<td>- Maintain adequate habitat for aspen-dependent wildlife species, including big game species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Calving/fawning areas</td>
<td>- Provide snags needed to maintain habitat for cavity-dependent wildlife species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Stands where type loss/conversion is imminent</td>
<td>- Provide a continuing supply of aspen trees suitable for cavities. These are both live and dead trees with DBH of 9 inches or more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasize aspen viewing areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife and Fish Resource Management</td>
<td>Manage for habitat needs of indicator species.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain standing dead trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Habitat Improvement and</td>
<td>Prescribe burn or treat aspen mechanically in order to promote suckering and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>revegetation of aspen patches where needed to provide adequate wildlife habitat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manage habitat for birds and small mammals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Resource Management</td>
<td>Closely manage grazing by domestic stock in treated aspen stands until</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regeneration is 6 feet tall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ASPEN ECOSYSTEM
#### FOREST-WIDE STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Maintain satisfactory livestock forage conditions. | - Vegetation in mid-serial or higher ecological conditions. 
- Ground cover ratings at least 70% on uplands. 80% on riparian areas. | |
| Reduce livestock and/or big game impacts, to protect areas under treatment for attainment of vegetative diversity objectives. | | |
| Establish and maintain vegetation consisting of a mixture of native species or proven introduced species that will enhance post-treatment. Accomplish this by planting, maintaining, and manipulating vegetation through mechanical and non-mechanical methods such as herbicide application, prescribed fire, seeding, interseeding, furrowing, terracing, pitting, ripping, etc. | | |
| Manage livestock and wild herbivore forage use to provide improvement and/or maintenance of aspen understory by implementing allowable use guides. | - See Standards & Guidelines - Uplands for planned rest requirements 
- Livestock and wild herbivore allowable forage use by range type are: | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Veg. Types</th>
<th>% Current Growth</th>
<th>Util. of Grass and Forbs (%)</th>
<th>Util. of Shrubs (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat Cond</td>
<td>Unsat Cond</td>
<td>Sat Cond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uplands, aspen, grassland, shrublands &amp; timber</td>
<td>65 45</td>
<td>60 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-alpine</td>
<td>45 40</td>
<td>35 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ASPEN ECOSYSTEM

**FOREST-WIDE STANDARDS & GUIDELINES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silvicultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For convenience in working with grass measurements, convert percentile utilization to stubble height in AMP's.

- **SAT** = Satisfactory Condition (Mid-seral or above)
- **UNSAT** = Unsatisfactory Condition (Below mid-seral)

- Vary utilization standards with grazing system and ecological condition. Specify standards in AMP.

- Silvicultural Standards: These standards may be exceeded on areas managed for old growth.

- Clearcut (Stand or Clone) aspen Forest cover types on a rotation of 80 to 120 years.

Utilize forage in transitory range that is available where demand exists, and where investments in regeneration can be protected.

- Grasses - 40-50% of average annual growth.
- Forbs - 20% of average annual growth.

Manage aspen forest cover type to perpetuate aspen using even-aged silviculture.
### UPLANDS

**FOREST-WIDE STANDARDS & GUIDELINES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range Resources Management</td>
<td>Repeated grazing use (two or three times) during the grazing season will not be allowed. Plan periodic rest.</td>
<td>- Implement or continue at least a 3-unit, planned rest grazing system for all upland areas within grazing allotments as a standard practice. Sheep allotments may have reason to eliminate the seed ripe treatment and route the sheep through the pastures to be grazed to take advantage of terrain features. One pasture will normally be rested the entire season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish proper use criteria for each grazing allotment/unit.</td>
<td>- Provide a standard of approximately 1.25 or greater acres per sheep month of suitable range in satisfactory condition on units grazed. (This equates to 6-12 sections per 1,200 sheep band for 3-month season.) Site specific AMPs will determine grazing capacity based on forage production and grazing impact on soils and vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Resource Range Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Utilization or trampling of preferred (key) species will not exceed the amounts specified in the allotment management plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Resource and Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Enforce Forest Travel Plan to prevent damage to vegetation and soils and eliminate harassment of livestock and big game.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Manage to maintain and improve important browse species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Determine those areas suitable for restoration and develop an action program for improvement of these lands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## UPLANDS
### FOREST-WIDE STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gear management towards improvement of apparent trend over a 5-year period on ranges below mid-seral ecological status.</td>
<td>-Where trend in ecological status is down, management changes will be initiated to reverse the trend. Work with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources to reduce wintering big game populations where needed to successfully restore desired vegetative conditions and determine levels at which populations should be retained to maintain restored conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerate noxious weed control programs on winter ranges.</td>
<td>-Initiate noxious weed control on dalmatian toadflax, and jointed goatgrass, and continue program for control of musk thistle and dyers woad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve vegetative diversity on all upland range. Priority areas for treatment: *(Bare soil areas and tarweed) as other last desirables. *Slopes where community type loss has occurred or is imminent. *Sagebrush stands.</td>
<td>-Meet adopted visual quality objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reestablish mid-late seral vegetation on degraded community types.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage for mid-seral or higher ecological conditions. Adjust herbivore numbers and season of use to attain vegetation diversity objectives. Establish and maintain vegetation consisting of a mixture of native species or proven introduced species which will enhance vegetative communities. Accomplish this by maintaining, vegetation through herbivore management or by manipulating vegetation through mechanical and non-mechanical methods such as prescribed burning, herbicides, and mowing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# UPLANDS
## FOREST-WIDE STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>as herbicide application, prescribed fire, seeding, scarifying, trampling, etc.</td>
<td>Implement allowable use guidelines to provide for the improvement of unsatisfactory rangeland conditions utilizing a planned rest grazing system.</td>
<td>Sheep will graze through foraging areas only once and will not return to the same area at a later date during the same grazing season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue noxious weed control program through biological, mechanical, and herbicide treatment methods.</td>
<td>Allotments will contain sufficient suitable range that a 3-unit planned rest system can be operational. Where this does not exist, consolidate allotments to enhance operations and improve vegetative conditions.</td>
<td>Bed sheep no more than twice on the same bed ground during the same grazing season. Some areas in unsatisfactory condition will require closure of bed grounds to improve vegetative conditions. Such areas will be specified in AMP’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit use of traditional bedgrounds and salting areas.</td>
<td>Maintain satisfactory livestock forage conditions.</td>
<td>Vegetation in mid-seral or higher ecological conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage livestock and wild herbivore forage use to provide improvement and/or maintenance of aspen by implementing allowable use guides.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ground cover ratings at least 70% on uplands. 80% on riparian areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Livestock and wild herbivore allowable forage use by range type and condition class are:
**Utilize forage in transitory range that is available where demand exists, and where investments in revegetation can be protected.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recent of Current Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Util of Grass and Forbs (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sat Unsat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Veg. Types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cond Cond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uplands, incl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspen, grassland,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shrublands &amp; timber</td>
<td></td>
<td>65 45 50 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-alpine</td>
<td></td>
<td>45 40 35 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For convenience in working with grass measurements, convert percent utilization to stubble height in AMP’s.

SAT = Satisfactory Condition (Mid-seral or above)
UNSAT = Unsatisfactory Condition (Below mid-seral)

- Vary utilization standards with grazing system and ecological condition. Specify standards in AMP.
- Maximum grazing use on transitory ranges resulting from clearcuts is:

Key shrubs - 20% of average annual growth.
5. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITION

Forest-wide standards and guidelines are developed to achieve a DFC of vegetative community types and soil stability. Each of the four identified "critical" rangelands on the Uinta National Forest will be managed under Alternative B to produce desired future vegetative communities. They are described as follows:

Riparian Area Ecosystems

Management of riparian areas on the Uinta National Forest will be emphasized. The DFC is to provide healthy, self-perpetuating plant communities in a mid- to late-seral ecological status, meet water quality standards, provide habitat for viable populations of native wildlife and fish, provide livestock forage, and provide stable stream channels and still waterbody shorelines. Important and distinctive values of riparian areas will be recognized when considering and implementing management activities. Emphasis will be towards maintaining or restoring the inherent biological, physical, and aesthetic values of riparian ecosystems on the Uinta National Forest.

The ecological status of individual riparian plant species is shown in the "Intermountain Region's Riparian Community Types" publication. It is used in conjunction with the Integrated Riparian Evaluation Guide. (Refer to Uinta National Forest Riparian Value Classification and Utilization Guide, Appendix 1-1.)

Grasses and Grasslike

Water sedge
Wooly sedge
Sedge
Smallwing sedge
Silver sedge
Beaked sedge
Bluejoint
Brookgrass
Spikerush
Rush, wiregrass
Nebraska sedge

Forbs

Longleaf arnica
Annual gentian
Mint
Gland cinquefoil
Straight-beak buttercup
Starry solomon’s-plume
Common dandelion
Common speedwell
American betch
Cow parsnip
Bluebells
Geranium

Cow parsnip
Bluebells
Geranium

Shrubs

Bush cinquefoil
Western common clover cherry
Woods rose
Golden currant
Boots willow
Coyote willow
Geyer willow
Pacific willow
Idaho wolfs willow
Currant

Cowparsnip
Bluebells
Geranium

Shrubs

Bush cinquefoil
Western common clover cherry
Woods rose
Golden currant
Boots willow
Coyote willow
Geyer willow
Pacific willow
Idaho wolfs willow
Currant

Heracleum lanatum
Mertensia ciliata
Geranium richardsonii

Poterilla fruticosa
Frunus virginiana
Rosa woodsii
Rubes aarum
Salix boothii
Salix exigua
Salix geyeriana
Salix lasiandra
Salix willisi
Rubus hudsonianum

Big Game Winter Range

Management of big game winter range on the Uinta National Forest will emphasize restoration and maintenance of the inherent biological, physical, hydrologic, and aesthetic values of these rangeland sites. These areas will be managed to attain or retain at least mid-seral ecological status. Physical restoration techniques will be utilized on areas classified as suitable where improved management systems cannot be expected to improve conditions within the desired timeframe. The objective of management and restoration programs will be to reduce the numbers of annual and other undesirable plant species and replace them with desirable perennial shrubs, grasses, and forbs which are more valuable for watershed protection and winter big game forage. Efforts to eliminate and control uses causing deterioration of vegetative cover will be implemented.

Vegetation characteristic of mid-seral stages of big game winter range should contain at least 50 percent by volume of the following and other desirable plant species.

Low Trees and Shrubs

Big Sagebrush
Bitterbrush
Cliffrose
Curlyleaf Mountain Mahogany
Birchleaf Mountain Mahogany
Smooth Sumac
Whitetenned rubber rabbitbrush
Gambel Oakbrush
Mountain Snowberry
Skunk Bush Sumac
Woods Rose
Fourwing Saltbush
Serviceberry

Artemisia tridentata
Purshia tridentata
Cliffrose
Cercocarpus ledifolius
Cercocarpus montanus
Rhus glabra
Chrysothamnus nauseosus albicaulis
Quercus gambelli
Symphoricarpus oreophilus
Rhus trilobata
Rosa woodsii
Atriplex canescens
Amelanchier alnifolia
Grasses

Bluebunch wheatgrass  
Western wheatgrass  
Junegrass  
Squirreltail  
Sandberg bluegrass  
Great Basin wildrye  
Indian ricegrass  
Intermediate wheatgrass  
Smooth bromegrass  
Orchard grass  
Crested wheatgrass  
Sheep fescue  
Oniongrass  
Smooth bromegrass  
Kentucky bluegrass  
Sandropseed  
Needle and Thread grass

Forbs

Long Leaf Phlox  
Blue Flax  
Hawksbeard  
Astragalus  
Arrowleaf Balsamroot  
Rockcress  
Indian Paintbrush  
Sego Lily  
Mountain Dandelion  
Milfoil Yarrow  
Small Bluebells  
Calyptanth  
Yellowbells  
Leopard-Lily  
Alfalfa  
Yellow Sweetclover  
Small Burnet

Elymus spicatus  
Elymus smithii  
Koeleria macrantha  
Elymus elymoides  
Poa secunda  
Elymus cinereus  
Stipa hymenodes  
Elymus hispidus  
Bromus intermis  
Dactylis glomerata  
Agropyron  
Festuca ovina  
Melica sp.  
Poa fendleriiana  
Poa pratensis  
Sporobolus cryptandrus  
Stipa comata  

Phlox longifolia  
Linum lewisii  
Crepis sp.  
Astragalus  
Balsamorhiza sagittata  
Arabis sp.  
Castillja sp.  
Chalochortus nuttallii  
Agoseris sp.  
Achillea millifolium  
Mertensia sp.  
Cryptantha  
Fritillaria pudica  
Fritillaria strophoecarpas  
Medicago sativa  
Melilotus officinalis  
Sanguisorba minor

Over-Grazed Ridgetops and Open Slopes

Ridgetop/open slope areas of concern are areas identified primarily with sheep grazing. They are often used for bedding and salting of sheep. They are geographically delineable areas associated with shallow soils and/or low growing vegetation.

Chapter II-31

Emphasis is on the management of that portion of upland ranges associated with historically heavy livestock use on less productive sites. Rangeland health in the area is often low- to mid-seral ecological states.

The DFC is a diversified vegetative cover that will stabilize soil and provide for watershed conditions that will absorb surface runoff and contribute to meeting water quality standards, stream stabilization, and improved habitat for fish and wildlife populations. Forage production for livestock grazing on these sites is a secondary consideration. Livestock grazing will be managed to assure maintenance or improvement of plant vigor, with restoration being the primary consideration. Where short- or long-term observations indicate trends are not moving towards mid- to late-seral ecological status, use of these areas will need to be modified or limited.

The DFC of mid- to late-seral ecological status on ridgetops and open slopes will be characterized by the following vegetation:

Grasses/Grass Like

Mountain Brome  
Slender Wheat Grass  
Onion Grass  
Smooth Brome  
Intermediate Wheatgrass  
Indian Ricegrass

Bromus marginatus  
Elymus trachycalus  
Melica bullosa  
Bromus inermis  
Agropyron intermedium  
Orzyopsis hymenoides

Forbs

Erigeron  
Buckwheat  
Blue Flax  
Pea ternon  
Potentilla  
Lomatium

Erigeron spp.  
Erigenun spp.  
Linum perenne  
Penstemon spp.  
Potentilla glandulosa  
Lomatium spp.

Shrubs

Red Elderberry  
Snowberry  
Shrubby Cinquefoil  
Yellow Rabbit Brush  
Silver Sagebrush  
Currant (Ribes)

Sambucus racemosa  
Symphoricarpos oreophilus  
Potentilla fruticosa  
Chrysanthemum viscidiflorus  
Artemisia cana  
Ribes spp.

Chapter II-32
Aspen Habitat

Management of aspen on the Uinta National Forest will be to maintain and improve aspen sites and associated vegetation. Vegetation will be improved or maintained at composition levels consistent with mid- to late seral ecologic conditions. Vegetative manipulation such as timber harvest, thinning, and prescribed fire will be utilized to control conifer encroachment. Aspen is managed to produce wildlife habitat, livestock forage, wood products, visual quality, and plant and animal diversity.

Aspen communities occupy approximately 193,000 acres over the Forest, with approximately one half of the total located on sheep allotments. Aspen/tall forb communities are usually identified with sheep grazing and are used primarily as sources of forage. Aspen stands often have a shrub understory, generally snowberry (Symphoricarpus). A few stands have a chokecherry (Prunus) understory. Elderberry (Sarac) often is present in scattered amounts in the community. The amount of area that supports these three understories has not been determined.

It is estimated that the aspen/tall forb communities occupy less than 20 percent of the total aspen area. The aspen/tall forb community is associated with deep, highly productive clay soils. The community may occur within aspen stand openings or between aspen stands. Generally, the community is located on gentle slopes. Due to past heavy utilization of the open aspen/tall forb community on some sheep allotments, without adequate rest to allow the preferred plants to recover from grazing, desirable forbs have been eliminated from the plant composition. As a result of continued heavy utilization, some of the aspen/tall forb sites have been reduced to early ecological status. Annual or least desirable plants dominate some sites. Production may be as low as 25 percent of potential. Open aspen/tall forb sites are often short of litter even when they are in later ecological status. The sites in early ecological status often contribute to surface runoff, erosion, and sedimentation in streams. The goal is to restore the aspen/tall forb sites to a high-mid or late ecological status.

In some cases, it is desirable to change the diversity of aspen stands. Diversity objectives are achieved by varying size, age, and shape of individual stands. Aspen stands are important for livestock grazing. Management of livestock must be coordinated with wildlife habitat needs and protection of aspen regeneration.

Aspen stand vegetation characteristic of mid- and upper-serial stages include but are not limited to the following species:

**Conifer/Dicots**
- Quaking Aspen
- Lodgepole Pine
- Rocky Mountain Juniper
- Subalpine Fir
- Engelmann Spruce
- Shrub
- Serviceberry
- Snowberry

**Forbs**
- Richardson Geranium
- Sticky Geranium
- Fendler Meadow rue
- Western Larkspur
- Porter Ligusticum
- Strawberry
- American Vetch
-Sweetclover
- Heartleaf arnica
- Sweetpea
- Bedstraw
- Valeriana (Western)
- Western yarrow
- Oregon daisy
- Bluebells
- Engelmann aster
- Cusick
- Dohbne
- Cowparsnip
- Violet
- Coneflower
- Potentilla
- Phacelia

**Woods Rose**
- Mahonia repens
- Prunus virginiana
- Atemesia tridentata, varpy
- Juniperous communis
- Paxistima spp.
- Sambucus racemosa
- Shepherdia canadensis
- Bromus anomalous
- B. margaratus
- Poa fendleri ana
- Elymus glaucus
- E. trachycaulus
- Stipa lesperei
- S. occidentalis
- S. nealsoni
- Carex geyeri
- Melica spectabilis
- Festuca thurberi
- Geranium richardsonii
- G. viscoussum
- Thalictrum fendleri
- Delphinium barbei
- Ligusticum porteri
- Fragaria vesca
- Vicia americana
- Osmorhiza spp.
- Arnica cordifolia
- Lathyrus leucanthus
- Galium septentrionale
- Valeriana occidentalis
- Achillea lanslosa
- Erigeron speciosus
- Mertensia spp.
- Aster engelmannii
- Agastache canikii
- apocynum androsaemi
- Heracleum latilatum
- Viola nuttalli/adunca
- Rudbeckia occidentals
- Potentilla argenta
- Phacelia sericea
The remaining rangeland (Uplands) vary from high western deserts at Vernon, to lofty mountains such as Mt. Nebo. Mountain valleys and meadows intersperse the area, broken by moderate to steep mountain slopes and ridges. The vegetative communities vary from those requiring as little as 10 inches of annual precipitation to those receiving as much as 60 inches.

These plant communities are diverse in both type and structure and provide habitat for big and small game animals, songbirds, raptors, and reptiles. Most of the available forage for all types of grazing animals is produced within the uplands communities.

The rangeland within the upland communities serves as an important watershed, producing approximately 506,600 acre-feet of water annually to streamflows, and supplying a large, but unmeasured, quantity of underground aquifers. Water for most communities adjacent to the Forest is secured in part or wholly from Forest springs.

Current management efforts are directed towards improvement or maintenance of watershed conditions, maintenance of vegetation in mid-seral to late-seral ecological status, and protection of water sources for on-site use. Recent emphasis has been placed on stabilization of watersheds, streambanks, low standard roads, and closure of non-System Forest roads.

Vegetation communities within the Uplands includes the following: Grasslands, dry meadow, wet meadow, tall forb, sagebrush, mountain shrub, conifer, alpine tundra, pinion-juniper and aspen (Forest Plan page 3-48 and 49).

**Upland Habitat Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Showy sticksedge</th>
<th>Hackelia forrhibunda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big stinging nettle</td>
<td>Urtic dioica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado columbine</td>
<td>Aquilegia coerulea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver rockcress</td>
<td>Arabis cohernisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia creeper</td>
<td>Clemans cokianiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinna tassymustard</td>
<td>Descurainia pinicata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireweed</td>
<td>Epilobium a-angustifolium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showy fraera</td>
<td>Fraera speciosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupine</td>
<td>Lupinus candidus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetansie</td>
<td>Osmorhiza occidentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penstemon</td>
<td>Penstemons spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinquefoil</td>
<td>Potentilla anserian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttercup</td>
<td>Ranunculus spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanceleaf figwort</td>
<td>Scrophularia lasioidea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterweed groundsel</td>
<td>Senico serra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False-hellebore</td>
<td>Veratrum caerulicum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter III - Affected Environment**

A detailed discussion on the environment of the Forest can be found in the Forest Plan (Pages 3-1 through 3-56). The following discussion involves only those aspects associated with one or more of the issues and concerns. These are the environmental resource factors found to be affected by the proposal.

Following are brief descriptions of the affected environment for each of the four identified critical areas—riparian zones, big game winter range, aspen ecosystems/communitys, and overgrazed ridge tops and open slopes. A brief description is also given for Upland Habitat types.

1. **Riparian Zones/Ecosystems**

A riparian area or ecosystem can be described as an area identified by the presence of vegetation that requires free or unbound water or conditions more moist than normally found in the area. It is a geographically delineated area with distinctive resource values.

All riparian zones within the Uinta National Forest have in common: (1) They create a well-defined habitat zone within the much drier surrounding areas, (2) they make up a minor portion of the overall area, (3) they are generally more productive in terms of biomass—plant and animal—the remainder of the Forest, and (4) they are a critical source of diversity within rangeland and forest ecosystems.

Riparian zones frequently have a higher number of edges and strata in a comparatively smaller area than the surrounding area. They produce habitat for a greater number of species, reflecting a diversity of plant species and community structure. Wildlife use riparian zones proportionately more than any other type of habitat. They are the most critical wildlife habitats on the Uinta National Forest. Several species of threatened, endangered, and sensitive plant and animal species are dependent for habitat in riparian zones on the Uinta National Forest. The endangered boulder eagle (Haliaetus leucocephalus) is a winter visitor to some of these areas. The sensitive spotted frog (Rana pretiosa) is suspected to exist in marshy areas along streams and in spring areas. Two sensitive trout, the Colorado Cutthroat (Oncorynchus clarki pleuriticus) and the Bonneville Cutthroat (Oncorynchus clarki stahli) are known to exist in streams on the Uinta National Forest. Utah's Tresses (Spiranthes diluvialis) was listed as a threatened plant on January 17, 1992. It is suspected to exist on lowland riparian areas. An inventory to determine the extent and range of this species is scheduled for the 1992 field season.

Riparian zones also provide forage for livestock, timber, recreation, water, and aesthetic values. They function as living filters to remove debris from surface runoff, provide a stabilizing influence for shorelines and stream channels, and provide an insulating effect to maintain desirable stream temperatures.

Management goals are to provide healthy, self-perpetuating plant communities, meet water quality standards, provide habitat for viable populations of wildlife and fish, and provide stable stream channels and still water-body shorelines. The aquatic ecosystem may contain fisheries habitat improvement and channel-stabilizing facilities that harmonize with the visual setting and maintain or improve wildlife or fish habitat requirements. The linear nature
of streamside riparian areas permits programming of management activities which are not visually evident or are visually subordinate.

2. ASPEN ECOSYSTEMS/COMMUNITIES

Aspen ecosystems are scattered throughout the Uinta National Forest, occurring as under story lodgepole pine and spruce/fir conifer stands, or as various climax aspen communities. Aspen stand characteristics vary, depending on soil type and elevations at which they occur.

Aspen communities play an important role in providing habitat for a variety of wildlife species and add vegetative diversity to the Forest ecosystem as a whole. Domestic livestock utilize aspen communities as important sources of forage. Where they exist adjacent to grassland pastures and sagebrush openings, aspen stands are utilized as areas for shading by both livestock and wildlife species. Elk and deer utilize aspen stands for calving/lactating during the spring. A sensitive species, the three-toed woodpecker (Picoides albolarvatus) may occasionally utilize aspens for nesting sites. A second bird species found in aspen stands, northern goshawk (Accipiter gentilis atricapillus), was recently added to the R-4 sensitive species list. This species is a resident of old growth aspen stands that are beginning to break up due to overmaturity.

The general public enjoys viewing aspen stands during late summer/fall months when leaves begin to turn, signaling the onset of winter. For many families and individuals, a trip to the Forest for viewing nature’s fall colors is an annual event.

3. BIG GAME WINTER RANGE

These sites generally consist of rangelands along the eastern foothills of Utah Valley and in the lower slopes in main canyons and draws on the rest of the Forest. South-facing slopes are often included at elevations as high as 8,000 feet. In Utah Valley these lands were formed by lacustrine deposits along the ancient shoreline of Lake Bonneville. They also include a number of alluvial fans which dissect the lake deposits at drainage mouths and landforms originating from landslide deposits. They were grazed by livestock very early in the settlement of the area and were some of the first areas to show the signs of overgrazing. Very little of this range is now used for livestock grazing. During the last 140 years they have also been heavily used by big game, particularly deer, and increasingly by elk in some areas. This use has been aggravated by the impacts of off-road vehicles, mining, and gravel extraction which have left scars open to erosion. It has been aggravated by occasional wildfire which has removed many of the more desirable browse species, leaving the areas open to invasion by cheatgrass and other annual plants and noxious weeds. Currently, most of this range is in a relatively early seral stage with limited promise of advancing due to heavy wildfire use fall through spring and the lack of more desirable plants to provide a seed source. Much of this resource is located in ownership other than National Forest, and range conditions on most of these tracts is unsatisfactory.

Of special concern are portions of this range between the mouth of Spanish Fork Canyon and Point of the Mountain, where the close proximity of human development, wildfire and associated impacts have heavily impacted this resource and its ability to provide the needs of wintering big game animals. These ranges have been greatly diminished in the last 30 years due to increased urban development in the foothill areas. Mule deer carrying capacity increased early on in response to vegetative changes associated with livestock grazing. In the absence of livestock grazing, plant succession has shifted from shrub communities to communities dominated by grasses and annual plants. Where perennial grasses have become dominant the shift is toward mid- to late-seral communities. Areas that have a good stand of perennial grasses sometimes show the same downward trend for sagebrush populations as those that are dominated by annuals.

The most common plant found on these sites along the Wasatch Front is cheatgrass. Other plants which are common on degraded sites are bulbous bluegrass, Sandberg bluegrass, sand dropseed, ragweed, gray thistle, cranebill, blue-eyed Mary, Colonlia, bar butter-cup, and associated other annuals. Broom snakeweed is a common halifah shrub which has invaded the area. The noxious weeds—Dalmatian toadflax, musk thistle, whitefoot, jointed goatgrass and dyer’s weed—are invading on disturbed areas. Oak brush, smooth sumac, skunkbush sumac, golden currant, and hackberry patches are present on northerly aspects and where moisture conditions are somewhat more favorable. Some remnants of bluebunch wheatgrass, big sagebrush, and rubber rabbitbrush can be found, but they are usually heavily browsed. Occasional plants or small patches of curlleaf mountain mahogany, chilfrose, and juniper are present and show heavy use. The Mountain Fuel gasline right-of-way has been reseeded and has a good stand of intermediate wheatgrass, smooth brome, and other introduced species where they have not been destroyed by off-road vehicle use. A few other areas have been effectively reseeded to introduced grasses. Successful plantings of four-winged saltbush have been made, and these established plants are surviving in spite of the heavy deer use in the area. Attempts at establishing bittersbrush by planting have generally been disappointing because of the harsh site and continued deer browsing.

Above the foothill slopes and in the main canyons these ranges are often dominated by an overstory of Gambel oakbrush or other mountain brush species.

Big sagebrush is often the dominant shrub in more open areas. Pinyon and juniper have encroached in many areas and now dominate many sites to the extent that other desirable plants are excluded. Understory plants include many of the same species listed for the foothill ranges, but include an increased variety of more desirable species.

Two plant species, one designated endangered and one designated sensitive, are found in big game winter range areas. The endangered, Clay Phacelia (Pseudalcea argillices), is found on open pinyon-juniper slopes in upper Spanish Fork Canyon. It has not been located on the Uinta National Forest during two recent inventory projects, but has been found within 1/4 mile of the National Forest boundary, and there is potential for it to exist on the Forest. Range improvement projects identified in this area have had and will continue to include special provisions for the protection of this species. The Tidestrom beardtongue (Penstemon tidestromii) is suspected to exist on sagebrush and pinyon-juniper communities on the Nebo division of the Uinta National Forest. Inventory work has not been completed but is planned within the next two years.

The goals of management on big game winter range area are to provide healthy, self-sustaining, desirable winter ranges that will provide for the forage needs of a sustainable big game
population, while stabilizing the soil and reducing the visual impact of roads, gravel extraction sites, unauthorized vehicle routes, and other disturbed areas. To accomplish these goals it will be necessary to reduce herbivore numbers to accommodate the re-establishment of desirable forage and watershed cover. In many areas on the east side of Utah Valley the mid-seral woody species that will offer the most winter forage and maintain the highest deer populations is big sagebrush. These ranges will be managed with big sagebrush as the minimum acceptable browse species and dominant woody vegetation. These areas will be targeted for utilization measurements. Restoration of these areas will emphasize big sagebrush, not those species recognized as "ice cream plants" (i.e., bitterbrush). In addition, increased control of off-road vehicles and other soil-disturbing activities will be necessary to achieve these goals. Vehicular travel is currently limited to designated routes, but violation of these regulations continues to be a problem.

4. OVERGRAZED RIDGETOPS AND OPEN SLOPES

High-elevation ridge tops and associated open slopes are areas identified with sheep use, primarily for bedding and salting. It is a geographically delineated area associated with shallow soil and primarily low-growing species. Steep slopes and those classified as unsuitable and in need of stabilization are also included.

Emphasis is on the management of that portion of the uplands associated with historically heavy livestock use on less productive sites. The result is unsatisfactory ecological conditions on sites in early seral condition. Some of the steeper sites have serious watershed problems, contributing surface runoff and sediment to adjacent streams.

The goal of management is to provide a stable watershed with diversified vegetative cover that will absorb surface runoff and contribute to meeting water quality standards, stream stabilization, improve wildlife and fish populations and fish spawning habitat.

Some of these sites support sensitive plant species. Species in this category that are known to exist on Uinta rangelands include sedge fescue, (Festuca desyclada) the dragon milkvetch, (Astragalus lutosus) and Garrett bladderpod, (Lesquerella garrettii). Inventory has been completed on all these species during the last two years.

Vegetation will be managed to achieve or maintain ecological sites in satisfactory condition that is, in mid- to late-seral status.

Where long-term observations indicate trends are not moving towards these conditions, use of these areas will be modified or limited.

5. UPLAND HABITAT

The uplands include approximately 596,500 acres or 71 percent of the total area in livestock grazing allotments. Most of them are in high-fair, good, and excellent condition or have an ecological status of low-mid to late-seral.

These plant communities are diverse in both type and structure and provide habitat for big and small game animals, songbirds, raptors, and reptiles.
CHAPTER IV - ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

This chapter contains a discussion of the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts of the alternatives described in Chapter II. By definition, impacts fall under the following three categories: (1) Direct environmental impacts are those that occur as a result of a change in current activity levels. (2) Indirect impacts are those that occur later in time or that occur to other segments of the environment. (3) Cumulative impacts are more complex and uncertain. They are the result of the project taking place over different periods of time and include additive impacts.

The intent of this chapter is to provide the basis for alternative comparison of the ICO’s. For easy reference, the public issues are repeated from Chapter I.

1. GRAZING ISSUES

Increasing numbers of big game animals, primarily elk, are resulting in competition for available forage between livestock and wildlife. The consequence is unacceptable levels of grazing on some areas of National Forest System Lands.

Some sheep allotments on the National Forest have areas that are in unsatisfactory ecological condition and are too small in total area to be managed with the periodic rest necessary for vegetative and soil recovery and improvement.

Alternative A - No Action--Current Management/Early to Mid-Seral Vegetative Community Types

Under the Forest Plan, vegetation treatment and livestock management systems are utilized to maintain or improve forage outputs for livestock and wildlife and to protect and improve watershed conditions. Direction is given to sustain livestock use at 1990 levels and to revise all range allotment plans to be consistent with Forest Plan direction by 1992. Direction is also given to shift livestock grazing from ranges which are in unsatisfactory condition and are not expected to improve through better management or by treatment.

The existing plan provides direction to produce 178,000 recreational visitors days (RVD’s) of wildlife outputs. No direction is given for the allocation of forage between livestock and wildlife, should conflicts occur. The goal is to provide and maintain wildlife habitat and to evaluate specific areas where wildlife control measures are needed. The allocation of forage between these animals would be left to the administrator, utilizing an interdisciplinary approach and public involvement in each case where conflicts occur.

An upper limit has been established for wintering elk numbers on the Diamond Fork-Strawberry elk herd unit. This limit is 1,200 head of elk counted on the winter range. The number needs to be firmly established by further evaluation of the winter range conditions. A draft plan for elk management has been completed on the Nebo Management Area. Similar management plans are needed for the Heber Lake and Salt Lake Timpasagas elk management units. Under either this alternative or Alternative B more information is needed to determine to what extent competition for forage and the resultant effects on ecological status of the ranges involved will be.

Similar management direction would be followed if this alternative were selected.

Alternative B - Watershed/Riparian Emphasis/Mid- to Late-Seral Vegetative Community Types Except Riparian Value Class I/Late- to PNC Vegetative Communities (Preferred Alternative)

More stringent protection of riparian areas will reduce conflicts between livestock, big game, and wildlife species by implementation of standards and guidelines established for forage utilization. In some instances, use of range by wildlife prior to the arrival of livestock may reduce the use that the latter can make of the area. This situation is most likely to occur on the high-elevation open ridges grazed by elk and perhaps on some riparian types.

More emphasis would be placed on increasing the size (acreage and forage production) of sheep allotments to accommodate a normal size band and do so within Forest standards and guidelines. Watershed and range conditions could be expected to improve at a slightly more rapid rate.

Alternative C - Recreation Emphasis

There would be no conflict between livestock and big game on Value Class I Riparian areas. However, it is doubtful if there would be much increase in big game use during the recreation months because of people conflicts with big game. Since the Class I Riparian areas would not be grazed during the summer there would be more forage available for big game use at least during the fall months. There would be some loss of livestock forage. It is estimated there are approximately 1,000 acres of Class I Riparian areas that would be closed to grazing under this alternative. If Class I Riparian areas produce an average of 2,000 lbs. of D & I plants/acre, there would be about 2.2 AUM’s per acre lost to livestock grazing capacity. However, due to use by recreationists (trampling of forage and disturbance of livestock) the 2,000 lbs. is probably not available in all cases, and the actual amount lost is something less than 2.2 AUM’s/acre. To close Class I Riparian Areas to cattle grazing, they would probably need to be fenced, at least in part, unless cattle allotments were converted to sheep grazing.

The cost of fencing all Class I Riparian Areas would be astronomical. For example, during 1990 an analysis was made to consider “Alternatives For Control of Cattle on Riparian Areas Adjacent to Diamond Fork Creek above Monks Hollow.” Several alternatives were considered. Alternative G considered installing lane fences along the stream. There would be a total of approximately 12.25 miles of fence involved at a cost of about $60,000. The AUM’s) within the closed area were estimated at 150.

Another alternative considered was changing the class of livestock use. Under this alternative, cattle would be exchanged for sheep. Much of the range on the Diamond Fork Allotment is better suited for sheep grazing. Considering the mountain topography, available water, and the amount (if any) of fence required, this alternative appears viable. Social and economic
problems, such as a failing sheep industry, and reluctance of present permittees to adjust their operations to accommodate sheep, may make this a non-functional alternative. From the standpoint of being able to fully utilize the total range resource with the least amount of environmental damage, this alternative is very viable.

If travel routes were fenced, there would be an area about one chain wide on each side of the road that would be excluded from grazing. In some situations, the entire travel route would not need to be fenced. It may be possible to fence certain canyons mouths and use the natural terrain, reducing the amount of fence required. The amount of forage lost would depend on the forage production of the particular vegetation type being excluded. For example: if the Rays Valley Road were fenced from the Forest Boundary at Sheep Creek to Diamond Fork-a distance of approximately 18 miles—there would be approximately 288 acres excluded from grazing. If usable forage production were 1,000 lbs./acre-1,000 lbs./acre X 65 = 650 lbs. usable forage/acre or a loss of .72 AUM/acre or 207 AUM's, there would be 36 miles of fence required to enclose the road right-way if no natural barriers were available for use. The cost would be $5,000.00 per mile, or a total cost of about $189,000.00. Additional fences would interfere with big game movement throughout the area. Fence maintenance requirements would greatly increase. Fences would interfere with some recreation uses such as horseback riding and hunting big game animals. To some Forest visitors, additional fences would be offensive and detract from scenic values. Fences would be effective in removing livestock from well traveled highways and Class I Riparian Areas. Fence installation and maintenance costs, and an economic recession in the sheep industry may make this a non-functional alternative.

2. WILDLIFE ISSUES

Current rangeland management practices may be having negative effects on TES species habitat which occur on National Forest System Lands.

As a result of past grazing practices and current levels of use, many big game winter ranges on the Uinta National Forest are in unsatisfactory condition, with an apparent downward trend.

Alternative A - No Action—Current Management/Early to Mid-Seral Vegetative Community Types

Specific direction concerning the management of TES plant and animal species on National Forest System Lands can be found on Pages 3-50 and 3-51 of the current Forest Plan. As directed, the Forest has continued to inventory species of concern and to collect information for the preparation of biological assessments.

Seven species were included on the Uinta's list of potential T&E plants until recently when the desert milkvetch, Astragalus deserticus, was dropped from the R-4 Sensitive Plant List.

In 1989 an inventory for clay phacelia, the Uinta's only endangered plant, was completed by the Nature Conservancy. Two new populations were found adjacent to the National Forest; however, none were located on National Forest System lands. The originally known populations have been fenced to protect them from big game and livestock grazing, but the two recently discovered populations are still subject to grazing
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by wildlife. Adjacent National Forest System Land is not grazed by livestock, but is heavily used by wintering big game animals. Concerns similar to those which resulted in the fencing of the former populations occur on these sites.

In 1990, an inventory of the sedge fence, Festuca dasyphylla, was completed on potential habitat on the Uinta National Forest by the Utah Natural Heritage Program. A substantial population was found within the Willow Creek Drainage on the Heber Ranger District.

Astragalus lutosus, another Uinta sensitive plant species was also located in small numbers during the previous survey. Negative impacts from grazing by both sheep and elk were noted in the survey report on this species. Further monitoring and study of the species was recommended.

Two additional sensitive plant species, Aster knips, King woody aster, and Leucaena glauca, Garrett's Bladderpod were inventoried by the Utah Natural Heritage Program during 1991 to determine their occurrence and status on the Uinta National Forest. Similar surveys will be completed on the other two sensitive plant species listed for the Uinta in subsequent years. As these studies are completed, the impacts of grazing on each will be assessed and grazing management adjusted, if needed, to protect these species.

Other Category Two candidate species for Federal listing that may occur on the Uinta National Forest include: Fernyngus hawk, the lady's tresses, Mountain plover, White-faced ibis, Northern goosack, Great Basin silvertong butterfly, Leatherside club, North American lynx, Hamilton milk-vetch, Flowers beartongue, Goodrich's beardtongue, Colorado cutthroat trout, Bonneville cutthroat trout, Flannel mouth sucker, Spangler's hydroporus diving beetle, Coalville mouth snail, Utah physa and Utah roundmouth snail

The following from "STUDY OF RARE OR ENDANGERED RAPTORS ON THE UINTA NATIONAL FOREST" J. A. Mosher, J. R. Murpho & C. M. White August 1974, provides information on the threatened Bald Eagle.

Field observations point out two aspects of the wintering Bald eagle population: That there are two periods of general dispersal over the Forest coinciding with the arrival and departure of the birds, and that the mid-winter concentration centers around the Nebo Creek drainage.

Aerial and ground surveys of the Nebo Creek drainage were conducted in search for a communal roost site for the dozen or more eagles observed in the area. The aerial survey extended beyond the Nebo Creek drainage to include Bennie Creek, Salt Hollow, Spencer Fork and Fode Canyon. Individual eagles were observed, but no communal roost was located.

It is our conclusion that, the Forest population has an abundance of roost sites; and roosting, therefore, is not concentrated into communal roosts.
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From a management point of view the concentration of wintering eagles in the Nebo Creek, Area should be considered in the planning for use of the area from October to April."

The known range of the peregrine falcon in Utah only slightly overlaps Uinta National Forest System Lands. However, three prior nesting locations are known within the Forest boundary (Porter and White, 1973). The history for these sites is reproduced from Porter and White (1973).

Site No | 1st Located & History, Last Known Active
--- | ---
17 | 1930s, 40s, 50s, 1967
18 | 1930s, 1939-1946
19 | 1930-1932

Taken from Table 1 Porter and White (1973).

On April 19, 1988, UDWR personnel observed two falcons flying around a cliff and defending their territory by chasing turkey vultures away. On April 23, 1988, the peregrines were positively identified as an adult male and an immature female. Intensive monitoring of this site over the following three years indicated the peregrines did not successfully nest. No peregrines were observed during 1991. This site is located within big game winter range and is far removed from domestic livestock grazing.

A survey of Uinta National Forest System Lands to determine the presence, or absence, of active peregrine falcons was completed in 1988-1989. No additional activity has been observed.

Monitoring of the Slate Canyon area is continuing under a cooperative effort with the UDWR.

Recent surveys by the UDWR have established the location of the western spotted frog in Salamander Lake located on the Pleasant Grove Ranger District. This was the only location within the Forest. A population was located southwest of Wallsburg, Utah, a few miles from the Forest boundary.

With respect to the unsatisfactory condition of big game winter range, the Forest Plan gives no specific direction to accelerate improvement efforts. It does list objectives to continue to identify and improve ranges in unsatisfactory condition and identify specific land management practices needed to meet wildlife management objectives.

It also provides direction to cooperate with UDWR and other Government agencies, as well as private landowners, to acquire and protect needed big game winter range.

Efforts to achieve these objectives have accelerated in recent years. A plan to improve big game winter range in Spanish Fork Canyon was completed in 1989, and 350 acres were treated in the Fall of 1990.

Elk and deer winter ranges are defined as follows: For mule deer, elevations below 7,500 feet with an aspect between 180 and 270 degrees azimuth, primarily in pinyon-juniper, oakbrush, mountain brush and sagebrush vegetative types; for elk, the same definition applies except for elevations below 8,500 feet; for mule, elevations up to 9,800 feet—moose usually do not stray far from creek bottoms where willow browse is available. Areas containing suitable stands of spruce/subalpine fir and white fir could also be considered critical.

Big game populations would continue to increase in numbers to the point where winter range conditions in terms of a sufficient quantity and quality of suitable forage would no longer be available. Watershed conditions would deteriorate, with the loss of vegetative ground cover from soil-holding plants and vegetative litter.

During severe winters, large die-offs of big game animals, particularly deer and to a lesser extent elk, could be expected due to the lack of adequate winter range. Depredation problems in residential areas along the Wasatch Front would be expected to increase.

**Alternative B - Watershed/Riparian Emphasis/Mid- To PNC Vegetative Types**

Under this alternative, the impacts on TES plant species would not be any different than under Alternative A. The same program would be followed for protection of these plants.

Efforts to manage and improve big game winter ranges would be expanded over current efforts under existing Forest Plan direction.

In cooperation with UDWR and interested publics, game populations would be reduced to allow treatment and recovery of winter range in unsatisfactory condition. Increased efforts would be made to restore winter habitat through physical rehabilitation measures, with emphasis along the Wasatch Front and in Spanish Fork Canyon. As this work would be completed, it would lead to a subsequent improvement of watershed conditions and visual quality in these areas.

Management strategies would be geared towards improvement of apparent trend over a 5-year period on ranges below mid-serial ecological status. Where trend is down, management changes would be initiated to reverse the trend. Utilization would be limited to 60 percent, on big sagebrush, bitterbrush, mountain mahogany, clffrose, and four-wing saltbush.

**Alternative D - Recreation Emphasis**

Under this alternative the impacts on TES plant species would be different than under Alternative A or B, particularly if the species were located within Class 1 riparian areas. Conflicts with livestock would be eliminated. People conflicts and problems would still persist. Class 1 riparian habitat improvement would be in direct proportion to the enforcement of the Riparian Standards and Guidelines where people are the problem, i.e., manage recreation areas on a rest-rotation system or some other type of rest system to protect and improve the habitat. Fencing major travel routes would provide a strip of habitat along each side of the road about a chain (66 feet) wide that would
be available for various wildlife species that may care to utilize it. However, under certain conditions, this could work to the detriment of wildlife if they are attracted to roadside zones. The probability of being killed by recreation and other traffic would greatly increase.

3. RECREATION ISSUES

Resource impacts associated with increased recreational demands such as off-highway vehicle use and dispersed camping are resulting in accelerated deterioration of the rangeland resources and watersheds conditions.

Livestock has been displaced from suitable range due to developed recreational facilities and other Forest Service developments.

Some grazing areas along roads and trails are often grazed excessively, caused by a lack of forage or a lack of proper livestock management.

Riparian areas (stream bottoms) are often impacted by livestock. Areas are grazed excessively and livestock manure makes recreation activities unpleasant.

Livestock on roads and trails often interfere with travel or offend recreationists (backpacking, hiking, horse backriding, and driving for pleasure.)

Alternative A - No Action–Current Management/Early to Mid-Seral Vegetative Community Types

The Forest Plan provides direction to manage off-road vehicle use to protect the Forest environment and renewable resources. Standard and Guideline No. 24 calls for the establishment of rest-rotation recreation use in riparian areas to reduce resource impacts. Although some progress has been made along these lines, this standard and guideline has not been fully implemented.

Recreation use on the Forest has more than doubled since the Forest Plan was approved 7 years ago. Impacts and accelerated deterioration are most obvious in the riparian areas located in canyon bottoms over the entire Forest. Recreation demands are not expected to diminish in the future.

In some instances, damage by off-highway vehicle use and recreation activity in riparian and other areas is equal to or more serious than that caused by ungulate grazing.

The displacement of livestock from suitable range has not occurred to any degree in the past 10 years. The construction of Blackhawk Campground in the early 1980's was the last significant impact on suitable livestock range.

Some conflicts will occur with dispersed recreation under either Alternative A or B (use on units where rest rotation is practical). Livestock will be more concentrated per unit area. Livestock and dispersed recreationists often prefer the same areas, such as relatively flat, grassy areas or dry meadows surrounded by trees that provide shade. Depending on length of stay, the conflict may be short lived. Conflicts generally result in the disturbance of livestock. Some forage may be trampled down and consequently not preferred by grazing animals. Amount of forage lost over the season is insignificant. Conflicts with developed recreation will be minimized by fencing developed campgrounds. Cattle and sheep crossing or trailing on Forest roads may, on occasion, interrupt people driving for sightseeing or other reasons.

A number of campgrounds have been constructed at Strawberry Reservoir; however, the lands used for recreation purposes were obtained by the Bureau of Reclamation from the Strawberry Water Users long before the area had National Forest status. The decision to withdraw the acquired Strawberry Valley lands from livestock grazing, at least on a temporary basis, and to emphasize wildlife/fisheries values on these lands is evaluated in the Strawberry Valley Management Area Final Environmental Impact Statement. This Final Environmental Impact Statement also amends the Forest Plan and provides direction for management of the acquired lands. The rationale for this decision can be found in the Record of Decision dated August 1, 1990.

It is expected that as the population along the Wasatch Front increases, so will impacts and conflicts with grazing of livestock increase.

Alternative B - WaterShed/Riparian Emphasis/Mid-To PNC Vegetative Types

The riparian value classification system developed to properly manage, protect and enhance riparian-dependent resource values recognizes three categories of riparian areas based upon four resource values: (1) Fisheries habitat value based upon potential for the site; (2) value of water use and water quality protection needs; (3) recreation resource value; and (4) wildlife habitat value. The three value classes allow different livestock utilization levels. The highest value riparian area will have the least amount of utilization by livestock, because other dependent resource values are being protected and there would be need to return these lands to late seral vegetative status within a 5-year time frame. Limits on utilization and stable height requirements will restrict the amount of herbivore use. Additional riding and herding, coupled with development of water sources out of riparian areas, may increase the length of time livestock can remain in a unit where the highest value riparian areas have been identified. It may become necessary to curtail recreation activities in highest value riparian areas if impacts associated with recreational activities prevent the area from reaching the objective DFC.

In lower value riparian areas, a greater level of utilization of forage by livestock and wildlife will be allowed. There will be limits on forage utilization and suitable tree heights—not as restrictive as Class I riparian areas.

The objective is to return these areas to mid-seral status over a 5- to 15-year time frame.

The length of time livestock can remain in these areas will depend upon how successful management activities are in keeping livestock out of riparian areas, thereby reducing overall utilization. It is expected livestock use will be adjusted in some manner.

It may become necessary to adjust recreation activities within highest value riparian areas if impacts prevent the areas from reaching desired ecological status or being able to maintain the desired range condition.
4. ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL ISSUES

The economic well-being of the local livestock industry is dependent upon a continual source of available range on Federally owned and administered lands.

Expanding elk herds are competing with livestock for forage. If elk populations are not better managed, livestock grazing capacities will suffer.

Fencing to keep livestock from entering and damaging high-value streams is not cost effective.

Alternative A - No Action—Current Management/Early to Mid-Successional Vegetative Community Types

The continued implementation of the current Forest Plan and associated standards and guidelines would continue providing the same level of opportunities and benefits actually made available during the past 7 years.

Trends in grazing by permitted numbers of domestic livestock will be similar to past levels of use. Over the next 8 years (Forest Plan period), trends have shown a slight decline in livestock numbers.

In some areas, the damage to fisheries and riparian resource from herbivore grazing will remain high.
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Critical big game winter range will remain in poor to fair condition, with downward or static trends, and will be unable to support objective population numbers of big game species.

Numbers of WFUD's and RVD's may begin to decline as consumptive and non-consumptive opportunities become fewer and recreational satisfaction decreases.

Alternative B - Watershed/Riparian Emphasis/Mid- to PNC Vegetative Types

Under Alternative B, management and protection of riparian areas, critical big game winter ranges, high elevation open slopes and aspen ecosystems will require changes in present livestock grazing. More intensive grazing systems may have to be developed to provide riparian vegetation the rest needed to complete plant growth cycles and achieve DFC's of mid- to late-serial ecological status. Vegetal utilization criteria will be designed to protect key area values. In some cases, production of livestock may have to be reduced. Costs for management and development of livestock grazing may increase on some allotments.

Societal change is occurring as young people from backgrounds with less acquaintance and attachment to agribusiness (farms, ranches and supporting businesses) enter the job market. They are influencing public opinion differently than their progenitors. They are generally more interested in noncommodity uses of the public land than those uses that produce products and have an impact on the land, scenic and recreation values. They tend to be conservative toward resource uses such as timber harvest, livestock grazing and mineral extraction and liberal toward protection of the environment and the scenery. This societal change is expected to continue. The trend of public opinion toward more conservative and protective uses of public lands is expected to continue, particularly in the urban Forest setting along the Wasatch Front.

The trend in the number of livestock grazed on the Uinta National Forest over the last decade has been slightly down. From 10-year records of cattle and sheep permitted to graze on the Forest, the high, low, and current numbers of animals and AUM's are: Cattle numbers-12,187 highest in 1981, 10,847 lowest in 1984, 11,351 current numbers; cattle AUM's-78,357 highest in 1993, 58,056 lowest in 1992, 62,474 current AUM's; sheep numbers-77,163 highest in 1982, 65,199 current numbers and lowest numbers in 10-year period; sheep AUM's-70,472 highest in 1984, 62,620 current AUM's (Refer to Appendix 5). A similar downward trend in total livestock grazing on the Forest is expected to continue over the next decade. This may stabilize as the small islands of unhealthy rangelands targeted by this Alternative are given the opportunity to improve and to reach the DFC described in Alternative B. The long-term viability of the livestock industry in the local area, as it is influenced by National Forest System Lands, is expected to improve as grazing standards and guidelines are implemented and the forage base improves in both condition and productivity.

Elk herds will be managed at population levels that are determined through the present Interagency Committee and Board of Big Game Control processes. The Board process includes public involvement. There is also public representation on the Board of Big Game Control.
Elk numbers in Utah have expanded dramatically over the last decade. Their numbers peaked on elk herd units on the Uinta National Forest in 1989 as determined from aerial trend counts conducted by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources. For the entire Forest, they have been held at or below that number since the 1988-89 count, though Kamas and Salt Lake-Timpanogos Herd Units have experienced increases (Refer to Appendix 6). Elk numbers are expected to remain relatively constant on the Mt. Nebo and the Diamond-Strawberry Herd Units where maximum herd numbers have been established in formal Elk Management Plans-plans that have had public and interagency involvement. Maximum herd numbers established for the Diamond-Strawberry Elk Herd Unit (largest on the Forest) are 1200 head as determined from aerial count on the winter range. Actual numbers would be expected to be somewhat greater. Maximum herd numbers established for the Mt. Nebo Elk Herd Unit (second largest on the Forest) are 800 head as determined from aerial count on the winter range. Actual numbers would be higher.

Elk population levels on the Salt Lake-Timpanogos, Heber-Red Creek and Kamas Herd Units are expected to be established in future elk management plans required by recent action of the Utah State Legislature.

All herbivore use of rangelands on the Uinta National Forest is expected to remain within the bounds of the grazing standards and guidelines in Alternative B. Where adjustment of grazing use is required for health of the ecosystem, it will be made with public involvement. Large shifts of grazing use between livestock and big game are not expected during the next 10-year planning period. Where conflicts between livestock and big game grazing capacities become political and are brought into the public forum, social pressure will most likely favor big game over livestock. At the same time, there will be social pressure to continue a viable, well-managed livestock presence on the National Forest.

Fencing cattle from riparian rangelands is not expected to be an economically sound solution for most of the riparian problems that are known to be accelerated by grazing on the Uinta National Forest.

Where cooperative efforts from interested parties-conservation groups and livestock interests-can combine efforts to solve specific problems, fencing may be a viable social solution. Various amounts of fencing, water developments, and other herbivore management facilities are expected to be used in combination with improved management practices to meet Alternative B standards and guidelines and the goals described for the desired future of rangelands on the Forest.

An economic analysis will be completed for each allotment as individual allotment management plan revisions are completed and site-specific changes in permitted numbers of livestock and WFUD’s or RVD’s are developed.

Alternative D - Recreation Emphasis

See fencing/orage discussion included under Grazing Pg. IV-2.
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5. RIPARIAN/WATERSHED

Unsatisfactory ecological condition of many riparian habitats, wetlands, and floodplains is contributing to poor water quality. Increased silt and sediment entering streams, instability of streambanks, and a lack of suitable riparian vegetation is having a negative effect on the fisheries and wildlife habitat and associated resources.

Alternative A - No Action—Current Management/Early to Mid-Seral Vegetative Community Types

The Forest Plan gives direction to develop and implement plans or projects for the improvement or restoration of degraded or poor quality floodplains, wetlands, and riparian habitat. Such plans can include changes in management as well as physical rehabilitation efforts. Much effort has gone into improvement of riparian areas since the Forest Plan was completed in 1984; however, specific guidance for management of these areas has not been available. Each proposal for improvement has been handled individually, with minimal common direction.

The Forest Plan direction would eventually lead to correction of problems which exist in riparian areas but at a slower rate than provided under Alternative B.

Alternative B - Watershed/Riparian Emphasis/Mid- to PNC Vegetative Types

This alternative would give more emphasis to the correction of problems in riparian areas and would hasten the recovery of riparian vegetation, reduce erosion, and improve wildlife habitat and water quality more than under Alternative A.

With the development of the aforementioned riparian value classification system and associated standards and guidelines, the unsatisfactory conditions common to many Forest riparian areas are expected to improve. Realization of mid- to late-seral vegetation conditions is expected sooner than under Alternative A.

Demand for stream fishing and dispersed camping has greatly increased on the Forest. There will be some conflict with fishers persons and dispersed campers when cattle or sheep are scheduled in units that have streams. This conflict will not occur every year or all season long, but will occur with the grazing schedule. Conflict with sheep is short lived because sheep tend to move away from water after drinking; and depending on vegetation condition, they may not trail to water every day. Cattle on the other hand, if not forced away from streams will spend most of their time there. Standards and guidelines for riparian areas will change this pattern and reduce conflicts with people.

Alternative D - Recreation Emphasis

This alternative would remove livestock conflicts from a large portion of the most desirable riparian habitat on the Forest. Class I riparian areas would be closed to livestock grazing. This action would bring about faster recovery to the areas not being affected by over use by livestock and recreationists. There would still be many problems to overcome, as described in the opening paragraph in this section, but they would be
directly related to human activities. The enforcement of the Riparian Standards and Guidelines could bring about recovery within a reasonable time. Conflicts between recreationists and livestock would be eliminated. People conflicts and problems would still persist. Class I riparian habitat improvement would be in direct proportion to the willingness of the Forest to enforce the Riparian Standards and Guidelines where people are the problem. (Meaning: Manage recreation areas on a rent-rotation system or some other type of rent system to protect and improve the habitat.)

6. MANAGEMENT ISSUES

DFC’s, management prescriptions, and standards and guidelines currently identified in the Forest Plan for rangeland management are inadequate and do not provide a common understanding of management direction.

Approved allotment management plans and grazing permits need to reflect appropriate standards and guidelines for achieving the DFC.

Many rangeland resource problems currently facing the Forest Service are directly attributable to a lack of commitment on the part of the Forest Service to ensure that grazing practices are consistent with approved AMP’s and a lack of commitment on the part of the permittee to adhere to approved management plans and acceptable grazing practices.

Alternative A - No Action—Current Management/Early to Mid-Seral Vegetative Community Types

Implementing the No-Action Alternative would leave the Forest Plan with no specific identification of DFC’s for which we wish to manage, and with no specific standards and guidelines to use as tools to monitor, design, and plan resource management actions as they relate to moving towards DFC’s.

Without specific descriptions, it will be difficult to determine whether we are moving toward desired conditions or not, and whether management actions taken might deter or impede progress towards those conditions.

Currently, there are no specific measurable standards or guidelines which can be incorporated into range AMP’s and grazing permits. This would continue to be the case with implementation of the No-Action Alternative. Specific items could be developed on a case-by-case basis and included as parts of these management plans and permits—but there may be no consistency across the Forest.

Implementation of the No-Action Alternative would not resolve the unsatisfactory winter range condition issue. There would be no emphasis to maintain aspen as a major vegetative component, thus reducing overall vegetative diversity across the Uinta National Forest. Aspen reduction would result in a loss of habitat for a variety of wildlife species, as well loss of a valuable source of forage for both wildlife and domestic livestock. Adverse impacts could result where excessive wildlife/livestock and recreational use occurs. Aspen stand regeneration could be limited, ecological and soil conditions could continue in a downward trend where conditions are now less than acceptable, and reduced ground cover and increased potential for unstable watershed conditions could result from all impacts. In areas where little or no use by either wildlife/livestock or publics occurs, ecological trends could progress to a point where aspen is replaced by conifer, thus losing the aspen component.

Alternative B - Watershed/Riparian Emphasis/Mid- To PNC Vegetative Types

Implementation of this alternative would help resolve the above-described management issues.

Desired future conditions, management prescriptions, and standards and guidelines would be specifically described. This would provide a basis for consistent application of required management practices and monitoring requirements across the Forest. In doing so, the Forest Service would be sending a signal that we are prepared to follow through with monitoring items referenced in the amendment (as required by law), and are committed to maintain grazing use in compliance with approved AMP’s, into which management standards and guidelines will be incorporated.

Implementation of this alternative would resolve many of the identified issues, primarily those dealing with overall vegetative conditions and other resource problems. Emphasis on maintaining aspen as an integral part of the forested ecosystem would provide vegetative diversity, habitat for a variety of wildlife species, and general esthetic quality. This alternative provides specific direction whereby all management activities, including livestock and wildlife grazing, can be monitored and adjusted as necessary to ensure protection of aspen resources and overall vegetative conditions associated with aspen communities.

Alternative D - Recreation Emphasis

Implementation of this alternative would resolve many of the issues addressed in this FEIS, particularly the use of Class I riparian areas by livestock. On many of the Class I riparian areas, the removal of livestock would bring about a faster recovery to the desired ecological status. However, this action would not by any means solve all management problems. Problems in canyons that are being used heavily by people, thus causing unsatisfactory watershed conditions, will continue to exist. Management efforts could be directed toward the enforcement of the Riparian Standards and Guidelines to solve resource problems directly related to overuse by recreationists.
CHAPTER V - IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

IMPLEMENTATION

This chapter describes the approach to be used in implementing the Forest-wide standards and guidelines.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Section details how the Forest Service will track implementation. The focus of this section is on accomplishment of goals and objectives of the Preferred Alternative detailed in Chapter IV.

This amendment clarifies and better describes the direction for rangeland management on the Uinta National Forest. Forest Service employees will be guided by this amendment as well as all previous amendments to the Forest Plan, and existing laws, regulations, policies, and guidelines.

A key element of implementation is consultation with the public. Throughout implementation, the full range of public information and involvement techniques will be applied, including frequent contact with groups and individuals involved with the day-to-day management on the Uinta National Forest.

Management direction outlined in this amendment will be used in analyzing future proposed uses by Uinta National Forest users. All permits, contracts, and requests for occupancy and use of the National Forest must be consistent with management direction and requirements identified in this document.

MONITORING & EVALUATION

Monitoring and evaluation are the management control systems for the Forest Plan. They provide the decisionmaker and the public with information on the progress and results of implementing the Forest Plan and its amendments.

Monitoring and evaluation compare the results being achieved with those predicted in the Forest Plan and its amendments.

GOALS OF MONITORING

Goals for monitoring and evaluating the Forest Plan and particularly this amendment are to confirm that:

1. The Uinta National Forest is implementing its planned standards and guidelines,
2. Existing and emerging public issues and management concerns are being adequately addressed,
3. Standards and guidelines appear to be effective in achieving Forest goals and objectives in the short term, and
4. Long-term validation monitoring substantiates that goals and objectives are being achieved.

MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

Monitoring requirements are in the Forest Plan Monitoring Section, Page 4-12.

Additional monitoring requirements from this amendment are shown below. The addition addresses items to be monitored, techniques, measurement frequency, acceptable variation, and standards to be followed.

Forest Plan monitoring with this addition is the long-term monitoring that can be expected, and is based on the presumption that adequate funding will be received. Monitoring scheduled is based on past funding levels, and the monitoring shown will be completed under similar funding levels in the future. Allotments will be monitored annually according to the requirements in AMP’s in addition to the long-term monitoring shown below (refer to Appendix I).

AMENDMENT TO FOREST MONITORING PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect To Be Measured</th>
<th>Monitoring Technique</th>
<th>Measurement Frequency</th>
<th>Variation Which Would Cause Further Evaluation</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riparian</td>
<td>Riparian Evaluation</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>10% Decline in Acres meeting toward desired Future</td>
<td>This amend. to FLRMP and R-4 Riparian Evaluation Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological status</td>
<td>10 Riparian Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Class 1 or II Streams)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Game</td>
<td>Interagency</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td>10% Decline in acres meeting or progressing toward desired future</td>
<td>Utah Interagency Guides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Range Ecological status</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter VI - List of Preparers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Agency/Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norman Huntsman</td>
<td>BS Range Management</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Range/Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range/Wildlife Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29 Years Federal Govt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene DePietro</td>
<td>BS Range Management</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Range Conservationist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range Conservationist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 Years Federal Govt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Smith</td>
<td>BS Range Management</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Range Conservationist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range Conservationist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 Years Federal Govt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Grifflie</td>
<td>BS Wildlife Management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Wildlife Biologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wildlife Biologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Years Federal Govt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Williams</td>
<td>BS Wildlife Management</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Wildlife Biologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wildlife Biologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 Years Federal Govt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Call</td>
<td>BFS Landscape Arch.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Forest Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Years Federal Govt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Skabelund</td>
<td>BS General Forestry</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Forest/Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forester-Watershed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 Years Federal Govt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Individuals Who Assisted the Preparers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Agency/Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. Frank Savage</td>
<td>BS Range Management</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Range/Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range/Wildlife Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32 Years Fed. Govt. - Ret.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Thompson</td>
<td>MS Fisheries Science</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fisheries Mgr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Fisheries Mgr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Years State Govt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter VII - Consultation with Others; List of Agencies, Organizations, and Persons to Whom Copies of the Environmental Impact Statement or Its Summary Have Been Sent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley National Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie National Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishlake National Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermountain Regional Office, U.S. Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manti-LaSal National Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Conservation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub Sciences Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch National Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Fork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heber City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orem City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provo City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santaquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Fork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Natural Resources &amp; Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Wildlife Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor, State of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Planning Coordinator (A65 State Planning House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention: Mito Barney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Forester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Dept. of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountainlands Association of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch Front Regional Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon County Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchenne County Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juab County Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake County Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanpete County Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit County Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele County Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah County Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ute Indian Tribe, Fort Duchesne, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Fork Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young University Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heber City Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephi Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payson Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provo City Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Fork Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springville Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Valley Community College Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressman Bill Orton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Jake Garn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Orrin Hatch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Associations and Private Citizens

Aagard, Vance
Anderson, Arvin
Allinson, Ned C.
Alloway, Ronald
Banner, Roger
Beckstrom, Merrill
Benning, Sergene
Bethers, Allen
Bingham, Tom
Brotherson, Max
Butterfield, Eldon
Butterfield, Wayne
Calvin E. Olsen Ranch, Inc.
Carter, Dick
Castagno, Cosetta
Castagno, Pete
Childs Ranches
Christensen, Garold
Christensen, LaMar
Cook, David P.
Cook, Marilyn & Janet E.
Coop. Sec. Corp., Tooele Stake
Dale Alfred Trust
Dods, Corinne S.
Durrant, Robert W.
Ecker, James H.
Fitzgerald, Athel
Fitzgerald, Don & Steven
Fitzgerald, Larry
Fitzgerald, Mont G.
Flinders, Jarren
Frank, Vincent
Giles, LaVon
Giles, Nolen
Giles, Ralph
Gowans, Don F.
Gowans, Phillip R.
Gurney, Melva
H&R Livestock
Hamilton, Lowell
Hartman, Bruce
Hartman, Randy
Hicken, Roger
Jasperson, William R.
Jessen, Mac
John, Rodney
Jones, Wayne

Jordan, Clift
Juab County Livestock Association
Bailey, Dean & Lynn
Belliston, Allen E.
Blackett, Evan, Marlow, & Morris
Bowles, Carl J. & Edna
Bowles, Spencer
Garrett, R. Blake
Garrett, Roscoe & Joseph
Garrett, Robert & Joseph
Jackson, Russell H.
Jarrett, Larry M.
Jarrett, M. M.
Lunt, Kent M.
McPherson, Gordon
McPherson, Merle
McPherson, Seth L.
McPherson, Seth & Thomas
McWilliams, Jimmy
Park, Edwin
Peterson, Cary G.
Reed, J. Waldon & Thelma
Winn, Chad P.
Kingston, Merlin B.
Larson, Douglas & Ardis
Larson, Glen R.
Macfarlane, Gary
McClimans, Richard
Moon, Alton
Moon, Kenneth
Moon, Lamont
Moon, Orven & Alton
Morgan, Earl C.
Nelson, Robert
Okelberry, Lee
Okelberry, Ray
Payson Livestock Association
Ahlin, Edwin
Ahlin, Warren L.
Argyle, Alan F.
Barney, Wendall
Beckstrom, Dale
Corless, Mike R. & Jan.
Cornaby, Dale
Cornaby, Albert B & April
Dixon, Ray Ranches
Haskell, Francis E.
Associations and Private Citizens (Cont’d.)

Isaac, Jay Russell
Kay, Lyle L.
Loveless, Jeff
Maurin, Charles H. & Afton
Mitchell, Donald L.
Mitchell, Keith & Lucille
Newitt, Duane & Marie
Prowitgaard, Donald
Scheurer, Stewart & Romona
Spanish Fork Stake
Stallings, Elden
Stein, John Ranches
Throckmorton, Sidney A.
Wilson Brothers
Youd, John D.
Parashke, James A.
Pederson, Cora
Provost, LaKen
Rabband, Irwin
Rabband, Wayne
Richens, Dennis
Roberts, Max
Sierra Club
Salt Lake County Fish & Game Assn.
Shiner, Miles
Smith, Allen
Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance
Spanish Fork Livestock Association
Aquas, Collins
Argyle, Alan F.
Balsly, Millard
Banks, Lynne B.
Bearson, Sherman V.
Beck, Jon C.
Child Ranches
Christmas, Lew, Leon & Joy
Corps. of Presiding Bishop
Butler Stake
Cowan, Joel
Cree, Ryan
Edman, John N.
Evans, Daniel R.
Finch, George H.
Galt, Allan H.
Gill, Frank
Hansen, Henry T.
Hansen, J. Kay
Hansen, John & Georgia
Hansen, Ted & Kim
Hanson, Harold H.
Hanson, Roland & Roy
Hester, Dale
Larsen, Glen R.
Larsen, Ted & Betty Rae
Ladlow, Donald & Ronald
Landell, Phillip & Niel
McKell, Arthur & Helen
McKell, Mark & Erma
Money, Eldon A.
Nelson, Frank & Jane
Nelson, Allen H.
Nelson, Harvey H.
Nelson, J. Ross & Mary Jane
Nelson, James S.
Richards, Dr. G. A.
Roach, Paul J.
Sheen, Kenneth
Butler Stake
Swanson, Alas
Swanson, Clyde & Cleve
Swanson, Ray A.
Thomas, Gene & Calene
Thomas, Robert, Rex & Elsie
Vincent, Fred
Vincent, Waldon & Evelyn
Warren, Welby & Mable
Williams, Keith A.
Woffinden, Emmis
Wise, Donald & Edna
Sweat, Allen
Sweat, Duane
Sweat, Evan
Sweat, Otis
The Wilderness Society
Thomas, Bernell
Utah Public Lands Coalition
Utah Wildlife Federation
Utah Cattlemen’s Association
Utah Audubon Society
Utah Woolgrowers’ Association
Utah State University, Dr. Wiedmeyer
Utah Farm Bureau Federation
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APPENDIX 1
RIPARIAN VALUE CLASSIFICATION/UTILIZATION GUIDES
UINTA NATIONAL FOREST

INTRODUCTION

All riparian zones within the Uinta National Forest have four things in common: (1) They create well-defined habitat zones within the much drier surrounding areas; (2) they make up a minor portion of the overall area; (3) they are generally more productive in terms of biomass—plant and animal—than the remainder of the Forest; and (4) they are critical sources of diversity within the Forest ecosystem.

Riparian areas, although comprising less than 1 percent (approximately 8,007 acres) of the Uinta National Forest, are among the Forest’s most productive and important habitats. Their significance to many resources is widely recognized.

RIPARIAN VALUE CLASSIFICATION

To properly manage, protect, and enhance these riparian-dependent resource values, a riparian value classification system was developed for the Uinta National Forest. This value classification recognizes three categories of riparian areas based upon four resource values: (1) fisheries habitat value based on potential for the site; (2) value of water use and water quality protection needs; (3) recreation resource value; and (4) and wildlife habitat value.

The three value classes are defined as follows:

A. RIPARIAN VALUE CLASS I

Highest Value Riparian Area (DFC is late seral to PNC ecological status and excellent soil stability rating.) Meeting any one of the listed criteria warrants a Class I rating:

1. Associated with a high value fishery habitat
2. Associated with high value water use and demand for high quality water
3. Associated with a high value recreation resource
4. Associated with a high value wildlife habitat

B. RIPARIAN VALUE CLASS II

High-value riparian area (DFC is mid- and late seral ecological status and good soil stability rating.) Meeting any one of the listed criteria warrants a Class II rating:

1. Associated with a moderate value fishery habitat
2. Associated with moderate value water use and water quality demand

C. RIPARIAN VALUE CLASS III

Moderate value riparian area (DFC is mid- seral ecological status and moderate soil stability rating.) Meeting any one of the listed criteria warrants a Class III rating:

1. Limited significance as a sport fishery
2. Associated with a low or limited value water use and water quality demand
3. Associated with limited value recreation resource
4. Associated with limited value wildlife habitat

A moderate value class in the above classification system does not mean the riparian areas so classified are not important.

All riparian areas are important to the multiple-use management of the Uinta National Forest. The value classification simply helps the manager determine the degree of protection (rest) or utilization a riparian area will receive to reach the targeted ecological status and the time period required to do so. For example, Value Class III riparian areas may have high value as water sources for livestock and wildlife, but they may be managed to meet a lower ecological status than Value Class II riparian areas that are managed for additional uses and higher quality outputs. The time allowed to reach the desired ecological status may be greater for Value Class III riparian areas.

A. FISHERY HABITAT VALUE CLASSIFICATION (This determines fisheries value under the preceding Riparian Value Class I, II, & III "A").

A system designed for the Uinta National Forest and used as one criterion in defining riparian value classes. Three fish habitat value classes are recognized.

1. High Value Fishery Habitat - Meets any of the listed criteria:
   a. Associated with locally significant sport fishery
   b. Associated with major drainages, where volumes of base water flows are 10 CFS or more
   c. Associated with fish spawning habitat on streams that are tributary to reservoirs
   d. Riparian potential is high.
   e. Fisheries potential is high.
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f. Threatened or endangered species are present.

2. **Moderate Value Fishery Habitat** - Meets any of the listed criteria:
   a. Associated with moderate sport fishery
   b. Associated with drainages where the volumes of base flow are approximately 3 to 10 CFS
   c. Riparian potential varies from moderate to high.
   d. Fisheries potential varies from moderate to high.
   e. Sensitive species are present.

3. **Low Value Fishery Habitat** - Meets any of the listed criteria:
   a. Associated with low or limited sport fishery
   b. Associated with drainages where base flows are below 3 CFS
   c. Riparian potential varies from low to moderate.
   d. Fisheries potential varies from low to moderate.

B. **WATER USE AND WATER QUALITY VALUE CLASSIFICATION** (This determines fisheries value under the preceding Riparian Value Class I, II, & III "A").

A system designed for the Uinta National Forest and used as one criterion in defining riparian value classes. Three water value classes are recognized.

1. **High Value Water Use and Demand for Quality Water** - Meets any of the listed criteria:
   a. Direct use of springs or streams for culinary or municipal water
   b. Water located in wilderness or on special areas

2. **Moderate Value Water Use and Demand for Quality Water** - Meets any of the listed criteria:
   a. Indirect use for culinary or municipal water (riparian areas in close proximity to culinary or municipal systems where overland waterflows could adversely affect culinary water supplies.)
   b. Riparian areas where overland flow could adversely affect special areas or direct use of water for special uses.
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3. **Low or Limited Value Water Use and Demand for Quality Water** - Meets any of the listed criteria:
   a. Not associated with culinary or municipal water supplies. Areas may be located within CUP water collection watersheds
   b. Not associated with wilderness or special areas, but may be important for downstream irrigation

C. **RECREATION RESOURCE VALUE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM** (This determines fisheries value under the preceding Riparian Value Class I, II, & III "C").

A system designed for the Uinta National Forest and used as one criteria in defining riparian value classes. Three recreation resource value classes are recognized:

1. **High Value Recreation Resource**

   An outstanding local recreational resource may be due to a combination of attributes or to one specific characteristic that creates exceptional local recreation opportunities for one or more activities. This resource would be significant to recreation users throughout the northern Utah region and would be a destination site.

2. **Moderate Value Recreation Resource**

   Moderate recreational resources are typically available locally. They have considerable recreation value, but the physical setting or experience opportunity may be considered standard for what is available locally. It may be an important recreation resource in part because it is convenient or easily accessible to user groups. Most users typically would not travel great distances to use this resource.

3. **Limited Value Recreation Resource**

   These resources may have recreation value, but relative to the other value classes do not offer as high a quality recreational experience, special physical setting or the intensity or uniqueness of experience described in the other value classes. The recreation value may be limited due to the inherent nature of the setting or restricted access.

D. **WILDLIFE VALUE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM** (This determines fisheries value under the preceding Riparian Value Class I, II, & III "D").

A system designed for the Uinta National Forest and used as one criteria in defining riparian value classes. Four wildlife habitat classes are recognized.

1. **High Value Wildlife Habitat** - Meets any of the listed criteria:
   a. Supports a threatened or endangered species.
   b. Supports limiting habitat for a dependent management indicator species.
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c. Areas of critical or limiting habitat
d. Areas contributing to excellent vertical habitat

2. Moderate Value Wildlife Habitat
a. Supports a sensitive species.
b. Areas with good vertical and horizontal diversity

3. Limited Value Wildlife Habitat
Provides a source of water, little horizontal or vertical diversity.

IDENTIFYING DESIRED FUTURE CONDITION FOR RIPARIAN HABITATS

Riparian area value classifications are used to identify the ecological status (desired community of plants and animals) towards which each classified riparian area should be managed. It is used in combination with the potential biotic community that can be expected due to the inherent capability of each site.

As inherent stream channel stability decreases, the condition of the associated riparian area becomes increasingly more important for the protection of soil productivity and water quality. That is, highly unstable stream beds and banks are not characteristics desired for highest value riparian areas, but are recognized as conditions to which it is desirable to apply the most stringent standards and guidelines.

RIPARIAN AREA EVALUATION

The Integrated Riparian Evaluation Guide, (Intermountain Region, May 1990) provides an integrated approach for: (1) A process to stratify and classify riparian areas according to their natural inherent characteristics and their respective existing conditions, (2) data collection, (3) evaluation of riparian areas.

The Integrated Riparian Evaluation Guide outlines three "levels" of evaluation. Riparian evaluations conducted on the Uinta National Forest are completed using the level that will provide the information needed at the time. Quantitative data are collected to solve site-specific problems and to assess impacts of management activities on riparian resources. Levels I and III have been conducted on the Forest.

A. LEVEL III OBJECTIVES

1. Provide detailed quantitative site information for riparian complexes to:
   a. Describe current status
   b. Quantify potential
   c. Provide data for management decisions
   d. Validate Forest Standards and Guidelines
   e. Develop design criteria for riparian habitat projects
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f. Quantify management effects
g. Identify factors limiting achievement of potential or management goals

2. Provide a monitoring framework to evaluate management activities.

B. RIPARIAN RESOURCE SURVEYS - The following surveys may be completed under Level III, depending on the issues to be resolved:

1. Vegetation
   a. Cross section composition
   b. Green line vegetation composition
   c. Woody species regeneration
   d. Nested frequency - See Range Analysis Handbook
   e. Production - See Range Analysis Handbook

2. Soil Data and Inventory
   a. Order 1 Survey
   b. Order 2 Surveys
   c. Soil compaction
   d. Soil puddling

3. Hydrology and Stream Dynamics
   a. Channel maintenance
   b. Floodplain
   c. Water Quality
   d. Channel Morphology

4. Aquatic Habitat & Fisheries
   a. GAWs level III transect
   b. GAWs macroinvertebrate species
   c. Instream flow incremental methodology
   d. Basin level fish habitat inventory

VEGETATION ECOLOGICAL STATUS

Each riparian complex is usually composed of a mix of 4 to 10 community types. A measurement of the percent each type covers within a complex (community type composition) can provide an indication of potential or ecological status. The percent of the complex covered by community types which are indicators of unnatural disturbances such as heavy grazing and trampling or soil compaction from recreation activities, provides an indication of impact. If there is a set kind and number of community types within a complex in "natural" condition, and if new types enter the scene when "unnatural" disturbing factors are present, we can measure the percent composition change in the types through two different intercept processes.
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A. CROSS SECTION COMPOSITION: At least 5 pace transects are established perpendicular to the riparian complex that cross the entire riparian area. Beginning and ending points for each transect are permanently marked with stakes that should be placed far enough back into the non-riparian area to allow subsequent measurements in case the riparian area expands. Community type composition is obtained by tallying the number of steps encountered for each type in relation to the number of steps used in all the transects.

Percent composition for each community type is calculated as follows: (Assumes examiner steps equal 2.5 feet):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Species</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky bluegrass</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun. Kentucky blue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of feet in all transects = 140

Composition of Kentucky bluegrass for the complex = 140/300 = 47 percent. Similarly, the composition of redtop for the complex = 15/300 = 5 percent. If the presence of Kentucky bluegrass and/or redtop represents disturbance types in the complex, 52 percent of the area indicates disturbance (47 percent Kentucky bluegrass plus 5 percent red top). The remaining 48 percent of types which are known to be natural to the area indicate the complex is in mid-seral status. The willow/beaked sedge and oatgrass community types, known to be natural to the area, indicate the complex is in mid-seral status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Types</th>
<th>Ecological Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willow/beaked sedge</td>
<td>Early ecological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatgrass</td>
<td>Early ecological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Very early ecological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total = 100 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early = 55 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle = 35 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late = 10 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total = 100 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. GREEN LINE VEGETATION COMPOSITION: Sampling community type composition along edges of live water can provide additional information over that collected by the cross-section process. Presence of permanent water in the plant root zone allows more rapid recovery of vegetation after disturbances. This permits a land manager to make an earlier evaluation of management geared to improve riparian condition. Also, measurement of this portion of the riparian area provides an indication of short-term trend. This is where the forces of water, as influenced by total watershed condition, play their most prominent role. Additionally, there is a strong relationship between amount and kind of vegetation along the water’s edge and bank stability. Natural plant species in this permanently watered area have developed rooting systems which enhance bank stability. An evaluation of the vegetation on this area can thus provide a good indication of the general health of the entire watershed.

The green line is defined as that specific area where a more or less continuous cover of perennial vegetation is encountered when moving away from the perennial water source.

At times the green line may be at the water’s edge, or it may be part way back on a gravel or sandbar. The green line may be only a foot or two wide, or may be many feet wide, depending on soil water features. Natural plant species forming the green line (e.g. beaked sedge or water sedge) are generally good buffers of water forces. Disturbance activities such as overgrazing or trampling by animals or people result in changes to species such as Kentucky bluegrass or redtop, both of which have a reduced ability to buffer water forces.

In most riparian settings, there is a continual effort by nature to form this green line of vegetation, even where the adjacent community types are composed of the more shallow-rooted species. Well developed green line vegetation stabilizes channel banks and buffers water forces. This enhances channel stability, even for inherently unstable stream types. Therefore, an evaluation of the community type composition of the green line can provide a good indication of the general health of the riparian area.

The green line transect begins on the right-hand side of the stream (looking down stream) at the point where the cross section composition transect intercepts the green line. Sampling proceeds down the green line using a step transect approach as described in the cross-section composition measurement.

The total number of feet of each community type encountered along the green line is tallied, and composition for each type computed as described in the cross-section composition measurement; for example:

| Total feet of each type (left and right side) = Community Type |
| Total feet in transect (726 feet or 363 feet) = Percent Composition each side |

An evaluation of percent of disturbance types (early ecological status) in relation to percent of natural types (late ecological status) provides an indication of present ecological status.
C. WOODY SPECIES REGENERATION - A measurement of woody species regeneration is made along the green line transect. The sampler uses a 6-foot pole which has the center marked. Measurements are made by walking 353 feet on each side of the stream, with the center of the pole held directly over the edge of the green line adjacent to the waterbody.

All woody species rooted within the ends of the pole are tallied based on the following age class categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SPECIES</th>
<th>AGE CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. NUMBER SPECIES = 1</td>
<td>SPREAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NUMBER SPECIES = 5 TO 10</td>
<td>SPREAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NUMBER SPECIES = 15 TO 20</td>
<td>SPREAD, MATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. NUMBER SPECIES = 25 TO 30</td>
<td>SPREAD, MATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NUMBER SPECIES = 35 TO 35</td>
<td>SPREAD, MATURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A tally of shrubs by age class provides a preliminary indication of regeneration of shrubs in that complex. A high proration of plants recorded in the sprout, young, and early mature categories would indicate the shrub component in this complex is in an upward trend. Conversely, low numbers recorded in the same age classes indicate the shrub component in this complex is in a downward trend. A comparison of settings where the complex is in as close to PNC as possible may be used as a standard to evaluate overall shrub status.

D. ESTIMATING CROSS SECTION COMPOSITION

An osculation of the disturbance types might be made. Kentucky bluegrass estimated at 55 percent of the total plant composition. Red top 10 percent, then 55 percent of the area indicates disturbance (55 percent Kentucky bluegrass plus 10 percent red top.) The remaining 30 percent of types which are known to be natural to the area indicate the complex is in early seral.

E. ESTIMATING GREEN LINE COMPOSITION

An osculation of the section of green line could be made and the plant species recorded and composition estimated as shown in the table below. Once the plant composition is determined, the stability and ecological status could be determined as shown in the table below. (Most likely, it would be necessary to pace a section of green line and mark a record of the amount of feet each community type occupies and enter that information into a form as shown below, then determine the stability and ecological status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIES</th>
<th>PREDICTED CLASS**</th>
<th>INDEX**</th>
<th>EARLY</th>
<th>LATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARL 50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROB 35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNO 4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEOH 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 100</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STABILITY</td>
<td>R.6 GOOD (REGIONAL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOREGION</td>
<td>64/6950 = 75 = LATE SERIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. ESTIMATING WOODY SPECIES REGENERATION

This element would be very difficult to estimate. However, a person could walk a section of green line and make an oscular estimation of the age classes of wood species.

In each of the categories (Riparian Value Classes), annual grazing inspections will often rely on stubble height measurements or estimations on the green line. The green line for stubble height determinations is defined as subirrigated areas adjacent to streams that are on the water’s edge or extend from the water’s edge several feet perpendicular to the stream. The purpose of moving out from the water’s edge is to be able to measure or observe enough area to get accurate stubble height measurements/estimations.

Limits on green line utilization, stubble leave heights for key streambank species, streambank trampling, and willow utilization on sprouts and young-age classes are parameters considered.

To take into account regrowth (the entire year’s growth of vegetation) and the stubble height that should remain following grazing for sediment filtering during spring flows, pastures grazed early under planned rest livestock management allowed higher food; age utilization values and shorter stubble height values than areas grazed following seed ripe. Stubble heights in AMPs should be calculated for “key management indicator species” that occur on individual allotment riparian areas. Utilization percentages (following tables) are given for this purpose.

Stubble height standards are expected to improve riparian area plant vigor, protect streambanks from excessive trampling damage, extract sediment, deter excessive feeding on willows, encourage late seral, bang stabilizing plants and generally improve riparian area health. Recovery of streambank form or shape will require more time than recovery of plant communities.
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RIPARIAN VALUE CLASSES/UTILIZATION GUIDES

To properly manage, protect, and enhance these riparian dependent resource values, grazing activities will be conducted by recognizing the three categories of riparian areas.

A. RIPARIAN VALUE CLASS I - Highest Value Riparian Area (DFC is lateseral to PNC ecological status and excellent Soil Stability Rating)

The overall objective is to return all vegetation classes to late and PNC status because all other values are tied to these classes. However, Value Class III will be managed at mid-seral status. Attempts to apply reseeded herbaceous species to riparian areas have not been successful.

Management objective:

Apply grazing management geared to returning all the vegetation communities in Value Class I to the DFC over a short time period (5-10 Yr). Management will include the most restrictive guidelines for grazing.

B. RIPARIAN VALUE CLASS II - High Value Riparian Area (DFC is mid- and late-seral ecological status and good soil stability rating.)

Management Objective:

Apply grazing management geared to returning all the vegetation communities in Value Class II to DFC over a 10-15 year time period. Management will include the moderately restrictive guidelines for grazing. Establish limits on green line utilization, stubble leave heights for streambank species, streambank trampling, and willow utilization on key age classes, sprout, and young.
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C. RIPARIAN VALUE CLASS III - Moderate Value Riparian Area (Desired future condition is mid-seral ecological status and moderate soil stability rating.)

Management Objective:

Apply grazing management geared to returning all the vegetation communities in Value Class III to desired future condition over a 20-year time period. Management will include the most liberal guidelines for grazing. Establish limits on green line utilization, stubble leave heights for streambank species, streambank trampling, and willow utilization on key age classes, sprout, and young.

--------

TIME ALLOWED FOR RESTORATION OF RIPARIAN PLANT COMMUNITIES

The line graph on the following page depicts Uinta National Forest Management Objectives for improving the ecological status of riparian plant communities for each of the three riparian value classes. It also depicts the time in years allowed to achieve management objectives under guidelines governing forage utilization and trampling by herbivores and under guidelines of timing of planned rest livestock grazing.

Current ecological status (vegetative conditions) of riparian plant communities on the Uinta National Forest are at various points on the graph from Very Early and Early Seral to the DFC (various points on the sloping line).

More restrictive herbivore grazing standards for Value Class I streams will move those plant communities to the DFC more quickly than the standards designed for Value Class II and III streams and riparian areas.
**Grazing Management Concept**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECOLOGICAL STATUS</th>
<th>5YR</th>
<th>10YR</th>
<th>15YR</th>
<th>20YR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATE</td>
<td>CLASS I</td>
<td></td>
<td>DFC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID</td>
<td>CLASS II</td>
<td>CLASS III</td>
<td>DFC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY EARLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grazing Standards & Guidelines**

**Riparian Plant Communities**

Grazing of Stream Value Classes
## APPENDIX 2

### TIME SCHEDULE AND PRIORITY LIST FOR ALLOTMENT MANAGEMENT PLANNING

**RANGE ECOSYSTEM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**5-YEAR RANGE ACTION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLOT. NO.</th>
<th>ALLOTMENT NAME</th>
<th>AMP NEEDS ENV. ASSESS.</th>
<th>AMP NEEDS UPDATE/REV.</th>
<th>CHANGE NEEDED IN MGMT. PRESCR.</th>
<th>AMP/NEPA REQ. LG. AMT. WORK</th>
<th>YEAR TO COMPLETE</th>
<th>PREV. PLAN COMPLETED</th>
<th>YEAR PREV. PLAN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>YEAR NEW PLAN COMPLETION</th>
<th>ADD'T TREND STUDIES</th>
<th>YEAR INSTALL TREND STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>HEBER RANGER DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>A HOLLOW &amp; LT. SAND CK. BEAR HOLE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>BEAVER</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>BRYANT'S FORK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>BUCKBOARD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>CABIN SPRING</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>CENTER CANYON</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>CHIPMAN - TRAIL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Currant Trail</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>DAVIS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>DEATH HOLLOW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>EAST DANIELS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>HEBER MOUNTAIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>INDIAN SPRING</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2

**TIME SCHEDULE AND PRIORITY LIST FOR ALLOTMENT MANAGEMENT PLANNING**

**RANGE ECOSYSTEM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**5-YEAR RANGE ACTION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLOT. NO.</th>
<th>ALLOTMENT NAME</th>
<th>AMP NEEDS ENV. ASSESS.</th>
<th>AMP NEEDS UPDATE/REV.</th>
<th>CHANGE NEEDED IN MGMT. PRESCR.</th>
<th>AMP/NEPA REQ. LG. AMT. WORK</th>
<th>YEAR TO COMPLETE</th>
<th>PREV. PLAN COMPLETED</th>
<th>YEAR PREV. PLAN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>YEAR NEW PLAN COMPLET.</th>
<th>ADD'T. TRENDS STUDIES</th>
<th>YEAR INSTALL TRENDS STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>LITTLE VALLEY</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>RIP</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>MCKINNEY</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>NOBLETT'S</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>PASS CREEK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>RIP</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>PETES KNOLL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>RIP</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>RED CREEK MOUNTAIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>SOAPSTONE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>RIP</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2

**TIME SCHEDULE AND PRIORITY LIST FOR ALLOTMENT MANAGEMENT PLANNING**

**RANGE ECOSYSTEM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**5-YEAR RANGE ACTION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>STREETER CREEK (NORTH)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>STREETER CREEK (SOUTH)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>TRAIL HOLLOW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>RIP</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>TROUT CREEK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>TWIN PEAKS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>UPPER RACE TRAIL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>RIP</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>WALLSBURG</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>WEST FORK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>WILLOW HOLLOW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>RIP</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>WOLF CREEK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLEASANT GROVE RANGER DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>DEER CREEK</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>MILL CANYON PEAK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>RIP</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>SNAKE CREEK</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 2

**TIME SCHEDULE AND PRIORITY LIST FOR ALLOTMENT MANAGEMENT PLANNING**

**RANGE ECOSYSTEM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**5-YEAR RANGE ACTION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLOT. NO.</th>
<th>ALLOTMENT NAME</th>
<th>AMP NEEDS ENV. ASSESS.</th>
<th>AMP NEEDS UPDATE/REV.</th>
<th>CHANGE NEEDED IN MGMT. PRESCR.</th>
<th>AMP/NEPA REQ. LG. AMT. WORK</th>
<th>YEAR TO COMPLETE</th>
<th>PREV. PLAN COMPLETED IN YEAR</th>
<th>YEAR PREV. PLAN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>YEAR NEW PLAN COMPLETED</th>
<th>ADD’T. TRENDS STUDIES</th>
<th>YEAR INSTALL TRENDS STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>TOOTH SPRING</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>BENHION</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>DIAMOND FORK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>GEMO-HILL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>MOBBLE CREEK</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>INDIAN-TRAIL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>NEPHI-SALT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>ONAQUI</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TIME SCHEDULE AND PRIORITY LIST FOR ALLOTMENT MANAGEMENT PLANNING
RANGE ECOSYSTEM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
5-YEAR RANGE ACTION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLOT. NO.</th>
<th>ALLOTMENT NAME</th>
<th>AMP NEEDS ENV. ASS.</th>
<th>AMP NEEDS UPDATE/ REV.</th>
<th>CHANGE NEEDED IN MGMT. PRESCR.</th>
<th>AMP/NEPA REQ. LG. AMT. WORK</th>
<th>YEAR TO COMPLETE</th>
<th>PREV. PLAN COMPLETED</th>
<th>YEAR PREV. PLAN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>YEAR NEW PLAN COMPLETED</th>
<th>ADD'T. TRENDS STUDIES</th>
<th>YEAR INSTALL TRENDS STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The 5-Year Action Plan shows the years NEPA and AMP’s are scheduled to be completed. Implementation of direction in the AMP’s may require additional time, depending upon the actions required and the complexity of those actions. In some situations range improvements (fences/water troughs) will need to be installed before improved grazing systems can be implemented. If grazing capacities are in question, time may be required to accurately determine capacities and to make needed adjustments.
EFFECTS OF PROPOSED ACTION

A. The proposed management alternative in the Rangeland EIS will have no effects on T&E species for the following reasons:

Peregrine Falcon
There are no livestock allotments within miles of any identified suitable, critical, or essential habitat components.

Bald Eagle
Livestock grazing does not occur on the Forest between October and April, when bald eagles are present.

Clay Phacelia
Clay phacelia has not been located on the Uista National Forest during two recent inventory projects, but has been found within 1/4 mile of the National Forest boundary. Because there is a possibility for it to exist on the Forest, precautions will be taken to protect suitable habitats for this species whenever range improvement projects occur.

Ute Lady's Tresses
Not known to occur on the Forest.

DETERMINATION

As a result of this evaluation, it is our professional determination that there will be no adverse effects upon the bald eagle, peregrine falcon, clay phacelia, or Ute lady's tresses as a result of implementation of the proposed management alternative in the Rangeland Ecosystem EIS for the Uista National Forest.

SIGNATURES

Prepared by:

Juan Spillet
Forest Wildlife Biologist

Approved by:

Norman Huntsman
Range, Wildlife, & Watershed Staff Officer
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Appendix 3-4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIES</th>
<th>HABITAT ANALYSIS, PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three-toed Woodpecker</td>
<td>Three-toed woodpeckers forage mainly in dead trees, although they will feed on live trees. They are found in northern coniferous and mixed forest types up to 9,000 ft. Nests may be found in spruce, pine, cedar, and aspen trees. Because they require snags for feeding, perching, nesting, and roosting, they are threatened by clearing of forests without snag retention. No conflicts with livestock grazing are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picoides tridactylus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Goshawk</td>
<td>The goshawk is a raptor of dense forest, both in nesting and foraging. It requires large tracts of undisturbed, mature forest, with occasional small breaks and riparian areas. Undesirable species vary, but generally thick shrub cover is disadvantageous to the hunting style of the goshawk, although riparian corridors are utilized fairly heavily due to prey distributions. It typically nests in mature Douglas-fir, ponderosa pine, lodgepole pine, or aspen. The preferred alternative is directed toward improving vegetation and litter conditions, which provide better habitat for goshawk prey. No conflicts with livestock grazing are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accipiter gentilis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotted Frog</td>
<td>According to the 1991 DWR survey, only one spotted frog population occurs on the Forest. This is at Salamander Lake, located on the Pleasant Grove District. Spotted frogs generally are found near permanent water, such as many edges of ponds or lakes, in alga-grown overflow pools of streams, or near springs with emergent vegetation during the breeding period. However, they may move considerable distances from water after breeding, often frequenting mixed conifer and subalpine forests, grasslands and brushlands of sage and rabbitbrush. They are thought to hibernate in holes near springs or other areas where water is unfrozen and constantly renewed. The preferred alternative is directed toward improving riparian habitats by applying standards and guidelines and limiting livestock grazing use. The application of the standards and guidelines and planned rest-grazing systems will be beneficial to spotted frog habitat. No conflicts with livestock grazing are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rana pretiosa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPTILES/AMPHIBIANS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Cutthroat Trout</td>
<td>The Colorado cutthroat is known to exist in streams on the Uinta National Forest. The preferred alternative is directed toward improving riparian habitats by applying standards and guidelines (Class I Streams), and limiting livestock grazing use. The application of the standards and guidelines and planned rest-grazing systems will be beneficial to Colorado cutthroat habitat. Reduced conflicts with livestock grazing are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oncorhyncus clarki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oncorhyncus clarki steelii</td>
<td>The Bonneville cutthroat is known to exist in streams on the Uinta National Forest. The preferred alternative is directed toward improving riparian habitats by applying standards and guidelines (Class 1 Streams), and limiting livestock grazing use. The application of the standards and guidelines and planned rest-grazing systems will be beneficial to Bonneville cutthroat habitat. Reduced conflicts with livestock grazing are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Woody Aster</td>
<td>Found in Alpinus and Douglas-fir - white fir communities in crevices of limestone and dolomite parent materials between 6,000 to 11,700 ft. elevation. There are no livestock allotments involved with these plant communities. Thus, no identified conflicts with livestock grazing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster kium var. kiumi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAGONS Milkvetch</td>
<td>Dragon Milkvetch occurs on the Forest. It is found on barrens of talus and clay soil of the Green River Formation with many of the same plants associated with Sedge forests. Negative impacts of grazing in the form of trails through and trampling of habitat by both sheep and elk are apparent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalus latius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIES</th>
<th>HABITAT ANALYSIS, PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Cutthroat Trout</td>
<td>The Colorado cutthroat is known to exist in streams on the Uinta National Forest. The preferred alternative is directed toward improving riparian habitats by applying standards and guidelines (Class I Streams), and limiting livestock grazing use. The application of the standards and guidelines and planned rest-grazing systems will be beneficial to Colorado cutthroat habitat. Reduced conflicts with livestock grazing are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oncorhyncus clarki pleurosticus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville Cutthroat Trout</td>
<td>The Bonneville cutthroat is known to exist in streams on the Uinta National Forest. The preferred alternative is directed toward improving riparian habitats by applying standards and guidelines (Class 1 Streams), and limiting livestock grazing use. The application of the standards and guidelines and planned rest-grazing systems will be beneficial to Bonneville cutthroat habitat. Reduced conflicts with livestock grazing are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oncorhyncus clarki steelii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Woody Aster</td>
<td>Found in Allunus and Douglas-fir - white fir communities in crevices of limestone and dolomite parent materials between 6,000 to 11,700 ft. elevation. There are no livestock allotments involved with these plant communities. Thus, no identified conflicts with livestock grazing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster kium var. kiumi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAGONS Milkvetch</td>
<td>Dragon Milkvetch occurs on the Forest. It is found on barrens of talus and clay soil of the Green River Formation with many of the same plants associated with Sedge forests. Negative impacts of grazing in the form of trails through and trampling of habitat by both sheep and elk are apparent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalus latius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### SPECIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIES</th>
<th>HABITAT ANALYSIS, PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Bladderpod</td>
<td>Inventory has been completed on this species during the last 2 years. The Preferred Alternative will offer better management for these sites under the guidelines for ridgetops and slopes. Rest-rotation grazing systems required for these sites will return vigor to the species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaquea garrettii</td>
<td>Garrett Bladderpod occurs in Alpine tundra, sub-alpine meadows, spruce-fir, and pine communities on limestone parent material, often in talus or on rock outcrops between 9,000 to 12,810 ft. elevation. This habitat occurs on the Mt. Timpanogos and Mt. Hebo Wilderness. An inventory on this species was completed during the last 2 years. Live-stock grazing has been removed from these communities. Effects of use by Mountain Goats need to be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidestrom Beardtongue</td>
<td>Tidestrom beardtongue possibly exists on sagebrush and pinyon-juniper communities on the Nebo Division of the Uinta National Forest. Inventory work has not been completed, but is planned within the next 2 years. Impacts by livestock grazing will be minimal under the required three-unit rest-grazing system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penstemon tidestromii</td>
<td>Sedge Fescue occurs on the Forest, on barren of talus and clay soil of the Green River Formation, with Eriogonum brevicaule, Collomia debilis, Astragalus latens, Lomatium kingii, Sitea Eymondii, Penstemon leonardii, Potentilla fruticosa, and Monardella odoratissima. Negative impacts of grazing in the form of trails through and trampling of habitat by both sheep and elk are apparent. An inventory on this species was completed during the last 2 years. The Preferred Alternative will offer better management for suitable sites under the guidelines for ridgetops and slopes. Rest-rotation grazing systems required for these sites will be beneficial to the species by providing rest periods from grazing use, to improve plant vigor and seed production. Controlled grazing after seed drop will trap seed into the soil, which will improve existing stands of sedge fescue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### CURRENT MANAGEMENT DIRECTION

Current policy, as stated in the Forest Service Manual (FSM 2670.32), includes the following:

1. Avoid or minimize impacts to species whose viability has been identified as a concern.
2. If impacts can not be avoided, analyze the significance of the potential adverse effects to the population or its habitat within the area of concern and on the species as a whole.

Specific direction concerning the management of TES plant and animal species on National Forest System Lands can be found on Pages 3-50 and 3-51 of the current Forest Plan. As directed, the Forest has continued to inventory species of concern and to collect information for the preparation of biological assessments on them.

Management goals are to provide healthy, self-perpetuating plant communities, meet water quality standards, provide habitat for viable populations of wildlife and fish, and provide stable stream channels and still water-body shorelines.

### DETERMINATION

The magnitude of these impacts will not be sufficient to reduce the viability of these sensitive species.

---

Juan Spilett  
Wildlife Biologist  
 Uinta National Forest
## APPENDIX 5
TOTAL NUMBER AND AUM'S OF SHEEP AND CATTLE PERMITTED TO GRAZE ON THE UNTA NATIONAL FOREST 1981 - 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>LIVESTOCK TYPE</th>
<th>LIVESTOCK NUMBER</th>
<th>TOTAL AUM'S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>CATTLE</td>
<td>12,187</td>
<td>64,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHEEP</td>
<td>73,870</td>
<td>67,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>CATTLE</td>
<td>11,243</td>
<td>58,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHEEP</td>
<td>77,103</td>
<td>70,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>CATTLE</td>
<td>12,025</td>
<td>78,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHEEP</td>
<td>68,515</td>
<td>69,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>CATTLE</td>
<td>10,847</td>
<td>77,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHEEP</td>
<td>70,003</td>
<td>70,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>CATTLE</td>
<td>11,425</td>
<td>61,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHEEP</td>
<td>70,308</td>
<td>69,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>CATTLE</td>
<td>11,425</td>
<td>61,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHEEP</td>
<td>70,308</td>
<td>69,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>CATTLE</td>
<td>12,049</td>
<td>66,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHEEP</td>
<td>68,634</td>
<td>69,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>CATTLE</td>
<td>11,380</td>
<td>62,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHEEP</td>
<td>68,311</td>
<td>68,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>CATTLE</td>
<td>11,419</td>
<td>62,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHEEP</td>
<td>68,311</td>
<td>69,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>CATTLE</td>
<td>11,416</td>
<td>62,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHEEP</td>
<td>65,199</td>
<td>65,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>CATTLE</td>
<td>11,261</td>
<td>62,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHEEP</td>
<td>65,199</td>
<td>65,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX 6
WINTER RANGE, AERIAL ELK COUNTS ON ELK HERD UNITS ON OR ADJACENT TO THE UNTA NATIONAL FOREST 1980 - 81 THROUGH 1990 - 91

**ELK HERD UNIT 5 - SALT LAKE-TIMPANOGOS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>BULLS</th>
<th>COWS</th>
<th>CALVES</th>
<th>(ANTLERLESS)</th>
<th>UNCLASSIFIED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(277)</td>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(164)</td>
<td></td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(164)</td>
<td></td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(144)</td>
<td></td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(144)</td>
<td></td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(144)</td>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(147)</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Ground count - feeding stations aerial count () Cows and calves.
++ Ground and aerial count
* Ground count
() Cows and calves

**ELK HERD UNIT 11 - NEBO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>BULLS</th>
<th>COWS</th>
<th>CALVES</th>
<th>(ANTLERLESS)</th>
<th>UNCLASSIFIED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### ELK HERD UNIT 13 - DIAMOND-STRAWBERRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>BULLS</th>
<th>COWS</th>
<th>CALVES</th>
<th>(ANTLERLESS)</th>
<th>UNCLASSIFIED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(164)</td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(216)</td>
<td></td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(327)</td>
<td></td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(397)</td>
<td></td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(520)</td>
<td></td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>No Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(606)</td>
<td></td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(815)</td>
<td></td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>1,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>808</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>821</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ground count

### ELK HERD UNIT 15 - HEBER-RED CREEK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>BULLS</th>
<th>COWS</th>
<th>CALVES</th>
<th>(ANTLERLESS)</th>
<th>UNCLASSIFIED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(220)</td>
<td></td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(297)</td>
<td></td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(216)</td>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>233</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(440)</td>
<td></td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>471</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>270</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(120)*</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Cows and calves included in unclassified

---
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Appendix 6-3
**Fisheries habitat** - Streams, lakes, and reservoirs that support fish.

**Floodplain** - Lowland and relatively flat areas adjoining inland and coastal waters, including as a minimum that area subject to a 1 percent or greater chance of flooding in any given year.

**Forage** - All browse and nonwoody plants available to wildlife and livestock for grazing or harvested for feeding.

**Forest Supervisor** - The official responsible for administering National Forest System Land in a Forest Service administrative unit, which may consist of two or more National Forests or all the Forests within a state. He/she reports to the Regional Forester.

**Forest System Roads** - Roads that are part of the Forest development transportation system, which includes all existing and planned roads as well as other special and terminal facilities designated as Forest development transportation facilities.

**Forest-wide Standard** - Performance criterion indicating acceptable norms, specifications, or quality that actions must meet to maintain the minimum considerations for a particular resource. This type of standard applies to all areas of the Forest regardless of other prescriptions applied.

**Game species** - Any species of wildlife or fish for which seasons and bag limits have been prescribed and which are normally harvested by hunters, trappers, and fishermen under state or Federal laws, codes, and regulations.

**Grass/forb** - An early Forest successional stage where grasses and forbs are the dominant vegetation.

**Grazing allotment** - See Range allotment.

**Guideline** - A set of land, resource, or human-use values or parameters meant to generally constrain organizational actions, usually stated as flexible and occasionally optional limits in this document.

**Habitat** - The place where a plant or animal naturally or normally lives or grows.

**Habitat Effectiveness** - The degree of use of habitat by wildlife as influenced by the amount of human disturbance and available, usable vegetative cover.

**Hiding Cover** - Vegetation that will hide 90 percent of an elk from the view of a human at a distance of 300 feet or less. The distance at which the animal is essentially hidden is called a "night distance".

**Indicator species** - A plant or animal species adapted to a particular kind of environment. Its presence is sufficient indication that specific habitat conditions are also present.

**Intensive grazing** - Grazing management that controls distribution of cattle and duration of use on the range, usually by fences, so parts of the range are rested during the growing season.

**Interdisciplinary Team** - A team of one or more individuals representing areas of knowledge and skills focusing on the same task, problem, or subject. Team member interaction provides necessary insight to all stages of the process.

**Issue** - A point, matter, or question of public discussion or interest to be addressed or decided through the planning process.

**Management concern** - An issue, problem, or a condition which limits the range of management practices identified by the Forest Service in the planning process.

**Management Indicator Species** - Species selected because its population changes indicate effects of management activities on the plant and animal community. A species whose condition can be used to assess the impacts of management actions on a particular area.

**Management Opportunity** - Statement of general actions, measures or treatments that address a public issue or management concern in a favorable way.

**Management Prescription** - A set of land and resource management policies that creates a desired future condition over time.

**Minimum Viable Population levels** - The minimum level of a population of an individual species needed to ensure the long-term existence of that species in natural, self-sustaining numbers adequately distributed throughout their habitat area.

**Multiple Use** - The management of all the various renewable surface resources of the National Forest System so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the needs of the American people; making the most judicious use of the land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitudes for periodic adjustments in use to conform to changing needs and conditions that some lands will be used for less than all of the resources, and harmonious and coordinated management of the various resources, each with the other, without impairment of the productivity of the land with consideration being given to the relative values of the various resources, and not necessarily the combination of uses that will give the greatest dollar return or the greatest unit output.

**National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)** - An act to declare a National policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment, to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man, to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation, and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality.

**National Forest System (NFS) Land** - National Forests, National Grasslands, or public lands, and other lands under the management of the Forest Service, including experimental areas and Bankhead-Jones Title III lands.

**NEPA** - See National Environmental Policy Act.

**NFS** - See National Forest System Land.
No-action alternative - The most likely condition expected to exist in the future if current management direction were to continue unchanged.

Nonconsumptive use - That use of a resource that does not reduce the supply. For example, nonconsumptive use of water includes hydroelectric power generation, boating, swimming, and fishing.

Non-game - Species of animals which are not managed for sport hunting resource.

Nuisance weeds - A plant species that is undesirable; conflicts, restricts, or otherwise causes problems with the management objectives.

OBV - Abbreviation for off-highway vehicle

Off-Highway Vehicle - Vehicles such as motorcycles, all-terrain vehicles, four-wheel drive vehicles, and snowmobiles.

Once-Over Grazing - Grazing an area of rangeland only once during the grazing season.

Permitted Grazing - Use of a National Forest range allotment under the terms of a grazing permit.

PNC - Potential Natural Community

Potential Natural Community - The biotic community that would be established if all successional sequences of its ecosystem were completed without additional human-caused disturbance under present environmental conditions. Grazing by native fauna, natural disturbances such as drought, floods, wildfires, insects, and diseases, are inherent in the development of potential natural communities which may include naturalized non-native species.

Public Issue - Subject or question of widespread public interest relating to management of the National Forest System.

Range - Land producing native forage for animal consumption and lands that are revegetated naturally or artificially to provide forage cover that is managed like native vegetation.

Rangeland - Land producing native forage for animal consumption and land that is revegetated naturally or artificially to provide forage cover that is managed like native vegetation.

Range allotment - An area designated for use of a prescribed number and kind of livestock under one management plan.

Range condition - The state of health of the range based on what it is naturally capable of producing.

Range of Alternatives - An alternative is one way of managing the Forest expressed as management emphasis leading to a unique set of goods and services being available to the public. A range of alternatives is then several different ways of managing the Forest, offering different levels of goods and services.

Range Trend - A change in ecological status of range vegetation or soil stability.

Record of Decision - A document separate from but associated with an Environmental Impact Statement that publicly and officially discloses the responsible official's decision on which alternative assessed in the Environmental Impact Statement to implement.

Recreational Visitor Day (RVD) - Twelve visitor hours, which may be aggregated continuously, intermittently, or simultaneously by one or more persons.

Rest-Rotation Grazing - An intensive system of management whereby grazing is deferred on various parts of the range during succeeding years, allowing the deferred portion complete rest for at least 1 year.

Riparian - Areas of land directly influenced by water. They usually have visible vegetative or physical characteristics reflecting this water influence. Stream sides, lake borders, or marshes are typical riparian areas.

Riparian Ecosystems - Transition between the aquatic ecosystem and the adjacent upland terrestrial ecosystem and is identified by soil characteristics and distinctive vegetation communities that require free, unbound water.

Scoping process - The public land management activities used to determine the range of actions, alternatives, and impacts to be considered in an Environmental Impact Statement.

Sediment - Solid material, both mineral and organic, that is in suspension being transported, or has been moved from its site of origin by air, water, gravity, or ice.

Selected alternative - The alternative recommended for implementation as the Forest Plan based on the evaluation completed in the planning process.

Sensitive species - Plant or animal species susceptible or vulnerable to activity impacts or habitat alterations.

Sevul condition - The unique characteristics of a biotic community which is in a developmental, transitory stage in an orderly ecological succession involving changes in species, structure, and community processes with time.

Small game - Birds and small mammals normally hunted or trapped.

Standard and Guideline - A principle requiring a specific level of attainment, a rule to measure against; a mandatory requirement.

Successional Stage - Stage or recognizable condition of a plant community that occurs during its development from bare ground to climax; for example, coniferous forests progress through six recognized stages: Grass-forb, shrub-seedlings, pole-sapling, young, mature, old growth.

Thermal Cover - Vegetation used by big game to help maintain comfortable body temperatures with minimal energy expenditure: For elk, a stand of coniferous trees 40 feet or more tall with an average crown cover exceeding 70 percent; for deer, a stand of coniferous trees at least 5 feet tall with an average crown cover of 75 percent.

Glensary-5

Glensary-6
Threatened species - Those plant or animal species likely to become endangered species throughout all or a significant portion of their range within the foreseeable future.

Tiering - Refers to the coverage of general matters in broader environmental impact statements or environmental assessments with subsequent other related statements in environmental assessments incorporating, by reference, the discussions contained in the previous document, solely on the issues specific to the statement subsequently prepared.

Utah National Forest - The administrative title of the National Forest System land administered by the Forest Service in Provo, Utah.

Unsatisfactory Ecological Condition - The state of a plant community type that does not meet the management objective set for a particular site or area of land based on its potential to produce vegetation to meet those objectives.

VQQ - An abbreviation of Visual Quality Objective.

Vegetation management - Activities designed primarily to promote the health of the Forest cover for multiple-use purposes.

Visual Quality Objective (VQQ) - Categories of acceptable landscape alteration measured in degrees of deviation from the natural-appearing landscape.

Watershed - The entire area that contributes to a drainage system or stream.

Wetlands - Areas that are inundated by surface or ground water with a frequency sufficient to support, and under normal circumstances do not support a prevalence of vegetable or aquatic life that requires saturated or seasonally saturated soil conditions for growth and reproduction.

Winter range - Refer to Big Game Winter Range

WFUD - See Wildlife and Fish User Day.

Wildlife and Fish User Day (WFUD) - A wildlife and fish user day which aggregates 12 visitor hours.

APPENDIX 8
RESPONSE LETTERS

Comment letters received in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Rangeland Ecosystem Forest Plan Amendment are published herein, along with our responses to them. Reference numbers have been provided on the letters which tie to the response. Location of page containing pertinent text revision are also listed.

Following is an index of all the comment letters received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index No.</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>8-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index No.</td>
<td>Page No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Dept. of Interior, Office of Environmental Affairs</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundance, Julie Mach</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Wilderness Association</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold M. Richins</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wilderness Society</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 5-3

8
under a separate heading within the management activities category entitled "mineral resources". If restrictions of commercial gravel operations are considered important to the maintenance of riparian areas, no mention was identified a land environmental document. In a large-scale project in the future. Furthermore, it would be helpful if the issue of whether in the document also showed recreation and key riparian areas. If the other lands discussed for special management (i.e., ecoregion zones, encompassing riparian and open space), and open access areas also have proposed mineral entry restrictions - generally, temporarily, or permanently - future documents should fully outline and discuss in a section concerning mineral-resource impacts that those restrictions could be.

Richard Grobholz
We agree that the decision to increase elk numbers should be coordinated between all parties involved. This is the reason the State holds public meetings prior to setting hunting seasons and permit numbers each year. This is also one reason the Board of Big Game Control exists—to give all interested an opportunity to provide input into big game harvest decisions.

There is currently a number cap of 1500 elk on the Diamond Fork-Strawberry elk Hunting Unit, which includes the area mentioned in your comments. The numbers are determined by aerial counts which are conducted each winter on the winter ranges after the hunting seasons are completed. An average aerial count on snow will usually pick up about 80 percent of the total number of elk; so when 1200 head are counted, the total elk population is expected to be about 1500 animals. This upper limit will not be increased without the public being contacted for their input.

We have revised the FEIS to incorporate additional information relative to economic and social values (pages IV-9 to IV-11).

We believe the scope of this document to be quite broad. In fact, it is a programmatic document which provides specific management direction for all rangelands on the Uinta National Forest, including the Strawberry Valley acquisition. It does not suggest how private lands or holdings outside the National Forests should be managed. It does, however, give direction for making cooperative management of those lands. The planning efforts you are concerned about would be handled by environmental assessment and grading allotment management plans that will be tied to this "umbrella" document.

There have been discussions concerning the possibility of incorporating portions of the Strawberry Valley Management Area with existing adjacent allotments. The Record of Decision for the FEIS on the Strawberry Valley Management Area deferred the decision concerning the future of livestock grazing on the area until the ecosystem is sufficiently recovered to meet a preponderance of the ecosystem guidelines. The guidelines define the level of the health of the streams and rangeland to be achieved. The final decision on whether or not such changes are made cannot take place until after the previous decision has been made. It then must be made in conjunction with the Strawberry Water Users Association, who by law, have the first right to future grazing privileges on the Strawberry Acquisition lands.

Your suggestion to District Ranger, Bob Riddle, that Strawberry Acquisition lands and adjacent grazing allotments be grazed together using more natural boundaries in a good one that will be discussed with the Strawberry Water Users and grazing permittees on adjacent allotments if grazing is reinstated.

We appreciate your interest in more direct involvement in National Forest land management decisions. It is our intention to cooperate with local land use management agencies and public officials. NEPA also requires consultation with all concerned agencies and individuals. Input is requested at several points throughout the NEPA process, including the opportunity for any interested party to be involved in Environmental Assessments which will subsequently be tied to this FEIS. Wasatch County is on our mailing list, and you will be notified of all such programs proposed in your area of interest.
(4) Umatilla County agrees with Umatilla National Forest that watershed protection should be a top priority in making multiple use decisions. We support decisions to protect the watershed and the resulting water quality. However, we urge decisions regarding grazing, recreation, and wildlife development should have public review and input.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

APPENDIX 84

Enclosure - Riddle Letter
July 29, 1991

Robert L. Middle, District Ranger
Wasatch Ranger District
Uintah National Forest
150 East 100 North
Blanding, Utah 84511

Dear Mr. Middle:

We would like you to consider these comments as "Posing Comments," relative to the proposed Environmental Impact Statement for grazing permits on the Uintah National Forest. We have discussed this matter among ourselves and have received comments from the County Planning Commission.

1. We feel your scope is too narrow. When you consider the grazing allotments as they existed before the acquisition of the Strawberry Valley Project, you impose several administrative boundaries that will not often make sense when you consider the area a functional natural living unit. Your scope of work should also consider the comments of the Strawberry areas and other related areas as integral to the overall areas with surrounding agricultural areas. While this would increase the size of the resulting grazing allotments, it does not change your responsibility to protect the area responsibly and it allows your scope to allocate the grazing impacts.

The larger area would help to identify and re-distribute problems and opportunities for improvements over the total related area instead of small isolated areas. This approach would provide a more proper insight into complimentary relationships and identify with an overall impact approach.

2. The Wasatch County Planning Commission agrees the Uintah National Forest should have examined protection as the top of the priority list when considering multiple use management decisions where Federal land is included in
any use. Wool is the second most used state in the United States and the Beaver Ranger District contains some of the most significant acreage in our state. However, untreated pasture should not be used to justify arbitrary reductions in grazing permits without careful and objective based environmental study.

3. When multiple use decisions are made, the environmental impacts of those decisions are often not considered as carefully as the environmental impacts. In this case theADDENDUM chers who have been grazing these lands have been and are now an important part of our economy and community fabric. Any study to determine the impacts of a removal decision which changes the historic grazing use of an area should also consider the economic impact on the surrounding communities and the livestock operators themselves.

4. Any attempts to reduce allocations or restrict use, in the area of forest watershed management, which are not

2-3

sustained by conclusions such as a part of a coordinated resource management plan developed for the Beaver Ranger

2-3

District area, which justify reductions in grazing permits without considering the full impacts to the surrounding areas. In particularity Forest Service grazing permits, when issued by the Forest Service, should be subject to greater environmental controls than are currently available for watershed improvement programs.

5. We support limits on unauthorized off road travel and efforts to restore ground cover to damaged vegetation vehicle use.

6. We support the development of performance objectives for land use programs on the Forest Service (i) define planning goals; (ii) define resource potential; (iii) define planning; and (iv) evaluate lessons learned.

7. We would like to see more direct involvement with local and other land use management agencies on individual unit decisions to ensure cooperation.

8. We note with satisfaction the Alviso Ranch and Moss Beach Allowance decisions have been prepared with the cooperation of the local operator.
Robert K. Middle
District Ranger
July 20, 1971

Page 3

9. We hope the Nisqually National Forest will remain committed
to working with Skamania County to develop a Coordinated

Appreciate this opportunity to work with you and wish to invite
you to meet with us and the Planning Commission as you respond to
these comments. We wish you well in your work and expect you will
work with us.

Sincerely

[Signature]

R. Donald McCord, Chair

[Signature]

Pete A. Saxon, Commissioner

[Signature]

V. Oliver Powell, Commissioner
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December 3, 1992

Peter N. Sharp
Utah National Forest
P.O. Box 1436
Provo, Utah 84602

Dear Mr. Sharp,

We have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Hungryland Basin Management and offer the following comments for your consideration. We support the selection of alternative 3 because greater emphasis will be placed on the management of several critical areas (riparian ecosystems, big game winter range, overgrown shrubstep and open slopes, and upland ecosystems) in order to prevent ecological changes that are consistent with the desired future conditions for these areas.

Chapter II-6: Under general direction for soil and water management activities as they are related to fish structures... "If deep structures are necessary, they shall be installed to allow for fish passage and habitat enhancement." [3-1]

Chapter II-12: Under general direction for big game winter range management activities as they are related to monitoring... "areas management favors improvement of apparent trend over a five-year period or range below one-year average occurring... (emphasized notation on 3-2)"

Chapter II-12: Under priority areas for range treatment, change big game winter range to big game cover range.

Chapter II-12: Under wildlife and fish resource management, define habitat effectiveness.

Chapter III-2, Paragraph 3
It should be mentioned that the winter range available for deer...
Chapter III-9, Paragraph 3

... along the eastern front has greatly diminished in the last 30 years due to increased urban development of cattle. While doing so, many species now occur only in response to vegetation changes consistent with intensive grazing, but in the absence of high density, since movement is shifted to new creation destroyed by grazing. In these cases, it is likely that such shifts reflect a progression towards old-field natural community rather than early. Areas that still have a good stand of potential success are those that are not used by cattle...

Chapter IV-2, Paragraph 7

... during severe droughts, large die-offs could be expected for mule deer, least likely for elk, and not likely for moose.

General Comments

... It is concerned that the livestock-insect competition issues that were listed in chapter I-1 were not adequately addressed in chapter IV. The issue is targeted primarily at elk, and the assumption is given that there is an effort being made on the part of the Division and the State for the NPS to identify reasonable uses for each species for the various units within the Forest. This should be reduced for both alternatives in chapter IV. There are four elk management units within the NPS authorized Forest. The management plan for the Smoky Mountains/Fortress Unit was completed and signed in February, 1971. The objective for this unit is to manage for a viable, healthy, elk population capable of supporting a stable annual herd much of 1980 estimated by 1990. A deer study has been completed for the same unit. The elk population on this unit is considered to be slightly smaller, ranging only slightly on the north end of the unit. The same plan for the Smoky Mountains/Fortress Unit has not been completed. Elk ranges are very limited, especially along the eastern front. Winter and summer trends have changed from 180 to 190 animals over the last five years, indicating a fairly stable population. Remaining and recreational developments are restricting elk ranges and reducing elk distribution by impacting summer ranges. The...
that could be classified as Value Class I solely on their wildlife
habitat values. We share the concern that Dr. Flinders expressed at
the meeting and expect that interagency involvement in the
classification process will help to resolve resource conflicts.

3) Additional emphasis should be given to participation in the
Interagency Big Game Range Trend Study Project. Study sites have
been located in key wintering areas on the Siskiyou National Forest
and data compiled from these sites should guide the assessment of
trend on winter ranges. Additional sites could be included in the
program if the Forest Service were to increase their level of
participation by including this comparative project in the
monitoring program for alternative B.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this draft EIS.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Regional Supervisor
We believe that the requirements of the subject Memorandum of Understanding have been met for this FEIS. A copy of the draft was mailed to Utah State Planning Coordinator (ABS Clearing House) and to every livestock permittee or livestock association which runs livestock on the Uinta National Forest. A copy was not sent to Duchesne County, but any permittee living in that County could have made it available to their County representatives if they wished to do so. Copies of the draft were mailed to Jabs, Sanpete, Tooele, Utah, and Wasatch Counties. We will add Duchesne County and other surrounding counties to our mailing list for future Environmental Impact Statements. The State Department of Agriculture was invited to attend the initial meeting with livestock permittees where the decision was made to prepare this document.

An executive committee was suggested by livestock interests, also a unanimous endorsement for Tom Bingham to be the livestock representative on the committee was given at that meeting.

Multiple-use principles are important. The emphasis in Alternative B is "healthy vegetation and soil resources". This emphasis has been added as Chapter II has been revised (page II-2). The intent of Alternative B is to attain more balanced multiple-use management based on the issues developed concerning the Forest's grazing management program. These issues relate to National, State, and local concerns. The final decision on implementation of the preferred alternative will take into consideration all comments received. As individual allotment management plans are developed, they will reflect the guidance outlined in this FEIS as well as additional site-specific guidance for individual allotments.

The MOU referred to in the previous paragraph will be adhered to when developing these plans, and local permits will have opportunity to be involved.

We agree that big game have contributed to the deterioration of winter ranges and so stated in the sentence immediately following the one you refer to. Changes have been made to improve clarity.

The section you refer to has been revised to reflect your comment (page 3-4).

See response #4-2.

See responses #4-2 and #3-8.

"Sensitive plants" are those which may have the potential to become Threatened or Endangered. Most Tulea are definitely not in that category, although we may wish they were. Their management is addressed in an Environmental Assessment released on April 31, 1988, for the Control of Noxious Weeds and Other Unwanted Plants on the Uinta National Forest.
We agree with your observation. Trampling at the right time is one of the reasons rest-rotation grazing is a successful system of management. The guidelines are developed to provide limits to the amount and timing of trampling.

The counties involved will have opportunity to provide input on any acquisition of big game winter range. We agree that winter range is the limiting factor on the number of big game animals that can be sustained on the Uinta National Forest. That is the reason for our proposing restoration projects on these areas.

The Uinta National Forest has seeded huge amounts of deteriorated rangelands including many depleted openings most often with success. We intend to continue this program where it is the best course of action. Plans for such improvements will be developed as part of individual allotment management plans.

Most of the rangeland on the Uinta National Forest is better suited to sheep use than to cattle use and, therefore, more AUM's can be derived by grazing sheep than cattle. Sheep also generally cause fewer impacts to wetlands and riparian areas than cattle; but as you indicate, the reverse is often true on ridgetops. Each situation must be handled on its own merits.

While it is true that under a rest-rotation program that is operated correctly, second growth can be utilized without damage to the plants, excessive soil disturbance is often evident if areas are reused. Where ranges are in acceptable ecological status, rotation is generally not a problem; but where improvement is needed, such use will likely slow the improvement process significantly.

We believe in many locations additional bedding areas are needed to relieve some of the restrictions that historically have been imposed. Admittedly, it will require more effort and many of our allotments will require more total acres than they now include but we believe this is an achievable goal. The bedding impact must be conservative enough to allow for improvement or other multiple-use values to be compromised.

The last statement under "Aspen Ecosystem Guidelines" has been eliminated from the document.

The wording in the narrative for "Aspen Habitat" has been revised in line with your comment (page 33). Observations by our Range Conservationists indicate that most degradation in aspen types have been caused by excessive livestock use.

We believe the general statement can be supported, however, we have changed the last sentence to make it less controversial (page 33).

This means that every situation will be settled on its own merits following review by an Interdisciplinary Team. See Appendix 7. We have added "public involvement".

See responses #2-1 and #3-5.
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Chapter 11-15 Aspen ecosystems. Livestock interests are not against aspen ecosystems. The uce boys, sheep breeders and their animals also enjoy the shade provided by Aspen trees as long as the density is with in reason...

Could an expert please advice the rest of us what the last statement under thecadetline means????

Chapter 11-15 Aspen waste can be both a soil stabilizer and range producer and livestock grazing need not be a secondary consideration. See my earlier comments regarding grazing.

Chapter 11-16 Aspen habitat. "Livestock grazing can occur, but in subordinate to wildlife habitat needs and protection of aspen needed for recreation" This statement is not in the spirit of multiple use mandated by the before mentioned Forest Law Amendments. The desired shado and forage needed in the Aspen ecosystem is a good goal, but I take advantage of scientific knowledge and studies on what animal ranges on what plants. Big game animals may be the limiting factors and sky to bring the next change to the Aspen ecosystems.

Chapter 11-2 Big game winter range. The last sentence of the first paragraph states that range conditions in general are such worse on these other areas (other than National forests). By what scientific evidence is in this statement based. Let's do away with this statement unless is can be proved. Such propaganda is not in the interest of the Livestock industry. I was not selected to represent the Foothills Citizens' Association for the Environment Board and to be given by the National Citizens' Association. Because I have closed my private ranges. I challenge the Forest Service to do no such conservation improvement as I have done.

Chapter 11-3 Seizure. Second paragraph states the allocation of range between these areas would be left to the administrators, utilizing an open-season allocation. 10-18 approaches in case where conflicts occur. This statement needs to be further clarified to what approach is really considered.

Chapter 17-4 Paragraph 1 in cooperation with BLM, game populations. Let's be reminded that the BLM has allowed game populations to grow above agreed upon levels. That in the case the BLM or the Eastern Mountains Community Group. A herd of 300 was allowed when BLM was not on the desired number. All numbers are increasing and as such to a BLM management plan is adopted by the BLM, the proposed wild populations should be allowed to and not ignored.

Summary
I have addressed by comments to only those in the BLM that I have concern with. I do believe that the Forest Service needs to offer a well thought out management plan that all affected Forest Interests and Livestock and avoid by. In so much as my primary home is derived only from grazing livestock and both public and private range land. I offer these comments to be considered as a part of the data. My comments are with the purpose to help project my future interest in the Ward National Forest, to protect my future livelihood and comments will bring and at this same time to a great amount of the community. I consider my comments to be biased in the interest of the livestock industry and I so do with pride but not at the expense of other interests.

I appreciate the range tour held in Strawberry Valley this fall and the tour helped answer many of the livestock's questions.

Respectfully,

[Signature]
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MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
Number 96-80-164-06-18

between the
COMMISSIONER OF THE UTAH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (UDA)
and
THE NORTHERN FORESTER
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREST SERVICE (NFS)

The purpose of this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is to promote efficient multiple-use management of the range resources of the Intermountain Region, USDA Forest Service. This cooperation is to be responsive to the overall public interest, promote healthy, useful National Forest System ranges and reflect a strong local ethic and apply current scientific forest and rangeland management principles.

This Memorandum of Understanding is to promote cooperation through consultation and coordination between the parties in matters relating to allotment management planning on the national forests in Utah. This cooperation is sought pursuant to Section 9 of the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of October 25, 1978, (7 U.S.C. 556, 1978 U.S.C. 1798).

When a single allotment is involved, each cooperation ensures full participation of the permittee(s) and UDA in the planning process if requested and agreed to by the parties. The objective is to develop an allotment management plan which best meets the direction of Forest Land Management Plan, and reconcile the economics associated with the allotment. Allotment management plans will be approved in writing by the responsible Forest Officer.
AUTHORIZATION

Code of Federal Regulations 36 CFR 272.7 (b) and (d) authorizes Forest Officers to work cooperatively with state livestock organizations and other organizations which have an interest in improvement of range management on public and private lands.

The parties hereby agree to the following:

I. The Regional Forester will:

A. Personally or through a representative inform the designated BLM representative of Forest Service meetings with permittees related to development or major revision of Allotment Management Plans that are likely to be controversial in nature if the permittee requests that BLM be involved.

B. Personally or through a representative provide the opportunity for the Commissioner, BLM or his representatives to participate in meetings and activities related to development or major revision of Allotment Management Plans that are likely to be controversial in nature if the permittee has asked that BLM be involved.

C. Personally or through a representative advise individual permittees when the USFS begins work on the development or revision of allotment management plans of BLM's interest in providing assistance and of the opportunity to request such assistance.

II. The Commissioner will:

Participate in the improvement of range management on national forests through participation in the allotment management planning process and dissemination and collection of information as necessary.

A. Be responsible for participation in the allotment management planning process on all national forests in Utah as requested by individual permittees or the Forest Service.

B. Respond to requests for advice from Forest Service and/or permittees on allotment management programs.

C. Provide available inventory, statistical, and research data as requested to the USFS Forest Service for allotment management planning.
III. Nothing in this Memorandum of Understanding shall be construed as:

A. Limiting or affecting in any way the authority or legal responsibility of the signatories or as binding either the State or the USDA Forest Service to perform beyond C’s respective authority of each, or to require either party to assume or replace any man in excess of appropriations available. Any information considered confidential would be excluded.

B. Precluding individual ranch operators or the Forest Service from requesting additional state participation, or participation by other parties.

IV. Each provision of this Memorandum of Understanding is subject to the laws and regulations of the State of Utah, and the laws of the United States and the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture.

V. Amendments to this Memorandum of Understanding may be proposed by either party and shall become effective upon approval by both parties.

VI. This Memorandum of Understanding shall become effective when signed by the parties hereto and shall continue in force unless formally terminated by one of the parties after thirty (30) days notice in writing to the other party of his intention to do so.

STATE OF UTAH

[Signature]

By: Mike "Cap" Perry, Commissioner
Utah Department of Agriculture

Date: 9/3/84

USDA FOREST SERVICE

[Signature]

By: Van Tieler, Regional Forester
USDA Forest Service

Date: 6/1/84
ORDINANCE OF THE UINTAH COUNTY COMMISSION, State of Utah, (1) adopting an emergency Ordinance to protect the public peace, general welfare, health and safety of the citizens and the Governments of Uintah County from immediate and ongoing economic and financial damage, (2) providing penalties for violations of the Ordinance, and (3) requesting that the Legislature of the State of Utah enact similar legislation to modify within state law such statutes as enacted by county Ordinance and by the United States Congress.

THE COMMISSION FINDS:

1. That the Public Rangelands Improvement Act (P.R.I.A.), 43 U.S.C. 141901-141906, was authorized by Congress on October 25, 1976, and has not been repealed by statute, regulation or court decree.

2. That the purpose of the Public Rangelands Improvement Act is to "[1] inventory and identify current public rangeland conditions and trends as part of an inventory process" and "[2] manage, maintain and improve the condition of the public rangelands so that they become as productive as feasible for all rangeland values." 43 U.S.C. 141901(b).

3. That pursuant to the Public Rangelands Improvement Act, on June 22, 1984, the State of Utah entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (M.O.U.) with the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior, the purpose of which is to provide for "consultation, cooperation, and coordination between the parties in matters relating to rangeland management on public lands of the United States in Utah, administrated by the Bureau of Land Management." The M.O.U. implies that it is the policy of the State Director, Bureau of Land Management Program and thus complies with the Congressional intent of the Act.

4. That this M.O.U. between the State of Utah and the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior has not been repealed or rescinded.

5. That pursuant to the Public Rangelands Improvement Act, on June 9, 1985, the Director of the Utah Department of Agriculture (U.D.A.) entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (M.O.U.) with the Regional Forester, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Region, the purpose of which is to "promote efficient multiple-use management of the range resources in the Intermountain Region, U.S.D.A. Forest Service. That management is to be responsive to the overall public interest, produce healthy, useful forests and grasslands, reflect a strong land ethic and apply current scientific Forest and rangeland management principles." The M.O.U. goes on to state, "When a single allotment is involved, such cooperation (as
authorised by the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of October 25, 1978) ensures full participation of the permittee(s) and U.S.A. in the planning process if requested and agreed to by the permittee(s).

6. That the N.O.U. between the Utah Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Forest Service has not been repealed or rescinded.

7. That the Public Rangelands Improvement Act and the accompanying Memorandum of Understanding represent sound land management principles for all federal lands managed by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, including those lands within Uintah County, Utah.

BE IT DECREED BY THE UINTAH COUNTY COMMISSION,
STATE OF UTAH

THE COMMISSION DECLARES:

1. That it is in the public welfare, public peace, health and safety of the citizens of Uintah County, passage of this Ordinance is required to protect the economic base upon which this County and its citizens depend.

2. That the Public Rangelands Improvement Act, 43 U.S.C. 1901 et seq., shall be adopted as a county Ordinance by the County Commissioners of Uintah County, Utah.

3. That the Memorandum of Understanding between the Utah Department of Agriculture and the Utah State Director, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior, dated June 25, 1986 shall be incorporated by reference into this county Ordinance, with the following provisions.

4. That the Memorandum of Understanding between the Director of the Utah Department of Agriculture (U.D.A.) and the Regional Forester, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forester, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (U.S.F.S.) Intermountain Region, dated June 25, 1986 shall be incorporated by reference into this county Ordinance, with the following provisions.

5. That the procedures set forth in the Public Rangelands Improvement Act and accompanying Memorandum of Understanding as modified by this Ordinance shall govern all actions involving the Forest Service and either an individual or group of livestock grazing permittee(s) or leasee(s), including but not necessarily limited to the issuance of a grazing permit(s) or leasee(s) by the federal agencies, the transfer or sale of a grazing permit(s) or leasee(s) from one party to another, the creation or revision of an allotment management plan, and other like actions or as requested by the permittee(s) or leasee(s).
6. That upon the initiation of the actions described above by the Bureau of Land Management or the permittee(s) or lessee(s), the Bureau of Land Management shall initiate the consultation procedures described in the Memorandum of Understanding between the Governor of Utah and the Utah State Director, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior, dated June 27, 1998, and adopted by this Ordinance. The initiation of such action under the R.O.P. shall occur within two week period of time.

7. That violations of this Ordinance by the federal agencies shall be deemed to be a violation of Uintah County ordinance number 6-2-1991. Liability under this ordinance shall be placed upon the federal official or officials responsible for making and implementing any decision which fails to comply with this ordinance.

8. That no violation of this Ordinance shall be assessed if all of the permittee(s) or lessee(s) affected by the agency decision releases, in writing, the federal agency of all responsibility for the violation within two weeks of the date of the agency decision.

9. That if any provision of this Ordinance or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity does not affect any other provision of this Ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to those ends the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

PASSED, ADOPTED AND SIGNED by the Uintah County Board of County Commissioners as Uintah County ordinance No. 6-2-1991 and recorded with the Uintah County Clerk this day of November, 1991.

BOARD OF UINTAH COUNTY COMMISSION

[Signatures]

Mark R. Allen, Chairman

[Signatures]

[Signatures]

[Signatures]

[Seal]

Uintah County Clerk
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

between

THE UTAH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

and

THE UTAH STATE DIRECTOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

It is the purpose and intent of this Memorandum of Understanding to provide for consultation, cooperation, and coordination between the parties in matters relating to allotment management plans on public lands of the United States in Utah administered by the Bureau of Land Management. This memorandum is in furtherance of the policies of the United States, as expressed by Congress in the following acts:

Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, (43 U.S.C. Section 1701 et seq). Section 505 provides, among other things, for meaningful public involvement of state officials in the development of land use program regulations and land use decisions for public lands which may have a significant impact on non-federal lands.

Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978, (P.L. 95-514; 92 Stat. 1601). Section 8 provides, among other things, for consultation, cooperation, and coordination with any state having lands within areas to be covered by allotment management plans.

This Memorandum of Understanding is to promote cooperation through consultation and coordination between the parties in matters relating to allotment management planning on public lands administered by BLM in Utah. This cooperation is sought pursuant to Section 8 of the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of October 25, 1978, (P.L. 95-514, 43 U.S.C. 1752).

1. The provisions of this memorandum do not create any new legal obligations, and do not create any new legal or financial responsibilities on the part of either party.

2. This memorandum is not intended to affect the respective authority of each, or to require either party to assume or expend any sum in excess of appropriations available. Any information considered confidential or proprietary by either party would be excluded.
III. Nothing in this Memorandum of Understanding shall be construed as:

A. Limiting or affecting in any way the authority or legal responsibility of the signature or of binding either the State or the USDA Forest Service to perform beyond the respective authority of each, or to require either party to assume or expend any sum in excess of appropriations available. Any information considered confidential would be excluded.

B. Precluding individual ranch operators or the Forest Service from requesting additional state participation, or participation by other parties.

IV. Each provision of the Memorandum of Understanding is subject to the laws and regulations of the State of Utah, and the laws of the United States and the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture.

V. Amendments to this Memorandum of Understanding may be proposed by either party and shall become effective upon approval by both parties.

VI. This Memorandum of Understanding shall become effective when signed by the parties hereto and shall continue in force unless formally terminated by one of the parties after thirty (30) days notice in writing to the other party of his intention to do so.

STATE OF UTAH

[Signature]

Dwight "Doc" Perry, Commissioner
Utah Department of Agriculture

Date: 5/31/86

U.S. FOREST SERVICE

[Signature]

Mike G. Bower, Regional Forester
USDA Forest Service

Date: 6/4/86
After reviewing the Uinta National Forest Rangeland Ecosystem and
Forest Plan Amendment we would like to suggest the following:
5-1, paragraph 3 to livestock members are on the executive
committee, but DVR and Utah Wildlife Coalition and many other
identities were solicited who are not direct users.
5-1, Alternative 1: No range or water improvements were
mentioned.
5-1, paragraph 3 to recognize the increase in big game contributing
to the decrease of winter forage.
5-5, p.3.3: Any given five year period; should be more specific.
Ch. 1-1(1), p.3 should be Uintah National Forest and maintain
present livestock grazing.
Ch. 11-2(1), p.2.3 grazing practices and increased number of elk.
Ch. 11-2(9), p.2.3 object- grazing should be consi-
dered equal.
p. 3: or newer accepted grazing plans.
Ch. II-4.3 Use for non access to evaluate
Ch. II-3: determine cause of riparian damage and restrict use
accordingly.
Ch. II-4: accepted range management plan
Ch. II-3-p: or other plans adopted for wildlife and domestic
livestock use
Ch. II-4(4): other acceptable grazing plans and use feed as a
measure not access.
Ch. II-16-p 3: How about restricting elk and deer?
Ch. II-19-p 2: suitable livestock grazing
Ch. II-22-p 1: Livestock grazing can occur but is not a sub-
ordinate to wildlife habitat needs, but each use should be analized
as to its historical usage.

Tom Bingham of the Utah Farm Bureau and Roger Banner, Utah State Range Ex-
tension Specialist, are on the committee to represent livestock interests. Tom was
recommended as a member of the committee by you, Vern, and that selection was
given unanimous approval of the livestock industry leaders present at the early scoping
meeting held at the Uinta National Forest Office.

Please review the last sentence of the first paragraph under Alternative B on page 5-2.

See last sentence of first paragraph on page 5-3.

The 5-year period is the interval at which winter range trend studies will be read and
evaluated.

The revisions you suggest have been made (page 1-2).

"Current levels of use," include any increases in elk numbers that may have occurred.

The purpose of this alternative is to give additional emphasis to other resource values
beyond that which current management achieves. The basic emphasis in Alternative B
is "healthy vegetation and soil resources" and that translates to improved watersheds,
riparian areas, and wildlife/fisheries habitat.

This guideline is a rule of thumb which directs the land manager to pay attention to a
problem common on the Uinta National Forest as new allotment plans are developed.
As you suggest, forage production as well as sheep distribution must be used in
capacity determinations. Currently, some sheep allotments contain too few acres to
produce the forage needed for permitted sheep numbers and provide for improved soil
and vegetation conditions.

The purpose for the standards and guidelines is to provide the direction for limiting use
so that riparian areas in unsuitable conditions can be improved to Forest
Plan goals and objectives.

If this comment refers to the DEIS requirement for planned rest grazing, this standard
will be required for sheep grazing only where the defined desired future condition has
not been achieved.

Changes have not been made as suggested. Where allotments do not meet the desired
future condition, rest-rotation grazing systems will be utilized. Where they do meet
desired range health goals, deferred grazing systems may be utilized.

See responses #5-8 and #5-11.

These guidelines apply to all grazing animals where it is possible to implement such
direction.

The narrative has been changed to include livestock forage as a purpose for which
these areas can be utilized.
Livestock utilization should be controlled by the availability of water and excessive herding should be limited due to trampling of forage movement of soil.

Economic of livestock production will be of paramount importance when livestock numbers are changed.

and improve wildlife and livestock habitat.

Due to the rapid increase of wildlife (especially elk) it will be very difficult to implement a successful grazing system on the summer allotments. With the 1200 elk allowed on the Elmont Park (Spanish Cow Canyon Strawberry unit with an 35-40% increase each year) the winter ranges will be heavily overgrazed.

I feel we have been betrayed by the Forest Service as they made the commitment that "The winter range would control the number of elk allowed on the summer range". Now you are exceeding the Winter Range.

Sincerely yours,

Vernon C. Wilson
December 17, 1991

Bob Riddle
Steve Smith
UNIJAAT NATIONA/ FOREST
Heber, Utah

Gentlemen:

As a permittee of the Uinta National Forest (Mud Creek Allotment), I am writing this letter to express some comments regarding "Draft Environmental Impact Statement".

I prefer Alternative B over Alternative A by the committee that made the report. Some concerns are:

1. Alternative B. Fishing and wildlife interests should not be given priority over grazing. I think fish and wildlife are important, but I do not believe that they should, under the multiple use concept, be given this priority. I have a large financial investment in my permit and because of the income I receive from my ranching operations, I pay taxes to support government, schools, etc. If the Forest Service were to decide, for example, that elk were to be allowed to increase dramatically and cattle have to decrease, it would critically hurt my ability to continue ranching. Presently the fishermen and the hunters do not pay any forest use taxes and they get benefit from the use of the forest lands. In fact, many of them avoid fee camping and picnic areas so they can use everything free. I do not have anything against hunting or fishing because I enjoy both, but I do not think that the integrity of the multiple use tradition can be maintained by giving priority to one group.

On page 5-3, paragraph 2, it infers that much of the problem with winter range has been due to overgrazing by livestock. In the same paragraph it also states that of the 122,682 forest acres only 333.5 is grazed by livestock. I believe that paragraph should put most (not all) the blame where it belongs, and that is not on livestock. It is my understanding that winter range is more critical than summer range in many areas. I believe that we need to look at wildlife numbers, especially elk, and that the DWR and the Forest Service need to set number limits on them also if we are to maintain the amount of both summer and winter forage desired by the Forest Service. In some riparian areas the elk have done far more damage than livestock. Livestock operators own a great deal of winter range that is used by deer and elk and the rancher

Alternative B does give more emphasis to wildlife and fish than is currently given in allotment management plans, because the values related to riparian areas, big game winter range, and much of the aspen type, directly and significantly influence fish and wildlife habitat.

See responses #3-1 and #3-8.

Please review Chapter III, section 3, with regards to the Big Game Winter Range problem. We do not believe we have put all the blame for these conditions on livestock use; but such use was, we believe, the beginning of the problem.

Range management systems must be designed to meet the needs of the basic soil, water, and vegetative resources during both wet and dry years. Alternative B is our best effort at doing that. Also, see our previous response #3-2. Some allotments may already meet the guidelines, and future planning efforts will determine whether they do or not.

Thank you for your confidence. We believe there has been a strong mutual effort to manage your allotment properly. The statement in Chapter IV under the topic "Management" is a public issue or concern that must be stated and addressed in the EIS.

See response #3-9.
in most cases feed the deer and elk free. Personally, I have never had anyone thank me for feeding the deer and elk which fed every winter. Most importantly, however, if planned correctly and with the proper execution of the plan, deer, elk, cattle and fish can be maintained in a balance. The public access and extensist groups cannot be put into a management model of forest services properties because too high a percentage do not understand the fundamentals of property management.

2. Under plan "B", whenever a time line is set, such as five years, some pretty radical measures can be used to assure that the deadline is met. Under the Mud Creek allotment, my desire has been to work diligently with the Forest Service and will continue to do so. However, one cannot control the weather and, under normal conditions, I do not believe there would ever be a problem. However, what if we were to go into another 3 year drought? I would like to comment that even with the drought, our range looks the best it ever has and it has consistently grown better. The forest supervisor in Haber can attest to this. Our allotment is in excellent shape but we too would like to see it stay that way and improve where necessary. We do not feel we would need a cut in numbers to keep our ranges in good shape.

In the booklet, in Chapter IV-7 #4 paragraph 3, it says many problems facing the Forest Service are attributable to a lack of commitment on the part of the Forest Service. I believe in our case this is false. Steve Smith and others in Haber City whom we have worked with, have been very diligent in keeping track of how our range is doing. I also would like to say that I take exception to the second part of the paragraph. We, as permittees, have tried very hard to work with our supervisors.

I would also like to comment in the riparian issue. As the streams are classified, I believe that the permittee should be included in the decision making process. For instance, parts of a particular stream may be classified in more than one way. As the stream leaves Strawberry Reservoir its use as a fishing stream may change drastically in a short distance, depending on water quantity, etc.

In Chapter IV-3 and Chapter IV-4, the NEIS mentions that perhaps to improve winter range, big game populations in some areas may need to be reduced. If this were to happen, although our range is summer range, I believe we could still maintain a healthy elk herd (we do need reductions in elk herd size to balance the availability of winter range). We would also maintain the AW's on our permit which we now have and our range could continue to be a high quality range.

In conclusion, I would like to comment that I believe livestock are often blamed unjustly for problems for which they are not
responsible. I also believe that livestock can co-exist with the
Uinta National Forest with other interests. However, I do not
believe that recreational wildlife, which are essentially non-
producers, should dictate grazing. Should the DNR pay a fee for big
game AUM’s, or the fishermen a fee for fish caught on forest
ranges? I do not believe these are necessarily answers because I
hope we can continue as we have in the past with the forests being
for the use of everyone.

Hopefully and justifiably, we can focus and finalize a plan
together that accommodates those components that are necessary to
bring about a peaceful and long standing solution between the
Forest Service and Permittees.

Respectfully,

[Signature]
Dear Sirs:

I am writing you concerning the Rangeland Ecosystem Forest Plan Amendment. There are several areas that raise questions to me. First the riparian areas that should maintain 80% of ground cover seems somewhat unreasonable to me, 80% of what? Do we have records showing what the use is? Most rangelands have increased. Even if livestock was held off these areas to maintain 80% the wildlife would continue full use. In areas on the range I’m on, the wildlife use the riparian areas more than the livestock.

Second, this brings us to another area. That of wildlife management, which was hardly even mentioned in DEIS. Elk herds have grown to uncountable numbers in the past five years, there is no control on them, where or when they feed or even the number of elk the forest is capable of handling in each area, along with feeding on young seedlings early in the year. Some cow permits definitely need looked at by Wildlife Division. Two main areas of concern in the DEIS are riparian and ridge top, both of which elk use heavily. Has there been any impact study done on what wildlife has done or does livestock get credit for all problems?

You also bring up some parts of erosion or areas sluffing off on slopes. Some natural dislocations will still occur around beaver dams and in heavy moisture years on slopes.

You talk about culverts, bridges, stream road construction and maintenance etc. But the Forest Service has not had the funds or even planned on any upkeep. Let alone any new construction. This list went on and on but where does funding come from for these improvements? The permittees are to follow these strict regulations, but does other groups, such as off road travel, fish projects, tearing up areas in main riparian areas to put in fish stations, timber sales leaving new roads all over Forest, A.T.V., dam and tunnel projects leaving areas completely out of productivity and ugly. I know these areas are listed but nobody watches anyone but permittees. Let’s even this agreement out for all: not just blame permittees for it or expect them to sacrifice for poor judgement in other areas.

The guidelines apply to use by wildlife as well as to livestock. Where they are causing problems, then solutions to those problems need to be developed. Riparian areas are some of the most potentially productive lands on the National forests. Ground cover in this instance refers to those parameters which help protect the soil surface, including plants and organic litter. There is little doubt that most riparian areas have the potential to achieve this objective.

See responses # 2-1 and #3-8. Where we believe elk are a problem we have recommended that antlerless permits be issued. For this coming season we have recommended 150 antlerless permits be issued on herd units associated with the Uinta National Forest. This includes 30 permits on Willow Creek of the Diamond-Strawberry unit, 30 on the Heber-Red Creek unit, and 50 permits on the Nebo North unit.

This document does not attempt to deal with natural, geologic erosion but with that which is accelerated by man’s activities.

These are the constraints that must be met whenever such activities are permitted. We acknowledge that we need to increase our efforts to assure that all activities that take place within riparian areas meet these standards and guidelines.
I feel that in general people don’t listen to what the ranchers have to say, or reasoning behind what they think. Forest permits are essential to ranching in the West. Ranchers are some of the best environmentalists there is. They want what's best for the rangelands 7-4 and still be able to maintain their ranching operations as they now exist. We also need fair considerations from other groups interested in Federal lands. The DEIS needs to be spread out evenly to all groups participating on forest land.

We appreciate the opportunity to be able to respond to this matter.

Sincerely,

Allen Sweat

[Signature]
December 15, 1991

C/O Steve Smith
Uinta Forest Supervisor
88 West 100 North
box 1428
Provo, Utah 84604

Dear Sir,

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Mr. Haeker, past supervisor, has stressed the importance of a 3 unit rest rotation system and consequently it has been implemented and enforced.

I do not agree with it. A 4 unit system is more practical and does not bring economic ruin to a permittee. In your Draft environmental Impact statement it was stated in favor of the wildlife on every statement you made. My family has used these ranges prior to existence of the U.S.F.S. for 6 generations. Some of us Okelberrys have been harding and heading sheep and cows on these ranges. We have been excluded from your decision making which effect our bottom line. We want some respect and consideration:

This past grazing season we restated what used to be a whole permit for 1100 sheep 7/1-9/30 (does know) there was very little rest large numbers of elk were there all summer.

I did not like the statements concerning private property and I don't think the U.S.F.S. and Utah Fish and Game has the right to condemn my private property to wildlife use practically by elk. Our spring/fall private property is over-grazed by elk in the fall/winter and spring time, even before we get there with our domesticated livestock.

There are several more problems but I believe with cooperation and including us livestock grazers in your statements we could exist. The Uinta Sheep and cattle grazers must have some impact into these matters. Hopefully you will accept a groups thoughts.

Sincerely,

Ray Okelberry

Ray Okelberry
Peter Karp  
Unita Forest Supervisor

I urge you to continue the use of Alternative A. Current management effects are directed toward the improvement of the forest as a whole. Also the present plan keeps a great economic value to the surrounding communities & its people.

Thanks

Roger Neilson  
Bridgeport, MT

Thank you for your opinion concerning the alternatives listed in the DEIS.
Fountain Green, Utah
December 26, 1991

Forest Supervisor
Uinta National Forest
83 East, 100 North
700 Box 1423
Provo, Utah 84603

Dear Sir:

In regard to the DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT, I appreciate the opportunity to voice my opinion on the proposed standards, revisions and guidelines.

The U.S. Forest Service and lands administered thereunder were historically set aside as a multiple use concept in order to benefit and provide for the welfare of the American people. In recent years we have seen an alarming trend away from multiple use and toward the direction of special interest groups, and sadly but understandably toward those few who cry the loudest. In order to administer these lands for the benefit of all Americans, this trend must be reversed.

General public conception of livestock grazing on public lands is greatly and erroneously influenced by false propaganda fostered by "Nature Nuts" environmentalists and the Division of Wildlife Resources. The radical environmentalists consider humanity as a festering sore upon the face of the earth and would do away with industrialized society entirely, while the DWR has historically used livestock as a scapegoat for their shortcomings. The truth is that with proper management these interests can all co-exist one with another.

Forest grazing is a renewable resource and benefits not only the livestock producers but every American who requires food and clothing for their families. To retain grazing practices in general at the status quo is to ensure these necessities which provide for the public welfare.

Hard economic times have come upon livestockmen, especially sheep producers in recent years. Further restrictions on grazing practices would mean the ruination of many of these producers and thusly would have a negative impact on American consumers. In many cases a ranchers assets are largely tied up in grazing allotments. Lots of, or significant reduction of these assets would spell disaster for these ranchers.
The American legacy of farming and ranching has provided low-cost food and clothing for its citizens as well as the world for 200 years and must be preserved.

Administrators of the Uinta National Forest have done an exemplary job of caring for these lands with few exceptions. Many of their decisions have not been agreeable to the livestock producers, but have been accepted in the best interests of range conservation and cooperation. The Uinta USFS has been responsible to the American public for the wise and most beneficial use of these lands. They have done a good job of monitoring and regulating grazing practices and should be allowed to continue as they have in the past. Big game management on forest lands, especially of non-native species such as elk, should also be monitored and regulated by the Forest Service and the DNR should be held accountable to the USFS. For the past 20 years livestock permitted numbers on forest lands have decreased steadily while elk numbers (which are especially destructive to the range because of their early migration to the high country) have increased exponentially.

The future of these lands and their value to all Americans is in your hands as men and women entrusted with a national treasure. Please deal with it wisely. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Scott D. Aagard
Box 112
Fountain Green, Utah 84632
The following letter was sent to the Vernon Grazing Association on January 7, 1992.

No comments on the DEIS have been received. A representative from the Vernon Association was invited to two meetings where the Forest Plan Amendment was discussed.

United States Forest Service
Uinta National Forest
P.O. Box 1428
Provo, UT 84603

Reply to: 2230 (1920)
Date: January 7, 1992

Vernon Livestock Association
P.O. Box 98
Vernon, Utah 84080

Gentlemen:

We have received your request for an extension of time to review and comment on the Uinta National Forest Rangeland Ecosystem-Forest Plan Amendment Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As you know, the publicized comment period ended January 3, 1992.

We want all interested parties to have an opportunity to review and comment on the Amendment. We will, therefore, do our best to get your suggestions in the final document even though they were received after the closing date. The same consideration will be given to other late comments. The earlier we receive your comments, the better opportunity we will have to get your information in the final document. It is unlikely that comments received after the end of January will be considered in the final printing of the document.

Thank you for your interest. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

LARRY R. CALL

PETER V. KARP
Forest Supervisor
We have revised the FEIS to include an additional alternative which emphasizes recreation opportunities (pages 5-3 and 11-3 to II-5).

There is no assurance that schedules in the Range Action Plan will be met. Allotment management plan revisions and NEPA compliance in a 5-year timeframe is a goal we have established. It will not be an easy goal to reach, but under current budgeting and workloads we intend to meet it. Action Plan dates have been revised in the FEIS.

This FEIS is a programmatic document that gives direction to the preparation of subsequent allotment management plans. Each allotment management plan will then have either a Categorical Exclusion, Environmental Assessment, or Environmental Impact Statement prepared on it to assess the site-specific impacts involved in accordance with NEPA regulations. The environmental analysis will determine the NEPA documentation required.

This is a statement of fact. These permittees are dependent on National Forest ranges to round out their operations. This does not mean that they are solely dependent on these resources or that other means of sustaining their livestock could not be found, but that historically, whether their operation is large or small, they have built a base of operations that to some degree is dependent on National Forest range resources under the current situation. It places no judgement as to the goodness or badness of this situation. We agree, however, that the Forest Service must address the value of the watersheds involved in relation to other values. The Uinta National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan gives priority to protection of soil and water resources, and this is one of the reasons for the development of this FEIS.

See response #2-2.

The direction to protect and enhance habitat for Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive plants and animals currently exists on pages 3-50 and 3-51, Wildlife Goal No. 13 of the Land and Resource Management Plan for the Uinta National Forest. The Forest already has an aggressive program for the management of these species. During the past 3 years, inventory work has been completed on 4 of the Forest's 5 sensitive plant species, as well as the only endangered plant species which has the potential to exist on the Forest. Plans to complete inventory work on the remaining one sensitive plant and the only threatened plant in the next two years are underway. Chapter III has been revised to include discussion of threatened, endangered, and sensitive species that may occur in riparian areas, on big game winter ranges, and on overgrazed ridgetops and open slopes.

We have revised the standards and guidelines to indicate that 3-unit systems are not the only planned rest systems which may be utilized. See also response #5-11.

We agree. We have deleted the word "proper". Stubble height as determined by percent utilization will be used as the standard for use and will be site and species specific (page II-10).

We have not changed this standard. The standard was developed by an ID team using the best information available from research literature and field experience.

1. SUMMARY

a. We support Alternative B - Watershed/Riparian/Mid-to-Late Seral Vegetation Community Types.

b. We have some concern of the lack of range of alternatives.

2. Specific Comments

a. Reference Appendix 2.

1) Were the schedules for 1991 set?

2) What assurance is there that subsequent schedules will be set?

b. Reference Page 5-1.

It appears that pre-judging the environmental impact is and will be covered with use of Environmental Assessments (EA's) rather than Environmental Impact Statement (EIS's). It is our understanding that EA's are used to determine if an EIS is needed, not as a surrogate for an EIS.

c. Reference Page 5-2.

It is stated that "Permittees who graze livestock on the Forest are dependent upon Forest rangelands for rounding out their livestock operations". In view of the fact that the average permittee has 20 head of livestock or less, it is difficult for us to understand why the permittees are dependent upon the Forest Service. The Forest Service must focus on the values of the watershed, not the values of the livestock operation.

d. Reference Chapter 1-2 ECONOMICS

The support for the statement contained in the Economics Chapter has not been provided in the draft EIS.

e. Reference Chapter 11-2.

We suggest a more aggressive effort in habitat management for threatened and endangered and sensitive species.

We agree that utilization will be difficult to monitor, but we have professionals who we trust can handle the job. These standards when met should improve plant growth and vigor, maintain organic litter cover, and provide for sediment filtering. This standard is important to the recovery of ridgetop areas grazed by sheep.

We agree that two grazing seasons rest (1-1/2 grazing seasons) is an important standard for improvement of Uinta National Forest rangelands. The Annual Management Plan will determine the specifics of needed rest, etc.

This is the minimum standard. It may be set higher depending on the specific allotment situation.

See our response #12-10 and #12-11.

This section has been revised to reflect your concern.

See response #2-2.

Most of the increased costs of management will fall on the permittees. The Forest Service will also incur increased costs in allotment administration and monitoring.

The management direction will be provided by incorporation of the standards and guidelines into the new annual management plans, and by implementation and monitoring of those plans.

This is a good suggestion. In fact, we would invite the Utah Wildlife Federation to assist us in our monitoring efforts. This would give you a better understanding of how this process will be implemented.

This document will complete the program level requirements of NEPA. It also includes an action plan for completion of the environmental analysis for individual allotments which have commonality. A date for NEPA compliance as per the action plan will be included in all grazing permits for allotments not in compliance with the standards and guidelines. The permit will also be amended to include the standards and guidelines.

We will issue term permits as they expire and will amend term permits as needed to provide for changes needed to meet the direction in the standards and guidelines. Such changes need not await the expiration of a term permit.
f. Reference Page 11-4 Range - 3rd Paragraph.

1) We suggest that, if a three unit rest rotation system doesn't work. The EIS provides for a five unit rotation system, or complete rest until the unit recovers.

2) We suggest the verbiage "proportions" be deleted from the 5th paragraph under Ranges-General Direction and insert vocabulary that will ensure use criteria will not result in overgrazed allotments.

g. Reference Chapter 11-5 General Direction and Standards and Guidelines.

1) The standards and guidelines for High Value Riparian Areas state 80% filtering surface and Moderate Value Riparian Areas states 70%.

2) We believe that both standards are too lenient. We suggest 80% for high value areas and 80% for moderate value areas. We also question what techniques will be used to measure the filtering vegetation and the frequency of measurements. The important thrust of this Direction is the stream must be filtered.

h. Reference Chapter 11-13 Resources Management General Directions and Standards and Guidelines.

1) We don't understand how the grasses, forbs and shrubs can be measured to the limits established. The percentages established are very subjective and difficult to monitor and for the most part have little objective meaning.

2) What is important is that the standards and guidelines ensure that the ranges be allowed sufficient time to recover between grazings. Experience reveals that ranges require at least two growing seasons rest to restore. Accordingly, we recommend at least 2 years rest between use periods.

i. Reference Chapter 11-15 Wildlife and Fish Resource Management

1) General Direction - manage for habitat needs of indicator species standard & guidelines state "maintain habitat capability at a level of at least 70% of potential capability..."

2) To us, 70% appears to be too low. We question what is the current coverage and how does that compare to the potential coverage? How will the increase in coverage be obtained and maintained? When?
j. Reference Chapter II-17 Standards and Guidelines for Measuring Grasses/Forbs and Shrubs.

Our response for these measurements are the same as our response in paragraph 2. b. Measuring the percent utilized is not so important in this issue. What is important is periodic rest of the plants.

k. Reference Chapter II-18 Standards and Guidelines

It appears to us that the shape (width and length) is important, not just a measurement of 40 acres.

l. Reference Chapter IV-9 Economics

1. We suggest that the economic analysis to support the statement contained in Chapter IV-5 be made a part of the EIS. It appears to us that EA's have not been conducted to evaluate the alternatives and a "owned" statement was used throughout the draft EIS to support livestock grazing.

2. Who will pay the increased costs for management and development of livestock grazing as stated in the draft EIS?

a. Reference Chapter IV-7 Management

Since you have stated that the Forest Plan does not adequately provide a common understanding of management direction, will the proposed grazing schedule correct this? How? When?

b. Reference Chapter V-2 Monitoring Requirements

As a cost reduction consideration, we recommend that volunteers from the universities, colleges and the private sector be trained in monitoring techniques and used in the monitoring process.

a. Release of Grazing Permits

1. It is our understanding that grazing permits cannot be released until the NEPA process is completed. What is the schedule for completing the NEPA process?

2. It is our position that livestock grazing is a legitimate multiple use of public lands where appropriate and economic to do so. However, preference grazing permits should not be released without full NEPA compliance and until management structures are in place and adequate in numbers of livestock and seasons of use have been made.
December 27, 1991

Uinta National Forest Supervisor
88 West 100 North
P.O. Box 1428
Provo, UT 84603

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is in regards to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We feel the livestock permits along with the D.N.R. should both be cooperating agencies in the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The livestock permits are the only group who are paying the Uinta Forest Service to use the public/federal land, therefore, we feel our input is a vital part of this study. Both Alternatives A and B have positive and negative points, therefore, we can not specify going with a specific alternative at this time.

The following are some areas of concern:

1. 3-Unit Rest Rotation System

This system is not adequate for livestock grazing in high mountain country. The rest rotation system has been developed for desert or semi-desert areas such as the Arizona Strip not high mountain country. While one unit is being rested by livestock grazing this so called "rested" unit is being grazed by uncontrolled big game. High country permits are supplied with both summer foliage and fall foliage for sheep.

2. Elk Population

The elk population is out of control. Years ago there was an Uinta Grazers Advisory Board which was supervised by Don Habaker, Forest Supervisor at that time. It was stated there would be an upper limit of 1200 head of elk on the Uinta Forest. This number has been far exceeded. The elk should be controlled by the D.N.R. and should be a high rated area of consideration when livestock is being blamed for over grazing. The public enjoys seeing livestock grazing as well as wildlife on open range.

Rest-rotation grazing was not developed for desert or semi-desert areas, although it has been successfully used to improve range conditions on many of these ranges. Rest-rotation grazing was developed mainly through the efforts of A. L. Horman in the Sierra Nevada Mountains, on the Lassen National Forest of Northeastern California. The system has since been successfully used to improve range conditions on many different allotments in a variety of climatic conditions and topography throughout the Western United States. It has been used with great success on the steep, mountainous topography of the Hobble Creek Cattle & Horse Allotment of the Uinta National Forest.

The system works, because it provides for all of the basic physiological needs of plants. It is somewhat more difficult to implement on allotments with steep topography. As with any grazing system, the herbivore use on the allotment must not exceed the capacity if it is to work successfully.

The 1,000 head limit was not set on the Uinta Forest but on the Diamond Fork-Strawberry Elk Management Unit. That cap has not been exceeded, although it was nearly reached in 1989 when 1,077 elk were counted on the winter range. See responses #2-1 and #3-8.

See responses #5-1, #8-3, and #12-4.

This may not be a problem on your permitted areas. Specific analysis of each allotment will determine what problems exist and where they exist.

Even though livestock is removed from Forest ranges before winter arrives, livestock can remove forage from these ranges prior to their exit, just as big game can remove forage from summer ranges before the livestock are allowed on these ranges. Livestock generally are not in competition with wildlife on Uinta winter ranges, but there are exceptions to that situation and where it occurs it must be dealt with. We agree that many big game animals are wintering on private lands and that residential development is a big factor on the loss of winter ranges, and we have so stated in the Big Game Winter Range section of Chapter III.

Predator control on the Uinta National Forest is not addressed by this FEIS but is addressed by an environmental assessment prepared in 1991. Predator control is continuing under new, more restrictive guidelines.

See responses #5-1, #8-3, and #12-4.
3. Riparian Improvement Efforts

   It is our concern that livestock should not be considered a big factor in riparian areas. Elk can damage riparian areas worse than livestock. If livestock is going to be manipulated or removed from these riparian areas, elk should also be removed.

   Livestock has been grazing in the Strawberry Valley long before the elk was transplanted there.

4. Ridgetops

   It is our option that ridgetops are in satisfactory condition in the areas we have been in.

5. Big Game Winter Range

   Livestock is removed from forest lands during October, therefore, winter range for big game is not being affected by livestock. Big game is wintering on lower elevation property (some of which is private property). The development of homes along the Wasatch Front is a big factor in less winter range for big game.

6. Compliance with Uinta National Forest Predator Control

   For the livestock industry to continue, it is essential for predator control to continue and improve as necessary. Predator control is not only beneficial to livestock but to all wildlife. With the recent introduction of the guard dogs to help control predators, this introduction has helped but predator control must be continued by ADC. It is vital to the livestock industry, as well as wildlife, the continued government trapping and helicopter winter control.

   The livestock industry is our livelihood and the livelihood of those who we employ. Proper usage of the Uinta National Forest is an area of high concern to us as well as to you. The livestock industry is a vital part of Utah. We have listed our concern and views above and request that all affected parties be considered regarding this study. We also feel that it is essential for livestock permits to be present at all meetings concerning this study.

Sincerely,

Marshall Backstrom & Sons Sheep
3232 N. 7300 South
Spanish Fork, UT 84660

enclosure
FOR THE PAST 20 YEARS
Rest-Rotation Grazing On The Arizona Strip

By Lee F. Humphs
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30 December 1991

Peter W. Karp, Forest Supervisor
Utah National Forest
P.O. Box 1428
Provo UT 84601

Dear Peter:


First, I wish to commend the general direction of the DEIS. I believe that the standards and guidelines presented in Alternative B, the preferred alternative, represent a tremendous step in the right direction in rangeland management on the Uinta. I do, however, have a few concerns and suggestions.

The major problem that I see with the DEIS is that it does not deal with all of the issues and concerns that I believe are important. This is true, at least in part, because most local citizens concerned with the Uinta Forest were not aware of the process until the DEIS was completed. I realize that the scope of the DEIS was limited under the direction of the former Forest Supervisor, but I encourage the Forest Service to publish public notices in the local newspaper as well as in the Federal Register. Most people simply do not read the Federal Register and, therefore, are not aware of the activities of the Forest Service unless there is some local notice.

One issue which is not adequately dealt with in the DEIS is the adverse impact of domestic livestock grazing on recreational use of the forest. As a matter of fact, the only discussion of the competition between recreation and grazing centers on the adverse effects of recreation on livestock grazing (p. 1-23). I see the loss of recreational use of the forest as a result of grazing to be a far more serious problem.

The DEIS mentions (p. IV-4) that recreational use of the forest has doubled since 1984. With the tremendous population growth rate in Utah County, recreational use will continue to climb in the foreseeable future. There is growing discontent among many local citizens about the perceived emphasis of the Forest Service on livestock grazing at the expense of other uses. This dissatisfaction is demonstrated by letters to local newspapers (see attachment) as well as by the improper and illegal defacement of livestock X-tag signs which occurred this summer in Payseu Canyon.

I live near Payseu and Sanataquin Canyons and I visit both areas many times throughout the year. Unfortunately, during much of the summer and early fall these areas are unusable due to livestock use. For example, my family and I hiked the Cultus Hollow Trail in upper Sanataquin Canyon this summer. We expected to enjoy a natural experience with forest

You are correct, the Notice of Intent to complete the Rangeland EIS was not published in local newspapers. Your comment is a good one, and we will publish such notices for future EIS's. Please see paragraph #3, Chapter II-I for additional information concerning scoping letters and meetings with special interest groups. In addition, three public open house meetings were held on the Forest during April, 1991.

We agree with your suggestion and have added additional information (pages 1-3 and IV-7 to IV-8).

Standards and Guidelines in the Rangeland EIS will help to ease the conflicts between recreation and livestock grazing.

We have received comments from other Forest users concerning the grazing use in the areas of Sanataquin and Holman Canyons. We believe the major problem was a failure of the permittees to properly manage their livestock and a lack of Forest Service action to take appropriate enforcement action.

We have developed a Recreation Alternative. See Alternative D. Chapter II-3.

See response #2-2.

Expansions of sheep allotments normally would not move sheep into areas not currently grazed. There may be some consolidations of existing sheep allotments in order to meet the standards and guidelines. Some allotments are currently too small to do so.

We agree. See Appendix 1-1.

We believe the added Recreation Alternative considers your concern. See response #14-5.

14-1

14-2

14-3

14-4

14-5
Letters

Bush delivering

Editor:

George Bush is delivering it as best as he can — the "New World Order."

The latest play in the North American Free Trade Agreement, which will be the foundation for a multinational coalition of North America, India, and South America. The plan will be modeled on the European Community whose Brussels government controls every move made by business and industry. Member countries have agreed to allow new investments in their national sovereignty with the goal of political integration.

The scenario is being repeated in Central America, Africa, and is proposed for Southeast Asia by some other than William Webster. Those who see independence, such as Cubans, recently were warned by Mr. Bush that 'Americanization' will not only be the policy of political independence.

"So, the subject is nationalism. It shouldn't be long before there is no need to keep America in the hands of Americans."

A. Golden Washington, AL

Doesn't add up

Editor:

I read Ahsen's Chron's Aug. 11 article "Branding behavior: a range destroyer in a bunch of heat." I agree with his statement "preservation," therefore, requires establishing the right balance between predator and prey. If the balance is right, it does not matter whether the animal is wild or domestic. But, he fails to mention that the balance is not "right" on many public grazing lands.

I have witnessed first-hand the extensive damage everywhere I go. Many times I have walked through fires and I have never seen a burn zone larger than 1 on many public grazing lands.

I have witnessed first-hand the extensive damage everywhere I go. Many times I have walked through fires, and I have never seen a burn zone larger than 1 on many public grazing lands. Indeed, my experience was not only that the balance is not "right," but there are many public grazing lands where the balance is "out of control." The evidence does not add up to what Mr. Ahsen says.

Mr. Ahsen seems concerned about waterfowl. But he surely has not seen the waterfowl when there is not enough water to feed them. I don't know how I got my drinking water from a well.

Donna Rupert

Allow latitude

Editor:

As a contributor to the Signature Books' anthology (The World of God: Essays on Mormon Scripture), I have observed the object of so much criticism. I am pleased by the recent remarks of PARMS book reviewer, David C. Peterson.

Peterson claims that Signature wants to prevent the dissemination of views critical of their books by legal intervention. But Peterson fails to mention that some Mormons, including PARMS president Stephen D. Ricks, were invited to contribute essays to The Word of God articulating their views of Mormon scripture — an invitation they declined.

Peterson's criteria for identifying works "harmful" to central Christian beliefs in trouble with religiosity. One important aspect of Mormon theology is the idea that contemporary American Americans are directly descended from the ancient Jews. This conception motivated early LDS missionary activity and is reflected in Joseph Smith's revelations. Indeed, while creating the Mormon Church, Joseph Smith wrote in a June 1835 letter that they were "resisting over the plains of the Nephites — picking up their dead and their bones, as a proof of the doom of Mormon's degrees of faculty." (Personal Writings of Joseph Smith, p. 516).

Yet former PARMS official John L. Sorenson has insisted that "whether the Book of Mormon granted land was in any part of the United States or not, there are strong grounds for denying the reliability of Joseph Smith's own statements.

Sorenson's views, circulated by PARMS, contradict the more than 150 years of Mormon tradition. For centuries, the Book of Mormon was taught as a "book of Mormon" in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints! I doubt it. Perhaps Peterson should allow the same latitude for other scholars he grants his colleagues.

Brad Lee Matheson
Salt Lake City
Dear Uinta Forest Supervisor:

I want to thank you very much for inviting me on the two range tours this past fall. I thought they were very well received as well as educational. I have read and studied the Forest Plan Draft and must admit I don’t understand all of it. There are a few things I would like to express my opinion on.

The first thing is the unit rest rotation. As a sheep man and having a knowledge of how sheep range I strongly support the unit rest system. I can agree with a rotation system, but I’ve seen too many examples that make me believe the unit rest system works. I personally feel that you do more damage to the forage by trying to contain the livestock, rather than let the grass lightly over the whole area. Each July I compare your fenced in areas against the grazing area and I see no difference. I think the key is good moisture in the fall, winter, and spring months. Most livestock people realize you can’t over graze and make a profit, because you sell pounds and over grazing deletes your pounds.

Another thing that bothers me is the D.R.S. as a cooperating agency in preparing the D.E.I.S. Even though the permits I utilize doesn’t have a problem with D.R.S. I can see the problems of the over populated areas as the D.R.S. is not reducing numbers to fit the winter range. Under alternative “K” it seems to me for riparian improvement it is the livestock which will be removed or manipulated instead of the wildlife. If I recall the Forest Service comes under the heading of Dept. of Ag, not the Dept. of D.R.S. or any other group. As long as we are producing food and fiber the livestock should never be removed unless there is a good cause.

In going back to the rest rotation system I would like to point out that our private land we use for our spring and fall grazing use is used the same way each year is in very good condition, and has had no negative effect from being used the same way every year.

December 30, 1991

[Additional text not fully visible due to the page being cut off.]

See response #13-1. The principles involved in rest-rotation grazing apply to sheep ranges as well as cattle ranges. We believe many of our sheep allotments may be too small to institute a system of rest-rotation grazing with the numbers of livestock that are currently being run on them. In those situations it may be more detrimental to rest part of the allotment and overuse the remainder so extensively that planned rest will not enable the plants to recover before they are grazed again.

See responses #7-1 and #7-2.

We agree that off-road-vehicle use is causing considerable damage to the forest environment. The need to control this is discussed in the FEIS in the Big Game Winter Range section of Chapter II. The Uinta National Forest has had an aggressive program since 1979 to close unnested roads and to control off-road vehicle use. This program is continuing and is guided by standards and guidelines on pages 3-148 to 3-181 of the Forest Plan and by the current version of the Forest Travel Plan.

Each allotment management plan developed under the guidance of this FEIS will address water developments and other range improvements needed to improve management on the allotment involved.

See responses #4-2, #4-10, and #6-1. Many allotments provide adequate forage to graze the permitted number of livestock. Some do not, and the grazing impact on these allotments will not be acceptable under the FEIS standards and guidelines.
I think for the most part the Forest Service is doing a good job. I realize it is hard to make everyone happy when it is for multiple use, but I also feel the general public does a lot more damage with their motor cycles, 4-wheelers, and those that try to make new roads with their 4 wheel drives than does the livestock person.

I think the Forest Service could do more with some water development in certain areas that would help distribute the livestock more.

For the most part I feel the sizes of the summer permits are about right for numbers. I would hate to see this cut as the livestock business has been very tough lately and we can't afford to run small herds because our expenses are the same. Hope the cots that are whispered in the D.E.I's. are just whispers because I get the feeling if there are cots it is for more wildlife that we don't have winter ranges for.

Once again I thank you for your consideration and hope a plan can be implemented in the Uinta National Forest that we can all live with.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
December 31, 1991

Peter 'Z. Lazy
Forest Supervisor
Uinta National Forest
P.O. Box 1428
88 West 100 North
Provo, Utah 84603

Dear Sir:

Thank you for the copy of the D.E.I.S. for the Uinta Forest and for the opportunity to respond to the document. Some amendments or comments that I feel should be made to the document are listed below.

5-2. Paragraph 2
I would dispute the statement in the first two lines simply because livestock do not use winter ranges used by elk.  

5-5. Paragraph 3
Alternative B would provide expanded efforts to improve big game winter ranges. Inasmuch as poor winter range is the only limiting factor controlling elk numbers, it is the only limiting factor that can be improved. To do so would seem futile to improve this winter range. To do so would be working at cross purposes with the objective of maintaining higher ranges. More big game winter range would mean more elk and more pressure on the higher range. Hence this proposal would reduce the number of elk. Then let the D.W.R. first reduce the number of elk. Then a substantial improvement of the higher range. A substantial improvement of the winter range without a practical reduction of elk numbers will spell eventual disaster for the higher range. From personal experience, let me say that D.W.R. 's track record of needed elk reductions is very dismal.

5-2. Paragraph should be amended on the second to the last line by striking the word "many" and inserting the word "some."  

On Chapter I-3 the paragraph should be amended by striking the period after the word "practices."  

Livestockmen will follow the rules and adhere to grazing plans and practices insofar as possible, but will do so with the knowledge that rest-rotation does not really work and that a deferred grazing system would be far more successful.

There are a number of areas both on and adjacent to the Uinta National Forest where livestock utilize winter ranges used by elk. Some of these are lower Daniels Canyon, Hobble Creek, Diamond Fork, Tie Fork and Indian Creek in upper Spanish Fork Canyon, Salt Creek, Nebo Creek, White River, Currant Creek, and the lower West Fork of the Duchesne River.

The attempts to improve big game winter range will be done to better support the big game and/or livestock numbers which now exist and to improve vegetative and watershed conditions in those areas needing improvement. See response #13-2.

We assume you are referring to the paragraph on page I-2 under 5. Riparian/watershed and not to page 5-2. The statements made on pages 1-1 through 1-3 are the issue statements generated from the public scoping process and are listed as they were submitted by the public. We have added your issue to this section of the FEIS.

See responses #13-1 and #15-1.

We believe this management direction is in line with our Forest Plan objectives and it is retained as a part of this document.

We agree and have revised the text in line with your suggestion (page III-4).

Page I-1 has been revised to include information concerning why this document has been prepared. Alternative B is needed to add more definitive standards and guidelines that will help achieve satisfactory ecological conditions-a goal in the current Forest Plan.

See responses #17-1 and #23-4.

While it is true that range conditions have generally improved on much of the rangeland on this Forest, we have been experiencing difficulty in achieving satisfactory ecological status on the four areas covered in detail in this FEIS. We believe efforts beyond those utilized in past management plans will be required to resolve these problems.
Chapter II-6
The first two lines under General Direction should be deleted. No purpose would be served in closing riparian driveways while these areas are being abused by elk.

Chapter III-3
On the next to the last line, the words "short" and "or" should be deleted. No reduction of grazing should be based on short-term observations.

The D.E.I.S. appears to be a studied and carefully written document, but contains some errors and misconceptions. I have pointed out a few of these in the letter above.

My overall comment is, "By junk the existing, carefully formulated Forest Plan, which is essentially Alternative A, by accepting it with Alternative B, which has been drafted under the pressure of a national environmental frenzy?" Alternative A is in place. It is working and moving forward. How much faster could Forest efforts move by adopting a whole new system? Open slopes, overgrazed ridges, riparian needs and aspen communities are all being addressed by the Forest at present.

It is unsettling to livestockmen to have the D.N.R. raised in the D.E.I.S. as a "cooperating agency." While we do not know exactly what, if any, influence the D.N.R. has had on the D.E.I.S., the natural inference is that it had some effect, and livestockmen resent the state agency's having anything to do with livestock's relationship with the Forest. Also, we wonder where "cooperation" by the D.N.R. appears and in what form.

We wonder why aid to late seral vegetation cannot be attained under the Forest plan, possibly with a few minor amendments to the plan.

Livestockmen believe in the multiple-use and renewable resource concepts and realize that we must co-exist with big game and must carry our share of range stability. In addition to being dependent upon national lands for our livelihood, most of us love the mountains and the deserts. We do ask that the Forest require accountability and responsibility on the part of D.N.R.

Thanks again for the opportunity to critique the D.E.I.S. and express ourselves as best we can. It appears to us that Alternative A would be the more stable and practical plan.

Yours truly,

Vance W. Angard
Dec 31, 1971
2325 E. 1200 S.,
Heber, Utah 84032

Uinta Forest Supervisor
88 West 100 North
P.O. Box 1428
Provo, Utah 84603

Dear Sir:

In reply to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and proposal to develop and manage the Strawberry Valley area I am deeply concerned about several proposals and changes on that study, as a producer using that area I have several changes or proposals that I would like to suggest.

1. The D.W.R. did not include in their original study a representative from the livestock (sheep and cattle) producers in the preparation of the D.E.I.S. therefore violating their agency as being a "cooperating agency".

2. The D.W.R. and Forest Service propose to reduce livestock numbers but do not have a program to control elk and deer herds which are destroying the feed and foliage on the same areas.

I strongly recommend that Alternative B is adopted with the following changes:

A. A four section rotation plan be used rather than the suggested three section plan. After years of livestock use on this land, I have found that the feed and foliage have a better recovery on a 4 section rotation use in opposition to a 3 section use. I have observed that the elk herds congregate on the third section and remain in that area because they are not disturbed, nothing moves them off the area. When the elk herds remain on a third section for any length of time they destroy more of the feed, and the water holes become muddy and unuseable for sheep.

As a sheep producer, I feel that I am as much an expert on the use of the land as anyone in the Forest Service or the E.I.S. It is to my advantage to manage and control the return of the grasses and foliage on my permitting. I have kept my livestock off my permits longer in July to allow the feed to have a good growth, only to find the elk herds have fed it off by the time the sheep arrive.

B. The number of AUM's allowed on a permit depends on the actual permit. Some sections can naturally feed more livestock than others. To make a statement that it takes 10 sections to support 1,000 head of sheep is not a true statement, actual conditions of the area should be considered.

I strongly recommend that the Fish and Game Dept. control the elk numbers as much as the sheep and cattle numbers. The elk are growing to such an extent that they are destroying the ranges, the elk are also overtaking the private summer ranges and pulling the deer into the lower valleys to the hay fields.

The Division of Wildlife Resources is not the preparer of this document. The Uinta National Forest has prepared the DEIS and the Division of Wildlife Resources is a cooperating agency with Charles Thompson, a Fisheries Biologist, representing that agency as a technical advisor. The livestock industry was represented by Tom Bling

This FEIS does not give direction to reduce livestock numbers, but to improve range conditions where they do not meet the desired condition. Some adjustment in both big game and livestock numbers may be necessary to achieve this objective. Any adjustments in livestock numbers will be the result of specific evaluation during the development of revised allotment management plans. Also see responses #2-1, #3-8, and #7-2.

The three-pasture planned-rest grazing system will generally be used. However, where it can be demonstrated that other rest systems can reach the objectives for the allotment, they will be considered. Also see responses #5-1, #6-1, and #6-4.

We agree with you. The guideline you refer to is only a rule-of-thumb. See response #5-8.

See response #2-2. We are seriously concerned about livestock grazing levels and impacts on the livestock industry.
I sincerely urge that you will seriously consider the impact some of the proposed changes will have on the sheep and cattle industry in this area. The livestock industry was once one of the largest industries in this area, but with low wool and lamb prices, cut in permits, increased land use fees, higher overhead, losses of livestock to predators, etc., etc., it is becoming more and more difficult to stay in the livestock business.

I am also enclosing an article I clipped from the Salt Lake Tribune, Dec. 30, 1981, which states the serious problems the wildlife is causing to the rural and city areas.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

Garold Christensen

enclosures
Exploding Deer Numbers
Causing Many Problems

by Michael Schmehl

Uncontrolled deer births with
tuberculosis, foot and mouth disease,
and other venereal diseases are
problems that are now being
encountered by the state and
regional parks. A recent study by
the U.S. Department of Agriculture
showed that deer populations in
six states had increased by 32% in
the past ten years. The numbers
in Utah have increased by 21% and
in Colorado by 26%. A study
conducted by the Wisconsin
Department of Natural Resources
showed that deer populations
in the state have increased by
20% in the past five years. The
increase is thought to be due
to the decrease in predator
numbers and the increase in
human populations in the area.

“BEST COPY AVAILABLE”
Mr. Peter M. Karp  
Forest Supervisor  
Uinta National Forest  
88 West, 100 North  
Provo, Utah 84603  

January 1, 1992  

Dear Mr. Karp:  

A comprehensive review of the Uinta National Forest's Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Rangeland Ecosystem Forest Plan Amendment, by officials of the Utah Wildlife Leadership Coalition has produced a number of observations.  

As you know, we are very interested in a number of the technical aspects of the DEIS, but our overriding concern is with the very significant policy level issues raised by the document. Consequently, the focus of this letter will be limited to those policy elements.  

The DEIS standards and guidelines reflect my understanding of the desired rangeland conditions which were recommended to the Uinta National Forest by the broad-based citizen's committees on which I served. Unfortunately, the necessary commitment by the Uinta to implement a plan which will achieve those desired conditions appears to be absent from the DEIS.  

The standards and guidelines are barely mentioned in the "purpose and need" section, and there is no connection between this section and the summary.  

A fundamental purpose of this amendment to the Forest Plan is to produce changes in grazing policy which will ultimately result in the upgrading of rangeland conditions on all grazing allotments to bring them into compliance with NEPA standards. Simply put, the Uinta National Forest must comply with NEPA requirements when making decisions about the reissuance of grazing permits if it truly aspires to achieve the desired conditions which I believe we all support. Put another way, NEPA doesn't contemplate any alternative to compliance with its requirements. It's the law. Cumulatively, the reissuance of grazing permits is a major, controversial federal action which requires NEPA compliance.  

Fully half of the allotments within the Uinta National Forest don't meet NEPA standards but the plan doesn't define how or when they will be brought up to the standard. It is critical that the plan identify actions which will be taken to bring the grazing permit system into line with rehabilitation requirements. The DEIS does not deal with permit reissuance at all.  

UTAH WILDLIFE LEADERSHIP COALITION  
P.O. BOX #1025 • SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84121  
DEDICATED TO THE PRESERVATION OF WILDLIFE, OUTDOOR RECREATION,  
SPORTS HUNTING AND FISHING AND UTAH'S QUALITY OF LIFE.  

Please refer to the 5-Year Action Plan in Appendix 2. The Uinta National Forest will do its best to meet the program outlined therein to implement the Preferred Alternative selected from this FEIS. We believe we can accomplish this objective under current funding and workload levels.  

We have "beefed up" the "Summary" and "Purpose And Need" sections to address your comments. Hopefully, these revisions are in line with your concerns.  

We believe this document and the guidance it provides meet NEPA requirements. The standards and guidelines developed in this FEIS will be added to all grazing permits by amendment, and no grazing permits will not be reissued until existing permits expire. The allotment specific environmental assessment and revised allotment plan will specify the necessary changes in management required to bring those individual allotments up to standard. The 5-year Action Plan mentioned in response #18-1 will guide the order and priority for accomplishment of this task. Temporary permits will not be issued for this purpose.  

The objectives you speak about are included in those listed under "Purpose And Need" in the beginning of Chapter I, but they were not included in the Summary. We believe we can accomplish the objectives of the plan with existing funding levels. It is still a possibility, however, that funding could shrink below current levels and slow our ambitious completion schedule. Most of the items listed in the 5-Year Action Plan have been accomplished as scheduled. Some revision of the plan has been made to make it current with the release of the FEIS. Some future revision may be necessary, especially if our proposed actions are affected by lengthy appeals.  

We believe that the examination of Alternative C in detail would be an exercise in paperwork production that would not lead to any productive end. It is not a viable alternative under current law. It is likely that some areas of vegetation would approach PNC under any Alternative (A, B, or D). We see it as highly unlikely, however, that significant public support could be developed for Alternative C. Furthermore, implementation would invite massive estrangement of much of the public. In addition, the alternative would be at odds with current law, Forest Servic policy, and goals and objectives included in the existing Forest Plan.  

We fail to understand your concern about public disclosure of this document. The process utilized to involve the public in the preparation of this document is outlined in Item 1 of Chapter II. See Chapter VII for the list of all the agencies and individuals who the DEIS was mailed to for public comment. We received 29 letters commenting on the DEIS. An Executive Board was convened for DEIS review and input from leaders of interested groups. You were a member of the board.
Utah's outdoor community supports grazing on public lands only when range degradation is absent and within a context which allows for the recovery of substandard allotments. Permits should not be released until standards and guidelines are in place. The wholesale reissuance of permits, which would be allowed by the DEIS, is unthinkable. An alternative which would allow the issue of temporary, non-preference permits may offer the opportunity to bring ranges under control in substandard allotments.

I am very disturbed by the absence of a declared objective in the DEIS summary and by the stated notion that compliance with the plan is necessary only if fiscal support is available. Said another way, the forest takes no responsibility for the implementation of this plan. In fact, the forest has not some of the milestones identified for accomplishment during 1991 in the schedule published in the subject document.

I am also disappointed that Alternative C was not considered in detail. Managing rangelands to support potential natural communities should be a primary alternative and it deserves very significant scrutiny. When considered within the context of only three alternatives, of which two were quickly dismissed, the preferred alternative suffers a serious lack of credibility.

Finally, I am concerned about the failure of the plan to provide for disclosure to the public. Strong public support for USFS initiatives rests on the continued involvement of the public in the process.

On behalf of the many outdoor groups of the UWL, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the Uinta National Forest planning process. I look forward to continuing the partnership which has been so productive.

Sincerely,

Bob Nelson
Chairman, UWL
To whom it may concern

Jan. 1, 1992

This letter is to address my concern towards the D.B.I.S. for the Uinta National Forest Rangeland Ecosystem Forest Plan Amendment.

My recommendation is to stay with Alternative "A" with minor changes in management directed toward improvements of watershed, riparian areas, and grazing on a case by case basis.

Livestock grazing has occurred on the National Forest Reserve reserves since the original forest reserves were set aside in 1891. Grazing allows the harvest of a valuable renewable natural resource that can be harvested in no other way. This in turn contributes food for fatter toward a stronger, more self-sufficient Nation. Alternative "A" continues win this use while allowing for change to improve forage output.

Alternative "B" proposes a change in that plan that will shift the use of forage from livestock to wildlife's priority. Under alternative "B", livestock numbers and seasons of use are already established according to available

This letter was received as photocopy reproductions signed by 11 individuals who are listed as follows: (The letter and responses thereto are included only once.) Rod Fitzgerald, Norma Fitzgerald, Mont Fitzgerald, Tim Atkinson, Daz Fitzgerald, Ron B. Smith, Leo Gertach, Carlos Smith, Stan Fitzgerald, Cory Fitzgerald, and Donner Fitzgerald.

Thank you for your opinion concerning the alternatives listed in the DEIS and for your interest in improving rangelands on the Uinta National Forest.

See responses #2-1, #6-1, #6-1, #7-1, and #7-2.

See response #8-4.

You have read something into the report that was not intended. The limits intended to improve big game winter range are on use of forage. Those animals that are causing the excess use will be controlled, not just livestock. Please note the general direction and standards and guidelines listed under the Range Resource Management Activity near the end of the Big Game Winter Range Forest-Wide Standards & Guidelines table in Chapter II. Utilization on desirable shrub species is limited to 60 percent. Where trend in ecological status is determined to be down, we intend to work with the Division of Wildlife Control to reduce wintering big game populations. This was done this past hunting season, when permits were given to harvest 111 antelope elk and 700 antelope deer during late season hunts along the Wasatch Front. Also see response #7-2.

You are correct when you say the Division of Wildlife Resources is not considered a permittee. Nor do they own the wildlife that graze the National Forests. These animals are owned by all the people of the State of Utah just as National Forest System Lands are owned by all the citizens of the United States. The Division of Wildlife Resources is charged with the management of these animals under the laws established by the State Legislature. The National Forests are managed by the Forest under the laws passed by Congress, which provide for administration of grazing lands for both livestock and wildlife. Congress has never required that wildlife which were a part of the ecosystem before white man arrived on the scene be covered by a grazing permit and fee. Just as livestock permittees do not always agree with the Forest Service on grazing management practices, we do not always see eye to eye with the Division of Wildlife Resources, but we are very interested in working cooperatively with both groups.

See response #2-2.

Grazing can have an effect on fire hazard. It may be either beneficial or non-beneficial, depending on the situation. Because it is site-specific it will not be discussed here, but where it is an issue it will be addressed in individual allotment management plans. We do not believe it will generally be of significant concern. Probably the most significant situation where grazing has affected our fire management program is in the lower elevation ranges where past overgrazing has resulted in heavy increases in cheatgrass and pinyon-juniper.
Forage, under Alternative "B", livestock would be further limited to the availability of forage while Big Game numbers would be allowed to continue to increase. Cooperation with the U.D.W.R. is mentioned several times, but according to Forest Service personnel, cooperation is rarely received.

Alternative "B" proposes at least a 5-unit planned rest grazing system for all livestock allotments, with no provisions or requirements for Big Game rest grazing systems. Alternative "B" states that 122,002 acres of suitable Big Game winter range (of which less than 20% is grazed by livestock) will be targeted for restoration by limiting utilization by livestock, not Big Game. The U.S. Division of Wildlife resources, though not considered a permittee, is informed of the largest permittee on the Uinta. (Big Game numbers and season of use are listed.) Yet, neither pays for the forage or follows Forest Service guidelines etc. The U.D.W.R. lacks a commitment to adhere to approved management plans and practices. By adopting Alternative "B", livestock numbers would surely be reduced, thereby reducing funds for such projects as winter range restoration, water developments, Nuisance weede control programs, etc. on the Forest.
Alternative "B" would have a devastating effect on the economic well-being of the local livestock industry, which in turn would affect the economies of many communities surrounding the Umatilla National Forest. Alternative "B" would limit recreational use of forest land, which would again affect economies of local communities.

Although grazing has always been looked at as a means of fire prevention, it seems to have lost its level of importance when Forest Service employees benefit more from suppression rather than prevention. Although this is not addressed in D.E.I.S. it should be. (Fire prevention)

The Forest Service has lost sight of the fact that no-one can benefit more by improving resources on the Unit than the livestock permittees on such.

Pal Fitzgerald
36 Old Town
camp
73 4452
We agree that administration of our existing range programs is not easy nor will it be an easy task to administer at a higher level of expectations. However, if we are to improve our management of rangelands we must set our sights at a higher level and do our best to achieve the new objectives. See responses #18-1, #18-2, and #18-4.

Such decisions are made by those preparing site-specific allotment management plans. They are approved by the District Ranger, as would be the case for any of the management activities listed in these tables.

As with the previous comment, those persons charged with allotment administration will make these decisions. However, in this case we have revised the text as you suggest (page II-11). That does not mean that there will not be some occasions where livestock are not herded through riparian areas, but that it will be avoided where other feasible options exist.

Channel changes are not ordinarily a part of grazing management practices. Any channel changes require a Utah State Stream Alteration permit and/or a 404 permit from the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers. Such permits require that public notice be given and opportunity for public input provided prior to approval and implementation of any such changes.

Though we cannot always provide daily supervision during the completion of all projects, we understand the importance of your concern and have added management direction to provide for close supervision of equipment use in riparian zones.

The Uinta National Forest has increased our attention to enforcement of the Forest Travel Plan in recent years. The new standard and guideline give increased emphasis to this effort. The suggestion you make is a good one. A grass roots system of reporting violations of the travel plan already exists along the Wasatch Front on the Pleasant Grove Ranger District, where concerned citizens are calling in about such incidents. Perhaps we should put effort into formalizing such procedures. Your suggestion will be passed along to those responsible for our law enforcement program.

This management direction refers to those winter ranges where soils, slopes, and other physical features make it feasible to perform hand or mechanical vegetative improvement. The direction has been revised to reflect that situation. Where physical rehabilitation is not practical, we will have to rely on improved grazing practices, including those listed in the standards and guidelines of this document, to achieve such improvement. Such practices are the key to range improvement and will affect many more acres than can possibly be physically treated.
On Chapter II-10 where the MDE requires that equipment
to be kept out of riparian areas, we feel that included
in this section should be measures which allow for daily
checks by Forest Service personnel in any area that is known
to contain any equipment.

On Chapter II-11 where the MDE refers to the enforcement
of the Forest Service Travel Plan, we feel that this is critical
to preventing damage to vegetation and soils, as well as
eliminating the harassment of wintering big game. As such,
we believe that a HIGH PRIORITY for the enforcement of
the Forest Travel Plan should be implemented. We would like
to propose the establishment of a HOT-LINE number for individ-
uals to turn in violators, manned by volunteers. This system
could operate much the same way as the DWR's current Poaching
Hot-Line does. However, for this program to succeed the
Forest Service must make the commitment of following through
on all tips provided by concerned citizens.

Another loophole that concerns this organization occurs
on Chapter II-12 where the MDE states "to determine those
winter ranges suitable for restoration and develop an action
program for improvement." Our chief concern here is what
happens to the ranges deemed not suitable?

On behalf of the Salt Lake County Fish & Game I ap-
preciate the opportunity to participate in the meeting held
on DEC. 11th, as well as having this opportunity to comment
on the MDE. We would like to also commend the efforts of
the Uinta Forest for their foresight in dealing with the
problems which affect our entire National Forests. It is
our hope that through the efforts of your office, soon the
entire National Forest will be re-examine their plans, and
eventually bring the Forest Service more in-line with the
wishes of the average user of our Forests.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD S. FORNEY
PRESIDENT
SLCFLA
Peter W. Karp
January 2, 1992
Page 8

The management plan for the Salt Lake-Timpanogos herd has not been completed. Winter ranges are very limited, especially along the Wasatch Front. Winter aerial trend counts have ranged from 244 to 170 animals over the last five years, indicating a fairly static population. Housing and recreational developments are restricting and reducing elk distribution by impacting summer range.

d. The management plan for the Heber-Red Creek Unit has not been completed. Aerial trend counts have ranged from 238 to 1990 to 670 in 1988-1989. The average over the last five years is 442 animals. Although the trend count for 1990-91 was lower than previous years, the herd has continued to increase.

The issue states that the increase in elk numbers has resulted in competition for forage between elk and livestock. Here competition for forage should be defined as an interaction between elk and livestock where the presence of one group causes a reduction in the production figures for the other (i.e., calf crop percent, calf weaning weights, rate of gain, etc.). Under Alternative A, this may be true for some allotments, but competition (as defined above) has never been documented. The presence of elk in areas used by livestock does not constitute competition.

Under Alternative B, restrictions placed on the use made by livestock in riparian zones (areas where livestock concentrate) may require that livestock numbers be reduced regardless of the degree of elk-livestock competition. In those instances, standards and guidelines for management of riparian zones, and not elk numbers, will limit opportunities for livestock reproduction.

The identified consequence is that this competition for forage leads to unacceptable levels of grazing use in some areas. To address this concern in either alternative, it will be necessary to determine if elk are contributing to the problem, or if excessive use is primarily a livestock management problem. A more intensive monitoring program would have to be implemented in areas of concern. This is more likely to get implemented under Alternative B.

2. A meeting was held on December 11, 1991 to discuss the draft EIS. During that meeting, Dr. Jerren Pflders brought up a good point regarding the management of Values Class III riparian areas. Dr. Pflders indicated that some of the most important areas for wildlife will fall into this classification due to their limited value as a sport fishery or for water for recreational use. Consequently, the most liberal guidelines for grazing may be implemented in areas that provide high value wildlife habitats. The vegetation communities in these areas will not be expected to return to the desired future condition as quickly as the higher priority riparian areas.

3-8
It becomes readily apparent that the classification of riparian areas on the Uinta National Forest is going to be one of the most important tasks identified in the Rangeland Ecosystem GIS. A rating of high or moderate value for any of the four criteria (fisheries, water, recreation, or wildlife habitat) can qualify an area for Value Class I or II status. The Utah Wildlife Information Network (UWIN) System, developed by the Division of Wildlife Resources, is a database that has identified critical and high value habitat for many high profile wildlife species on the Uinta National Forest. This information should be used to identify areas that could be classified as Value Class I solely on their wildlife habitat value. We share the concern expressed by Dr. Finders at the meeting, and expect that interagency involvement in the classification process will help to resolve resource conflicts.

3. Additional emphasis should be given to participation in the Interagency Big Game Range Trend Study Project. Study sites have been located in key wintering areas on the Uinta National Forest and data compiled from these sites should guide the assessment of trends on winter ranges. Additional sites could be included in the program if the Forest Service were to increase their level of participation by including this cooperative project in the monitoring program for Alternative B.

Specific Comments

Chapter II-4
Under general direction for soil and water management activities for riparian ecosystems as they are related to drop structures, the underscored phrase should be added to item 3: "If drop structures are necessary, they shall be installed to allow for fish passage and sediment transport."

Chapter II-12
Under general direction for big game winter range management activities as they are related to monitoring, the underscored phrase should be added to item 2: "Grazing management towards improvement of apparent trend over a five-year period on ranges below mid-elevation ecological status. Coordinate monitoring of range trend with DWR-USFS-BLM Interagency Big Game Range Trend Study Program."

Chapter II-15
Under priority areas for aspen treatment in aspen ecosystems change big game winter range to big game summer range.

Chapter II-15
Under wildlife and fish resource management, define habitat effectiveness when addressing "habitat effectiveness for elk."

Chapter III-2, Paragraph 3
It should be mentioned that the winter range available for deer along the Wasatch Front has greatly diminished in the last 30 years due to increased urban
development of foothill areas. In response to vegetation changes associated with livestock grazing, the carrying capacity for mule deer increased. In the absence of grazing, plant succession has shifted to communities dominated by grasses. On these sites, it is likely that such shifts reflect a progression towards mid-late seral stage communities rather than early seral stage. Areas that still have a good stand of perennial grasses show the same downward trend for the sagebrush population as those that are dominated by shrubs.

Chapter III-A, Paragraph 3
The factors that influence sagebrush populations along the Wasatch Front need to be identified. It then needs to be determined if changes in shrub vigor, production, and reproduction can be brought about by reducing deer numbers. Enclosures built as part of a Forest Service Shrub Lab research project east of Pleasant Grove show no evidence of shrub recruitment. A study conducted by Bruce Welch and Fred Wagstaff showed that sufficient seed was produced by shrubs to allow for establishment of seedlings, but establishment was limited to areas in close proximity to sagebrush "mother plants" where grasses were removed by cultivation. It could be that the heavy deer use has just sped up a process that we set in motion as soon as livestock were removed from the foothills and the area was managed solely for its value as a watershed.

Chapter IV-A, Paragraph 7
During severe winters, large die-offs could be expected for mule deer, less likely for elk, and not likely for moose.

The Committee appreciates the opportunity to review this proposal. Please direct any other written questions regarding this correspondence to the Utah State Clearinghouse at the above address, or call Carolyn Wright at (801) 535-1835 or John Harja at (801) 535-1859.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Brad T. Barber
State Planning Coordinator
Peter W. Karp  
Forest Supervisor  
Uinta National Forest  
88 West 100 North  
P.O. Box 1418  
Provo, Utah 84603  

January 2, 1992

Dear Mr. Karp:

I am writing in response to the DEIS for Rangeland Ecosystem Management on the Uinta National Forest. I have read the plan and have a response that I feel is important. I wish my response to be considered and a record kept of it.

I find the DEIS to be written in a very narrow, biased way which considers primarily wildlife as nearly its only objective. It is very easy to see that the DEIS has a main objective of establishing standards that are quantifiable and will be used with the main purpose of displacing as much public grazing as possible.

The six person committee to represent the "interest concerned with the management of National Forest rangeland resources" is to be put very lightly-a great hoax. If it were really meant to represent all interests concerned it should have included all those concerned and given all interests a balanced representation. The committee now consists of three individuals whose foremost purpose is increasing wildlife. The other two are Forest Service people and the last is a member of the Farm Bureau. A very well stacked committee (five against one) when it comes to representing wildlife interests against grazing of livestock, mining interests and timber. It seems that the Forest personnel have set out with an agenda to accomplish and then stacked the committee and facts so that the agenda may be accomplished without actually finding the problem and the reason for the problems and then directing resources to correct the actual problems.

Now that I have stated my positions regarding the DEIS and you likely consider me as a fanatic not to be listened to, I will explain my reasoning.

On Page 5-3 of the DEIS the emphasis of the preferred alternative (Plan B) is only for fish and wildlife habitats! What about all the other uses of the forest? All of the changes mentioned are important, e.g., vegetative management, streambank stabilisation, riparian, watershed, water quality and big game winter range, but for the publics sake isn't anything also important besides fish and wildlife habitats. Why not emphasize resources management that would seek excellent range and watershed conditions that would benefit all forest uses in a balanced manner and use and maintain the economic stability of those who have historically used this ground?

When talking about critical big game winter range on Page 5-3 you mention that grazing capacity has decreased and the first cause mentioned is "heavy use by livestock." See then at the end of the same paragraph state that less than 20% of that critical winter range owned by the Forest is grazed by livestock.

See responses #4-2, #6-1, #6-4, and #7-1.

There are two members of the Committee representing agricultural interests. See responses #5-1, #17-1, and #17-2. During our initial contacts with the livestock interests (both sheepmen and cattlemen) it was their request that Mr. Bingham represent them on the committee. The committee does not vote nor make decisions but acted as an advisory panel in the formulation of this document.

See responses #4-3 and #6-3.

See responses #2-1, #4-10, #7-2, #19-1, and #19-4.

Again, see responses #7-1 and #7-2 as well as #8-4 and #13-5. Livestock is not expected to take all the responsibility for overgrazed conditions. As you know, the livestock interests are represented on the Board of Game Control by both a sheepman and a cattlemam. Your concerns about specific problems with wildlife on any rangelands should be expressed to those individuals along with data supporting your concerns.

See responses #2-1, #3-8, #13-2, and #19-4.

See response #6-5.

The ridgetop area you refer to was an area we believe can be improved by implementation of the standards and guidelines in the FEIS. This specific area has improved during recent years because of concentrated efforts at better management. That is the purpose of the implementation of the new standards and guidelines to reverse range trend where it may be down, and improve conditions which are unsatisfactory. We apparently disagree on the potential of this site.

On the second area you refer to, our intent is not to grow trees where none have ever grown, but to reestablish understory vegetation where the environment is capable of supporting it and to provide for reproduction of overstory vegetation where it does or has existed under mid-seral to PNC conditions. Site conditions and potential must be taken into consideration when making such evaluations.
It appears that by a very biased bunch, livestock use is the first to be blamed but is likely the least responsible.

It is a well known and stated fact by the UCMR that the limiting resource in conjunction with big game numbers is winter range. It is in real trouble in many areas of the state but the division is still trying to increase numbers of big game at nearly any expense. On Page IV-4 you state that the forest and UCMR would get together to control game populations. This has been a problem for many years and we are yet to see any action. I have personally been in meetings where blame and responsibility is passed back and forth to each other by the two agencies and it is clear that neither will take action.

On Page IV-1 and IV-2 it is recognized that some riparian is over used by wildlife and livestock. It is also stated that standards and guidelines will reduce the problem and that because wildlife grass the area first, livestock use will have to be restricted. Why hasn't a restriction of wildlife numbers been considered to preserve livestock grazing in an area? You recognize the problem of elk overgrazing riparian and riparian areas but mention nothing about controlling their numbers. Why? Is livestock grazing to take all the slack and responsibility for correction of overgrazed areas? As long as a supervising committee is stacked 5 to 1 in that manner I'm afraid it will.

For a long time there has been a need to look at available winter and summer range for elk and deer and determine what a realistic number of wildlife is without ruining the resources. What has happened is that numbers of wildlife have been increased, range conditions deteriorate and the shifts are made in grazing of livestock. It is critical and only fair that the wildlife numbers not be allowed to grow beyond what resources will handle. It is morally wrong to take away grazing rights and privileges because there is more wildlife and they will need the resources presently allocated to livestock. In other forest areas, limits have been set on wildlife numbers, but not in our forest. If there are wildlife numbers set they tend to be kept secret. We must have limits set on wildlife numbers and then adequate control measures to see that these limits are kept. When livestock people take stock on the forest they are subject to count and should be. Wildlife should have similar measures and should be kept in specified limits so that livestock grazing and the economic stability of livestock people and their communities are not jeopardized. Returning to the opening statement in the DEIS on Page 8-2 why is fish and wildlife habitat the only or even the main emphasis?

On Page 1-2 of it is mentioned that many transplanted resource problems are directly attributable to lack of commitment on the Forest Service's part to ensure management plans are followed and lack of commitment on the permits part to follow the plans. I do not disagree that this statement is true in some cases. I am however, appalled by your lack of perspective with respect to how this problem has been influenced by increase in wildlife numbers, especially elk.

On the meeting/editstrip held this fall that discussed the DEIS I was given the impression that in some cases the forest people are trying to make the land support vegetation that nature never intended. On one riparian we were shown an area of tarwed and a sparse vegetation. This was pointed out as an area of concern. It was pointed out how grazing had adversely affected such areas and would have to be greatly reduced or eliminated in the future.
By walking a few yards in three different directions the cover changed drastically, the feed was tall and ungrazed for the season and had clearly not been adversely affected either that year or for several years previous. When the Forest Service personnel was asked why there was none high grass in one spot and a few yards away was a sparsely covered area he could not answer. It was not due to overgrazing but it sure caught the blame as an example of the major problems mentioned in the DEIS.

We were then taken to a small clearing in some aspens and shown this as called problem. We were told that because of grazing pressure, new plants could not get started in the clearing. Upon looking over the clearing there were no old stumps, fallas, trees, or roots or anything else to evidence that trees ever had grown in the clearing. It appeared that men trying to kill tree grow where nature had not intended them to grow. Looking less than 50 yards in any direction there were thick stands of aspen trees. I was lead to believe that in the forest there should not be any clearing in the trees. Reading specifications such as those on Pages 11-15 as to how the forest must look tells me that we think we can make the forest look just like we want it to look. I realize that some standards must be set so that these stands can maintain themselves but if we start to kill the elements of nature where it will and will not grow trees on the deer and elk can hide we will all be in for a surprise.

In summary I feel that:

1) The supervising committee is way out of balance and strongly biased against livestock grazing.
2) The emphasis of Alternative B is only for fish and wildlife habitat and not a balanced emphasis for all users of the forest.
3) Overgrazing of livestock is being blamed for winter range problems when livestock grazing is not even allowed on 80% of the forest winter range.
4) Elk limits have not been set as to how large a population will be allowed.
5) In areas where elk have caused the overgrazing, livestock will be pulled off or grazing reduced to regulate the problem rather than the elk be reduced to maintain present grazing rights.
6) Neither the Forest nor the USDA will take responsibility to manage elk in areas that are overgrazed.
7) Forest management by the Forest Service and the permittees is blamed for the range conditions without considering the damages that are inflicted by wildlife.
8) The forest must be cared for and kept in good condition for future generations. However, from the DEIS and the field trip I get the indication that in some instances we may be trying to get things to grow in areas they were never intended to and blaming grazing of livestock for the resulting failures.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

 DPR R. Anderson
 Permittee-Uinta National Forest

cc: Senator Jake Garn
 Senator Orrin Hatch
 Rep. Bill Orton
 Wasatch County Commission
 Utah County Commission
 Farm Bureau
January 2, 1992

Peter M. Karp
Uinta Forest Supervisor
58 West 100 North
P.O. Box 1428
Provo, UT 84603

Peter,

I don't feel that the 3 unit rest rotation is the best way to improve the range. I think it is better to graze it lightly and use it all.

If you intend on using the rest rotation system, the elk and deer herds should also be kept off those areas. I feel there is lack of control over elk and deer populations by the DN or the Forest while making efforts to improve their winter range.

One problem I see is that the elk and deer don't stay on the forest for winter range, they come down lower on private ground and eat forage, hay and salt right in our back yards. We buy a permit and pay a fee for the privilege to run our livestock on Government ground and it seems to me that whoever is responsible for this wildlife should pay a fee to the private land owner for grazing and other damages caused by the deer and elk.

When the feed gets low we move our sheep but no one manages the wildlife and they don't understand where private land begins. The DN needs to assume its responsibilities with the wildlife.

As I see it there are over half of the representatives on your 6 person committee that represent wildlife and then on your very first page, the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources is referred to as a cooperating agency in preparation of these DEIS.

I suggest to you that possibly you should have included some persons with livestock interests, other than Farm Bureau, to serve on this committee, then possibly the Wildlife Resource people could spend some thought to being a real cooperating agency by managing their Wildlife.

I feel that the Forest Service is trying to reduce the grazing range by livestock form 20% to 0%.

Sincerely, Clark Fitzgerald

See responses #5-11, #8-1, #13-1, and #15-1.

See response #8-4

See response #13-5. Perhaps private landowners should work with various county and State elected officials to establish legal means where the private landowner could receive compensation for wildlife use on private lands.

See responses #5-1, #17-1, and #22-2. The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources was designated a cooperating agency under the regulations of the National Environmental Policy Act (1508.5).

A cooperating agency means any Federal agency (a state or local agency of similar qualifications) other than a lead agency which has jurisdiction by law or other special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposal or a reasonable alternative for legislative or other major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

See responses #4-2 and #17-2.
In accordance with our responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, Region VIII of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has completed its review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Rangeland Ecosystem Management in the Uinta National Forest.

This document describes proposed actions which expand and focus the general management activities outlined in the 1984 Uinta National Forest Plan, and is an amendment to that document. Two actions are explored in depth out of three alternatives which were considered. Presented are: A) continuation of current activities without major change and B) alteration of current management activities to achieve an emphasis on the preservation and improvement of the watershed, riparian habitat and wildlife/fisheries values.

Eliminated from detailed discussion was a third alternative (C) which managed for potential natural (vegetative) communities which would have imposed greater restrictions on other rangeland activities, especially grazing.

The DEIS is generally a good document, presenting Forest Service (FS) analysis and rationale succinctly. This has helped keep the length of this document much more in-line with CEQ guidelines, for which the EPA expresses its appreciation.

However, the FS should have provided more information concerning its rationale supporting its decision to eliminate Alternative C. The FS merely states that due to considerations (issues) identified during the preparation of the DEIS it eliminated this option. A more detailed discussion identifying precisely to which issues it refers to would be appropriate here.

Additionally, the FS should provide a more thorough analysis of the (potential) interactions between current management activities, those proposed in the preferred alternative, and those foregone by elimination of Alternative C. Are there...
Important aspects of Alternative C which might be reasonably and profitably incorporated into the proposed action? Without such an analysis, the reader must infer just which issues are relevant, and these are not readily identified in the DEIS.

In general, the EPA finds that this FS DEIS does a good job in analyzing potential impacts and areas of concern. Based on the analysis presented and with the caveat mentioned above, the EPA finds it supports the goals of the preferred action, Alternative B.

While Region VIII of the EPA finds this DEIS to be adequate in most respects, due to the issues previously raised, we rate the proposed action EC-2. In this instance, this rating should be interpreted to mean that the EPA has environmental concerns which stem from a lack of information in the areas identified above, rather than from any substantive objections to the preferred alternative as presented. A copy of a summary of EPA NEPA review ratings is included.

If you have any question concerning this review, please contact either myself or Gene Keesey, Project Review Officer, at FTS 330-1693 or commercial 303-293-1693.

Sincerely,

Robert R. DeSpain, Chief
Environmental Assessment Branch
Water Management Division
We agree that additional surveys and monitoring of threatened species are needed and will plan to continue monitoring as part of the Forest's program of work. Should a management need occur for some specific information, necessary surveys will be conducted. Chapter III has been revised to include more information concerning the status of Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive plant and animal species on the Forest and Inventory work completed and planned.

We agree and have added the information in Chapter IV.

We agree. We have revised this section and the information is included on page S-5.

The intent of this EIS is to emphasize the management of livestock in riparian areas. We believe this action will result in improved habitat for other Category Two candidate species. We do not think it is necessary or desirable to conduct numerous surveys in order to implement the proposed action in this EIS. Forest Plan Wildlife Standards and Guidelines Page 3-154 provide the following: "Conduct habitat surveys only when a specific management need is identified using the Question, Rule and Data (QRD) process". We have added the additional species you suggested to the FEIS Chapter III.

See response #19-1.

See responses #1-1. Mineral activities have not been a problem to date on the Forest. The standards and guidelines were included in case they might be needed at some future time. We have added a minerals section as you suggest (page II-13).
Mr. Peter W. Karp

Currently available to support proposed rules. Further biological research and field study is generally needed to ascertain the status of Category two species, and it is likely that many will be found not to warrant listing. However, while candidate species have no legal protection under the Endangered Species Act, the FEIS should consider the potential impacts to these species, thereby avoiding complications should they be listed prior to completion of a Record of Decision.

Page 8-2, last paragraph, should be revised to include streams, lakes, reservoirs, and riparian ecosystems, and include mention of fish and invertebrate resources.

Chapter II (page 19) indicates that management of riparian areas will be emphasised. Consequently, since information on species composition and abundance is not included in the FEIS, amphibian survey information should be provided in the FEIS. In addition, fish communities should also be surveyed and the data analysed in the FEIS.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) believes that Alternative B is preferable to Alternative A from the perspective of fish and wildlife resources.

Mineral Resources

The tabulation of forest-wide standards and guidelines for the riparian ecosystem includes the following rules (among others) under the management activities entry called "engineering" (Chapter II-6, II-9):

1. Odewater from gravel-crushing operations shall be treated. The level of turbidity of discharged water cannot exceed the turbidity at normal flow of the stream into which water is released.

2. Borrow material from stream channels may be removed when not detrimental to water quality, fisheries, or channel hydraulics.

3. Unless needed to improve channel hydraulics of aquatic habitat, materials will not be removed from channels within or contiguous to established recreation areas.

4. A mineral evaluation by a qualified geologist, mining engineer, or mineral specialist will be required prior to approving mining operating plans in key riparian areas.

The standards and guidelines above appear to be a mix of those pertinent to Forest Service channelisation work and those intended to affect mineral location. DOI suggests that standards and guidelines pertinent to mineral location or leasing be
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tabulated under a separate heading within the management activities category entitled "Mineral Resources". If restriction of commercial gravel operations are considered important to the maintenance of riparian areas, DOI recommends that the FEIS and any subsequent environmental documents include a map of such operations in the forest; furthermore, it would be helpful if the same map or another in the document also showed recreation and key riparian areas. If the other lands discussed for special management (big game winter ranges, overgrazed ridgetops and open spaces, and upland ecosystems) also have proposed mineral entry restrictions (seasonally, temporarily, or permanently), the FEIS and future documents should fully tabulate and discuss in a section concerning mineral-resource impacts what those restrictions would be.

Sincerely,

Robert F. Hendrick
Regional Environmental Officer
January 3, 1992

Peter W. Karp, Forest Supervisor
Uinta National Forest
P.O. Box 1432
80 West 100 North
Provo, Utah 84601

Dear Mr. Karp

After reviewing information and attending meetings held by the Uinta National Forest to discuss the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for RangeLand Ecosystem Management, I have the following comments to submit:

The Uinta National Forest is proposing two alternatives, A and B to manage the range ecosystems. It is the opinion of Sundance that Alternative B is preferable over a no-action alternative. 

It is the further opinion of Sundance that another alternative should have been offered with even more stringent goals and guidelines discussed.

In areas of particular concern to Sundance is the use of OHV's. The language in the Draft EIS does not address this problem adequately and should tighten restrictions for OHV use.

We appreciate the Uinta National Forest and its fine staff and hope to continue a working together to protect this precious resource.

Sincerely

Julie Beck
Sundance
Environmental Facilitator

See response #19-1.
We have added a Recreation Alternative as you have suggested. See Chapter II.

We agree that off-road-vehicle use is causing considerable damage to the forest environment. The need to control this is discussed in the FEIS in the Big Game Winter Range and Uplands sections of Chapter II. The Uinta National Forest has had an aggressive program to close unneeded roads and to control off road vehicle use since 1979. This program is continuing and is guided by standards and guidelines on pages 3-148 to 3-151 of the Forest Plan and by the current version of the Forest Travel Plan.
We have added and analyzed a recreation alternative. We believe that the examination of Alternative C in detail would be an exercise in paperwork production that would not lead to any productive end. It is likely that some areas of vegetation will end up in PNC under either Alternatives A, B, or D. We see it as highly unlikely that any significant public support would be developed for Alternative C. In addition, implementation would invite massive entanglement of much of the public. In addition the alternative would be at odds with current law, policy, and goals and objectives included in the existing Forest Plan.

We agree with your suggestion and have clarified the management objectives for Alternative B (II-3).

We agree with your suggestion that repeated grazing not be allowed and have revised the standard and guidelines to reflect this change (page II-10).

We agree with your suggestion that new water developments not be allowed in riparian areas and have revised the standard and guidelines to reflect this change (page II-10).

We agree with your suggestion that no material from construction activities will be cast into the mean high waterline, and have revised the standard and guidelines to reflect this change (page I-14).

We do not agree that the revegetation of riparian areas be done with only native species. Revegetation will be done with appropriate exotic or native species.

It is not possible under present mining laws to exclude mining operations in riparian areas.

We agree with your suggestion that ridgestops need to be better defined, and have revised the standard and guidelines to reflect this change (page II-20).

We agree that stubble heights are easier to monitor, and stubble heights will take precedence over utilization standards. We do not think there will be a problem with moisture conditions and plant growth since we are directing our monitoring efforts toward plants that are within the greenline and which for the most part exist below the ordinary high water line.

We have reviewed the riparian guidelines and made some changes as you suggested in the amount of utilization and stubble heights. Clary/Webster use total utilization along the greenline. We are directing our efforts to monitoring what we believe are the key species: Beaked sedge Carex rostrata (CARO), Water sedge Carex aquatilis (CAAQ), and Field horsetail Equisetum arvense (EVAR). We agree stubble heights of six inches of desirable hydric greenline species is proving to be adequate for Class I. The Forest Service is still evaluating 3-inch stubble heights. Generally 3 inches may not be satisfactory even though information from Clary/Webster indicates a 3-inch stubble is adequate for some lower value streams where mid-seral status is acceptable—especially if the area is being managed under a rest rotation grazing system.
Proposed Standards and Guidelines. General Concerns

Several of the proposed standards and guidelines need to be improved to meet the goals of the amendment and EIS. For example, rather than avoiding “repeated grazing use” during the field season (page II-4), repeated grazing use should not be allowed. That should be a part of each annual operating plan. In fact, the allotments on the Uinta do and will have, as the EIS indicates, some type of rotation system. All new livestock water developments should be out of riparian areas (II-4). No material from construction activities should be cast into the high mean water line (II-4). Revegetation of riparian areas should be done with only native species (II-4). No mining operations should be allowed in riparian areas (II-4).

The standards for overgrazed ridgetops need to be better defined. Does the EIS mean to say only ridgetops in early seral condition are overgrazed and in need of improvement (II-13)? Obviously, all ridgetops, particularly on sheep allotments, have specific management concerns and need to be carefully managed.

Standards and Guidelines, Utilization Standards

One of the biggest problems with the EIS is the proposed utilization standards. Many of these standards will not achieve the desired objectives.

The riparian guidelines ought to be changed to a standardized format either as suitable height or a utilization percentage. In many instances, the utilization percentages are not the same as the suitable heights. Plant vigor and moisture conditions can greatly affect plant growth and change the relationship between utilization percentages and suitable heights. Which will govern in these cases? Suitable heights are easier to monitor so they may be the preferred method for dealing with key grasses.

On Riparian Value Class I the utilization standard is too high and the stubble height is slightly too short for the late season. USDA General Technical Report INT-343, Managing Grazing of Riparian Areas in the Intermountain Region, Glary and Webster (1993), reports that use on excellent condition wet meadows should not exceed 25 to 40% (Ratifil 1977) and a stubble height of 4 inches or more may be necessary to protect riparian ecosystem functions (Glatfelter 1995). The utilization rate of 50% and 5" stubble height for late seral to PNC are inadequate as are the corresponding rates for mild, early and very early seral conditions. Also, research has shown that in some types of streams with important fishery values, streambank stability may be negatively affected before utilization standards are reached.

The same holds true for the other riparian areas. The utilization standards are too high. Late season stubble heights of 3" won't maintain ecological condition, even at a mid-seral state.

We do not agree with your comments on ridgetops that are in satisfactory condition. The 80 percent rule was developed many years back and centered on yearly removal. The 65 percent use on the heavy use year of a rest rotation should be adequate unless there is a special soil problem.

See comment 27-7.

We will consider streams containing Bonneville cutthroat or Colorado cutthroat and streams inside wilderness areas as Class II riparian areas.

The streams will be classified at the Ranger District level. The public, permitees and other interested parties will be invited to provide input into the process.

We agree with your assessment. The section on aspen addresses more than range issues. It was not the original intent of this EIS to address more than range issues. Therefore, aspen harvesting concerns have been removed.

We agree there must be a base level of monitoring. All allotments will be monitored regularly. The grazed units will be annually monitored to check compliance with the annual operating plan which will include the standards and guidelines in this EIS. Most of the riparian areas will be monitored as part of the allotment examination. Rest areas will be monitored to assure that they are rested. The ten annual riparian evaluations refers to installing and/or remeasuring ten long-term monitoring transects each year.

Appendix 8-78
The utilization standards for the overgrazed ridges are too high (I-13). Removing 65% of the grasses and forbs in satisfactory condition exceeds the 50% rule of thumb in range management, even if there is planned rest built into the system. Furthermore, without knowing the interval between rest periods, any utilization figure above 50% is arbitrary.

The use figures are again too high on the aspen ecosystems. 65% utilization in aspen/riparian and aspen/uplands in satisfactory condition is too high as are the unsatisfactory condition utilization standards for those same areas. Under the best conditions, shrub use should be limited to about 40%, they are much more sensitive to grazing than are herbaceous plants. The subalpine/aspen utilization standards are only slightly better. Reducing them by at least 20% per category should be done.

Riparian Value Classifications

The criteria for classifying riparian areas needs clarification. For example, will streams containing Summerville or Colorado cutthroat be considered class 1 riparian areas, because these two species are sensitive, even though such streams may not be considered high value sport fisheries? What about stream courses inside wilderness areas? Wilderness is not mentioned in any of the criteria, yet it is an important resource.

Aside from the ad hocness over the classification criteria, the EIS does not indicate who, when or how each stream on the Forest will be classified. Since the criteria are quite subjective, will the public be asked to provide input into the selection process?

Aspen

The entire section on aspen addresses more than range issues, it provides silvicultural prescriptions for harvesting aspen as well as a management philosophy of maximum manipulation and "management" (read, cut). (I-15 and II-17). There is no indication in the EIS that the AEO will be changed. Yet direction is given to harvest all aspen stands (except old growth) at 30 - 60 year intervals to provide forage. That appears to change the suitable acreage (Forest Plan I-3) and would also increase the AEO, in either event requiring a significant amendment or revision of the forest plan. This issue needs to be clarified.

Aside from the environmental consequences of increasing aspen harvests—which are not analyzed in the EIS (even though that seems to be the intent of aspen management)—there are economic considerations. Is there a demand for additional aspen products and what about economic considerations of below-cost sales? What about allowing fire to resume its natural role on the Forest? The EIS provides no analysis or information with which to make a decision on aspen silviculture. If aspen management is a significant issue in the EIS, then alternative management options must be analyzed.
Monitoring

The EIS is seriously lacking a solid monitoring plan and a commitment to monitoring (V-1 and V-2). The EIS notes, "Annual budgets may not fund the monitoring described. Since there is no monitoring in the EIS for overgrazed ridgetops, how can their status and trend be determined (V-2)? Riparian evaluations will only be conducted on Class I and II streams at a rate of ten annually? At least one riparian area per allotment should be monitored annually for the riparian guidelines to have any meaning. Using stubble height, monitoring can be done more rapidly."

Professional management requires adequate monitoring. Without adequate monitoring, there should be no grazing. That is a basic tenet of professional land management.

The purpose of this EIS was to help achieve range management goals. If all that is done is adoption of utilization standards, without monitoring, then the EIS has been a waste of time. In the absence of monitoring on each allotment, it appears that as much progress would have been made without an amendment, where only the priority areas would be monitored.

Please keep us updated on this issue. If you have any questions about this comment, don't hesitate to contact our office.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gary Manzanune
Conservation Director
To whom it may concern:

We as a permittee on the Uinta National Forest welcome this opportunity to offer input regarding grazing on public lands. The following are issues in which we feel there needs to be changes and or assistance rendered, they are as follows: 1) Resting one unit vs using all units 2) Water development.

1) Resting one unit vs using all units - We feel that we can best manage the allotment by using all three grazing units. Not all of our units have water on them thus requiring the sheep to travel further for water. By using all the units we can enhance the use of the range and the sheep are able to graze to the water thus have no degrading effect on the land.

2) Water development - On our Dry Hollow unit there is no water for the livestock. We would like assistance in building a pond to catch run off water and develop a spring.

With help in developing the necessary water and by using all units we can better manage our livestock and better manage the range.

We have enjoyed working with the Forest Rangers in the Naber District over the past years. We are looking forward to working with you in the future.

Sincerely,
Harold H. Richards
N.R. Livestock
We disagree that the DEIS does not include a real no action alternative. The no-action alternative describes the current management situation, and as such meets the intent of NEPA. Based on public input we have revised the document to include an additional alternative which deals with recreation. We believe this meets NEPA requirements. The FEIS includes both a preferred and an environmentally preferred alternative. Also see responses #18-5 and #24-1.

Rest rotation grazing is a proven method of improving rangelands no matter how badly they are deteriorated. The rate of recovery will not be as fast as if areas were completely closed to grazing, but where properly implemented it has provided satisfactory rates of improvement. Riparian areas are areas which have the greatest potential for recovery. But where needed, additional rest or complete rest can be implemented under the proposed guidelines. The standards and guidelines are the minimum standards that must be met under Alternative B.

Alternative C was considered but excluded from further evaluations because it did not meet the Forest Plan objectives. It would have eliminated most of the grazing as well as access to and use of most of the developed recreation sites and dispersed camping areas on the Forest. Again see responses #18-5 and #24-1.

The targeting of sagebrush communities for range improvement work is not an attempt to eliminate such communities. In fact, the goal is to reestablish sagebrush and other desirable grass species where cheat grass and other invading plants have taken over because of past grazing practices. So far as playon-Juniper stands are concerned, there is no desire to eliminate this species; the intent is to modify its abundance to provide additional wildlife forage where past grazing practices have favored playon-Juniper invasion and the related loss of desirable forage and watershed cover.

We disagree, as we have stated to advocates on the other end of the management spectrum, Alternative B is our proposal to upgrade range management on the Uinta, to protect wildlife, watershed, and aesthetic values, while still meeting the Forest Service's mandate to practice a multiple use program that includes harvest of the forage resource by big game and livestock. See response #4-2. We agree that it will take more time to meet our objective as discussed previously in response #2-2. We expect that if Alternative B is implemented the result will be very noticeable in the long term towards meeting the multiple use objectives outlined in the Forest Plan.
The amendment identifies pinyon-juniper woodlands and sagebrush communities, both native plant communities, as priority areas for "treatment". In this case, "treatment" means plant community conversion and in fact, elimination of that native plant community. Targeting these native plant communities for elimination is inappropriate and a violation of NHPA.

Prescribed management by riparian classes, as established in the proposed amendment, leave important streams and water dependent resources in continued jeopardy. Both vegetation and soil stability standards are inadequate to protect the full range of riparian values.

The amendment delays achievement of desired future condition for Class II riparian areas for 10 years when most riparian zones could regenerate themselves much more quickly if grazing impacts were more greatly reduced or eliminated. The desired future condition of all Class III riparian zones is barely above use: inefactory and even then wouldn't be achieved for 20 years. These standards perpetuate abusive management practices are unacceptable.

This analysis is a prescription for continued abusive management of the plant communities, riparian resources and watersheds on the Delta National Forest. The proposed amendment fails to meet the mandates of both the National Environmental Policy Act, the National Forest Management Act, and the Clean Water Act.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

June Lessen
United States Department of the Interior
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
FISH AND WILDLIFE ENHANCEMENT
UTAH STATE OFFICE
900 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
1300 WEST 2000 SOUTH
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84104-4100

June 3, 1992

Peter V. Karp
Uinta National Forest
P.O. Box 1428
Provo, UT 84603

Dear Mr. Karp:

In response to your letter of May 20, 1992 concerning the Biological Assessment for
the "Rangeland Ecosystem EIS, Forest Plan Amendment, Uinta National Forest, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concur with your "no effect"
determination for threatened and endangered species and critical habitat.

We appreciate your interest in conserving endangered species.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Assistant Field Supervisor

Appendix 8-84