

**DECISION NOTICE AND
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
Stansbury Vegetation Treatment
USDA Forest Service
Salt Lake Ranger District, Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest
Tooele County, Utah**

Decision and Reasons for the Decision

Background

The project area is located within the Salt Lake Ranger District of the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest on the northwestern portion of the Stansbury Mountains, in Tooele County. Approximately 80% of the historic sagebrush communities on the west side of the Stansbury Mountains have been replaced by juniper. The loss of sagebrush has led to a loss of wildlife habitat and a need to improve habitat conditions in the area. In addition, recently burned areas in this landscape have been invaded by non-native species that have greatly altered the fire regime. Wildfires within the dense, juniper invasion stands are generally crown fires, creating dangerous conditions for fire fighters and producing undesirably severe fire effects.

The primary purpose of this project is to restore sagebrush ecosystems to a properly functioning condition in the Stansbury Mountains, to minimize the potential for invasion of cheatgrass following wildfires on these sites currently dominated by juniper, and to alter the fuel profile so that less hazardous fuel conditions exist for fire suppression forces.

An environmental assessment (EA) for the Stansbury Vegetation Research and Treatment project was completed in August 2006, and analyzed two alternatives to meet this need (the proposed action and no action). The EA is available at <http://www.fs.fed.us/r4/uwc/projects/wcnf/decisions/index.shtml>. The action alternative included experimental plot treatments (prescribed burn, mechanical Bull Hog treatment, and mechanical chainsaw treatment on 12.5 to 35 acre units), exclosure fencing of the plots, chemical treatment on 200 acres within the 2000 Box Canyon Fire area, and mechanical Bull Hog treatment of 500 acres outside the experimental plots. The proposed action also included a Forest Plan amendment to allow mechanical treatment for low elevation juniper communities in the Stansbury Mountains. A Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact for the research treatments and exclosure fencing portion of the proposed action was signed on August 25, 2006. The research treatments were completed in September and October of 2007.

A decision on the 500-acre mechanical treatment and required Forest Plan amendment (and herbicide treatment) was deferred for further consideration. Now, after careful consideration, I have made a decision on the mechanical treatment and Forest Plan amendment. The herbicide treatment portion of the proposed action is still under consideration.

Decision

Based upon my review of all alternatives and preliminary results of the research treatments, I have decided to implement the additional mechanical treatment of up to 500 acres with a Bull Hog wood shredder or similar mechanical masticator, which converts standing juniper into compost materials on site.

My decision requires a non-significant amendment to the Wasatch-Cache Forest Plan standard (S2.6) that prohibits vegetation/fuel treatment in areas mapped as Management Prescription 2.6. This one-time waiver applies only to the 500 acres analyzed as the project area in the Stansbury Vegetation Treatment Environmental Assessment (See Map, Appendix B). In other areas of the Wasatch-Cache portion of the Forest where Management Prescription 2.6 is applied mechanical treatment is not allowed. Any additional mechanical juniper treatment in other MP 2.6 areas will be analyzed and decided in future NEPA documents, and will require another Forest Plan amendment.

Because this is a one-time waiver of the standard, Forest Plan language will not change. The standard states:

(S2.6) Timber harvest, vegetation/fuel treatment, road construction, new recreation development, and new trail construction are not allowed.

I am still considering the chemical vegetation treatment portion of Alternative 2 and may issue another Decision Notice in the future. If I decide to implement the chemical vegetation treatment portion, notice of the decision will be published in the newspaper of record and there will be another opportunity for administrative appeal. Like the preceding research treatments, implementing the mechanical treatment does not presuppose the chemical treatment described in Alternative 2 will be later approved and completed. Neither component is dependent upon the other for its justification and implementing one does not automatically lead to the other. The effects of Alternative 2 were fully analyzed.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are part of my decision and will reduce some of the potential impacts of the project. The Forest Plan forestwide standards and guidelines (See Appendix A) relevant to my decision are also incorporated.

1. Use of the Bull Hog equipment:
 - a. Only allowed in dry periods to avoid soil compaction
 - b. Confined to the normal dry season – extending from approximately April 1 through October 15 (But see also Mitigation #8). The operating season can be extended on either side of these dates when the ground is not snow covered and soil moisture content is below 15-20% by volume.

2. Leave overstory clumps near fencing to reduce the linear effect of fencing in the landscape.
3. The three archeological sites that were determined to be significant will be flagged by the Forest archeologists and physically avoided (with a 50-meter buffer) during the implementation of this project.
4. No ground-disturbing treatments can be done within 25 feet of permanently flowing or intermittently flowing stream channels.
5. Incidental to the machine mastication, chainsaws may occasionally be used to buck up any larger branches not sufficiently shredded by the masticator, and to cut any low limbs remaining at the masticated stump base. These cuts will be made so that material is at or near ground level, and no visible smooth-cut stumps or large limbs will remain.
6. Off-road equipment (such as the masticator) will be washed of all visible soil and potential weed seeds before entering the project area and upon leaving the project area.
7. Noxious weed inventory and treatment will be conducted in the project area for each of the three years following mastication.
8. To minimize effects on migratory bird nesting, implementation will not begin before late June.

Reasons for the Decision

The negative environmental effects of juniper replacement of sagebrush/grass communities have been well-recognized across a wide area of the Great Basin and elsewhere. Mechanical treatments have produced much improved conditions, as indicated by preliminary results from the Stansbury Research Treatments and extensive similar, older treatments by the Bureau of Land Management in Tooele County and vicinity. Juniper treatment is most effective and efficient when implemented before understory vegetation is significantly depleted due to canopy-crown closure. We are nearing that point in the Stansbury Mountains, but currently have good understory and a window of opportunity to treat while results are expected to be highly favorable. Thus there is a certain amount of urgency to this project.

Significant issues discussed in the EA were impacts to archeological resources, roadless resource, water resources, scenery, soil, and wildlife. I believe the mitigation measures incorporated as part of my decision will minimize any potential impacts. The cultural sites eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places will be protected through 50 meter buffer zones. Soil compaction will be prevented by operating in dry conditions. With little to no sediment movement predicted there will be no adverse effects to water quality. The project will improve wildlife habitat for those species that prefer open sagebrush and grasslands. Species that prefer older juniper woodlands will still find suitable habitat in extensive, adjacent, untreated areas. In addition, no rare plant species have been located through surveys so none will be affected by these treatments.

Initial post-research treatment monitoring conducted by the Forest Soil Scientist, Hydrologist, and Fire Ecologist and Joint Fire Science Researchers indicated favorable (or neutral) short-term results from the Bull Hog research plot treatment. We expect similar results in the larger mechanical treatment area.

Concern about whether mechanical mastication of juniper would preclude the potential for future designation of the Stansbury Mountains Roadless Area as wilderness was raised as an issue. Currently a large part of the Stansbury Mountains is part of an inventoried roadless area as established by the Forest Service Roadless Area Conservation Final Environmental Impact Statement, Volume 2 dated November 2000. Under Regional roadless area inventory protocol and Forest Service Handbook direction, an area can be considered roadless and have potential for wilderness consideration if past management activities are mitigated by the passage of time or visibility of the action allows the area to appear natural. The primary criterion is whether the imprint of human's work is substantially unnoticeable or unrecognizable, as interpreted that the average lay person would not recognize the impact, or the impact is minor in comparison with the larger landscape.

Intermountain Region and Forest Service Handbook direction (FSH 1909.12, Chapter 70) specifically address timber harvest areas and their suitability for inclusion into consideration for potential wilderness. Although juniper mastication (as proposed in this project) is not typically considered timber harvest, some of the effects may be similar. Timber harvest areas are allowed if logging evidence is substantially unnoticeable, such as without apparent stumps, skid trails, roads, or clearcuts.

Based on observations of treatments on adjacent Bureau of Land Management lands, where mechanical mastication similar to the proposed treatment occurred about four years ago, only short-term effects on wilderness attributes are expected. Temporary effects on noise, solitude, and visuals are expected from project implementation. Shredded material accumulation, occasional larger dead branches, and masticated juniper stumps will be present, but not obvious beyond a couple of years. It is expected that the casual observer would consider treatment effects substantially unnoticeable. The Uinta-Wasatch-Cache Forest Plan revision is scheduled for about 2013 or later. By that time, the proposed treatment is likely to be substantially unnoticeable, and thus the treatment would not preclude wilderness eligibility consideration.

As discussed in the EA, from an ecological perspective the natural integrity and apparent naturalness have been altered by fire suppression and livestock grazing contributing to unnaturally dense stands of juniper under current conditions. In the long term, the proposed treatment would improve wilderness characteristics because vegetation would be closer to its natural range of variation. No roads or trails would be constructed. See the Wilderness Area Attributes Worksheets in the project record.

Other Alternatives Considered

In addition to the selected alternative, I considered also considered the No Action Alternative. A comparison of the alternatives can be found in Chapter 2 of the EA.

Alternative 1 (No Action)

Under the No Action alternative, current management plans would continue to guide management of the project area. There would be no vegetation treatments within the juniper communities. Under this alternative, environmental consequences would continue to occur because the existing environment is not static and juniper encroachment would continue, further eliminating native species and setting the stage for hot crown fires, leading to even further cheatgrass dominance.

Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

This alternative includes the research treatments, which have been implemented, and the 500-acre mechanical treatment and Forest Plan amendment described in the Decision section. In addition, the following chemical vegetation treatment included within Alternative 2 was considered, but not included in the decision:

Chemically treat invasive species on up to 200 acres within the 2000 Box Canyon Fire area. Treatments would include a combination of Plateau to treat the cheatgrass, and Dicamba or other broadleaf herbicides to treat prickly lettuce.

- a. Small 1-2 acre plots would be established in a 40-acre portion of the Box Canyon Fire that would require hand removal of burned junipers before chemical treatments can be applied.
- b. Large plots would be included within the 200-acre area that would require using a bullhog for removal of burned junipers before chemical treatments can be applied.

Public Involvement

A proposal to conduct research and treat juniper stands in this portion of the Stansbury Mountains was first listed in the Schedule of Proposed Actions in July 2005. The proposal was provided to the public and other agencies for comment during a scoping period which extended from June 27 to August 5, 2005. In addition, as part of the public involvement process, the agency consulted with federal and state agencies, the Goshute Tribe and universities. A preliminary EA was sent to interested parties on June 1, 2006 and published on the Wasatch-Cache National Forest website. A legal notice published in the Salt Lake Tribune on June 3, 2006 allowing for a 30-day notice and comment period of the preliminary EA.

Using the comments from the public, other agencies, the Goshute tribe and universities, the interdisciplinary team identified several issues regarding the effects of the proposed action. Main issues of concern included effects of the treatments on archeological sites, TE&S species, wildlife, and roadless values (see EA Chapter 1, *Issues* section for a complete discussion). To address these concerns, the Forest Service created the alternatives and mitigation measures described above.

Finding of No Significant Impact

After considering the environmental effects associated with the treatments which were described in the EA, I have determined that these actions will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment considering the context and intensity of impacts (40 CFR 1508.27). Thus, an environmental impact statement will not be prepared. I base my finding on the following:

1. My finding of no significant environmental effects is not biased by the beneficial effects of the action.
2. There will be no significant effects on public health and safety. Manual and mechanical treatments are routinely used with no discernible effects on public health and safety. (see EA Chapter 2, *Mitigation Measures*).
3. There will be no significant effects on unique characteristics of the area. The action will move the project area towards the desired future conditions in the WCNF Forest Plan (see EA Chapter 1, *Forest Service Guidance*). The Forest landscape architect determined that the action would be compliant with Forest Plan direction for a natural appearing Landscape Character Theme (see EA Chapter 3, *Scenery Management*).
4. The effects on the quality of the human environment are not likely to be highly controversial since there is no known scientific controversy over the impacts of the project (see EA Chapter 3).
5. We have considerable experience with the types of activities to be implemented. The effects analysis shows the effects are not uncertain, and do not involve unique or unknown risk.
6. The action is not likely to establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects. No significant effects are anticipated from this or future projects of its kind. (See EA Chapter 3.)
7. The cumulative impacts are not significant (see EA Chapter 3). The effects disclosed in the EA from the full implementation of Alternative 2 revealed no significant cumulative impacts.
8. The Forest archeologist identified three cultural sites eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places in the project area. The action will have no significant adverse effect on these sites since the archeologist will flag a 50-meter buffer zone around the cultural resources and consult with personnel implementing the project (see EA Chapter 3, *Heritage Resources*).
9. The action will not adversely affect any endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species act of 1973. There are two threatened & endangered species listed for Tooele County: Ute ladies'-tresses

and yellow-billed cuckoo. Neither the Ute ladies'-tresses nor the yellow-billed cuckoo has potential habitat within the project area. (see EA Chapter 3, *Wildlife Resources*).

10. The action will not violate Federal, State, and local laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

SIGNIFICANCE OF FOREST PLAN AMENDMENT

The "significance" of an amendment must be determined. It is important to note that there is a difference between "significance" of the change to a forest plan and "significance" of the environmental impacts of the Proposed Action as defined by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). Determination of "significance" for a forest plan amendment is based on the following criteria defined in the Forest Service Manual 1926.5 (Regional Forester letter dated August 9, 2007).

Changes to the land management plan that are not significant can result from:

1. Actions that do not significantly alter the multiple-use goals and objectives for long-term land and resource management.
2. Adjustments of management area boundaries or management prescriptions resulting from further on-site analysis when the adjustments do not cause significant changes in the multiple-use goals and objectives for long-term land and resource management.
3. Minor changes in standards and guidelines.
4. Opportunities for additional projects or activities that will contribute to achievement of the management prescription.

Goals and Objectives

This amendment will not alter the multiple-use goals and objectives for long-term land and resource management established during the planning process (See the Final Environmental Impact Statement accompanying the Revised Forest Plan, 2003).

Management Prescription

Allowing this one-time waiver for vegetation/fuel treatment in this specific location within management prescription 2.6 does not change or affect the management prescription for the rest of the Forest or for future projects in this same area. It does not alter management area boundaries.

Minor changes in Standards and Guidelines

This change is limited to only this project and is a waiver of standard S2.6 (Revised Forest Plan page 4-67). Because the waiver is limited in this way it is considered a minor change.

Opportunities for additional projects or activities that contribute to the achievement of the management prescription

This change will neither preclude nor necessitate additional projects. This change does not alter the ability to achieve the primary emphasis of management prescription 2.6. The area mapped as 2.6 will continue to be managed with a focus on its undeveloped character. Because the treatment is to restore sagebrush communities the landscape in the future will more closely represent historic conditions.

After reviewing the Forest Service manual direction, the proposed amendment for the Proposed Action was found to be not significant in accordance with the requirements of sections 1926.51 and 1926.52.

Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations

This decision to allow mechanical treatments of juniper stands in the Stansbury Mountains is consistent with the intent of the Wasatch-Cache forest plan's long term goals and objectives listed in Chapter 4 (pp. 4-1 through 4-117). The action is also consistent with specific direction for the Stansbury Management Area on pages 4-166 through 4-175. The project was designed in conformance with land and resource management plan standards and incorporates appropriate land and resource management plan guidelines for soil, water, and aquatic resources, wildlife resources, and vegetation values.

Clean Water Act – The Clean Water Act requires each state to implement its own water quality standards. The State of Utah's Water Quality Anti-degradation Policy requires maintenance of water quality to protect existing in-stream Beneficial Uses on streams designated as Category I High Quality Water. All surface waters geographically located within the boundaries of the Wasatch-Cache National Forest whether on public or private lands are designated as Category I High Quality Water. This project will maintain water at existing high quality.

Executive Order 11990 of May 1977 – This order requires the Forest Service to take action to minimize destruction, loss, or degradation of wetlands and to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands. In compliance with this order, Forest Service direction requires that analysis be completed to determine whether adverse impacts would result.

There are no wetlands within the project area. My decision is in compliance with EO 11990

Executive Order 11988 of May 1977 – This order required the Forest Service to provide leadership and take action to (1) minimize adverse impacts associated with occupancy and modification of floodplains and reduce risk of flood loss, (2) minimize impacts of floods on human safety, health and welfare, and (3) restore and preserve natural and beneficial values served by floodplains.

There are no floodplains within the project area.

Endangered Species Act – This Act directs that all Federal departments and agencies shall seek to conserve endangered, and threatened (and proposed) species of fish, wildlife and plants. This obligation is further clarified in a National Interagency Memorandum of Agreement (dated August 30, 2000) which states our shared mission to “...enhance conservation of imperiled species while delivering appropriate goods and services provided by the lands and resources.”

Based on the disclosure in Chapter 4 concerning threatened and endangered or proposed wildlife, plant or fish species, correspondence with the USFWS, and the Biological Assessment, it has been determined there are no adverse effects to populations of endangered, and threatened (and proposed) species of fish, wildlife and plants relative to this decision.

Executive Order 13186 of January 10, 2001 – In December 2008, a National Memorandum of Understanding on the Migratory Bird Treaty Act was signed by the USDI Fish and Wildlife Service and the USDA Forest Service. In this MOU, “the parties mutually agree that it is important to: 1) focus on bird populations; 2) focus on habitat restoration and enhancement where actions can benefit specific ecosystems and migratory birds dependent on them; 3) recognize that actions taken to benefit some migratory bird populations may adversely affect other migratory bird populations; and 4) recognize that actions that may provide long-term benefits to migratory birds may have short-term impacts on individual birds.”

After careful review, based on the discussion in Chapter 3 of the EA and information in the project file concerning migratory birds, my decision is in compliance with this Executive Order for the Conservation of Migratory Birds.

Executive Order 13112 – Invasive Species – This Executive Order directs that Federal Agencies should not authorize any activities that would increase the spread of invasive species. Based on the mitigation and management requirements included as part of my decision, the approved activity will not increase the spread of invasive species.

American Antiquities Act of 1906 and the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 – Based on the discussion in Chapters 3 concerning Heritage Resources and the project file documentation, it has been determined there would be no measurable effects to any historic properties relative to this decision.

Prime Farmland, Rangeland and Forest Land (Secretary of Agriculture Memorandum 1827) – There is no prime farmland within the project area. The Decision does not make any changes to grazing allotments found within the project area.

Civil rights – Based on comments received during scoping and the comment period no conflicts have been identified with other Federal, State or local agencies or with Native Americans, other minorities women, or civil rights of any United States citizen.

Executive Order 12898 of February 16, 1994 “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice on Minority Populations and Low-income Populations” - This order requires federal Agencies to the extent practicable and permitted by law to make achieving environmental justice

part of its mission by identifying and addressing as appropriate disproportionately high and adverse human health effects, of its programs and policies and activities on minorities and low-income populations in the United States and territorial possessions. In compliance with this Executive Order the Wasatch-National Forest through intensive scoping and public involvement attempted to identify interested and affected parties, including minorities and low-income populations for this project. A comment period was held for 30 days following the publication of the legal notice in the Salt Lake Tribune.

No minorities and low-income populations were identified during public involvement activities.

Roadless Area Conservation Rule (RACR), of January 12, 2001 (Federal Register, Vol. 66 No. 9, 2001) This Rule prohibits road construction and reconstruction in inventoried roadless areas with certain exemptions. In May 2005 the Dept of Agriculture adopted a new Rule for managing roadless areas. On September 20, 2006, the United States District Court for the Northern District of California issued a decision in the consolidated cases California v. USDA and Wilderness Society v. USFS enjoining the 2005 State Petitions Rule and reinstating the 2001 Roadless Rule. Since then, the Federal District Court of Wyoming again held the 2001 Roadless area conservation rule was unlawfully promulgated and ordered the Rule be permanently enjoined. Forest Service field offices have been directed to defer from taking any action that would have the potential to create a conflict with either court's order. This decision is consistent with this direction.

Administrative Review or Appeal Opportunities

This decision is subject to administrative review (appeal) pursuant to 36 CFR Part 215. The appeal must be filed (regular mail, fax, email, hand-delivery, or express delivery) with the Appeal Deciding Officer at *Appeal Deciding Officer, Harv Forsgren, Regional Forester, 324 25th Street, Ogden, Utah 84401 fax 801-625-5277*. The office business hours for those submitting hand-delivered appeals are: 8:00 to 4:30, Monday through Friday, excluding holidays. Electronic appeals must be submitted in a format such as an email message, plain text (.txt), rich text format (.rtf), and Word (.doc) to appeals-intermtn-regional-office@fs.fed.us. In cases where no identifiable name is attached to an electronic message, a verification of identity will be required. A scanned signature is one way to provide verification.

Appeals, including attachments, must be filed within 45 days from the publication date of this notice in the Salt Lake Tribune, the newspaper of record. Attachments received after the 45 day appeal period will not be considered. The publication date in the Salt Lake Tribune, newspaper of record, is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an appeal. Those wishing to appeal this decision should not rely upon dates or timeframe information provided by any other source.

Individuals or organizations who submitted comments during the comment period specified at 215.6 may appeal this decision. The notice of appeal must meet the appeal content requirements at 36 CFR 215.14.

Implementation Date

If no appeals are filed within the 45-day time period, implementation of the decision may occur on, but not before, 5 business days from the close of the appeal filing period. When appeals are filed, implementation may occur on, but not before, the 15th business day following the date of the last appeal disposition.

Contact

For additional information concerning this decision or the Forest Service appeal process, contact Steve Scheid, 6944 S 300 E, Salt Lake City UT 84121, 801-733-2689.



Brian Ferebee
Forest Supervisor
Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest

4/22/09
Date

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Wasatch-Cache Forest Plan AMENDMENT NO. 6

Effective with the Decision for the Stansbury Vegetation Treatment Environmental Assessment,
April 22, 2009

POSTING NOTICE:

Because this is a waiver there are no insert pages associated with this posting notice.

EXPLANATION:

The analysis to substantiate this change in a management prescription standard within the Stansbury Management area is found in the Stansbury Vegetation Treatment Environmental Assessment, August 2006.

Forest Plan standard (S2.6) prohibits vegetation/fuel treatment in areas mapped as Management Prescription 2.6. The standard states:

(S2.6) Timber harvest, vegetation/fuel treatment, road construction, new recreation development, and new trail construction are not allowed.

This one-time waiver applies only to the 500 acres analyzed as the project area in the Stansbury Vegetation Treatment Environmental Assessment (See Decision Notice Map, Appendix B). In other areas of the Forest where Management Prescription 2.6 is applied vegetation/fuel treatment is not allowed. Any additional vegetation/fuel treatment in other MP 2.6 areas will be analyzed and decided in future NEPA documents, and will require another Forest Plan amendment. (See EA for the Stansbury Vegetation Treatment Project for details.)

This amendment is a non-significant amendment to the Wasatch-Cache Forest Plan that amends standard (S2.6) in Management Prescription 2.6 (Undeveloped Areas) as it is applied to this specific project only. In other areas of the Wasatch-Cache where standard S2.6 is applied, timber harvest, vegetation/fuel treatment, road construction, new recreation development, and new trail construction are not allowed.

APPENDIX A

The following Forest-wide Standards and Guidelines (LRMP 4-36 – 4-38) are applicable to Stansbury mechanical vegetation treatment project decision:

- (S1) Allow no ground-based skidding on slopes greater than 40 percent.
- (S7) Allow management activities to result in no less than 85% of potential ground cover for each vegetation cover type. (See Appendix VII for potential ground cover values by cover type.)
- (G4) At the end of an activity, allow no more than 15% of an activity area (defined in Glossary) to have detrimental soil displacement, puddling, compaction and/or to be severely burned.
- (G5) Do not allow activities that could result in water yield increases that would degrade water quality and impact beneficial uses.
- (G9) Avoid soil disturbing activities (those that remove surface organic matter exposing mineral soil) on steep, erosive, and unstable slopes, and in riparian, wetlands, floodplains, wet meadows, and alpine areas.
- (G11) Use Best Management Practices and Soil and Water Conservation Practices during project level assessment and implementation to ensure maintenance of soil productivity, minimization of sediment discharge into streams, lakes and wetlands to protect of designated beneficial uses.
- (G59) Manage Forest landscapes according to Landscape Character Themes, and Scenic Integrity Objectives as mapped. (See Chapter 4, A.7. Scenery Management for definitions).
- (G60) Resource management activities should not be permitted to reduce Scenic Integrity below Objectives stated for Management Prescription Categories.
- (S32) Review undertakings that may affect cultural resources to identify potential impacts. Compliance with Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act shall be completed before the responsible agency official signs the project decision document.
- (G88) Design any mitigation measures necessary to resolve adverse affects to sites in such a way that they provide the maximum public benefit that the sites (or the information derived from them) can offer.

APPENDIX B – MAP

Stansbury Mechanical Vegetation Treatment

