

# **Uinta National Forest**

## **State of the Forest Report For Fiscal Years 1999 and 2000**

**July 2002**

Note: The categories in the “Activity, Practice, or Resource” column were taken directly from the 1993 Monitoring and Evaluation Program Amendment to the 1984 Forest Plan.

**The Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, is committed to the policy that all persons shall have access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, religion, color, sex, age, handicap, or national origin.**

---

---

## LETTER FROM THE FOREST SUPERVISOR

---

---

Dear Uinta National Forest Stakeholder:

The Uinta National Forest is well underway on the process of revising the *Uinta National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan* (Forest Plan). We have monitored and evaluated implementation of the existing Forest Plan. Previous monitoring efforts were summarized in the *September 1999 State of the Forest Report*, and in the *Preliminary Analysis of the Management Situation* (AMS) which was prepared as part of the revision process. This *2002 State of the Forest Report* summarizes information from the 1999 State of the Forest Report and the AMS, and summarizes monitoring and evaluation information since that time.

The primary purpose of this report is to describe the condition of the Uinta National Forest, and results of continued implementation of the 1984 Forest Plan (as amended). State of the Forest reports usually evaluate the need to amend or revise forest plans; however, the decision to revise the Uinta Forest Plan has already been made and the revision effort initiated. The *Draft Revised Forest Plan* and accompanying *Draft Environmental Impact Statement* were released for public comment and review in May of 2001. Many of the needs for change identified in the AMS, and the 1999 and this *2002 State of the Forest Report* are being addressed in the revision. This report is intended to meet the requirements for forest plan monitoring, and to convey the results of that monitoring to you.

We hope that you will continue to be involved and participate in implementation of our 1984 and revised Forest Plans. If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Marlene DePietro, Planning Team Leader, at (801) 342-5100. Electronic copies of this report are available on the Forest's web site at <http://www.fs.fed.us/r4/uinta/>.

Sincerely,

*/s/ Peter W. Karp*

PETER W. KARP  
Forest Supervisor

### **INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE:**

The “State of the Forest Report” is intended to help National Forest managers, other agency managers, and the public evaluate environmental conditions and trends, and the effects of Uinta National Forest land management activities and supporting programs.

The 1984 Uinta National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) contains a set of monitoring requirements intended to monitor consistency of Forest management activities with Forest Plan direction, the effectiveness of applying Forest Plan direction in achieving desired goals and objectives, and the validity of Forest Plan goals and objectives. These monitoring requirements were changed in 1993 through a Forest Plan amendment. This report focuses on the monitoring requirements in the Forest Plan, as amended. This report is presented in tabular form, and items evaluated in the report are listed in the same order as presented in the monitoring requirements section of the amended Forest Plan. This report is made available to the public by posting on the Forest’s web page (<http://www.fs.fed.us/r4/uinta/>).

Today’s management emphasis for the Forest Service is best portrayed by the Forest Service’s Natural Resource Agenda (<http://www.fs.fed.us/news/agenda/>). Four themes are described in the Natural Resource Agenda: (1) watershed restoration, (2) sustainable ecosystem management, (3) forest roads, and (4) recreation. Since the Natural Resource Agenda was adopted, fire has emerged (i.e. National Fire Plan) as a major theme that must also be given equal emphasis on the Forest.

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<b>RECREATION</b>	
<p><b>RECREATION USER PREFERENCES - DISPERSED CAMPING</b> (NOTE: Recreation User Preferences by Recreation Opportunity Classes is the Forest Plan monitoring item, this item as presented is not but is presented as additional information)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Dispersed camping has long been a major recreational activity on the Forest. The 1984 Forest Plan projected an increase in dispersed recreation use corresponding to projected population growth in northern Utah. The 1984 Forest Plan did not provide a lot of direction specific to dispersed recreation management.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Dispersed recreation use, including dispersed camping, on the Forest is increasing. On key weekends and holidays, most of the traditionally used dispersed camping sites are occupied. In some cases, this use is adversely affecting the environment (e.g. disposal of waste, soil compaction, wildlife disturbance, erosion, etc.). In response to this, efforts are underway to develop dispersed recreation management plans for key areas on the Forest. By 1995, preliminary inventory work in several areas on the Forest had been initiated. These include dispersed camping sites along the Nebo Scenic Loop Road, Diamond Fork Canyon, Right Fork Hobbie Creek, American Fork Canyon, Squaw Peak, Cascade Springs, White River drainage, and Santaquin Canyon. A total of approximately 107 sites were recorded. Since then, a portion of the sites inventoried in Lower Diamond Fork have been closed as a result of Central Utah Project (CUP) work, and a portion of the sites along the north end of Payson Canyon were administratively closed due to unacceptable resource damage. Once the inventory work is completed for the Forest, assessments using Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) will be done to determine whether the site should remain open as is, remain open with mitigation measures to limit damage to adjacent resources, or be recommended for closure. In 1996, estimated dispersed recreation use exceeded predictions in the 1984 Forest Plan by 23 percent. This reflects an increasing demand for this activity nationally, and displacement as developed facilities fill to capacity. In addition, part of this growth is likely due to population growth in northern Utah, developments in technology, changes in lifestyles, and displacement due to management restrictions on other lands.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> Dispersed recreation use continues to exceed 1984 Forest Plan projections.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Same as 1998.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Same as 1999. Some dispersed campsites were temporarily closed for rehabilitation.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p>RECREATION USER PREFERENCES - DEVELOPED RECREATION (NOTE: Recreation User Preferences by Recreation Opportunity Classes is the Forest Plan monitoring item, this item as presented is not but is presented as additional information)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Developed recreation facilities under the 1984 Forest Plan have a capacity of approximately 22,100 People At One Time (PAOTs), for an estimated yearly capacity of 2,121,200 Recreation Visitor Days (RVDs). The 1984 Forest Plan anticipated funding for and construction of additional campgrounds to accommodate the projected increase in use.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> On peak weekends and holidays, demand at most developed recreation facilities exceeds supply. Since 1984, several campgrounds have been closed, remodeled, expanded, or developed to accommodate the increase in use. Recent funding levels have not supported a major increase in capacity. Concerns have arisen about a growing backlog of maintenance needs at many developed sites. These factors have resulted in a shift towards focusing on maintaining and improving existing sites. In 1997, the American Fork Canyon Loop Fee Demonstration Area was established and implemented.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> Increasingly, use levels on key weekends and holidays exceed the supply of sites available at developed campgrounds. The Diamond and Palmyra Campgrounds were closed for reconstruction reducing the capacity on the Forest to about 28,100 PAOTs. Current facilities available for public use consist of 27 campgrounds, 13 picnic areas/day use sites, 8 interpretive sites, 15 boating/fishing access sites, 51 developed trailheads/transfer stations, 11 scenic overlooks, 1 visitor center, 106 recreation residences, and 5 organization camps. Sites continue to degrade as they reach their design lives, and there is a large maintenance backlog associated with them. Accessibility surveys have been completed on most developed sites and improvements in accessibility have been made at many.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Capacity and facilities available for public use remain as described for 1998.</p> <p>In 1999 the Forest Service initiated a new system of tracking physical assets. This system, called INFRA, includes determining each asset’s location, condition, deferred and annual maintenance needs. One component of INFRA includes developed recreation facilities. Approximately 20 percent of the recreation buildings and developed recreation sites on the Uinta NF were surveyed in 1999, and information from these was loaded into the INFRA database.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Same as for 1998 and 1999, except that the Diamond and Palmyra Campgrounds, which underwent reconstruction in 1998, were combined and reopened for public use. This</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>effort, funded by the Utah Mitigation Reclamation and Conservation Commission as part of the Central Utah Project, replaced existing campground facilities and resulted in improvements to address accessibility and environmental impacts, but also resulted in loss of 4 group sites and about 190 PAOTs in capacity. Construction of a group site(s) in the Diamond Fork area is being planned. Current capacity is approximately 28,500 PAOTs. The Lodgepole Campground is scheduled for remodeling within the next year. Current facilities consists of 28 campgrounds, 13 picnic areas/day use sites, 8 interpretive sites, 15 boating/fishing access sites, 51 developed trailheads/transfer stations, 11 scenic overlooks, 1 visitor center, 106 recreation residences, and 5 organization camps. INFRA was continued, but work focused on other elements of INFRA and thus no additional physical inventory of recreation buildings or developed recreation sites was completed this fiscal year.</p>
<p><b>RECREATION USER PREFERENCES – MOTORIZED/NON-MOTORIZED ROAD- AND TRAIL-BASED RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES</b>            (NOTE: Recreation User Preferences by Recreation Opportunity Classes is the Forest Plan monitoring item, this item as presented is not but is presented as additional information)</p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> Data on the Forest Trail system has only partially been validated. Data available in 1984 suggested there were approximately 820 miles of system trails on the Forest, with 89 miles meeting appropriate maintenance standards. In 1984 there were also about 920 miles of road where high-clearance vehicles are required or advised. In 1984 there were 2 snowmobile parking lots and about 25 miles of groomed snowmobile trail on the Forest.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> Many of the trails and trailheads for motorized (i.e. snowmobile, motorcycle, and ATV) recreation use have been reconstructed or constructed in partnership with the State of Utah Division of Parks and Recreation. This partnership enables the State of Utah to utilize vehicle registration fees for development and maintenance of trails and parking facilities. The program is designed to provide enhanced opportunities to those members of the public who pay the fees.</p> <p>Winter motorized recreation continues to grow in popularity. Snowmobile registrations in Utah increased from 16,481 in 1990 to 29,014 in 1997. The Utah Division of Parks and Recreation and Daniels Summit Lodge groom about 119 miles of snowmobile trail on the Forest. The Utah Department of Transportation and concessionaires are responsible for plowing 9 parking lots associated with the use of snowmobiles on the Forest. Non-motorized winter recreation use is also increasing. The Pleasant Grove ranger District is plowing and maintaining 3 winter recreation parking lots in the American Fork Canyon Loop Fee Demonstration project area.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>Motorized and non-motorized road and trail-based recreation use is increasing. In particular, off-highway vehicle use has also grown in popularity. OHV registrations in Utah increased from 30,858 in 1990 to 72,124 in 1997. Over the last several years, five to fifteen miles of trail have been constructed or reconstructed annually. In addition to Forest Service trail crews, volunteers, and private entities perform some of this work as well as annual trail maintenance. About five miles of trail are under Adopt-a-Trail agreements. These agreements assure that annual maintenance will be performed on those trails by the organization or individual that has adopted the trail.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> Forest travel maps, including the 1996 Interagency Recreation Travel Map – Salt Lake/Provo, identify roads and trails open for various uses. Some trails are not part of an integrated system and many short, dead-end trails exist. Designating a comprehensive trail system for mechanized/motorized use would result in the identification of appropriate trails that provide adequate opportunities and thereby reduce the desire to pioneer new trails.</p> <p>FY98 data indicated there were approximately 637 miles of system trails on the Forest, with 473 miles meeting appropriate maintenance standards. Data identified 41 trailheads, and 911 miles of road where high-clearance vehicles are required or advised. This included about 390 miles of road open to non-street legal Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs). Use levels on many of the trails are high, and in some places negative impacts are occurring to other resources. A large backlog of trail maintenance work exists. FY98 data indicates there were about 120 miles of groomed snowmobile trail on the Forest, and nine trail heads. There are currently 11 miles of designated cross-country ski trails and four associated trailheads on the Forest. About 2 miles of these trails are groomed.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Same as 1998.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> The Interagency Recreation Travel Map – Salt Lake/Provo is updated, published and made available to the public. Although the actual amount of trails has changed little over the last three years, the mileage has changed to reflect better measurement techniques (use of Global Positioning Systems and Geographic Information Systems) and data (from INFRA). Based on this updated information, we estimate there are approximately 590 miles of inventoried trails (non-motorized 290, motorized 300) and 51 trailheads on the Forest. In</p>



ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>addition, there are about 670 miles of road where use of high clearance vehicles is advised. This includes 390 miles of road open to use by non-street legal OHVs. Approximately 500 of the 590 miles of trail meet appropriate maintenance standards. There are approximately 120 miles of groomed snowmobile trail and 14 trailheads designed to accommodate snowmobile use on the Forest. Cross-country ski trails were as described for 1998.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p><b>RECREATION USER PREFERENCES BY RECREATION OPPORTUNITY SPECTRUM (ROS) CLASS</b> (Supply versus Demand)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Recreationists choose a setting and activity to create a desired experience. The ROS system describes different classes of outdoor environments, activities, and experience opportunities (see below):</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Classes and Settings</b></p>
	<p>Primitive                      Very high probability of solitude, closeness to nature, challenge and risk; essentially unmodified natural environment; minimal evidence of other users; few restrictions evident; non-motorized access and travel on trails or cross country; no vegetation alterations.</p>
	<p>Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized              High probability of solitude, closeness to nature, challenge and risk; natural appearing environment; some evidence of others; minimum of subtle, on-site controls; non-motorized access and travel on trails except for permitted heli-skiing, some primitive roads or cross country; vegetation alterations to enhance forest health are few and widely dispersed.</p>
	<p>Semi-Primitive                      Moderate probability of solitude, closeness to nature, high degree of challenge and risk using motorized equipment; predominantly natural appearing environment; few users but evidence on trails; minimum of subtle, on-site controls; vegetation alterations few, widely dispersed and visually subordinate.</p>
<p>Roaded Natural                      Opportunity to be with other users in developed sites, little challenge or risk; predominantly natural appearing environment as viewed from sensitive roads and trails with moderate evidence of human sights and sounds; moderate concentration of users at campsites; some obvious user control; access and travel is standard motorized vehicles; resource modification and utilization practices are evident but harmonize with the natural environment.</p>	
<p>Rural                                      Opportunity to be with others is important as is facility convenience, little challenge or risk except for activities like downhill skiing; natural environment is culturally modified; high interaction among users; obvious</p>	

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS														
	<p>on-site controls; access and travel facilities are for intensified motorized use.</p> <p>Urban</p> <p>Opportunity to be with others is very important as is facility and experience convenience, challenge and risk are unimportant except for competitive sports; urbanized environment that may have a natural appearing backdrop high interaction among large number of users; intensive on-site controls; access and travel facilities are highly intense motorized use often with mass transit supplements; vegetation is planted and maintained.</p> <p>The 1984 Forest Plan, as amended, did not make any recreation opportunity allocation decisions. It did; however, estimate the mix of recreation opportunities that would be available through implementation of the Forest Plan. This (adjusted to reflect changes in land ownership) are shown in the following table:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>1984 Projections of ROS Opportunities on the Uinta NF</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="900 813 1745 1081"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="900 813 1507 870">ROS Classification</th> <th data-bbox="1507 813 1745 870">Acreage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="900 870 1507 906">Primitive</td> <td data-bbox="1507 870 1745 906">58,400</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="900 906 1507 941">Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized</td> <td data-bbox="1507 906 1745 941">390,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="900 941 1507 977">Semi-Primitive Motorized</td> <td data-bbox="1507 941 1745 977">208,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="900 977 1507 1013">Roaded Natural</td> <td data-bbox="1507 977 1745 1013">167,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="900 1013 1507 1049">Rural</td> <td data-bbox="1507 1013 1745 1049">73,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="900 1049 1507 1081">Urban</td> <td data-bbox="1507 1049 1745 1081">1,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Landscapes on the Forest are managed to provide the physical, social, and managerial environments needed to produce a variety of recreation opportunities and experiences. Decisions on activities and uses are made project by project, with little Forest Plan direction available to provide guidance. The exception is in designated wilderness, and the Strawberry Management Area where the Forest Plan prescribes the ROS. The following table is an estimation of existing ROS opportunities on the Forest:</p>	ROS Classification	Acreage	Primitive	58,400	Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized	390,000	Semi-Primitive Motorized	208,000	Roaded Natural	167,000	Rural	73,000	Urban	1,000
ROS Classification	Acreage														
Primitive	58,400														
Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized	390,000														
Semi-Primitive Motorized	208,000														
Roaded Natural	167,000														
Rural	73,000														
Urban	1,000														

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS														
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Estimation of Existing ROS Opportunities on the Uinta NF</b></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="900 358 1507 418">ROS Classification</th> <th data-bbox="1507 358 1745 418">Acreage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="900 418 1507 451">Primitive</td> <td data-bbox="1507 418 1745 451">58,400</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="900 451 1507 483">Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized</td> <td data-bbox="1507 451 1745 483">43,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="900 483 1507 516">Semi-Primitive Motorized</td> <td data-bbox="1507 483 1745 516">456,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="900 516 1507 548">Roaded Natural</td> <td data-bbox="1507 516 1745 548">338,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="900 548 1507 581">Rural</td> <td data-bbox="1507 548 1745 581">2,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="900 581 1507 626">Urban</td> <td data-bbox="1507 581 1745 626">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	ROS Classification	Acreage	Primitive	58,400	Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized	43,000	Semi-Primitive Motorized	456,000	Roaded Natural	338,000	Rural	2,000	Urban	0
ROS Classification	Acreage														
Primitive	58,400														
Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized	43,000														
Semi-Primitive Motorized	456,000														
Roaded Natural	338,000														
Rural	2,000														
Urban	0														
<p><b>SITE/FACILITY CONDITION HEALTH, SANITATION AND SAFETY</b></p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Water quality at public facilities on the Forest is monitored monthly during the season of use. The primary tests are for water-borne bacteria and nitrate.</p> <p>The 1984 Forest Plan calls for monitoring facilities for safety problems and increased maintenance costs. All facilities on the Forest were inspected for radon and asbestos, and any facilities found needing treatment were treated prior to 1996. Energy efficiency improvements commensurate with current technology have been completed on all facilities.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Condition surveys for water systems are completed every 3 years to meet Safe Drinking Water Act standards. Most surveys yield satisfactory results (see the following table). When unsatisfactory tests occurred, all necessary measures have been taken to correct the problem and ensure that water quality is maintained. The following table displays the results of bacteriological water system tests conducted annually on Forest administrative and recreation drinking water systems.</p>														

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS																			
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Uinta NF Bacteriological Water System Test Results – 1998 through 2000</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="768 347 1877 493"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th># Tests</th> <th># Tests Passed</th> <th>System Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>228</td> <td>208</td> <td>91%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>213</td> <td>207</td> <td>97%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>196</td> <td>181</td> <td>93%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Vulnerability assessments, and condition surveys for health and safety have been done. Retrofitting facilities as a result of these surveys is constantly ongoing to meet Federal and State safe drinking water standards. Historically, funding has been lacking and a backlog of work remains. Over the last 3 years, 4 water systems (One in 1998, one in 1999, and two in 2000) have been reconstructed.</p> <p>INFRA (a system for inventorying physical assets on the national forests) was initiated in 1999 to identify deferred and annual maintenance, and improvement needs. Recreation and administrative buildings are included in the elements being inventoried through INFRA. Through Fiscal Year 2000, 25 of 81 administrative facilities and 27 of 225 recreation buildings had been inventoried and input into INFRA.</p>				Year	# Tests	# Tests Passed	System Score	1998	228	208	91%	1999	213	207	97%	2000	196	181	93%
Year	# Tests	# Tests Passed	System Score																	
1998	228	208	91%																	
1999	213	207	97%																	
2000	196	181	93%																	

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS														
SITE/FACILITY ACCESSIBILITY	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Most administrative and recreation buildings on the Forest were constructed many years ago and prior to passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Consequently, most of these facilities were not accessible for persons with disabilities. Since ADA was passed, the Forest has been working to identify accessibility needs. During this same time, standards for ADA accessibility have changed. The Forest has been working to remodel/reconstruct facilities to address accessibility needs. This is often an expensive task, and accomplishment of this work is limited by the amount of funding available from year to year.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> INFRA (a system for inventorying physical assets on the national forests) was initiated in 1999 to identify deferred and annual maintenance, and improvement needs. Through 2000, about 50% of the 81 administrative and 225 recreation administrative buildings on the Forest had been surveyed. Data on accessibility from this inventory is displayed in the following table:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Overview of Building Accessibility on Uinta NF Based on INFRA Data</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="716 829 1927 1422"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="716 829 867 867">Year</th> <th data-bbox="867 829 1367 867">Building Status</th> <th data-bbox="1367 829 1927 867">Comments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="716 867 867 1110">1998</td> <td data-bbox="867 867 1367 1110">                     301 Buildings:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 104 Accessible</li> <li>◆ 56 Useable</li> <li>◆ 141 Not Accessible</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1367 867 1927 1110"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Built 5 new accessible recreation buildings</li> <li>◆ Replaced 8 recreation buildings with accessible buildings</li> <li>◆ Remodeled 1 restroom at an administrative site to make it accessible</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="716 1110 867 1284">1999</td> <td data-bbox="867 1110 1367 1284">                     301 Buildings:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 106 Accessible</li> <li>◆ 55 Useable</li> <li>◆ 140 Not Accessible</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1367 1110 1927 1284"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Replaced 1 recreation building with accessible building</li> <li>◆ Remodeled 1 restroom at an administrative site to make it accessible</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="716 1284 867 1422">2000</td> <td data-bbox="867 1284 1367 1422">                     306 Buildings:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 124 Accessible</li> <li>◆ 55 Useable</li> <li>◆ 127 Not Accessible</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1367 1284 1927 1422"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Built 4 new accessible recreation buildings</li> <li>◆ Built 1 new accessible administrative facility</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Building Status	Comments	1998	301 Buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 104 Accessible</li> <li>◆ 56 Useable</li> <li>◆ 141 Not Accessible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Built 5 new accessible recreation buildings</li> <li>◆ Replaced 8 recreation buildings with accessible buildings</li> <li>◆ Remodeled 1 restroom at an administrative site to make it accessible</li> </ul>	1999	301 Buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 106 Accessible</li> <li>◆ 55 Useable</li> <li>◆ 140 Not Accessible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Replaced 1 recreation building with accessible building</li> <li>◆ Remodeled 1 restroom at an administrative site to make it accessible</li> </ul>	2000	306 Buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 124 Accessible</li> <li>◆ 55 Useable</li> <li>◆ 127 Not Accessible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Built 4 new accessible recreation buildings</li> <li>◆ Built 1 new accessible administrative facility</li> </ul>
	Year	Building Status	Comments												
	1998	301 Buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 104 Accessible</li> <li>◆ 56 Useable</li> <li>◆ 141 Not Accessible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Built 5 new accessible recreation buildings</li> <li>◆ Replaced 8 recreation buildings with accessible buildings</li> <li>◆ Remodeled 1 restroom at an administrative site to make it accessible</li> </ul>												
	1999	301 Buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 106 Accessible</li> <li>◆ 55 Useable</li> <li>◆ 140 Not Accessible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Replaced 1 recreation building with accessible building</li> <li>◆ Remodeled 1 restroom at an administrative site to make it accessible</li> </ul>												
2000	306 Buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 124 Accessible</li> <li>◆ 55 Useable</li> <li>◆ 127 Not Accessible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Built 4 new accessible recreation buildings</li> <li>◆ Built 1 new accessible administrative facility</li> </ul>													

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Replaced 13 recreation buildings with accessible buildings</li> </ul>
<p><b>OFF-ROAD VEHICLE IMPACTS</b> (Compliance with 36 CFR 295)</p>	<p>Most offices have been modified to meet current accessibility requirements.</p> <p>Although the Forest has upgraded many of its existing campgrounds, outdated facilities are common. Many parking spurs are too short for modern recreational vehicles, and many toilets have doorways too narrow for wheelchairs. As funds become available, the trend has been to devote resources to upgrading those campgrounds that receive high levels of use first. At many sites across the Forest, improvements in accessibility have been made. Where technically feasible, recreation facilities are reconstructed to be accessible within the limits of the site. Needs for additional facilities are overshadowed by a shortfall in maintenance and rehabilitation funds for existing facilities. All site development proposals and site improvement plans are reviewed for compliance with ADA requirements.</p> <p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The Uinta NF is closed to vehicle use unless designated open; except for the retrieval of legally taken game.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> OHV use on the Forest has grown significantly over the last decade (see Recreation User Preferences – Motorized/Non-Motorized Recreation section). Coincident with increased use has been an increase in OHV capability to utilize terrain and operate in conditions that were previously inoperable. The State of Utah offers environmental education for ATV purchasers designed to increase environmental awareness and decrease environmental impacts. These efforts have probably successfully deterred a significant amount of inappropriate ATV use. Nevertheless, inappropriate and illegal off-road vehicle use is still occurring across most accessible areas of the Forest. These impacts are caused by year-round illegal off-road/off-trail ATV use. In addition, retrieval of game during hunting season is causing resource damage in many cases. Law enforcement officers have found this provision very difficult to enforce. In addition, this use occurs at a time of year when soils are often saturated and susceptible to damage. Two-track “ghost” roads (unclassified roads) are also being illegally created and used by Forest visitors.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> See “Current Conditions and Trends”. According to the LAMARS database, about 214 violation notices were issued in calendar year 1998. Fifty-two (52) of these were issued for</p>	

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>illegal operation of OHVs in closed areas, or off-road. This (52 violations) compares to about 90 violations (each year) issued in 1992 and 1993.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Same as 1998. According to the LAMARS database, about 1,332 violation notices were issued in calendar year 1999. This is a major increase over the number of violations issued in 1998. Part of this increase is due to an increase in law enforcement staffing in 1999, part of which was made possible by funding generated through the American Fork Fee Demo program. This program, and other funds, enabled hiring several additional Forest Protection Officers including 2 summer motorcycle patrol persons, 2 jeep patrol persons, and 2 ATV patrol persons. Two-hundred fourteen (214) of the violations were issued for illegal operation of OHVs in closed areas, or off-road.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Same as 1999. According to the LAMARS database, about 1,042 violation notices were issued in calendar year 2000. One-hundred sixty-six (166) of these were issued for illegal operation of OHVs in closed areas, or off-road.</p>



ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p><b>CULTURAL/HERITAGE RESOURCE PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT</b></p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> The 1984 Forest Plan contains a goal to have cultural resources input on all projects by 1994. In 1984, only 14,217 acres had been surveyed and 290 sites documented.</p> <p>Since 1984, the implementing regulations for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act have been amended. The new regulations require higher levels of tribal and community consultation, reduce the options for resolving adverse effects, and require more extensive consultation with State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPO) regarding all stages of the Section 106 process. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 requires an inventory of existing artifact collections and consultation with tribes to develop plans and procedures for use in the event human remains are discovered.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> Cultural resources input and coordination with the SHPO and Tribes is occurring on all projects. Additional lands are being surveyed annually as part of the planning process for other (non-heritage) projects. Through 1997 about 42,300 acres of the Forest had been surveyed.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> Additional lands have been surveyed, but much of the Forest remains unsurveyed due to lack of funding. A total of 292 sites had been documented on the Forest.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Same as 1998.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> At the end of September 2000, about 8 percent of the Forest (72,769 acres) had been surveyed for archaeological and historical sites and 362 sites documented.</p> <p>About one-third (122) of the previously recorded sites date to the era of American Indian settlement before Europeans began visiting the Uinta National Forest (c. 8,000 B.C. to A.D. 1776). Most of these sites are relatively short-term campsites and/or places where people processed plants, butchered animals, or carried out other activities as part of their cycle of life. Many more American Indian sites probably exist on the Forest. One type of site likely existing on the Forest is a traditional cultural property (also known as a sacred site).</p> <p>Two-thirds of the sites documented on the Forest (240) date from the historic European-American era (after A.D. 1776). These sites include mines, logging camps, water control</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>features, livestock grazer’s camp, homesteads, military camps, and Forest management facilities. Outstanding among these are the Theater-in-the-Pines Amphitheater, the American Fork and Sheeprock area Mining Districts, Vernon and Diamond Fork homesteading landscapes, and the Strawberry Valley military sites.</p>
<p><b>VISUAL EFFECTS</b></p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The 1984 Forest Plan was developed utilizing the 1974 Visual Management System (VMS). A Visual Resource Management Implementation Plan for the Uinta National Forest was prepared as a supplement to the Forest Plan; however, the Forest Plan was never amended to incorporate this direction.</p> <p>The Strawberry Valley Management Area Forest Plan Amendment established Visual Quality Objectives (VQOs) for the Strawberry Project lands. These VQOs have been amended once. The Strawberry Management Area has been managed in accordance with this direction, as amended.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> The inventory of VQOs and the comparative layer of the Visual Absorption Capacity have been used to provide scenery management direction for proposed activities on the Forest. The Strawberry Management Area has been managed in accordance with Forest Plan VQOs.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> See “Current Conditions and Trends” above.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> See “Current Conditions and Trends” above.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> The Forest began the process of replacing the VMS with the new (1995) Scenery Management System (SMS). In the interim, the existing Visual Quality Inventory completed in 1984 has been updated and will be incorporated into the revised Forest Plan.</p>
<p><b>WILDERNESS</b></p>	
<p><b>WILDERNESS CONDITION, USE, AND DISTRIBUTION</b></p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The Uinta NF contains 3 designated wilderness areas. Lone Peak Wilderness Area is about 31,165 acres in size and is shared with the Wasatch-Cache NF (20,829 acres on Uinta NF, 10,336 acres on Wasatch-Cache NF). This wilderness was established in 1978 and management direction for it was included in the 1984 Forest Plan. Mount Timpanogos (10,518 acres) and Mt. Nebo (27,070 acres) Wilderness Areas were</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>established in 1984 and are located entirely on the Uinta NF. These two wilderness areas were established after the Forest Plan was approved. The Forest Plan was corrected in 1995 and 1996 to address the change in status for these areas.</p> <p>Since the Forest Plan was approved, the Forest Service has embraced Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) to define capacity, rather than using numbers of persons present. This process subzones wilderness into three opportunity classes and defines what biological, social, and physical conditions are acceptable within each class.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> Recreation use in the three wilderness areas is heavy in several locations, especially in the Mount Timpanogos and Lone Peak Wilderness Areas. Types of recreation use vary by wilderness area and terrain. The Mount Timpanogos Wilderness Area receives most of the Forest’s wilderness use. Most use occurs in late spring through fall, with over 90 percent of use along trails. Use is particularly heavy on weekends, holidays, and on nights when there is a full moon (moonlight hiking). Other activities include, but are not limited to, backpacking, horseback riding, llama trekking, fishing, and hunting. Some overnight use occurs, but is very limited. Evidence of heavily used campsites is not common. More common are trails and trail corridors with extremely heavy use and impacts.</p> <p>Current management emphasis is to manage these heavy impact areas while trying to confine use to these corridors, providing protection to adjacent resources, and protecting the more pristine nature of the general wilderness area. The need to establish hardened sites in these corridors is evident; however, the steepness of the terrain is not conducive to the establishment of many campsites. In some areas, use is significant enough to warrant consideration of providing sanitation facilities, which were specifically allowed in the enabling legislation establishing the Mount Timpanogos Wilderness Area. There are 2 toilets on Mount Timpanogos.</p> <p>Technical rock climbing has increased significantly in Lone Peak in the last five years. In Mount Timpanogos, 95 percent of all use is by day visitors. Some overnight camping occurs in the Mount Nebo and Lone Peak Wilderness Areas. Limited winter use occurs in all three areas.</p> <p>A major wilderness related law enforcement issue is motorized encroachment by ATVs and</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>snowmobiles. Staffing and funding hampers enforcement. Other problems include illegal campfires, group size violations, and trail cutting.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> In the Mount Nebo Wilderness Area issues for defining LAC have been identified, opportunity classes have been defined, and an inventory of existing resources and social conditions has been made. In the Mount Timpanogos and Lone Peak Wilderness Areas, only inventories have been completed. Total use in the three areas is estimated to be 132,000 RVDs per year.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Use data is not available. Otherwise, see “Current Conditions and Trends”</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Use data is not available. Otherwise, see “Current Conditions and Trends”</p>
WILDLIFE, FISH, AND BIOTIC RESOURCES (MANAGEMENT INDICATOR SPECIES)	
<p><b>BIG GAME (Mule Deer and Elk) EARLY TO MID-SUCCESSIONAL</b> (Aspen, Conifer, Mountain Brush, Sagebrush-Grass)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The Uinta NF provides year-round habitat for a variety of wildlife species. The 1984 Forest Plan identifies game species as Management Indicator Species to be used to monitor impacts of resource management activities. Of the habitat provided on the Forest, winter range is identified as most important, and was emphasized in the Rangeland Amendment to the Forest Plan. The vast majority of winter range for big game species that utilize the Uinta NF is located on the Wasatch Front on private lands and along the lower slopes of the Forest.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Most critical winter range occurs off-Forest. Some of these areas are being impacted, primarily by urban growth and development. These impacts have increased the value of winter range on the Uinta NF. Vegetative conditions are somewhat stable, but there is evidence that conditions are generally deteriorating and not meeting desired future conditions. Habitat quality is also measured by the relative ability of game species to be undisturbed while utilizing the areas. Urbanization is hindering this along the Wasatch Front. Winter range areas elsewhere on the Forest provide more security as they are further from the Front. Most big game winter range on the Forest, and especially that along the Wasatch Front, is not grazed by domestic livestock.</p> <p>Mule deer have declined from higher population levels in the 1960s but are currently at or near population objectives established by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) in the herd units. Local areas may still be depressed within the herd units. Elk are currently at or above population objectives established by the UDWR. The Forest Service participates in</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>management for all these species by providing input through the Regional Advisory Councils in association with the UDWR. Attention is given in project planning to mitigate effects to the big game species.</p> <p>There are 29 winter range trend study sites on or near the Forest that are part of a State-wide Forest Service/Utah Division of Wildlife Resources monitoring study. These sites are periodically monitored. These sites were last evaluated in 1997. Soil conditions on 27 sites were described as stable in trend, with two sites improving. Browse conditions on 24 sites were described as stable, with two sites increasing and three decreasing. The herbaceous understory on 20 sites was stable, one was decreasing, and six were increasing. Browse utilization on nine sites was described as light, 15 as moderate, and five as heavy. It is hard to determine the exact cause for the decline in winter range conditions, but it may be decadence coupled with increasing pressure by wildlife (due to shrinking winter range).</p>
<b>BEAVER</b> (Riparian, Wetlands)	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Beaver play an important part in the overall stability and health of riparian ecosystems. Their dams provide natural flow control structures, maintain water levels, and help minimize erosion in riparian systems. Beaver were identified as a management indicator for riparian systems on the Uinta NF.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Landscape assessments conducted on the Forest have indicated that a lack of beaver presence may be cause for concern for riparian functioning and health. Beaver activity and presence is monitored in conjunction with stream and aquatic biota surveys. In addition, other surveys have been initiated to estimate beaver populations and trends. Areas where beaver dams were eradicated in 1990 during rotenone treatments for fisheries improvement in Strawberry Valley have been slowly recovering, with beaver recolonizing these areas. Improvements in riparian conditions across the Forest continue to favor beaver. Potential conflicts continue where livestock grazing and wildlife browsing occur in aspen and willow communities that have been harvested by beaver, but are not adequately rested to allow regeneration. Establishment of new dams and recolonizing of older dam sites is occurring across the Forest. In general, these suggest beaver populations are depressed from early 1900 levels, but are stable or slowly increasing recently.</p>
<b>BALD EAGLE</b> (Select Winter Roost Areas Along Riparian Areas)	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Based on surveys and knowledge of the area, bald eagles do not nest within or near the Forest, nor are historic nests known to have occurred. Bald eagles have</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>established winter roosts near and on the Forest in riparian areas dominated with large cottonwood trees. Bald eagles have been sighted roosting early in the winter at Strawberry Reservoir. They have also been sighted roosting in the Heber Valley area, Vernon area, and in numerous canyons along the Wasatch Front, including Provo Canyon and Diamond Fork. Bald eagles may also forage through the Forest during migration flights. Foraging on the Forest involves the selection of prey species such as fish, small mammals, and carrion. Eagles typically use the Forest from November through March.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Bald eagle roost and nesting surveys, which occur primarily off-Forest for example, eagle surveys are conducted annually in the Vernon area), indicate populations are increasing. Although there has been improvement in the overall habitat and environment used by this and other species, it is not likely that population increases are due to Forest management activities as roost sites on the Forest are limited. Species recovery has not been attributed to management efforts on the Uinta NF, but rather to range-wide efforts in the reduction of pesticide use (DDT) and to other efforts. An increase in sightings and use of the Forest has occurred concurrently with the overall increase in the population. The bald eagle was petitioned for removal from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife’s Threatened and Endangered Species List in January 2001.</p> <p>During winter bald eagle surveys conducted on Diamond Fork between 1996 and 2000, as part of monitoring activities tied to Central Utah Project (CUP) construction activities, eagles were sighted, but no communal roost sites were seen.</p>
<p><b>PEREGRINE FALCON</b> (Rock Outcrops, Cliffs)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> No nesting or breeding is known to occur on the Forest. Peregrine falcons historically nested in American Fork Canyon, and may re-establish in the future as populations increase. Migrational use of the Forest occurs.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> In August 1999 the peregrine falcon was removed from the Threatened and Endangered Species List, and is now considered under the Forest Service’s sensitive species management. No peregrines have been sighted in recent years on the Uinta National Forest.</p>
<p><b>GOSHAWK</b> (Old growth [Douglas-fir, mixed conifer, and aspen])</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Surveys of potential habitat are conducted in association with proposed projects. There has not been a forest-wide survey outside of these proposed treatment areas.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>A ponderosa pine plantation containing one known territory was infested by bark beetles. The stand experienced near total mortality, and goshawks using the territory failed to return. The stand was subsequently harvested and replanted.</p> <p>Through 1997, survey efforts had identified 14 goshawk territories on the Uinta NF. However, there are almost certainly more that are unknown as surveys have primarily been focused on specific projects, and an abundance of adequate habitat exists outside of these survey areas.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> Hawk Watch International conducts spring migration counts of raptors, including goshawks, near the Jordanelle Reservoir. These counts indicate that goshawk population levels are stable. Current studies continue in Utah and will be used to assess winter migrations and further assess habitat use. Climate and prey base likely have the largest effects on goshawk population levels. Falconry occurs in Utah and this may account for the removal of a few fledglings (0 to 5) each year from nests on the Forest. This activity is regulated by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR).</p> <p><b>1998:</b> Project surveys identified 2 new (previously unknown) territories. In addition, a goshawk territory within the ongoing Timber Mountain Timber Sale project area was monitored. This territory had an active nest so project activities in the area were delayed until after birds had fledged.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> No new territories were discovered in 1999. Timber Mountain and a nest site associated with a campground improvement project had active nest sites, so project activities in these areas were delayed until after the birds had fledged.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Three new territories were discovered, raising the total on the Uinta NF to 19. Monitoring in the Trapper Hollow area failed to find any returning birds. However, the Timber Mountain site was again occupied and had 3 fledglings.</p> <p>The forest plans of the six national forests in Utah were amended in March 2000 through development of the Northern Utah Goshawk Amendment. This amendment was developed in response to a conservation strategy and agreement developed for goshawks that outlined provisions for goshawk habitat management.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p><b>SALMONIDS</b> (Bonneville and Colorado cutthroat trout) (Aquatic)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The Uinta National Forest provides habitat for Bonneville and Colorado cutthroat trout, both of which are classified as sensitive species. In 1997, a <i>Conservation Agreement and Strategy for Bonneville Cutthroat Trout</i> in the State of Utah, and a <i>Conservation Agreement and Strategy for Colorado River Cutthroat Trout</i> were approved. These established State-wide and basin goals for conservation populations, and identified several miles of streams on the Forest that might be managed to achieve these goals. The <i>1992 Rangeland Amendment</i> to the Uinta Forest Plan included management direction emphasizing protection of riparian areas, watersheds, fish and wildlife habitat, and water quality.</p> <p><b>Bonneville cutthroat trout:</b> Small isolated populations of Bonneville cutthroat trout have been found on the Forest in Hobble Creek, the upper reaches of the American Fork River, and small tributaries of both the Provo River and Spanish Fork River. Electrofishing surveys conducted in 1995 and 1996 indicate that remnant populations of Bonneville cutthroat trout are common in several streams in the upper reaches of the Provo River drainage. Competition from non-native fish, hybridization, predation, and competition pose a significant threat to Bonneville cutthroat trout in these streams. Hobble Creek drainage is a small watershed draining a central portion of the western face of the Wasatch Mountains in Utah Valley. Detailed population surveys and genetic status have not been completed for this drainage; however, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) and Forest Service biologists have unconfirmed reports of cutthroat in the upper reaches of the drainage. The Spanish Fork drainage contains potential Bonneville cutthroat stream habitat. Trout are known to occupy streams in upper Diamond Fork. Past surveys indicate that self-sustaining populations of remnant Bonneville cutthroat trout are present in Tie Fork.</p> <p><b>Colorado cutthroat trout:</b> Drainages on the east side of the Forest flow into the Colorado River system, and these historically were inhabited by Colorado River cutthroat trout. These drainages include the West Fork of the Duchesne River, Currant Creek, Willow Creek, and White River. Fish in the West Fork of the Duchesne River drainage are isolated from the lower portion of the creek by the Vat Diversion. This population is in good condition and has been used as a source to reestablish native fisheries in other areas. Currant Creek above Currant Creek Reservoir has fish that are isolated from lower Currant Creek by Currant Creek Dam and Reservoir. Fish barriers above the reservoir isolate some of the streams from fish stocked in the reservoir. Tributaries to the reservoir are small and potential for the population</p>



ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>to expand is limited because of competition with non-native trout stocked in the reservoir. Willow Creek, a tributary to the Strawberry River below Soldier Creek Dam, also provides habitat for Colorado River cutthroat trout. However, management opportunities here for expanding the Colorado cutthroat trout population are limited because the fish are hybridized with Yellowstone cutthroat trout. The fish in this drainage are isolated from those in the Strawberry River by a de-watered section of stream below the Forest boundary. The Forest contains about 17 miles of the White River and its tributaries. The UDWR suspects the Right Fork of White River contains a population of naturally reproducing Colorado cutthroat trout.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b></p> <p><b>1998:</b> The Bonneville and Colorado cutthroat trout were petitioned for listing under the Endangered Species Act. Genetic testing to determine the purity of resident cutthroat trout is ongoing under an agreement with the State of Utah. In 1998 the Forest implemented restoration/enhancement activities on 3.5 miles of stream for fisheries habitat improvement. The Forest also conducted R1/R4 aquatic habitat inventory in Tie Fork, North Fork American Fork, Nebo, Wardsworth, Upper Diamond Fork, Halls Fork, Chase, Bennie, Vernon, Race Track, Layout, Low Pass, and S. Fork Currant Creeks. In addition, samples from cutthroat trout in Layout Creek were collected for DNA testing (to evaluate the purity of the populations there).</p> <p><b>1999:</b> In 1999 the Forest implemented restoration/fisheries habitat enhancement activities on 9.5 miles of stream. The Forest, in cooperation with adjoining Forests, initiated an analysis to identify Colorado and Bonneville cutthroat populations at risk. This effort was initiated in support of the Forest Plan revision effort. In addition, the Forest surveyed 13 streams for Bonneville cutthroat trout. No cutthroat trout were found in 7 of these streams (Jones Ranch, Frank Young, Shram, First Water, Dry, Mary Ellen Gulch, and South Fork American Fork Creeks). Cutthroat trout were found in the remaining 6 streams (Cottonwood, Little Diamond, S.Fork Deer, Peetetneet, R.Fork Peetetneet, and Wimmer Ranch Creeks) and samples were collected for DNA testing to evaluate their genetic purity. Except for Peetetneet Creek (found pure strand), results from the DNA tests are not yet returned from the laboratory.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> In 2000 the Forest completed fish habitat restoration/enhancement work on about thirteen miles of stream. Work continued on the viability assessment for the Forest Plan revision effort. No additional aquatic surveys or DNA testing was conducted.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p><b>SAGE GROUSE</b> (Sagebrush [old growth and successional])</p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> Populations of sage grouse are known to be on the Forest in the Vernon Unit of the Spanish Fork Ranger District and the Strawberry Valley area on the Heber Ranger District. The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) conducts annual population counts on leks in these areas. Habitat within Strawberry Valley was reduced significantly with the construction and recent expansion of Strawberry Reservoir. Historical range treatments (e.g., sagebrush and willow removal, rodent poisoning) may also have reduced populations.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> In response to concerns over the depressed sage grouse population in Strawberry Valley, a cooperative research study has been initiated. March 2000 marked the beginning of the third year of the study.</p> <p>Winter migratory areas were identified in 1999 and 2000 and winter habitat data were collected in these areas, as well as in Strawberry Valley. Sagebrush canopy cover (15%) and height (51 cm) in the migratory areas were within recommended levels. In Strawberry Valley, sagebrush canopy cover (13.4%) in sites where grouse were found fell within recommended levels (10-30%), but some other sites fell just short (9.92%). This is likely due to lack of site potential, rather than an actual lack of older sagebrush given the condition of a higher canopy cover throughout the valley. Summer habitat for grouse was also evaluated in 1998 and 1999. Habitat measurements fell within recommended levels; however, habitat in unoccupied areas displayed a lower forb component due to aggressive invasion of smooth brome.</p> <p>In 1999, 50 males were observed strutting at the Strawberry lek. In 2000, this dropped to 31 males. Through this study, grouse at Strawberry have been collared and monitored. This monitoring indicated that the non-native red fox is a major predator on this population. In response to this, Wildlife Services, at the request of UDWR, conducted red fox control on or near the lek (16 fox den entrances treated), and in the Chipman Creek area where a majority of the nesting and brood-rearing occurs (28 fox den entrances treated). These treatments appeared to be effective. Mortality of adult collared sage grouse dropped from 64 percent in 1999, to 27 percent in 2000. Similarly, brood counts increased from 0.27 chicks/hen in 1999 to 1.4 chicks/hen in 2000.</p> <p>The Vernon sage grouse population is not considered migratory, and has increased from approximately 20 males attending the Little Valley lek in 1998, to 50 males in 2000.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>With the increased concern on the species, the UDWR is developing a statewide conservation strategy to identify necessary protection measures. The Uinta NF has been participating in this effort. The majority of the habitat for the species occurs <u>off</u> of National Forest System lands in Utah.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> In cooperation with UDWR, the Forest developed, and is continuing to refine, maps delineating sage grouse habitat in Strawberry Valley and the Vernon Unit. About three acres of habitat improvement work were completed on the primary Strawberry Valley lek.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> About ten acres of sage grouse habitat improvement work was completed in Strawberry Valley.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> About 15 acres of sage grouse habitat improvement was completed in the Trout Creek area in Strawberry Valley.</p>
<p><b>THREE-TOED WOODPECKER</b> (Snags, old growth, or decadent conifer and aspen)</p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> On the Uinta National Forest, as elsewhere in Utah and the West, the three-toed woodpecker is dependent primarily on old growth spruce/fir forests, with population fluctuations tied to spruce beetle infestation levels. Three-toed woodpeckers will also utilize other coniferous forest types, particularly in other areas of Utah. Forested stands recently killed by fire are also prime habitat for the species. With increased concern for this species, project-specific surveys and mitigation began in 1990.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> This woodpecker’s status is unknown, and population levels may fluctuate locally and regionally in response to large insect epidemics. Regionally, breeding bird trend studies suggest that the species is stable or increasing throughout its range. Due to the presence of mature spruce/fir conditions throughout most of northern Utah, it is not likely that a lack of habitat is affecting this species or causing a downward trend.</p> <p>Three-toed woodpeckers have been observed (3 times during the 1997-2000 period) during annual breeding bird surveys conducted on the Forest. With the species' dependency on snags, old growth coniferous forests, and insect levels, it is not likely that past and current management activities have altered the habitat sufficiently to create species declines. Insect activity continues to increase and cycle on the Forest, providing forage and habitat.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p><b>MACROINVERTEBRATES</b> (Water quality, sedimentation production)</p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> Macroinvertebrate species such as mayfly (Ephemeroptera), caddisfly (Trichoptera), stonefly (Plecoptera), dobsonfly (Megaloptera), dragonfly (Odonata), water beetles (Coleoptera), wasps (Hymenoptera), and parasites (Diptera) are key elements in the food chain. These insects may be used as indicators of environmental quality. Collection and analysis of macroinvertebrate and water chemistry data is used for water quality monitoring.</p> <p>Macroinvertebrate data collected through 1994 indicated overall “stable” aquatic habitat conditions for 1978 through 1993. An exception to this exists in Strawberry Valley, where in 1990 Strawberry Reservoir and its tributaries were treated to eliminate undesirable fish species. Through 1993, 10 to 27 percent of the aquatic invertebrate taxa present before treatment were still missing. Through 1996, each Strawberry sampling station was still missing at least some taxa.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> Macroinvertebrate samples are collected annually (12 streams sampled in 1999, 38 in 2000) for analysis. The Forest has been in the process of changing laboratories used to analyze and evaluate the samples. As a result, only some of the samples collected during 1998-2000 have been analyzed, and the evaluation of the results has not yet been completed. Forest hydrologists and biologists expect the results of this information to indicate generally stable aquatic habitat conditions (similar to past results).</p>
<p><b>HABITAT DIVERSITY</b> (How is diversity affected by planned acts?)</p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> Ecosystems are described as being at their Properly Functioning Condition (PFC) when they are dynamic and resilient to disturbances in their structure, composition, and natural processes of their biological and physical components</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b>  <i>A Sub-Regional Assessment for Properly Functioning Conditions for Areas Encompassing the National Forests in Northern Utah</i> was completed in 1998 to evaluate PFC for various subject areas. This assessment identified subject areas and general locations at various stages of risk for significant loss, or at risk of losing structural and/or biological diversity. The following areas and general locations on the Uinta are at high risk: seral aspen in all areas, pinyon/juniper in the Bonneville Basin, riparian areas in the Wasatch Mountains and Bonneville Basin, aquatic habitats in the Bonneville Basin, and tall forb in the Wasatch Mountains. The following areas and locations within the Forest are at moderate to high risk: pinyon-juniper in the Wasatch Mountains, riparian in the Uinta Mountains, aquatic in the</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>Wasatch and Uinta Mountains, birchleaf mahogany in the Uinta Mountains, Douglas-fir in all areas, and white fir-spruce/fir in the Wasatch Mountains. These areas will require attention to ensure their sustainability within the landscape.</p> <p><b>Aquatic and riparian ecosystems</b> represent some of the most altered communities both on the Forest and throughout the West. Several known sensitive and rare species rely on aquatic systems including the spotted frog, boreal toad, spring snails, and amphibians. Monitoring indicates that even where standards and guidelines are being met, recovery is not occurring as quickly as was anticipated. Grazing activities (by both livestock and wildlife) tend to limit the rate at which these areas improve. This is true even in areas not grazed by domestic livestock. Recreation use in dispersed sites adjacent to or located within riparian areas also limits rate of improvement. The Forest has implemented numerous projects over the last several years to protect these sites and/or mitigate impacts from recreation, roads, and grazing activities.</p> <p>Many non-stream or lake related riparian areas have not been mapped or inventoried, and information on them is incomplete. Other than grazing utilization and trend studies, little monitoring for these types of impacts has been conducted.</p> <p>Forest monitoring shows riparian vegetation along many stream reaches to be in early seral condition. Trends are stable or upward on the majority of study sites, but some show declining conditions. Monitoring at Strawberry Valley, however, suggests that it may still take several decades to restore hydrologic function (e.g., narrow channels and raise water tables) so that riparian vegetation expands to reach across the valley floor as it once did.</p> <p><b>High elevation areas</b> are at potential risk from recreation use and grazing by wildlife. Little quantitative monitoring has been conducted to assess these impacts.</p> <p>The Forest contains numerous <b>caves and cliffs</b>, including 69 caves identified as significant in accordance with the Federal Cave Resources Protection Act of 1988. In addition to providing a unique recreation opportunity, many caves provide habitat for sensitive bat species. Some of these caves are popular attractions for recreationists, with the potential of adversely affecting the cave resources. Increasing recreational use of cliffs by climbers poses a threat to sensitive flora and fauna habitat.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>Prior to the introduction of domestic sheep, <b>tall forb dominated communities</b> were common on broad, open ridges and valleys at mid to high elevations (9,000 to 10,500 feet). Many portions of these areas have been invaded by species such as tarweed and western coneflower, which are difficult to control and have little forage value. It is unclear how extensive the loss of topsoil from these sites has been and how this has impacted the potential of the sites. Where indicator species are largely absent, attaining and/or maintaining soil stability under the existing desirable vegetation may be the most realistic long-term objective. Where tarweed dominates, even maintenance of soil stability may be difficult. Application of expensive rehabilitation measures may be an option in the future, but to date, treatments of heavy tarweed infestation have had limited success.</p> <p>Only 6,400 acres of <b>tall forb types</b> have been mapped on the Forest. In a few places, such as the cirque basins on Mount Timpanogos and the spiked sagebrush communities on Mount Nebo, this type likely resembles its historic structure (i.e., dominance by tall forb species). However, even on some of these sites, community composition still reflects impacts from past sheep grazing as evidenced by a preponderance of tall larkspur, a species poisonous to sheep. On these same sites, ground cover remains less than desired for this type. On the majority of sites once occupied by tall forbs, loss of soil and seed-source makes it difficult to evaluate current potential. Sites with at least some tall forb indicator species remaining (typically geranium) are managed to maintain an upward trend in order that composition may improve through time. Where indicator species are largely absent, attaining and/or maintaining soil stability under the existing desirable vegetation may be the most realistic long-term objective. Where tarweed dominates, even maintenance of soil stability may be difficult.</p> <p><b>Oak/maple stands</b> are generally mature and overmature across most of the Forest, as evidenced by buildups of leaf litter, dead branches within clones, and advanced stem age. Oak/maple stands are not believed to be at immediate risk due to these overmature conditions. Insects may temporarily weaken affected clones but outbreaks seem to be sporadic in time and space; however, the values associated with younger stands are certainly diminished and heavy fuel loads in mature and overmature stands pose a risk to public safety in urban interface areas. Understory diversity and cover has been reduced dramatically where cheatgrass and other exotic annuals occur. Treatment activities have been limited to prescribed burn projects in recent years, and some very limited mechanical treatments. Most</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>of these treatments have occurred along urban interface areas.</p> <p>Studies performed in this vegetation type across much of the Wasatch Mountains portion of the Forest showed stem ages exceeding 50 years in nearly 60 percent of the 145 plots sampled; 15 percent had stems older than 100 years. Fire ecologists believe that prior to European settlement crown fires burned in this type on a 20 to 50 year interval (fire ecologists refer to this as the mean fire return interval, meaning that any given acre burned, on average, once every 20 to 50 years). Stem ages suggest a much longer interval at present. Modeling of the current conditions shows that 6,000 to 12,000 acres would have to be burned annually for several decades to return oak to PFC across the Forest (i.e., to provide a balanced range of age and size classes), while 4,000 to 10,000 acres would need to burn annually to maintain PFC if it can be achieved.</p> <p><b>Pinyon/juniper</b> is believed to exceed its historic distribution by as much as 50 percent in the Great Basin. Heavy historic grazing and suppression of fire are thought to have contributed significantly to this trend. Existing pinyon/juniper stands are dominated by denser structural stages and are considered to be outside PFC. Grass and forb understory components are often substantially reduced and ground cover may not exceed 20 percent. In some areas, particularly in the Bonneville Basin, cheatgrass has become the dominant understory vegetation. On many sites erosion has accelerated and wildlife, watershed, and grazing values have been diminished. The fire regime has changed from that of more frequent, small, low intensity ground fires, which served to thin stands and eliminate tree recruitment into adjacent sagebrush, to large crown-carried fires. Vegetative cover types that have been reduced by this encroachment include sagebrush/grass, oak, and mountain brush.</p> <p>There is a preponderance of moderate to dense <b>sagebrush</b> across much of the Forest due to a dramatically decreased frequency of fire over the past decades. An exception is the Vernon area where fires during 1990 to 1995 burned more than 20 percent of the sagebrush type. In the Strawberry Valley area, almost three-fourths of 32,000 acres of sagebrush have canopy covers exceeding 15 to 18 percent. Based on a historic mean fire return interval of 20 to 40 years in sagebrush, it is estimated that at PFC 800 to 1600 acres in Strawberry Valley would burn (or be otherwise treated) annually. The diversity of understory species in sagebrush is less than desired across much of the Forest due to prolonged competition from sagebrush resulting from fire suppression and past heavy grazing, especially in the early 1900s. Competition from sagebrush may become detrimental to understory species at sagebrush</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>canopies as low as 13 to 15 percent. Most of the sagebrush types on the Forest can be expected to reach 15 percent canopy cover within 20 years after burning. Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) winter range monitoring includes nine studies located in sagebrush on the Forest. Trends for soil, browse, and herbaceous cover are generally static. Sagebrush plants on most sites are predominantly decadent, and recruitment of young plants is poor to fair. Cheatgrass is present on all sites, but is increasing on only one-half. Range studies conducted by the Forest on sagebrush sites on summer range show a variety of conditions. Sites with perennial grasses and forbs have generally shown good improvement, while conditions in those dominated by annual grasses and forbs tend to be static. Overall, sagebrush densities are heavy, with a preponderance of mature and decadent individuals. A detailed study of sagebrush communities at three sites in critical winter range along the Wasatch Front has shown accelerated decline in the vigor of sagebrush plants and little recruitment over the last eight years. Similar trends are seen inside and outside of fenced exclosures at each of the three sites.</p> <p>Many acres of mountain big sagebrush have been treated and replanted to crested and intermediate wheatgrasses or smooth brome. Where crested wheatgrass was planted, native species have begun to reestablish among the bunchgrasses. Smooth brome, and to some extent intermediate wheatgrass, is rhizomatous and forms dense stands that continue to exclude sagebrush and other native grasses and forbs 30 to 40 years after treatment. Where treatments have not occurred, sagebrush stands tend to be dominated by older individuals and have dense canopy cover. Understory species are often limited (presumably by competition for moisture from sagebrush roots in the interspaces between plants), ground cover is low, and soil erosion can be a problem on moderate slopes and/or naturally erosive soils. At lower to moderate elevations in the Bonneville Basin and Wasatch Mountains, pinyon/juniper types have spread into adjacent sagebrush communities as a result of over 100 years of fire suppression and heavy historic livestock grazing. On some of these sites the loss of understory diversity is substantial, soil seed reserves are depleted, and surface soil erosion is excessive. At lower to moderate elevations in the Bonneville Basin and Wasatch Mountains, pinyon/juniper types have spread into adjacent sagebrush communities as a result of over 100 years of fire suppression and heavy historic livestock grazing.</p> <p>In <b>cottonwood gallery forests</b>, trees are aging and recruitment of young trees is often inadequate to replace those individuals that die or must be removed for public safety. Poor</p>



ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>recruitment can result from different causes depending on the local situation: grazing, recreation use (both trampling and cutting), altered stream flow regimes, and diversions that seasonally reduce or eliminate surface flows may prevent establishment of seedlings. Grazing and recreation use can also impact understory development, reducing overall plant cover as well as species diversity. Exotic plants threaten to out-compete native riparian species where they become established. Tamarisk has replaced willows along thousands of miles of stream throughout the Southwest, and small infestations have been found in several drainages on the Forest in the last 5 to 10 years. Perennial pepperweed dominates banks along sections of the Spanish Fork River just below the Forest boundary, and is beginning to spread onto the Forest along Diamond Fork. Canada thistle already infests several thousand acres on the Forest; many of these acres are in riparian areas.</p> <p>Overall, 70 to 80 percent of <b>seral aspen stands</b> are mature or old, with understories ranging from very few trees to heavy encroachment of conifer according to the assessment. Many of these stands are mature or are becoming decadent. Currently 81 percent of the seral aspen is in the middle stages of succession to coniferous types based on the Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) data. The recent report, <i>Forest Resources of the Uinta National Forest</i>, states that approximately 39 percent of the historical levels of aspen have been replaced by conifer. Structural diversity is also lost as many of the aspen stands in mature and older classes dominate the area. Recent vegetation treatments (clearcut) totaling approximately 400 acres have occurred in the past ten years on the Heber Ranger District. An additional 300 acres are currently scheduled for treatment. Most of the treated areas have regenerated well and are now supporting sapling size stands. Minor portions of some regeneration treatment areas have experienced heavy sheep and elk use shortly after harvest and have regenerated poorly or not at all; however, the stands as a whole have met successful regeneration standards.</p> <p>Analysis of 1995 FIA data indicates about 285,350 acres of the Uinta were formerly <b>aspen</b>. The same inventory found only 174,450 acres to be considered aspen today. This indicates an ongoing loss of the aspen type on the Forest. PFC analyses have recognized this, and have identified aspen as at risk. The risk of losing seral aspen is high. The risk of losing the stable aspen type is low; however, some individual clones are at risk of being lost as the overstories decline, and regeneration is continually impacted by ungulate grazing. Elk, in addition to livestock, are cited in the Wasatch Mountains PFC Assessment as posing a potential threat to regeneration success. As herd sizes increase, so does the grazing</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>pressure on young aspen sprouts.</p> <p><b>Stable aspen stands</b> occur mostly in the lower elevations and/or on the drier, south facing sites and exhibit little to no conifer encroachment. Some of the stands that the Wasatch Mountains PFC Assessment discusses are currently demonstrating the ability to regenerate without disturbance and may even form uneven-aged stands. According to the Wasatch Mountains PFC Assessment, many of the stable stands are declining; however, if released from grazing pressure and stimulated by fire, these stands may regenerate by sprouting. The risk of losing the stable aspen type is low; however, some individual clones are at risk of being lost as the overstories decline, and regeneration is continually impacted by ungulate grazing. Elk, in addition to livestock, are cited in the Wasatch Mountains PFC Assessment as posing a potential threat to regeneration success. As herd sizes increase, so does the grazing pressure on young aspen sprouts.</p> <p><b>Douglas-fir/white fir stands</b> have been subject to high levels of insect and disease outbreaks. Stands on the Spanish Fork Ranger District have experienced high levels of mortality from the fir engraver beetle, western balsam bark beetle, and Douglas-fir bark beetle, particularly in the Hobble Creek and Payson Canyon areas. Occurrences of dwarf mistletoes in Douglas-fir are also high in the White River and other drainages. The risk for losses in this type is moderate to high. Large woody fuel buildup due to bark beetle mortality combined with a predominance of white fir in the understory has created a condition where fires may be outside the historic range of variability, becoming catastrophic. These fires may in some cases lead to long-term conversion of these sites to oak and mountain brush types.</p> <p>Most of the <b>spruce/fir stands</b> are mid-aged to mature. Some areas harvested in the 1940s and 1950s have developed into thick sapling size stands, predominantly of subalpine fir. Since clearcut logging is not practiced in the spruce type, there are few seedling size stands on the Forest. Many of these older post WWII era (1940 through 1960) clearcut logging sites have regenerated poorly. Many harvested stands with mid-aged overstories do have some seedling and sapling spruce in the understory. There is low risk of losing the Engelmann spruce/subalpine fir type. Further spruce beetle activity may change structure and composition of stands. As the older spruce are killed, they are likely to be replaced by fir where it is dominant in the understory. Fire could replace some stands; however, the occurrence is unlikely due to current suppression tactics. A subalpine fir beetle epidemic</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>could change composition. Spruce beetle infestations would continue in areas with high basal area and large diameter trees. A basal area of greater than 110, and 20 inches Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) are the approximate thresholds for potential infestation. This, in conjunction with harvesting practices, would likely continue to provide regeneration and an increase in younger aged stands.</p> <p>The PFC assessments conducted for the Wasatch and Uinta Mountains estimated that in <b>spruce/fir, Douglas-fir/white fir, and aspen communities</b>, more than 40 percent of these areas are comprised of mature and old trees. As much as 85 to 90 percent may be mature and decadent in some cases. This would indicate that over the ecological region there is no lack of old growth in these types, particularly given the steep terrain of some areas and wilderness designations that have prevented harvesting in other areas. There has also been greater fire suppression, reducing the amount of young stands created. This would indicate that there is in fact a lack of young stands to provide mosaics of vegetative diversity. For the past two decades, there has been reduced timber harvesting activity throughout the region, allowing more mature conditions to persist. This regional assessment appears to hold true for the Uinta NF as well. A 1999 analysis estimated the availability or potential for old growth within the spruce/fir communities. No analysis has been done in the Douglas-fir/white fir or aspen types, but it may be assumed that a similar history and distribution occurs.</p> <p>The FIA data, however, shows that of 21 plots conducted on the Forest in the <b>spruce/fir type</b>, only one (4 percent of the area represented by the plots) has a stand age greater than 120 years old. Similarly, an inventory conducted for the North Heber District Landscape Assessment revealed that approximately 5 percent of the spruce/fir in that area could be classified as old growth according to Intermountain Region criteria, though the inventory did not look at all areas within the watersheds with possible old growth. With regard to the configuration of the spruce/fir vegetation, a review of a vegetation map shows a naturally fragmented occurrence throughout the Forest. Harvesting activities have not changed the distribution of the spruce/fir, but rather its structure. In summary, there appears to be adequate mature and old spruce/fir on the Forest to meet a 10 percent old growth requirement. However, areas that have experienced historic and current harvesting activities may not have adequate amounts remaining.</p> <p>Several small, isolated groves of <b>naturally occurring ponderosa pine</b> occur on the Forest,</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>intermixed with white fir, Douglas-fir, and Gambel oak on white fir habitat types. Natural regeneration is occurring in these stands.</p> <p>The 1984 Forest Plan contains direction to retain at least 10 percent of the forest types in an <b>old growth</b> condition. Since the Forest Plan was developed, the Intermountain Region of the Forest Service developed definitions of “old growth” for several forest types. The Uinta National Forest has not been inventoried to determine which lands meet this definition. Analysis of 1995 FIA data estimated the acreage of "mature" forest (stands over 100 years of age) on the Uinta, but did not make specific determinations for old growth. Many of these “mature” stands on the Uinta may indeed be old growth. According to this inventory, about 85,000 acres (23 percent) of the 377,651 acres of forest on the Uinta is “mature.” Although the data and analysis does not indicate the acreage of “mature” forest that meets the definitions of old growth, it is probable that the acreage is well above the 10 percent Forest Plan requirement. Due to past fire suppression, this percentage, and the amount of old growth, may also be higher than occurred historically. Fire suppression effects have been offset, to a limited degree, by pre-1990s harvests. Current management prescriptions may be promoting old growth development in spruce/fir.</p>
<p><b>FISH/RIPARIAN HABITAT</b> (Is fish/riparian habitat being maintained or lost?)</p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> Aquatic environments represent some of the most altered communities on the Forest and throughout the West. Much of the aquatic diversity present at the beginning of the century has been lost due to habitat loss from water diversions and reservoirs. Water diversions and dams that collect and distribute water for agriculture and municipal uses have resulted in serious water losses from individual streams and drainages. Impacts from the development of dams and diversions on the Forest include significant stream fragmentation, particularly in alluvial reaches where the stream leaves the high gradient canyons. De-watered reaches, culverts, and other barriers have reduced the amount of habitat, habitat accessibility, and limited ease of movement through most stream systems within the Forest.</p> <p>The 1984 Forest Plan contains no specific direction for management of aquatic ecosystems other than the riparian section of the Rangeland Ecosystem Amendment. Rangeland Ecosystem Amendment direction focuses on the management of streamside vegetation.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> Riparian monitoring has been conducted primarily through use of transects. These transects monitor vegetative conditions. There are about 75 such transects on the Forest, and measurements are scheduled every five years. Monitoring</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>suggests that in most cases standards are being met and the areas are meeting or progressing toward the desired condition. Monitoring also indicates that recovery is not occurring as quickly as was anticipated, even where standards and guidelines are being met. This is true even in areas not grazed by domestic livestock. Some stream channel inventories have also been conducted.</p> <p>Diseases from introduced fish have contributed to the decline in native cutthroat trout. Predation, competition, and hybridization from introduced aquatic species are also factors in the decline of native fish, amphibians, and mollusks. The loss of most native aquatic species has led to an increase in the diversity of non-native fish and amphibians that have prospered from reservoir development. Increases in water flows from trans-basin diversions have degraded stream and riparian habitat in Sixth Water Creek, Diamond Fork Creek, and the Spanish Fork River. Habitat altered by dams and diversions has also changed the composition and distribution of aquatic insects (macroinvertebrates) and mollusks.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> About 3.5 miles of stream improvement and 23 acres of lake improvement (mostly Payson Lakes) were completed on the Forest. Improvements consisted of riparian shrub and tree plantings, lake access hardening, and rock and log structures placements.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Approximately 8.5 miles of stream improvement (mostly in 6<sup>th</sup> Water Creek) and 0 acres of lake improvement were completed on the Forest. Improvements consisted primarily of riparian shrub and tree plantings, streambank stabilization, and rock and log placements. In addition, about 7 miles of stream were inventoried.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> On the Uinta NF, about 6 miles of stream improvement (mostly in Trout Creek, Little Provo Deer Creek, and Diamond Fork) and 0 acres of lake improvement were completed. Improvements included riparian shrub and tree plantings and streambank stabilization. In addition, about 12.5 miles of stream (Willow Creek-upper Strawberry River, American Fork River, White River) were inventoried.</p>
<p><b>UTE LADIES'-TRESSES</b></p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> Populations of Ute ladies'-tresses (ULT) are found in a few locations in Utah and Wasatch Counties, including sites within the Provo, American Fork, and Spanish Fork River drainages. The species occurs elsewhere in the state, as well as in Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and western Nebraska. A draft recovery plan has been</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>developed for the species. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is in the process of completing a status review for this species.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> The only known occurrences of ULT on the Uinta National Forest are along Diamond Fork, with adjacent populations located just off-forest along Spanish Fork River. Extensive surveys have failed to locate it elsewhere on the Forest. In the Diamond Fork drainage, 60 “colonies” have been identified, each occurring on a distinct depositional (flood-created) surface. In 1998, a year of record flowering in Diamond Fork, extensive survey resulted in a population estimate of 16,500 flowering individuals in these colonies. Based on population estimates and acres of occupied habitat, the Diamond Fork complex is the largest along the Wasatch Front (the six other occurrences total less than 1,000 flowering individuals) and one of the largest, most concentrated occurrences throughout the species’ range. Diamond Fork/Spanish Fork contains nearly one-quarter of the less than 60,000 flowering individuals believed to represent the total Ute ladies’-tresses population in 1999. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service considers this population to be one of the most valuable metapopulations range-wide, and as such it is a high priority for conservation and protection.</p> <p>In 2000, the Forest helped fund a study to identify the insect species most important in pollinating the ULT. The Forest also placed down woody debris on about 7 acres in the Diamond Fork drainage to improve habitat important for the primary ULT pollinators.</p>
<p><b>CLAY PHACELIA</b></p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> The endangered clay phacelia is endemic to Spanish Fork Canyon on substrates derived from shales of the Green River Formation. The plant occurs on steep, sparsely vegetated slopes among mountain brush and pinyon/juniper communities, at elevations from 5,900 to 6,500 feet. No populations are known to occur on the Forest, but they do occur adjacent to it, within a few hundred yards of the boundary. Potential habitat exists on the Forest, as confirmed by a study comparing soils, vegetation, and physical parameters on potential sites on the Forest with occupied sites.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> Surveys for the species were conducted on the Forest in conjunction with the study mentioned above, as well as with several project-specific analyses with no plants found. The Utah Natural Heritage Program also conducted surveys of the Forest and found no plants on National Forest System lands. There is an approved recovery plan for clay phacelia, and the Uinta National Forest participates actively in recovery</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	efforts, both as a member of the recovery team and in implementing recovery tasks.
RANGE MANAGEMENT	
<p><b>FORAGE UTILIZATION AND TIMING OF USE</b> (Is forage utilization and time of use sustainable while maintaining or trending toward DFC?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> In 1993 the Forest Plan Rangeland Amendment was approved. This amendment established forage utilization standards for livestock use in riparian areas, uplands, big game winter range, aspen sites, and degraded ridgetops. These standards are described in terms of stubble height, and percent utilization. The Forest Plan also prescribes use of a rest-rotation management system.</p> <p>Implementation of the various grazing management strategies employed on the Forest provides periodic rest during the growing season to each portion of an allotment. No year-round grazing occurs on the Forest. Each grazing permit prescribes a grazing season. However, the actual date when livestock enter an allotment only occurs after a Forest Service range management specialist judges the range to be ready. Similarly, the exit date may be moved forward if grazing utilization levels are reached.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> The Forest does not measure the actual weight of vegetation grown or consumed at specific sites on the Forest. However, each allotment is monitored for utilization in regards to stubble height, and monitored ocularly in regards to percent utilization. This monitoring is done as part of the ongoing permit administration. In 1994 forage conditions were monitored on about 81 percent of the allotments. The monitoring indicated approximately 8 percent of the rangelands were meeting DFC, 90 percent were moving towards DFC, and 2 percent were not moving towards DFC. Monitoring in 1995 to 1996 yielded similar results.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> Funding levels limited the amount and intensity of rangeland monitoring and permit administration. Nine allotments were administered to standard (utilization monitored, and all necessary permit actions taken). Less formal and intensive monitoring, and a lower standard of administration occurred on the remainder of the allotments. This monitoring found that utilization was generally within prescribed limits, though there were some localized problem areas. These problem areas occur where livestock distribution was inadequate, or in some cases, where additional heavy use by wildlife occurs.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> In 1999, fifteen allotments were administered to standard. Less formal, intensive</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>monitoring and administration occurred on the remainder of the allotments. The results of this administration and associated monitoring were similar to those for 1998. Monitoring occurred on about 54 percent of NFS lands within active grazing allotments on the Forest. About 95 percent of the lands monitored were judged to be meeting or moving toward forest plan objectives.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> In 2000, seven allotments were administered to standard. Less formal, intensive monitoring and administration occurred on the remainder of the allotments. Monitoring occurred on about 11 percent of NFS lands within active grazing allotments on the Forest. About 97 percent of the lands monitored were judged to be meeting or moving toward forest plan objectives.</p>
<p><b>CONDITION AND TREND OF SUITABLE RANGELAND AND RANGELANDS IN NEED OF REHABILITATION</b> (Management affect on Condition and Trend)</p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> In 1993 the Forest Plan Rangeland Amendment was approved. This amendment defined Desired Future Conditions for riparian areas, uplands, big game winter range, aspen sites, and degraded ridgetops. Riparian area and big game winter range condition and trend are addressed in separate monitoring items.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> In 1994, 54 rangeland condition and trend studies were completed that showed range trends were static or upward for most sites. Range conditions on allotments were generally moving toward Desired Future Conditions (DFC), especially in upper elevation aspen. Shrubs were generally in an upward trend, ground cover was improving, but late seral forbs were still uncommon. In 1995 and 1996, data was collected for 27 study sites, with conditions similar to the 1994 observations.</p> <p>Eight trend studies in wildland fire burn areas were evaluated in 1997. This study found that the post-burn seeding that had been done was successful.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> No rangeland vegetation studies were completed in 1998.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Vegetation monitoring was conducted at 15 sites on the Forest. Conditions were judged as follows: 5 in early seral, 6 in mid-seral, and 1 at potential natural condition (PNC). Two of the sites had no PNC against which to compare. Trend was observed at four sites, two had a stable trend and two a downward trend. The downward trends were tied to an increase in smooth brome, which is a good soil stabilizer but tends to eliminate other vegetation in the</p>



ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>area. This reduces species diversity, resulting in lower condition classifications.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Vegetation monitoring was conducted on five upland vegetation sites. Conditions for these sites were classified as early to mid-seral. Vegetative trends were identified at 3 sites: up at 1 site, stable at another site, and downward at a third site. The downward trend occurred where the grass component had increased and resulted in a decrease in the forb component.</p>
<p><b>HABITAT DIVERSITY</b> (Conserved By Management Prescription)</p>	<p>See “Habitat diversity” under the “Wildlife, Fish, and Biotic Resources” section.</p>
<p><b>CARRYING CAPACITY</b> (AUMs) (Is supply being maintained?)</p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> Carrying capacity is a function of many factors including the weather, acreage available for grazing, vegetation type and condition, utilization standards, livestock type, availability of water, and livestock management practices. The Uinta NF monitors carrying capacity by considering vegetation use and trend for existing stocking levels and seasons of use, rather than measuring forage production and calculating a theoretical carrying capacity.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> Demand for forage for cattle on the Forest exceeds supply. This is evidenced by numerous annual requests for additional grazing on the Forest. Demand for forage for sheep is less than supply as evidenced by vacant allotments, allotments in temporary non-use, and requests for conversions from sheep to cattle.</p> <p>The Forest does not measure the actual weight of vegetation grown or consumed at specific sites on the Forest. However, estimates of site production data is available from other sources (e.g. NRCS soil survey publications). Except for some abnormally dry or wet weather years, monitoring indicates that the forage utilization is nearing the established standards when planned grazing ends (i.e. there is not a lot of unused forage, grazing utilization standards have not been exceeded, and livestock have not had to be removed early because forage consumption has reached utilization limits). This indicates the amount of livestock use is within the carrying capacity of the land.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> In 1998 a bill was enacted which exchanged certain surface and mineral rights between the U.S. Government and the State of Utah. This land exchange resulted in transfer of six grazing allotments encompassing approximately 10,400 acres of land to the Uinta NF.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>There were 73 active grazing allotments on the Forest. Twenty-four of these (not including the 42,980 acres of Strawberry Project lands as an allotment) were cattle allotments, and 49 were sheep allotments. During 1998, a permittee waived his grazing permit back to the government for 2 sheep allotments in the Mt. Timpanogos area. These permits continue to be vacant, and this is unlikely to change in the short-term considering the economic conditions the sheep industry is facing. In addition, bighorn sheep have recently been reintroduced onto Mount Timpanogos and potential conflicts between bighorns and domestic sheep would have to be evaluated before domestic sheep grazing could be reauthorized on these 2 allotments. These allotments encompass about 12,400 acres. In addition, Strawberry Water Users also inquired about the possibility of returning grazing to the Strawberry Project lands. This was denied due to incomplete recovery of these lands.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> There were 71 active grazing allotments, encompassing about 677,600 acres, on the Uinta NF. In addition, there are 2 vacant sheep allotments encompassing about 12,400 acres. Some permittees requested conversion of sheep permits to cattle permits, but no permanent changes were approved. In addition, Strawberry Water Users also inquired about the possibility of returning grazing to the Strawberry Project lands. This was denied due to incomplete recovery of these lands.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> There were 71 active grazing allotments, and 2 vacant sheep allotments on the Uinta NF. The 71 allotments are utilized by 152 permittees. Some permittees requested conversion of sheep permits to cattle permits, but no permanent changes were approved. In addition, Strawberry Water Users also inquired about the possibility of returning grazing to the Strawberry Project lands. This was denied due to incomplete recovery of these lands.</p> <p>The 71 allotments support about 100,255 animal unit months (AUMs) of livestock grazing. In addition, about 35,500 AUMs of forage are utilized by wild ungulates (based on estimated herd unit population numbers of elk/deer/moose, and the average amount of time spent utilizing forage on the Uinta National Forest), totaling approximately 135,755 AUMs of use across the entire Forest.</p>
<p><b>RIPARIAN ECOLOGICAL STATUS</b> (Effect of range management on attainment of riparian resources'</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> In 1993 the Forest Plan Rangeland Amendment was approved. This amendment placed an increased emphasis on management of activities within riparian areas,</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
DFCs?)	<p>defined DFCs for riparian areas, and outlined time frames for meeting objectives for overall improvement and meeting the DFCs.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Forest monitoring shows riparian vegetation along many stream reaches to be in early seral condition. Many of these sites are occupied by <i>Poa pratensis</i> (Kentucky bluegrass). This is an early seral species that provides good soil cover and protection. Trends are stable or upward on the majority of study sites, but some show declining conditions. Continued grazing by livestock and elk is believed to slow the rate of improvement in some areas, while heavy recreation use has similar impacts in and near developed and popular dispersed recreation sites. Where grazing has been removed and recreational access to stream banks limited (as in Strawberry Valley), recovery of stream bank vegetation has been more rapid. Monitoring at Strawberry Valley, however, suggests that it may still take several decades to restore hydrologic function (i.e., narrow channels and raise water tables) so that riparian vegetation expands to reach across the valley floor as it once did. The Forest has implemented numerous projects over the last several years to protect these sites from recreation, road, and grazing impacts.</p> <p>Each year, some of the riparian studies are conducted. Several study sites are located to monitor conditions in problem areas, and these are not representative of the surrounding area. Two riparian studies were read in 1998, twenty-two in 1999, and five in 2000. Data indicates that 55 percent of the greenlines (first vegetation encountered from the water course) studied, and 67 percent of those within areas grazed by livestock, are in mid-seral or later ecological condition. About 43 percent have a stable or upward trend. Monitoring indicates that even where standards and guidelines are being met, recovery is not occurring as quickly as was anticipated. This is true even in areas not grazed by domestic livestock, or heavily impacted by wildlife or recreation use.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> Other than as described above, no riparian monitoring was completed in 1998.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Rangeland management specialists assessed riparian conditions on about 81 percent of the riparian areas within active allotments. This monitoring judged about 90 percent of the riparian areas monitored to be at, or moving toward DFC.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Rangeland management specialists assessed riparian conditions on about 17 percent</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>of the riparian areas within active allotments. This monitoring judged about 94 percent of the riparian areas monitored to be at, or moving toward DFC.</p>
<p><b>BIG GAME WINTER RANGE ECOLOGICAL STATUS</b> (Vegetation condition?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> In 1993 the Forest Plan Rangeland Amendment was approved. This amendment defined Desired Future Conditions for big game winter range. Big game winter range has been mapped by the UDWR. Most big game winter range on the Forest, and especially along the Wasatch Front, is not within livestock grazing allotments.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) monitors big game winter range trends Statewide, including several plots on the Uinta NF. The Uinta NF annually contributes funding toward this effort. Each plot is reread every five years. Those on the Uinta were last read in 1997; however, the findings were not available until 1998. This monitoring indicates winter range conditions, especially along the Wasatch Front, are less than desired. Many factors likely contribute to this. These include the ever-increasing rapid urbanization of traditional winter range areas, increasingly concentrated use by wildlife, increasing decadence and limited reproduction of several shrub species, invasion by exotic plant species, and impacts due to recreation, particularly off-highway vehicle use.</p> <p>The Uinta NF has partnered with the Forest Service Shrub Laboratory in conducting a detailed study of sagebrush communities at three paired (fenced/unfenced and accessible to wildlife ungulates) sites in critical winter range along the Wasatch Front. This study, last read in 1998, has shown accelerated decline in the vigor of sagebrush plants and little recruitment over the last eight years. Similar trends are seen inside and outside of fenced exclosures at the three sites, but more seedlings and young have been observed within the fenced plots.</p>
<p><b>TIMBER MANAGEMENT</b></p>	
<p><b>LAND SUITABILITY CLASS</b> (Are non-suitable lands now suitable?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The Forest Plan allocated 20,900 acres of the Uinta NF as suited for timber management. These include 15,800 acres of conifer and 5,100 acres of aspen, mostly in the Heber Management Area.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> All harvest activities, regardless of the purpose and need, are limited to those areas that are available and considered appropriate for timber harvest. Harvest activities on the Uinta NF have generally been initiated to address a variety of non-timber production needs including watershed health, forest ecosystem health, wildlife habitat needs, and aspen regeneration. Producing wood products has not been a primary</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS																																		
	emphasis for timber management on the Uinta NF. During 1998-2000, no adjustments to timber suitability classification were identified as needed, and no changes were made.																																		
<p><b>TIMBER RESOURCE SALE SCHEDULE</b> (Do timber sales meet ASQ and TSPQ?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Management of timber resources has been focused on meeting a variety of needs including watershed health, forest ecosystem health, wildlife habitat needs, and aspen regeneration. Producing wood products has not been a primary emphasis for timber management on the Uinta NF.</p> <p>The Forest Plan established an “Allowable Sale Quantity” or ASQ of an average of 1.9 million board feet (MMBF)/year over the planning period. For the first planning period (1981-1990), the Forest sold an average of 1.735 MMBF chargeable against the ASQ. This was equivalent to 91 percent of the ASQ. The second planning period runs from 1991-2000. In addition to a demand and projected output for commercial sales of sawtimber, the Forest Plan anticipated a significant demand for fuelwood and contained an objective of selling 9 MMBF (18,000 cords) annually.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> The total volume of timber offered for sale averaged 3.281 MMBF over the 1991-2000 planning period. Market conditions have not changed substantially since 1984 when demand was listed at 6 MMBF per year. Purchasers continue to be locally owned, small, family-operated mills. Mill capacity for the four primary purchasers of Uinta NF sawtimber is between 6 and 10 MMBF.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Timber Products Sold On the Uinta NF</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="711 1013 1932 1399"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="711 1013 957 1182">Year</th> <th data-bbox="957 1013 1199 1182">Total Sawtimber Offered (MMBF)</th> <th data-bbox="1199 1013 1442 1182">Sawtimber Offered - Chargeable Toward ASQ (MMBF)</th> <th data-bbox="1442 1013 1684 1182">Fuelwood Sold (Cords)</th> <th data-bbox="1684 1013 1932 1182">Christmas Tree Permits Sold (number of trees)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="711 1182 957 1214">1991-1997</td> <td data-bbox="957 1182 1199 1214">22.184</td> <td data-bbox="1199 1182 1442 1214">8.916</td> <td data-bbox="1442 1182 1684 1214">13,048</td> <td data-bbox="1684 1182 1932 1214">14,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="711 1214 957 1247">1998</td> <td data-bbox="957 1214 1199 1247">6.534</td> <td data-bbox="1199 1214 1442 1247">2.591</td> <td data-bbox="1442 1214 1684 1247">840</td> <td data-bbox="1684 1214 1932 1247">1500</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="711 1247 957 1279">1999</td> <td data-bbox="957 1247 1199 1279">0.661</td> <td data-bbox="1199 1247 1442 1279">0.584</td> <td data-bbox="1442 1247 1684 1279">728</td> <td data-bbox="1684 1247 1932 1279">1500</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="711 1279 957 1312">2000</td> <td data-bbox="957 1279 1199 1312">3.434</td> <td data-bbox="1199 1279 1442 1312">1.541</td> <td data-bbox="1442 1279 1684 1312">648</td> <td data-bbox="1684 1279 1932 1312">1661</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="711 1312 957 1399">Total for Planning Period</td> <td data-bbox="957 1312 1199 1399">32.813</td> <td data-bbox="1199 1312 1442 1399">13.632</td> <td data-bbox="1442 1312 1684 1399">15,264</td> <td data-bbox="1684 1312 1932 1399">19,161</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Year	Total Sawtimber Offered (MMBF)	Sawtimber Offered - Chargeable Toward ASQ (MMBF)	Fuelwood Sold (Cords)	Christmas Tree Permits Sold (number of trees)	1991-1997	22.184	8.916	13,048	14,500	1998	6.534	2.591	840	1500	1999	0.661	0.584	728	1500	2000	3.434	1.541	648	1661	Total for Planning Period	32.813	13.632	15,264	19,161
Year	Total Sawtimber Offered (MMBF)	Sawtimber Offered - Chargeable Toward ASQ (MMBF)	Fuelwood Sold (Cords)	Christmas Tree Permits Sold (number of trees)																															
1991-1997	22.184	8.916	13,048	14,500																															
1998	6.534	2.591	840	1500																															
1999	0.661	0.584	728	1500																															
2000	3.434	1.541	648	1661																															
Total for Planning Period	32.813	13.632	15,264	19,161																															

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS				
	Planning Period Annual Average	3.281	1.363	1,526	1,916
<p><b>TIMBER HARVEST AREA</b> (Are harvest areas in compliance with Forest Plan/R4 standards?)</p>	<p>Fuelwood demand has dropped substantially and over the last three years has ranged between 648 to 840 cords per year (0.324 to 0.420 MMBF/year). Supplies have been primarily provided by the Heber Ranger District through collection of dead and down material and utilization of logging debris. Currently, the fuelwood supply is limited by access, but is adequate to meet or exceed demand. Demand over the next few years for fuelwood is expected to stay at about this level.</p> <p>Christmas tree permits have historically only been issued on the Heber Ranger District. Commercial Christmas tree sales are not offered on the Forest. Personal-use Christmas tree permits are offered. Demand for these permits remains extremely high and permits are sold-out within a few hours of going on sale.</p> <p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Monitoring harvest area size is required under the National Forest Management Act. Clearcuts larger than 40 acres in size must be approved by the Regional Forester.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Timber harvest areas complied with all Forest Plan standards. No clearcuts were conducted on the Uinta NF during 1998–2000 (see the table in the following section). No even-age harvests (i.e. clearcut or shelterwood cuts) exceeded 40 acres in size. The total acreage harvested each year is listed below.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> Harvest activities were conducted on approximately 342 acres. All of these were regeneration harvests with 316 acres of selection cuts and 24 acres of shelterwood cuts.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Harvest activities were conducted on approximately 450 acres. Of this, only 34 acres were regeneration treatments (shelterwood cuts), the remainder were sanitation-salvage harvests of insect impacted trees.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Harvest activities were conducted on approximately 195 acres. Of this, about 104 acres (all selection cuts) were regeneration treatments, the remainder were sanitation-salvage harvests of insect impacted trees.</p>				

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS																																				
<p><b>SILVICULTURAL PRACTICES</b> (Are silvicultural practices in compliance with Forest Plan management direction?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The Forest Plan identifies even-aged silviculture for managing timber resources. This has been applied for species that are typically even-aged such as aspen and lodgepole pine. However, most of the timber harvest has occurred in typically uneven-aged spruce/fir stands. Uneven-age silvicultural systems such as single and group selection have been the harvest methods of choice in these stands.</p> <p>The Forest Plan recognized there would be a need to precommercially thin nonmerchantable timber stands to improve their health and vigor. Similarly, The Forest Plan recognized that reforestation activities would be needed. The Forest Plan projected an average of 50 acres per year of each of these treatments would be needed.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> A variety of harvest methods have been employed on the Forest. Between 1998 and 2000 timber harvest on the Uinta NF focused on salvage and insect infestation risk reduction in uneven-aged spruce-fir stands. This is reflected in the types of harvest methods employed.</p> <p>The Forest has emphasized natural regeneration and only planted when natural regeneration is not expected to be successful. This is reflected in the following table. Precommercial thinning and release treatments have been emphasized in recent years, due to a backlog of needs and availability of funding. The goal of these thinnings has been to release trees for better growth, and improve forest health.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Acres of Commercial Timber Harvest by Harvest Method</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="844 1079 1799 1401"> <thead> <tr> <th>Harvest Type\Year</th> <th>1998</th> <th>1999</th> <th>2000</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Clearcut</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shelterwood Harvest</td> <td>26</td> <td>34</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Selection Harvest</td> <td>316</td> <td>0</td> <td>104</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Intermediate Thinning</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sanitation-Salvage</td> <td>0</td> <td>416</td> <td>91</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Commercial Harvest</b></td> <td><b>342</b></td> <td><b>450</b></td> <td><b>195</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Precommercial Thinning/Release</td> <td>85</td> <td>424</td> <td>185</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Site Preparation for Natural Regeneration</td> <td>294</td> <td>74</td> <td>226</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Harvest Type\Year	1998	1999	2000	Clearcut	0	0	0	Shelterwood Harvest	26	34	0	Selection Harvest	316	0	104	Intermediate Thinning	0	0	0	Sanitation-Salvage	0	416	91	<b>Total Commercial Harvest</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>195</b>	Precommercial Thinning/Release	85	424	185	Site Preparation for Natural Regeneration	294	74	226
Harvest Type\Year	1998	1999	2000																																		
Clearcut	0	0	0																																		
Shelterwood Harvest	26	34	0																																		
Selection Harvest	316	0	104																																		
Intermediate Thinning	0	0	0																																		
Sanitation-Salvage	0	416	91																																		
<b>Total Commercial Harvest</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>195</b>																																		
Precommercial Thinning/Release	85	424	185																																		
Site Preparation for Natural Regeneration	294	74	226																																		

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS			
	Tree Planting	0	0	0
<p><b>REFORESTATION – ADEQUATE RESTOCKING WITHIN FIVE YEARS OF HARVEST</b> (Timber sale area compliance?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Tree survival is monitored (i.e. survival surveys) the first and third year following planting to determine if an adequate number of planted trees survived to meet Forest and Regional standards for stocking (i.e. minimum number of trees/acres). On harvest units that are not planted, regeneration surveys are conducted the third and fifth year after harvest to determine if naturally regenerated stands meet Forest and Regional standards. Both natural and artificial regeneration methods are utilized on the Forest, with natural regeneration methods emphasized due to economic considerations.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Monitoring indicates harvested stands have been regenerated in accordance with National Forest Management Act (NFMA) requirements.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> In 1998, 368 acres of stands that had been harvested and had mechanical site preparation were certified as meeting regional and Forest Plan standards for stocking. As noted in the previous section, site preparation to achieve natural regeneration was completed on 294 acres.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> The 1999 SILVA Report indicates no survival or regeneration surveys were completed, and no stands were certified as stocked. Site preparation to achieve natural regeneration was completed on 74 acres (see the preceding section).</p> <p><b>2000:</b> The 2000 SILVA Report indicates no survival or regeneration surveys were completed, and no stands were certified as stocked. Site preparation to achieve natural regeneration was completed on 226 acres (see the preceding section).</p>			
<p><b>INSECT AND DISEASE ACTIVITY</b> (Maintain numbers within endemic proportions?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Insects and diseases are disturbance agents that are often beneficial. Many different insect and disease species have been noted on the Forest, including bark beetles, defoliators (both insect and diseases), stem decay fungi, root disease organisms, and dwarf mistletoes. The most significant disturbance agents have been the bark beetles, Mormon crickets, and dwarf mistletoes.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Since 1981 there have been two major outbreaks of bark beetles in northern Utah, the first peaking in 1983 (the mountain pine beetle) and the second between 1993 and 1995 (the mountain pine, Douglas-fir, and fir engraver beetles).</p>			



ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS								
	<p>The mountain pine beetle outbreak mortality was limited to about 1,000 trees on the Forest, but the Douglas-fir and fir engraver beetle outbreaks have been much more significant. The 1995 outbreak of these insects resulted in the death of approximately 120,000 trees on the Forest. A 1993 forest inventory indicated that mortality exceeded growth for subalpine fir.</p> <p>Endemic levels of fir engraver beetle were exceeded in the mid-1990s, and spurred an increase in salvage harvest operations to address forest health concerns and limit further expansion of the insect outbreaks. Recent regional monitoring of these insects indicates that the subalpine fir mortality is still above endemic levels, but has tapered off in extent of impact on forested stands. Spruce beetle is still active, and is increasing, particularly on the northern end of the Heber Ranger District.</p> <p>Large epidemic populations of Mormon crickets, a species native to western North America, periodically develop in the Great Basin area. This includes the area encompassing the Vernon Unit of the Uinta NF.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> In 1998, a large epidemic of Mormon crickets developed in the area encompassing the Vernon Unit. Approximately 30,000 acres of Tooele County were infested and about 1,100 acres, including some on the Uinta NF, were treated to control this insect. Though not recorded in detection results, a small amount of mountain pine beetle mortality in limber pine was also detected. See the following table.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> The Mormon cricket epidemic in Utah continued to grow. Control efforts continued, including some (about 760 acres) treatments on the Vernon unit. Though not recorded in the survey data, defoliation on Gambel oak and aspen was also high. See the following table.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Utah's Mormon cricket epidemic continued to grow. An estimated 346,000 acres of Tooele County, including nearly all of the Vernon Unit, was infested. Control efforts continued. The following table summarizes forest insect levels.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Number of Trees Killed on the Uinta NF</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="835 1328 1801 1401"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="835 1328 1226 1365">Agent/Year</th> <th data-bbox="1226 1328 1419 1365">1998</th> <th data-bbox="1419 1328 1612 1365">1999</th> <th data-bbox="1612 1328 1801 1365">2000</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="835 1365 1226 1401">Mountain Pine Beetle</td> <td data-bbox="1226 1365 1419 1401">0</td> <td data-bbox="1419 1365 1612 1401">0</td> <td data-bbox="1612 1365 1801 1401">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Agent/Year	1998	1999	2000	Mountain Pine Beetle	0	0	0
Agent/Year	1998	1999	2000						
Mountain Pine Beetle	0	0	0						

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS			
	Douglas-fir Beetle	1,800	3,100	1,300
	Spruce Beetle	1,100	300	300
	Fir Engraver Beetle	0	200	0
	Subalpine Fir Mortality	100	2,900	900
	Fall Cankerworm	0	0	50
	Aspen Decline	0	0	1,500
SOIL/AIR/WATERSHED RESOURCES				
<p><b>AIR QUALITY</b> (Uses and activities comply with federal, state, and local air quality standards and airshed classifications?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The entire Uinta NF is a Class II area for air quality. A large percentage of air pollutants within Utah, and on the Forest originate from the urban Wasatch Front. Utah County, which contains much of the Forest, is designated a non-attainment area for particulate matter. No other portion of the Forest lies within a non-attainment area. The Utah Division of Air Quality (UDAQ) monitors air quality at 28 stations. Six of these are located in urban areas in Utah County near the Forest. The Forest also cooperates with the National Park Service in operating an IMPROVE air quality monitoring site near Timpanogos Cave and Lone Peak Wilderness Area.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> The Uinta NF is downwind of major sources of pollutants, and elevated levels of some pollutants have been observed. Though levels of some pollutants are elevated, air quality on the Forest is generally good.</p> <p>No management actions on the Forest are believed to have been the cause of clean air standard exceedances. The primary potential adverse effects from the Forest on air quality are dust from road use and construction, and smoke from prescribed burns and wildfires. The Forest manages wildland fire use and prescribed fire in accordance with the Utah Smoke Management Plan. This plan requires approval and coordination with the UDAQ to ensure these activities do not cause an exceedance of air quality standards.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> The one-hour and eight-hour standards for ozone were exceeded several times at UDAQ monitoring sites in Utah County. These exceedances were not of sufficient duration and magnitude to violate the Clean Air Act. No exceedances were observed at the Timpanogos IMPROVE site.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> UDAQ monitoring data indicates no exceedances of any air quality standards at the</p>			

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>stations near the Uinta NF. No exceedances were observed at the Timpanogos IMPROVE site.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> There were several exceedances of the standards for ozone. It is believed these were caused in part, by hydrocarbon emissions from wildfires in the west.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p><b>WATER QUALITY/BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMPs)</b> (Compliance with state water quality standards and adequacy of BMPs?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Water quality is assessed in terms of designated beneficial uses as defined by the State of Utah Division of Water Quality (UDWQ). The majority of streams and reservoirs on the Forest provide water for domestic and agricultural uses, coldwater fisheries, recreation, and wildlife. Maintaining the quality of these waters is becoming increasingly important as the demand for water increases along with the rapidly growing urban population.</p> <p>The 1984 Forest Plan strongly emphasized watershed restoration, due to the widespread impacts of the 1983-84 floods. In the 10-year period following 1984, over 9,348 acres of watershed improvements were completed. The majority of the watershed improvement projects identified in the Forest Plan were completed by 1992. Some of the listed projects still have not been completed due to changes in priorities, budget constraints, or both.</p> <p>The Uinta National Forest, in cooperation with the UDWQ, maintains a network of 19 baseline water quality sites. Beginning in 1990, these sites have been monitored on a 5-year rotation with four sites being monitored each year.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Generally, water quality monitoring is tied to the baseline sites or to specific resource related activities. The abandoned mine lands restoration work that is ongoing is focusing water quality data collection, and monitoring activities as well. Based on water quality monitoring results from baseline sites, resource management activities are not impacting water quality. Abandoned mines are posing problems from leaching of heavy metals into ground water and streams.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> Water quality monitoring was conducted in the White River drainage, and data indicated that standards were being met for all parameters other than phosphorous. These results were not considered overly significant because the soil types in the sample area are inherently high in phosphorous. Consequently, it is difficult to determine whether resource activities and uses are contributing to the levels or not.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> A new baseline site was added this year (Wardsworth Creek above confluence with Hobble Creek) and was included as one of the four sites sampled. Water quality monitoring consisted of water chemistry sampling at 22 sites, macroinvertebrate sampling at 12 sites, chemical analysis of tissue in 20 fish, and a chemical tracer study conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS).</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p><b>American Fork River Abandoned Mine Project</b></p> <p>Three water quality-monitoring projects were conducted in the American Fork River watershed. These included monitoring of water wells at the Pacific Mine, a tracer study conducted by USGS, and fish tissue sampling.</p> <p>Nine groundwater-monitoring wells were established at the Pacific Mine in the North Fork American Fork (NFAF) drainage. These wells were sampled once each. Analysis shows that each well monitored for cadmium, lead, and zinc exceeded the acute criteria for fish. Eight of nine wells sampled for iron and copper exceeded the acute standards for fish, and eight of nine wells sampled for aluminum exceeded the chronic fish standards.</p> <p>A fish tissue analysis was conducted in the NFAF. These fish were sampled for arsenic (As), cadmium (Cd), mercury (Hg), lead (Pb), antimony (Sb), and zinc (Zn). Results obtained from the study indicate that many of these fish have excessive As, Cd, and Pb in their systems. Additional monitoring should be completed before final management judgments are made about human consumption of fish from the NFAF. The amount of lead detected in these fish is alarming due to the fact that lead does not bioaccumulate, meaning that for lead to accumulate in the tissue of biological organisms it must be a regular part of their diet or there must be some other exposure pathway.</p> <p>The USGS completed a tracer injection study in the NFAF drainage. Tracer injection studies are used to quantify metal loads from abandoned and inactive mines in a watershed. The study will determine where metal loads enter the stream, quantify the loading from ground water inflows, and identify important instream processes that affect the transport of metals in the stream. Final results should be ready in 2001.</p> <p><b>Vernon/Sheeprock Abandoned Mine Project</b></p> <p>The Vernon/Sheeprock portion of the Forest is an area where abandoned mine drainage could be contaminating water supplies. The area is used primarily for livestock grazing and limited domestic use. The University of Utah sampled several sites here in 1999. The purpose of these samples is to show if more comprehensive water quality monitoring is necessary in the area. Results have not yet been received.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p><b>2000:</b> Water quality monitoring consisted of water chemistry sampling at 101 sites, macroinvertebrate sampling at 38 sites, and a chemical tracer study conducted by the USGS. Water qualities at baseline sites are meeting State of Utah water quality standards. Water quality sampling at 40 sites in the NFAF drainage and 42 sites in the Vernon/Sheeprock area indicates State standards are being exceeded for lead, cadmium, zinc, mercury (one site), iron, and aluminum. These results are tied to the abandoned mines in the area. Results from the tracer study initiated in the NFAF drainage in 1999 will not be available until 2001. Another tracer study was initiated in Mary Ellen Gulch in 2000.</p>
<p><b>RIPARIAN AREAS, FLOOD PLAINS, WETLANDS</b> (Effects on riparian values, soil and water quality, and streambank stability. Is mitigation adequate?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> In 1993 the Forest Plan Rangeland Amendment was approved. This amendment placed an increased emphasis on management of activities within riparian areas, defined Desired Future Conditions (DFCs) for riparian areas, and outlined time frames for meeting objectives for overall improvement and meeting the DFCs.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Riparian monitoring has been conducted primarily through the use of transects. Normally, only vegetative conditions are monitored. Monitoring suggests that in most cases standards are being met and the areas are meeting or progressing toward the Desired Future Condition (DFC). This suggests that Forest Plan standards and guidelines and project specific mitigation measures are effective in meeting resource protection measures. For more information refer to the “<i>RANGE MANAGEMENT, RIPARIAN ECOLOGICAL STATUS</i>” section of this document.</p> <p>From 1991 to 2000, streambank stability has been evaluated at 81 riparian area study sites. About 67 percent of these sites were judged to have moderate to excellent stability. Streambank stability was evaluated at 28 riparian area study sites from 1998 to 2000. About 50 percent of these sites were judged to have moderate to excellent streambank stability.</p>
<p><b>SOIL PRODUCTIVITY/SOIL CONSERVATION PRACTICES</b> (Range and timber) (Changes/losses?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Since 1984, Forest Plan direction on the rehabilitation of deteriorated or fire-impacted soils has been effectively implemented under the Burned Area Rehabilitation Program. Due to a lack of funding and staffing, soils support has not always been available for all projects. Soil productivity is the inherent capacity of a soil to support the growth of specified plants, plant communities, or a sequence of plant communities. Management activities implemented under the Forest Plan which have had an effect on soil productivity include:</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road, trail, and landing construction,</li> <li>• Vegetation manipulation such as prescribed fire, timber harvest, and range improvements,</li> <li>• Dispersed recreation activities such as off-road vehicle use and camping, particularly in riparian areas,</li> <li>• Livestock concentration areas such as troughs, bedding grounds, and driveways, and</li> <li>• Catastrophic wildfires and the exclusion of fire, particularly in areas dominated by decadent sagebrush and juniper vegetation types.</li> </ul> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Analysis of the Forest Plan objectives for soil surveys indicate the following accomplishments and deficiencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surveys have been completed to the intensity needed for the Forest Plan on nearly 80 percent of the Forest. The old age and lack of documentation of all existing surveys make it impossible for the Forest to fully cooperate in the National Cooperative Soil Survey program. In 1999, a soils inventory was initiated in upper Strawberry Valley. In 2000, an ongoing soil inventory for Tooele County was completed. This inventory encompassed the Vernon Unit of the Uinta NF.</li> <li>• Detailed mapping of wetlands and riparian areas needed to support project level analysis exists for about 5 percent of the Forest land base.</li> <li>• Geologic hazards mapping exists for the entire Forest at a very broad scale, and for some of the Forest at a detailed, site-specific scale.</li> <li>• Range condition and trend monitoring studies are conducted annually. In addition to evaluating condition and trend of rangelands, these studies also consider soil stability trends. Four of the six sites where soil trend data was available in 1998-2000 indicate soil stability is stable or improving.</li> </ul>
<p><b>WATERSHED CONDITION</b> (Are watershed conditions trending toward the DFC within each NF watershed?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Watershed conditions are generally determined using a combination of data sources including upland vegetation conditions and trends, riparian area conditions and trends, water quality, and soil stability. Assessments of resource conditions, including overall</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>watershed conditions, have been made for a few watersheds across the Forest through development of landscape assessments. Landscape assessments have been completed on the Vernon Unit and Strawberry Valley.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Nearly half the Forest has been included in landscape assessments. The White River Landscape Assessment was completed in 1998. The North End (northern Heber Ranger District) Landscape Assessment was completed in 1999. The Diamond Fork Landscape Assessment was completed in cooperation with Utah Reclamation Mitigation Commission in 2000.</p> <p>These assessments have generally identified that vegetative conditions within each watershed are comprised of older age classes, and in some cases ground cover has decreased, especially where conifers are encroaching into aspen and where juniper encroaches into adjacent sagebrush/grass types. Watershed conditions are somewhat less than desired in relation to these instances. In cases where watershed improvement activities have occurred, smooth brome has created a good ground cover to control erosion, but overall vegetative composition is lacking, and from a vegetative standpoint, conditions are less than desirable.</p> <p>The Inland West Watershed Initiative started in 1997. The Forest participated in 1998 and 1999 by providing data for this broadscale analysis. In April of 1999 a map identifying Class I (priority watersheds – in need of restoration work) watersheds in Utah was released. Of the eight watersheds on the Uinta NF, two were identified as Class I watersheds: Spanish Fork River and Provo River.</p>
<b>MINERALS/ENERGY AND GEOLOGY</b>	
<p><b>MINERAL AND ENERGY EXPLORATION</b> (Adequacy of permitting process?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The 1984 Forest Plan contains five standards and guidelines that describe situations under which various restrictions on exploration and development would be applied. None are clearly specific as to whether they apply to only leasable minerals or if they apply to common variety and locatable minerals as well.</p> <p>In 1997 the Forest Plan was amended through the <i>Western Uinta Basin Oil and Gas Leasing Amendment</i>. This amendment provided new direction for applying lease stipulations for portions of the Heber and Spanish Fork Ranger Districts.</p>



ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b></p> <p><b>1998:</b> Non-bonded non-energy operations processed ..... 1            Bonded, non-energy operations processed..... 4            Energy operations processed..... 1</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Non-bonded non-energy operations processed ..... 9            Bonded, non-energy operations processed..... 2            Energy operations processed..... 1</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Non-bonded non-energy operations processed ..... 3            Bonded, non-energy operations processed..... 9            Energy operations processed..... 2</p>
<p><b>COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS OF OPERATING PLANS</b> (Is operation within range established by Forest Plan standards and guidelines?)</p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> The amount of administration of energy and non-energy minerals operations depends upon the number of active operations on the Forest.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> Over the last several years, the number of active mineral operations has been low. All active mineral operations on the Forest were administered to standard and consistent with Forest Plan standards and guidelines. The number of operations administered are listed below:</p> <p><b>1998:</b> Bonded non-energy operations administered to standard..... 0            Total energy operations administered to standard ..... 1</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Bonded non-energy operations administered to standard..... 1            Total energy operations administered to standard ..... 10</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Bonded non-energy operations administered to standard..... 0            Total energy operations administered to standard ..... 0</p>
<p><b>EXERCISE OF RESERVED AND OUTSTANDING RIGHTS BY MINERALS OWNER</b> (Protection and maintenance of surface resources?)</p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> Changes in the Bureau of Land Management’s (BLM) mining claim recordation procedures in 1993 resulted in the abandonment of thousands of mining claims in the West.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b></p> <p><b>1998:</b> The Utah BLM mining records from January 1998 show only 126 claims still on record for the Uinta National Forest. Seventy-one of these do not have a current assessment on file and will likely be declared as abandoned and void by the BLM. Only one small mine is operating.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> There are 53 active mines on the Forest, all of which are recorded with the BLM. Nine of these mines have operating plans on file with the Forest Service. Claimants for the remainder of the mines are engaged in assessment work to keep claims current, but are not actively working the mines.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Same as 1999.</p>
<p><b>PROJECT RECLAMATION</b> (Effectiveness of work done?)</p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> The Sheeprock Mountains and American Fork Canyon areas were actively mined from the 1800's until the early 1960's. Many of the mine sites in these areas are located on privately-owned inholdings; however, some are on lands now managed by the Uinta NF. These areas bear evidence of this activity with tailings piles, mine adits, and other mining artifacts. Many of the mines were sealed in the mid-1990's by the Utah Department of Natural Resources Division of Oil, Gas and Mining. Some of the mine openings continue to pose safety hazards, and mines and mine tailings are impacting the environment.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b></p> <p><b>1998:</b> No reclamation work was done, but preliminary data collection in American Fork Canyon was initiated to evaluate the potential environmental impacts/hazards.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> No reclamation work was done. Data collection continued. This included gathering information on the physical and biological components of the ecosystem as well as identifying potentially responsible parties to help finance reclamation.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> No reclamation work was done, but data collection in American Fork Canyon was accelerated. In addition, data collection in the Sheeprock Mountains was initiated. The planning and design work, and securing of financing is ongoing for reclamation of mining claims in American Fork Canyon. Work was initiated to identify potential options for reclamation of sites in American Fork Canyon.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<b>LANDS</b>	
<p><b>ROAD AND TRAIL RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION</b></p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> There is demonstrated public interest and need to protect historic access (roads and trails) to the Forest. The Forest has identified needs for 102 ROWs to secure access to the Forest. To address these needs, the Forest may negotiate directly with landowners to acquire legal access. Additionally, other political bodies, including Wasatch and Utah Counties and the cities adjacent to the Uinta NF, are utilizing methods to protect access. Some of the identified ROWs needed will likely be perfected by political entities other than the Forest Service. The Forest has also cooperated with and encouraged cities and counties to acquire ROW within their jurisdiction.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b></p> <p><b>1998:</b> One mile of ROW was acquired.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Three ROWs were acquired.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> No ROW acquisitions were completed in 2000. Work on two easements was undertaken, but no ROW acquisitions were completed in 2000.</p>
<p><b>LAND EXCHANGE, ACQUISITION, PURCHASE</b></p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> Landownership adjustments are undertaken to improve manageability of National Forest System lands, protect key resources, facilitate use, or a number of other purposes. Adjustments also occasionally are facilitated by Acts of Congress (e.g. Strawberry Lands transfer to the Uinta NF in 1988, and 1999 State Land Exchange). The consummation of landownership adjustments often takes several years from initiation to title transfer.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b></p> <p><b>1998:</b> No land adjustments were completed during 1998.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> About 269 acres were acquired through purchase or donation. In addition, about 11,690 acres were acquired through the State of Utah land exchange, and 1.98 acres were exchanged for 6.71 acres under the Small Tracts Act.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> No land adjustments were completed during 2000.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p><b>OCCUPANCY TRESPASS</b></p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Occupancy trespass cases (i.e. physical occupation of NFS lands) cases continue to be identified and slowly resolved. In some cases these have been resolved by employing the Small Tracts Act, where the trespass was innocent and resolution resulted in public benefit. Resolution can include removal of occupancy, or exchanging or purchasing the lands involved.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> The Forest has documented numerous instances of encroachments where privately owned improvements have been located on National Forest System lands. Examples include telephone lines, optic cable lines, and out buildings. In the past, most occupancy trespasses are situations where NFS lands were occupied for many years. However, the rapid development experienced in northern Utah in recent years is generating new cases. Since 1984, the Forest has taken action to resolve numerous occupancy trespass cases. In 1999, one case was resolved, and three additional, unresolved cases were identified. In 1998 and in 2000, no cases were resolved and no new cases were identified.</p> <p>In an attempt to reduce problems with occupancy trespass, the Forest is exploring opportunities to establish more “defensible” boundary lines utilizing cultural and natural features such as roads, trails, and ridgelines. Along the Wasatch Front in Utah County these features also include existing firebreak roads, and portions of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. Private lands between these features and the Forest could be exchanged for NFS lands falling outside these areas.</p>
<p><b>LANDLINE LOCATION</b></p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Landline location and maintenance are important to prevent inadvertent trespass into and off of the Forest. This is especially true as recreation use continues to grow and lands adjacent to the Forest are developed.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> The Forest continues to locate and mark landline locations. However, due to budget constraints the amount of accomplishment is less than projected as needed by Forest managers, and less than the objectives identified in the 1984 Forest Plan (13 miles/year).</p> <p><b>1998:</b> Three miles of new boundary were marked to standard.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p><b>1999:</b> Five miles of landline were located and marked, and an additional five miles of landline were maintained.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Six miles of new boundary were marked to standard, three miles of landline maintenance were accomplished, and one mile of special area boundary location was accomplished.</p>
<p><b>SPECIAL USES APPLICATIONS</b></p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Occupancy and use of NFS lands is generally authorized via a special use permit. Special use permits are generally broken into two groups: (1) recreation related permits, and (2) non-recreation related permits. Recreation special uses are not addressed in this “Lands” section of this report.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> The number of authorizations has steadily increased since 1984, due mainly to the development of private land in or near the communities and resorts within the Forest boundary, a trend that is likely to continue. The Forest has experienced a problem with not being able to process all new applications as a result of a shortage of available staffing and funding. Priorities established in the 1984 Forest Plan have been used to determine which applications will be processed each year.</p> <p>On average, approximately 150 non-recreation special use authorizations are in existence on the Forest, although this number varies because some authorizations expire and new ones are issued. The actual number of improvements, uses, or occupancies may exceed 200 because many authorizations provide for multiple occupancies. However, the total area occupied by all these non-recreation authorizations is relatively small, covering less than 0.5 percent of the total Forest area.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> There are currently 144 term (one year or longer) non-recreation special uses authorized by special use permits on the Uinta NF. Sixteen applications for ditch easements have been received as a result of the Colorado Ditch Bill of 1986. Special use permits currently authorize 14 ditches. These permits will be eliminated if easements are granted. The Forest has three hydropower projects that Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) will be considering for re-licensing in the next four years.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p><b>1999:</b> Forty-four applications were processed and a total of 162 special use permits were administered. The Snake Creek hydropower project was relicensed by FERC.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> During FY2000, 14 applications were processed and a total of 168 special use permits were administered. FERC has initiated the process of considering relicensing of two hydropower projects (American Fork and Bartholomew) on the Forest.</p>
<b>FACILITIES</b>	
<p><b>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM INVENTORY</b> (Is transportation system inventory current and accurate?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Roads are essential to access the Forest. Roads support a variety of activities, and are necessary for management of the Forest. Roads are considered “classified” or “unclassified”. Classified roads are those identified by the Forest Service as necessary and/or desired, and unclassified are other unnecessary, unauthorized, and/or undesirable roads on the Forest. Only classified roads are recognized on the Forest Transportation System. Recent administrative policies and environmental issues have heightened attention toward roads within the national forests.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> The mileage of classified roads on the Forest has been and is expected to remain relatively stable. Changes in landownership and better inventory data have lead to changes in the number of miles reported. Actual changes in the amount of facilities have been, and are expected to continue to be, very minor. The standard of some classified roads will change over time as opportunities to improve roads develop, and as road management objectives change in response to increases or changes in use.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> The transportation system identified 1,370 miles of Forest Development Roads within the Proclaimed Forest boundary. Of these, 421 miles are maintenance level 3, 4, and 5 roads (open and useable by passenger cars); 911 miles are maintenance level 2 roads (high clearance vehicles); and 38 miles are maintenance level 1 roads (road closed to use) on the Forest. There are approximately 140 miles of asphalt-surfaced roads on the Forest.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> INFRA (a system for inventorying physical assets on the national forests) was initiated in 1999 to identify deferred and annual maintenance, and improvement needs. Forest System roads are included in the elements being inventoried through INFRA. INFRA inventory efforts in 1999 focused on the higher standard roads (Maintenance level 3, 4 and 5).</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p><b>2000:</b> INFRA inventory efforts continued. Inventory efforts were expanded to include Maintenance Level 1 and 2 roads. INFRA data indicates there are approximately 1,267 miles of classified road within the Proclaimed Forest boundary. Of this, about 1,120 miles occur on National Forest System (NFS) lands. The remaining 150 miles of classified roads occur on lands non-NFS lands. Of the 1,120 miles of classified roads on NFS lands, approximately 380 miles are Maintenance Level 3, 4, or 5 roads; 671 miles are Maintenance Level 2 roads; and 63 miles are Maintenance Level 1 roads.</p> <p>Forest roads are also inventoried by surface type. There are 794 miles of native surface, 146 miles of aggregate surface, and 178 miles of asphalt or bituminous surface roads on the Forest. The 149 miles of roads not on National Forest System lands but within the Forest boundary include 101 miles of native surface, 18 miles of aggregate surface, and 30 miles of asphalt surface roads.</p>
<p><b>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ACCOMPLISHMENTS</b></p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Recurrent maintenance has focused on providing safe facilities with varying standards for various types of vehicles, reducing the effects to water resources, and allowing access to and through appropriate areas of the Forest. Levels of maintenance vary from minimal activities intended to protect the road investment and nearby environment, to maximum activities intended to provide comfort, convenience of travel, and high speed uninterrupted traffic flow.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Historically, funding levels have been inadequate to maintain Forest roads to desired standards. Over the last few years, funding for road maintenance has increased, and with this, so has the amount of maintenance.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> The Forest maintained to standard 350 miles of road. About 97 miles of road were maintained using Forest Service crews, 252 miles through agreements with the counties, and 1 mile by timber sale purchasers.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Same as for 1998, see above.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> The Forest maintained a total of 389 miles of Forest roads. About 106 miles were maintained using Forest Service personnel; 233 miles through agreements with counties; and 50 miles through timber sale purchasers.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS																
	<p>With assistance from Juab and Utah Counties, a surface treatment of chipping and sealing the Nebo Scenic Loop Road was completed. This treatment is expected to last five to six years. Other existing asphalt roads such as the Cascade Springs Scenic Road, Santaquin Canyon, Squaw Peak, Whiting Campground, West and East Side Strawberry, Sheep Creek, and Upper Diamond Fork will all require surface treatment within the next two to five years.</p>																
<p><b>TRAFFIC USE</b> (Rates and types of uses/seasons?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The Forest normally does not conduct traffic counts. However, the Utah Department of Transportation does conduct traffic counts on some roads.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Traffic on Forest roads varies from year to year depending on weather conditions and other factors. A large majority of road use on the Forest is related to recreation use. Throughout the nation, west, and on the Uinta NF outdoor recreation use is growing. This has generally resulted in increases in traffic on Forest roads.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> No data reported.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> The only Forest road on which traffic counts were conducted in 1999 was State Route 92 through American Fork Canyon. The majority of visitors are local, entering the area for picnicking, camping, off-highway vehicle (OHV) use, hiking, hunting, and fishing. Use tends to decline somewhat during August and increases again in September and October primarily due to leaf viewing and, to a lesser extent, hunting activities. The traffic count data obtained follows:</p> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p><b>Traffic Count Data for 1999</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="984 1097 1367 1167">Dates of Traffic Count - 1999</th> <th data-bbox="1367 1097 1661 1167">Number of Incoming Vehicles</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="984 1167 1367 1203">May 18-31</td> <td data-bbox="1367 1167 1661 1203">14,541</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="984 1203 1367 1239">June 1-20</td> <td data-bbox="1367 1203 1661 1239">38,873</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="984 1239 1367 1274">July 1-9, 22-30</td> <td data-bbox="1367 1239 1661 1274">47,053</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="984 1274 1367 1310">August 12-31</td> <td data-bbox="1367 1274 1661 1310">27,012</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="984 1310 1367 1346">September</td> <td data-bbox="1367 1310 1661 1346">38,072</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="984 1346 1367 1382">October</td> <td data-bbox="1367 1346 1661 1382">27,256</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="984 1382 1367 1409">November</td> <td data-bbox="1367 1382 1661 1409">8,684</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </div>	Dates of Traffic Count - 1999	Number of Incoming Vehicles	May 18-31	14,541	June 1-20	38,873	July 1-9, 22-30	47,053	August 12-31	27,012	September	38,072	October	27,256	November	8,684
Dates of Traffic Count - 1999	Number of Incoming Vehicles																
May 18-31	14,541																
June 1-20	38,873																
July 1-9, 22-30	47,053																
August 12-31	27,012																
September	38,072																
October	27,256																
November	8,684																



ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS																																										
	December	6,752																																									
	<p><b>2000:</b> Traffic counts on the Forest in 2000 were conducted in American Fork Canyon and Aspen Grove. Use patterns were similar to those observed in 1999. The traffic count data obtained follows:</p>																																										
	<p><b>Traffic Count Data for 2000</b></p>																																										
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="835 511 1220 581" rowspan="2">Dates of Traffic Count – 2000</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1220 511 1808 544">Number of Incoming Vehicles</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="1220 544 1514 581">American Fork</th> <th data-bbox="1514 544 1808 581">Aspen Grove</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="835 581 1220 613">January</td> <td data-bbox="1220 581 1514 613">7,706</td> <td data-bbox="1514 581 1808 613">Not available</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="835 613 1220 646">February</td> <td data-bbox="1220 613 1514 646">7,010</td> <td data-bbox="1514 613 1808 646">Not available</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="835 646 1220 678">March</td> <td data-bbox="1220 646 1514 678">7,580</td> <td data-bbox="1514 646 1808 678">Not available</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="835 678 1220 711">April</td> <td data-bbox="1220 678 1514 711">12,089</td> <td data-bbox="1514 678 1808 711">Not available</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="835 711 1220 743">May</td> <td data-bbox="1220 711 1514 743">27,948</td> <td data-bbox="1514 711 1808 743">Not available</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="835 743 1220 776">June</td> <td data-bbox="1220 743 1514 776">40,978</td> <td data-bbox="1514 743 1808 776">Not available</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="835 776 1220 808">July</td> <td data-bbox="1220 776 1514 808">48,423</td> <td data-bbox="1514 776 1808 808">Not available</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="835 808 1220 841">August</td> <td data-bbox="1220 808 1514 841">28,254</td> <td data-bbox="1514 808 1808 841">Not available</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="835 841 1220 873">September</td> <td data-bbox="1220 841 1514 873">32,294</td> <td data-bbox="1514 841 1808 873">Not available</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="835 873 1220 906">October</td> <td data-bbox="1220 873 1514 906">25,770</td> <td data-bbox="1514 873 1808 906">9,436</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="835 906 1220 938">November</td> <td data-bbox="1220 906 1514 938">6,390</td> <td data-bbox="1514 906 1808 938">1,540*</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="835 938 1220 971">December</td> <td data-bbox="1220 938 1514 971">7,709</td> <td data-bbox="1514 938 1808 971">1,856</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Dates of Traffic Count – 2000	Number of Incoming Vehicles		American Fork	Aspen Grove	January	7,706	Not available	February	7,010	Not available	March	7,580	Not available	April	12,089	Not available	May	27,948	Not available	June	40,978	Not available	July	48,423	Not available	August	28,254	Not available	September	32,294	Not available	October	25,770	9,436	November	6,390	1,540*	December	7,709	1,856
Dates of Traffic Count – 2000	Number of Incoming Vehicles																																										
	American Fork	Aspen Grove																																									
January	7,706	Not available																																									
February	7,010	Not available																																									
March	7,580	Not available																																									
April	12,089	Not available																																									
May	27,948	Not available																																									
June	40,978	Not available																																									
July	48,423	Not available																																									
August	28,254	Not available																																									
September	32,294	Not available																																									
October	25,770	9,436																																									
November	6,390	1,540*																																									
December	7,709	1,856																																									
	<p>* Estimate based on count of 770 from November 12-18.</p>																																										
<p><b>OHV USE</b> (Potential effects of vehicle use off roads and on classified areas and trails?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> OHV user compliance and adverse impacts are discussed in the “RECREATION, OFF-ROAD VEHICLE IMPACTS” section of this report, and therefore are not repeated here. This section focuses on supply and demand for OHV opportunities on the Forest. Uinta National Forest System lands are closed to vehicle use unless designated open, with the exception of game retrieval during hunting season.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Demand for OHV use has grown rapidly over the last decade. Opportunities for OHV’s in northern Utah have decreased off-Forest, and have remained relatively static on the Forest. As a result, use levels are high in many areas, and user conflicts sometimes occur. Though most OHV users stay on designated roads and trails,</p>																																										

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>many do not. This non-compliance is occurring across the more accessible areas of the Forest, creating “ghost roads” and causing resource damage. No formal surveys have been conducted to quantify the extent of this damage.</p> <p>INFRA (a system for inventorying physical assets on the national forests) was initiated in 1999 to identify deferred and annual maintenance, and improvement needs. Forest System roads and trails are included in the elements being inventoried through INFRA. INFRA inventory efforts in 1999 focused on the higher standard roads (Maintenance level 3, 4 and 5).</p> <p>INFRA inventory efforts continued in 2000. Inventory efforts were expanded to include trails and Maintenance Level 1 and 2 roads. INFRA data indicates there are approximately 300 miles of trails on the Forest open for motorized use. A large majority of trails on the Forest meet standards. In many situations, OHV trails on the Forest have not been specifically designed for the type and level of use they are receiving. As a result, many of these trails are not part of an integrated system and many short, dead-end trails exist. There are about 670 miles of roads where use of high clearance vehicles is advised. This includes about 389 miles of road open to use by non-street legal OHVs.</p>
<p><b>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION</b> (Arterial, collector, and select local roads – accomplishment of DFC for roads?)</p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> Most of the roads identified for the Forest Transportation System are in place. During the 1985-1997 time period, about 13 miles of new road construction and 75.3 miles of reconstruction occurred.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> Most of the roads identified for the Forest Transportation System are in place and road work on the Forest is mostly reconstruction, rather than new construction.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> About 1.5 miles of the Tut Creek Road was reconstructed. A portion of this was paid for using 10% Road and Trail Deposit monies. The purpose of this reconstruction was to reduce impacts from the existing road on water quality and fisheries habitat, and to complete to standard this arterial road accessing Currant Creek Reservoir.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> None</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p><b>2000:</b> About 1.7 miles of the Indian Creek Road were reconstructed. The purpose of this reconstruction was to improve to standard this arterial road.</p>
<p><b>TRAIL SYSTEM CONSTRUCTION/RECONSTRUCTION</b> (Accomplishment of DFC for trails?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> INFRA was initiated in 1999 to identify deferred and annual maintenance, and improvement needs. Forest System trails are included in the elements being inventoried through INFRA. Not all of the trails have yet been inventoried. INFRA data indicates there are about 590 miles of system trails and 51 trailheads on the Forest.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> During the early 1990's an average of approximately 15 miles of trail was constructed or reconstructed annually and 260 miles maintained to standard. Much of the trail maintenance is performed by private entities. Volunteer labor accounts for about 60 percent of the yearly maintenance. Currently, about five miles of trail are under Adopt-a-Trail agreements. With the present trail system and related support facilities, use levels are sometimes high enough that negative impacts are occurring. A large backlog of work exists and many trails are in poor locations.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> About 2 miles of trail were constructed/reconstructed.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> 3.5 miles of trail were constructed/reconstructed.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Five miles of trail were constructed/reconstructed. In addition to Forest Service trail crews, volunteers and private entities perform some of this work, as well as annual trail maintenance.</p>
<p><b>STRUCTURES</b> (Condition of structures?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The accessibility of buildings (Americans with Disabilities Act compliance) and energy, radon, and asbestos status are discussed in the "RECREATION – SITE/FACILITY CONDITION HEALTH, SANITATION AND SAFETY" section of this report, and therefore are not repeated here. This section discusses other aspects of buildings, and dams and bridges on the Forest.</p> <p>The 1986 <i>Facilities Master Plan</i> for the Uinta NF called for new District and Supervisor's Offices. A new Heber District Office has been constructed.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS													
	<p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> Dams, bridges and buildings on the Forest are being inspected as called for. As these buildings age, a backlog of maintenance, replacement, or removal needs is growing.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> The Forest has 14 administrative sites and work centers. Many of these buildings are deteriorating and reaching the end of their useful life. Some site locations are no longer aesthetically pleasing, and have been surrounded by residential areas since construction.</p> <p>Seventeen dams are located on the Uinta NF. Fourteen of the dams are under special use permits to local irrigation companies and a municipality. Within the past 12 years, two dams on Silver and Pittsburgh Lakes have been returned to the Forest with the irrigation companies vacating their special use permits. These dams and lakes are now owned and managed by the Forest Service. All dams on the Forest are required to be in compliance with the State of Utah’s dam regulations and policy, including those under special use permits. Inspections are completed annually by the State of Utah in partnership with the Forest Service and the permittee. Recent inspections indicate all dams on the Forest are in a safe condition.</p> <p>There are 25 road bridges on the Forest. These are inspected according to guidelines established by the Federal Highway Administration. Due to age, and in some cases, inadequate maintenance, 14 of the 25 bridges have less than 10 years left before replacement is necessary. Seven of those 14 bridges have less than five years of design life left. Of the seven bridges with less than five years of design life left, one (Strawberry River bridge) has been closed due to loss of structural integrity and three others are in critical condition.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> INFRA (a system for inventorying physical assets on the national forests) was initiated to identify deferred and annual maintenance, and improvement needs. Forest System dams, bridges and buildings are included in the elements being inventoried through INFRA.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Inventoried (in INFRA) Building Conditions on the Uinta NF</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="711 1265 1932 1404"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="711 1265 1119 1300">Building Condition</th> <th data-bbox="1119 1265 1524 1300">Administrative Buildings</th> <th data-bbox="1524 1265 1932 1300">Recreation Buildings</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="711 1300 1119 1336">Poor</td> <td data-bbox="1119 1300 1524 1336">12</td> <td data-bbox="1524 1300 1932 1336">38</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="711 1336 1119 1372">Satisfactory</td> <td data-bbox="1119 1336 1524 1372">61</td> <td data-bbox="1524 1336 1932 1372">137</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="711 1372 1119 1404">Good</td> <td data-bbox="1119 1372 1524 1404">8</td> <td data-bbox="1524 1372 1932 1404">37</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Building Condition	Administrative Buildings	Recreation Buildings	Poor	12	38	Satisfactory	61	137	Good	8	37
Building Condition	Administrative Buildings	Recreation Buildings												
Poor	12	38												
Satisfactory	61	137												
Good	8	37												

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>Most of these buildings, including the recreation buildings such as restrooms, are well beyond their design life. The Forest is constantly working to replace and/or upgrade buildings such as restrooms with simple and improved technical designed venting systems. Other buildings, including the Spanish Fork and Pleasant Ranger District Offices, are in need of upgrade and/or replacement. Employee space requirements and locations within residential areas are factors that contribute to the need to upgrade and/or relocate these offices. The Spanish Fork Administrative Site, a work center and storage facility, is now located within residential home tracts. This site has become functionally obsolete and a non-conforming facility.</p> <p>Silver Lake dam has been inventoried and classified by the Forest Service and the State of Utah as a moderate hazard dam.</p> <p>The Strawberry River bridge, which was closed to use in 1998, was removed, and the adjoining road decommissioned.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Same as 1999, except no bridges were removed.</p>
<p><b>TRANSPORTATION/UTILITY CORRIDORS</b> (Are needs and Forest Plan standards being met?)</p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> Six energy transportation corridors were identified in the 1984 Forest Plan. These corridors do not include the high voltage power line and natural gas pipeline traversing the Provo East Bench, the high voltage power line traversing Provo Canyon, or the American Fork Canyon transmission line.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> Most roads, electric power and telephone lines, natural gas transmission lines, ditches, and other water transmission facilities are authorized through special use permits. A large percentage of the authorizations are issued to local government and public utility entities. A variety of water transmission facilities make up the largest category of occupancy authorized. Communication site and utility corridor designations exist at numerous locations on the Forest; however, new technologies such as cellular telephones and fiber optic cable, as well as increased demand for utilities such as electric power and natural gas distribution, have increased the requests for more areas with these designations. In the last three to five years the number of requests for special uses has increased</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	approximately 30 percent.
<p><b>ROAD DESIGN</b> (According to standards appropriate for planned uses?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The Forest Service employs road standards designed to achieve the road management objective established for each road.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Many of these roads were built to standards not consistent with current road management objectives, and/or are causing unnecessary environmental impacts. As a result, these roads are being redesigned and relocated as opportunities become available.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> About 1.5 miles of the Tut Creek Road were redesigned to standard and the reconstruction work completed.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> No redesign work was completed.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> About 1.7 miles of the Indian Creek Road were redesigned, and the reconstruction work completed. In addition, preliminary redesign work was completed for about 4 miles of the Springville Crossing-Rays Valley Road.</p>
<p><b>NATIONAL AND REGIONAL DIRECTION</b> (Changes; Plan compliance?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The <i>Uinta National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan</i> (Forest Plan) was approved in 1984. Through 1997, the Forest Plan had been amended seven times and corrected twice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Strawberry Valley Management Area Amendment</u>, 1990: Added management direction for the newly acquired Strawberry Project lands.</li> <li>• <u>Predator Control Amendment</u>, 1991: Approved a coordinated predator control program and provided direction on control methods, areas, and approval procedures.</li> </ul>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<b>PLANNING</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Rangeland Ecosystem Amendment</u>, 1992: Defined desired future conditions and associated standards and guidelines and monitoring requirements for rangelands.</li> </ul>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Forest Plan Implementation/Monitoring and Evaluation Program Amendment</u>, 1993: Redefined monitoring and evaluation requirements in the Forest Plan.</li> <li>• <u>Pleasant Grove Management Area Special Use Provision Amendment</u>, 1994: Eliminated provisions for a Special Use Permit for the proposed Seven Peaks Resort.</li> <li>• <u>Western Uinta Basin Oil and Gas Leasing Amendment</u>, 1997: Provided new direction for applying lease stipulations for portions of the Heber and Spanish Fork Management Areas.</li> <li>• <u>Sage Creek Visual Quality Objective Amendment</u>, 1994: Site-specific amendment changed the visual quality objective in the Sage Creek area from retention to partial retention.</li> <li>• <u>Correction No. 1</u>, 1995: Simplified and clarified management direction for Mount Timpanogos and Mount Nebo Wilderness Areas. Management direction was not changed.</li> <li>• <u>Correction No. 2</u>, 1996: Corrected an editorial oversight in Correction No. 1.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> Two major national policy emphases, the National Roadless Area Conservation and the Forest Roads Policy, affecting the Uinta NF were initiated during the 1998-2000 period. These and the Uinta National Forest Plan are discussed in more detail below:</p> <p><b>National Roadless Area Conservation Rule:</b> In October of 1999 President Clinton asked the Forest Service to begin an open public process to address how roadless areas within the national forest system would be managed in the future. The Forest Service prepared an Environmental Impact Statement and on January 12, 2001, issued a final rule. The rule was litigated and the District Court of Idaho enjoined the Forest Service from implementing the rule. This decision has been appealed.</p> <p><b>Forest Road Management Policy and Rule:</b> The Forest Service proposed to refine the agency’s road management policy. Public involvement for this proposal was initiated in January of 1998. On January 4, 2001, Forest Service Chief Dombeck approved a new forest road management policy. This policy relies heavily on scientific analysis and public involvement to provide a road system that is safe, responsive to public needs, environmentally sound, affordable, and efficient to manage. This policy shifts the agency’s emphasis from developing its transportation system to managing its transportation in an environmentally and financially responsible manner.</p> <p><b>Uinta National Forest Plan:</b> No Forest Plan amendments were completed in 1998 or 1999. Two Forest Plan amendments, the Northern Goshawk Amendment and Utah Fire Amendment, were initiated in FY 1999. The Northern Goshawk Amendment was approved in March of 2000, and the Utah Fire</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>Amendment was approved in May of 2001. The Utah Northern Goshawk Amendment provided direction to maintain and restore habitat for the northern goshawk.</p> <p>In response to National Forest Management Act requirements, and management issues and needs, the Uinta NF has initiated the process of revising the Forest Plan. A <i>Preliminary Analysis of the Management Situation</i> (AMS) was released for public review and comment in August of 1999. Scoping for the Forest Plan revision occurred concurrent with release of the AMS. The Revision is focused on addressing topics, which must be addressed (required by regulation or law) and areas identified as needs for change in the AMS. These revision topics are summarized below:</p> <p><b>Topics Which Must Be Addressed in the Forest Plan Revision:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establish direction to provide interim protection for the four river segments eligible for the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, as required by the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968.</li> <li>2. Evaluate and consider recommending roadless areas for wilderness designation as required by Forest Service policy, federal regulations, and the Utah Wilderness Act of 1984.</li> <li>3. Reevaluate lands suited for timber production as required by the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (NFMA).</li> <li>4. Determine areas where change may be needed based on information from monitoring reports, insight from Forest Service employees, issues raised by the public and other government agencies, requirements in Forest Service Handbooks and Manuals, and employment of new management direction and policy.</li> </ol> <p>Topics Where Monitoring Indicates Existing Direction Is Inconsistent with Achieving Forest Plan, Ecosystem Management, or Natural Resource Agenda Goals: Experience in implementing the Forest Plan indicates existing management direction for the following topics is too limited or is inappropriate. Forest Plan direction could be changed on a project-by-project basis through various amendments; however, addressing these topics through the revision would eliminate the need for several future site-specific amendments and would facilitate achievement of ecosystem management and Natural Resource Agenda goals.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Revise timber practices by expanding the array of silvicultural systems and harvest methods that may be used.</li> </ol>



ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Eliminate the guideline that allows off-road and off-trail motorized vehicle use to retrieve legally-taken big game animals.</li> <li>3. Expand management direction for areas of heavy dispersed recreation use by developing Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) guidelines and using Meaningful Measures.</li> <li>4. Revise fuelwood harvest levels to more accurately reflect demand.</li> <li>5. Update/revise the list of Management Indicator Species (MIS).</li> <li>6. Shift emphasis from adding developed recreation capacity to managing and (when necessary) reconstructing existing developed recreation facilities.</li> <li>7. Remove post and pole harvest objectives provided to the public as a service.</li> </ol> <p><b>Topics Where the Current Forest Plan Insufficiently Articulates Management Intent:</b> Experience has shown that the lack of specificity or direction in the following areas has hampered implementation of the Forest Plan. Addressing these topics, while not required, would provide the necessary over-arching framework to allow effective implementation of the Forest Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refine management area boundaries to better reflect ecosystems on the Forest.</li> <li>2. Define management prescriptions for all areas of the Forest.</li> <li>3. Identify Desired Future Conditions (DFCs) for all ecosystems.</li> <li>4. Identify desired recreation environments.</li> <li>5. Identify desired scenery management objectives.</li> <li>6. Delineate areas suitable for livestock grazing.</li> <li>7. Establish direction for managing cave resources.</li> </ol> <p><b>Topics Where Corrections Would Not Require Significant Revision Resources:</b> Addressing these topics in the Forest Plan revision would simplify and clarify the intent of the Forest Plan and would not likely require significant resource expenditures.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove administrative or procedural direction including information that is redundant or unrelated to land and resource management planning or one of the six decisions made in forest</li> </ol>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>plans.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Correct typographical and description errors.</li> <li>3. Correct and clarify direction for 3-pasture rest rotation to be one of several management options.</li> <li>4. Clarify which minerals standards and guidelines apply to leasable, locatable, or salable minerals.</li> <li>5. Incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) for water and air quality standards.</li> <li>6. Remove direction for afforestation of oak woodlands.</li> <li>7. Eliminate objectives and implementation schedules that are not required.</li> <li>8. Update property management goals and terminology.</li> <li>9. Remove direction allowing horse use during hunting season in all developed sites.</li> <li>10. Identify the Jumpoff Research Natural Area (RNA) and its management direction. Although the Chief of the Forest Service signed the Establishment Record designating the Jumpoff RNA in 1988, the Forest Plan was never amended to recognize the RNA. The proposed action is to identify the Jumpoff RNA and develop a corresponding management prescription and appropriate management direction.</li> <li>11. Differentiate standards from guidelines.</li> <li>12. Revise and correct the section describing amendment of the Forest Plan. The proposed action is to clarify that Forest Plan amendments are needed only when one of the six decisions made in the Forest Plan must be adjusted.</li> <li>13. Eliminate redundant monitoring requirements.</li> <li>14. Correct the monitoring frequency for timber suitability.</li> <li>15. Update acreages and other “current situation” data in the Forest Plan.</li> <li>16. Use People at One Time (PAOTs) instead of Recreation Visitor Days (RVDs) for developed recreation objectives.</li> </ol>
<p><b>INFORMATION/RESOURCE CONDITIONS</b> (Adequate? Effective? And valid? DFC</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Information on resource conditions is needed to make informed decisions on land management activities. The 1984 Forest Plan recognized this and established several objectives for completing inventory data.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
being achieved?)	<p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> Inventory information concerning the Forest’s land and water resources is much more complete than it was in 1984. Though the rate of progress is slower than desired, the Forest is continuing to inventory a wide array of resources. Information from these inventories is being converted to digital format where it is more readily accessible and useable. In addition, the Forest now has a Geographic Information System (GIS) that greatly enhances the Forest Plan revision process.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> Inventory accomplishments were not tracked in 1998, so acres/miles of inventory cannot be reported. Many inventories were conducted in 1998. Many of these have been described in other sections in this report (e.g. WILDLIFE, RANGE, WATERSHED) and are not reiterated here. In addition to these inventories, a major effort on the Forest in 1998 was to convert and refine basic resource information so it could be incorporated in the Forest’s GIS and used for Forest Planning and other work.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Inventory accomplishments included 7 miles of aquatic ecological unit inventory; 3,050 acres of wildlife habitat inventory; 2 miles of aquatic biota inventory; and an unreported acreage of heritage resource inventory. As with 1998, efforts continued to incorporate this data into the Forest’s GIS.</p> <p>INFRA, an inventory of real property assets on the national forests, was initiated in 1999. This included both field inventory (physical inventory) and storage of data about facilities into the INFRA database (being developed). Efforts focused on roads, trails, recreation structures, buildings, dams, range, and wildlife structures. In general, a physical inventory was completed on about 20-33 percent of each of these types of facilities.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Inventory accomplishments included 12.5 miles of aquatic ecological unit inventory; 15,000 acres of terrestrial ecological unit inventory; 4,500 acres of vegetation inventory; 17,161 acres of aquatic biota inventory/monitoring; 10 miles of aquatic biota inventory; and 31,477 acres of heritage resource inventory. As with 1998, efforts continued to incorporate this data into the Forest’s GIS. Useable data layers were made accessible to internet users from the Forest’s website.</p> <p>INFRA was continued. The INFRA database continued to be refined, and where possible, data from the inventory was incorporated into this database. In general, inventory was completed on an additional 25-75% percent of each type of facilities.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p><b>REGION AND FOREST MANAGEMENT SITUATION</b> (Forest management activities vs. local social values?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The population of northern Utah has grown significantly since the Forest Plan was approved. However, a significant amount of growth was anticipated when the Forest Plan was developed. With the growth and increased urbanization has come a gradual shift in values that the local population desires from the Uinta NF. The Forest Plan provides a general framework for forest management activities. Under the Forest Plan, most of the Uinta NF was to be managed emphasizing wildlife, watershed, recreation, and other amenity values. These values are consistent with the values most commonly espoused by the increasingly urban society in northern Utah. Furthermore, the 1984 Forest Plan was fairly general, and therefore, fairly flexible in its ability to adjust to changing societal needs. Several amendments have been completed, or are underway, to address situations where Forest Plan direction needed to be changed or improved.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Goal attainment reports and public comments received to date in response to scoping for the Forest Plan revision indicate that current management direction generally addresses the significant issues that affect the Forest. Implementation of the Forest Plan has not been highly controversial, though some projects implementing the Forest Plan have been appealed. The following significant public issues, management concerns, and resource use and development opportunities have been identified and are being addressed through the revision process.</p> <p><b>Recreation/Recreation Access:</b> Recreation is increasingly the predominant use of the Uinta NF. As the number of visitors to the Forest has increased, so have the types and extent of recreational uses. Mountain biking, snowmobiling, rock climbing, and the use of all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) are among the recreational activities that have grown dramatically since development of the Forest Plan. More traditional activities like fishing and hiking have also increased in use. The majority of the public who submitted comments on the AMS were against limiting motorized recreation use. Their concerns centered on maintaining accessibility for the elderly and disabled, and continuing to have public lands open and available for all uses. Other members of the public have called for more restrictions on motorized recreation use. They believe that any increase in acreage open for motorized use will lead to a continued degradation of forest resources and will decrease opportunities for solitude.</p> <p><b>Roadless/Wilderness:</b> Approximately 58,000 acres, or six percent, of the Uinta National Forest has been designated Wilderness. Approximately 557,800 acres, or 62 percent, of the remaining acres on the Forest are considered roadless (see the <i>Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Draft Forest Plan, Appendix C, Roadless Area Reevaluation and Recommendation for Wilderness, 2001</i>, for more detail).</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>Some people favor the backcountry, non-motorized experience provided by wilderness designation, and are concerned that the integrity of the ecosystem will be disrupted by development and motorized vehicle use. Others oppose wilderness recommendations in favor of motorized recreation, timber, mining, grazing, and other commodity uses for those areas.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity/Viability:</b> Biodiversity is the variety and abundance of life and its processes, including all living organisms, the genetic differences among them, and the communities and ecosystems in which they occur. Many concepts of biodiversity are relatively new and were therefore not fully addressed in the Forest Plan. Since development of the Forest Plan, the Forest Service has embraced an ecosystem-based approach to resource management. Recent policies and precedents have provided new guidance for maintaining biodiversity. Sensitive species have been identified, and Forest managers have been directed to help ensure viable populations of all native and desirable non-native species. At the same time, a growing public demands management that accommodates use of the Forest. There is a concern about maintaining a diverse, healthy, productive, and sustainable ecosystem while determining the proper balance of management and land use activities.</p> <p><b>Air/Watershed/Water Quality:</b> Water quality is assessed in terms of designated beneficial uses as defined by the State of Utah Division of Water Quality. The majority of streams and reservoirs on the Uinta National Forest provide water for domestic and agricultural uses, cold-water fisheries, recreation, livestock, and wildlife. Maintaining the quality of these waters is becoming increasingly important as the demand for water by the rapidly growing urban population increases. In addition to the emphasis on watershed protection in the Natural Resource Agenda goals, the Forest has an added responsibility to protect the watersheds of the surrounding communities.</p> <p><b>Social/Economic:</b> A large segment of the public is apprehensive about the social and economic impacts of potential changes in management and subsequent use of the Uinta NF as a result of Forest Plan revision. Many members of the public do not want Forest Plan decisions to have a detrimental effect on the local quality of life; they desire that the associated economic effects be generally beneficial. Some members of the public define beneficial effects as maintaining or expanding commodity uses of the forest such as mineral developments and timber harvest. Others believe that decreasing or discontinuing commodity uses would be the best use of the Forest.</p> <p><b>Monitoring/Evaluation:</b> Some members of the public are concerned the Uinta NF is not monitoring the correct resources to determine if current management is adequately protecting or improving forest</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>resources. In addition, some people believe the Forest is not monitoring at a level necessary for the data to be credible. Others expressed concern that the Forest would be unable to increase either the monitoring quantity or frequency given the Forest’s difficulty in accomplishing current monitoring requirements.</p> <p><b>Lands - Property Boundary Management:</b> Points of access to the Uinta National Forest are being lost as a result of private land development and urban sprawl adjacent to the Forest. Additionally, as these private lands are developed, the lack of an identifiable Forest boundary is resulting in trespass problems such as private structures or facilities being built on the Forest. Private inholdings also contribute to trespass problems when developments built on these lands encroach onto National Forest System land. Livestock grazing on private inholdings sometimes cross onto the Forest as well.</p>
<p><b>PUBLIC ISSUE RESOLUTION</b> (Success of Forest Plan implementation in resolving/addressing issues, concerns, opportunities?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The Uinta NF has long placed great amount of emphasis on working informally with interested and concerned citizens, groups, and agencies to resolve conflicts before they result in appeals or litigation. In general these efforts have been highly successful and relatively few Forest Service permit, project, or planning decisions have been appealed, and very few litigated.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> In general, implementation of the Forest Plan has not been highly controversial. Only a limited number of permit actions and project decisions have been administratively appealed and/or litigated. Similar to most other Forests in the nation, national forest management is becoming increasingly controversial. The numbers of appeals and amount of litigation has increased. In addition, the number and complexity of requests for information have significantly increased.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> One campground concessionaire permit action (36 CFR 251 appeal) was appealed. No project or forest plan decisions were appealed.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> One concessionaire permit action (36 CFR 251 appeal) was appealed. This decision was affirmed.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> One campground concessionaire and one ski area permit decision (36 CFR 251 appeals) were appealed (2 appeals). In addition, one ski area decision (same decision as one of the permit appeals), and one timber sale decision were appealed (36 CFR 215 appeals). All decisions were affirmed. The ski area project decision was subsequently litigated and the District</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>Court affirmed the Forest Service’s decision. The court’s decision has subsequently been appealed.</p>
<p><b>EFFECTS ON LANDS WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO FOREST ADMINISTERED BY OTHERS</b> (Forest Service management impacts of other lands and vice versa?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The Uinta NF affects, and is affected by land uses on neighboring lands. Unlike many national forests in the west, the Uinta NF primarily adjoins privately owned lands rather than lands managed by other Federal agencies. The Uinta NF lies entirely within the State of Utah, and within Juab, Utah, Wasatch, Tooele, and Sanpete Counties. Numerous towns and cities adjoin the Forest, and in many cases their “city limits” encompass some neighboring NFS lands.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> There is growing pressure being applied to NFS lands due to urban growth along the Wasatch Front. The Forest is cooperating with adjacent landowners and administering agencies to minimize environmental impacts while meeting growing public needs. In recent years, numerous cases of encroachment (see “LANDS, OCCUPANCY TRESSPASS” section of this document) have occurred. In addition, requests for utility easements and/or other municipal infrastructure needs (e.g. water tank sites) have grown.</p> <p>In addition to management of wildlands, the Uinta NF also has some administrative facilities located within municipalities. Some of these (i.e. Spanish Fork Administrative Site, Spanish Fork Ranger District, Nephi Work Center, and Pleasant Grove Ranger District Office) no longer conform to surrounding uses. Where large parcels of pastureland once surrounded the administrative site, these areas are now residential areas. Conflicts and costs to blend these facilities into the neighborhood are increasing.</p> <p>The Nebo Loop was designated a National Scenic Byway in 1998. Planning and implementation resulting from this designation is being accomplished in cooperation with federal, State, Utah and Juab Counties, and local governments, and other private non-profit entities.</p> <p>Several Forest roads have the potential of becoming part of the Federal Aid Highway program such as the Cascade Springs Scenic Road, Nebo Scenic Loop Road, and Sheep Creek-Indian Creek routes. Several other roads are being considered for designation as part of the public roads network, with the connotation that the standard is potentially high enough to be considered for other funding sources. Continual coordination and collaboration with state and county officials in the management of transportation facilities to and through the Forest has been implemented to ensure that access is</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p data-bbox="575 269 1898 334">maintained, standards are consistent, safety issues are addressed, and efficiency is considered at all times. County officials have indicated the intent to pursue R.S. 2477 rights on numerous Forest roads.</p> <p data-bbox="575 370 1919 467">The Bonneville Shoreline and Great Western Trails are being implemented on the Uinta National Forest. These trails cross lands under multiple jurisdictions and require coordination with state and county governments as well as private land owners.</p> <p data-bbox="575 503 1925 701">Weeds have moved from lower to higher elevations, originating on agricultural and developed lands in the valleys and eventually spreading onto the Forest. Some noxious weed species, however, are showing up in the headwaters of drainages, far from other infestations. If these species become established, seed could quickly spread downstream and create problems where none previously existed. Other pests such as Mormon crickets and bark beetles move from National Forest System lands onto adjacent private property adversely affecting crops and forested areas.</p> <p data-bbox="575 737 1919 899">Management activities on adjacent lands also have the potential to affect National Forest System lands. Timber sales on private property in the White River drainage impact roads in the area and may impact other resources such as water quality. This in turn affects the management activities on National Forest System lands. Needed management activities may not be implemented on NFS lands due to unacceptable cumulative effects.</p> <p data-bbox="575 935 1919 1205">Increased urban/rural development in areas bordering National Forest System lands results in increased pressure on the Uinta National Forest to protect adjacent private lands and developments. Increased fuel loads on NFS lands as a result of decades of forest fire prevention increase the risk to adjacent private properties. Wildfires that occur on lands adjacent to private holdings increase the risk of soil instability in the form of erosion and mudslides onto private property. Additionally, wildfire has the potential to adversely affect air quality for neighboring communities. By the same token, air pollution generated in nearby urban parts of Utah County limit the ability of the Forest Service to implement prescribed burning to reduce accumulated fuel loads.</p> <p data-bbox="575 1273 1919 1403">The Uinta National Forest is adjacent to a large urban area, and viewsheds containing portions of the Forest affect the quality of life for many people in these urban areas. Additionally, private lands near the Forest are generally more valuable when there is a scenic view of Forest Service lands from a given property. Property values and other less tangible yet important benefits to many may increase or</p>



ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	decrease adjacent to the Forest depending upon the quality of the scenery.
<b>FOREST PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COSTS</b> (As projected?)	This section is redundant with the “GENERAL ADMINISTRATION, COST OF CARRYING OUT PLANNED MANAGMENT DIRECTION” section of his document. Please refer to that section.
<b>RESEARCH NEEDS</b>	See the “RESEARCH” section later in this document.
<b>PROTECTION</b>	
<b>SUPPRESSION POLICY AND FIRE INTENSITY</b> (wildfire) (Is policy appropriate and being followed?)	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> Fire occurrence has increased nearly 10 fold since the mid-1900s, primarily due to better reporting by the public and an increase in fuels. Suppression policies have changed from full suppression of all wildfires to making suppression choices based on the resource values involved and the opportunities to meet resource management objectives. There has been a shift to recognize fire as a natural process that helps maintain healthy vegetative conditions by limiting decadence and disease infestations in older growth forms that are more susceptible to deterioration. Unlike many Forest Plans, the 1984 Uinta Forest Plan recognized the role of fire in the ecosystem and provided for the use of prescribed fire.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> As fuel loadings and human use of the Forest grows, the number, intensity and size of fires is increasing. Fire suppression policy is being followed, but with growing fuel levels and numbers of human-caused fires, fire size and intensity is also growing.</p> <p>Federal fire policy has changed since 1984. At the time the Forest Plan was approved all able-bodied employees were expected to participate in fire suppression activities. At that time, there were few long-term, essentially full-time “professional” fire fighters employed on the Forest. Instead, fires were suppressed by employees with other regular duties. Regional and national concerns over safety and increasingly difficult and complex fire-fighting situations resulted in a change in policy. This policy emphasizes maintaining a core cadre of long-term fire fighters to manage and lead the primary fire fighting force. The Forest Plan contains numerous statements pertinent to the old policy. In recognition of the change in fire policy, a forest plan amendment was initiated in October of 1998 (Utah Fire Amendment). A Pre-Decisional Environmental Assessment for the Utah Fire Amendment was released for public review and comment in October of 2000.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p><b>1999:</b> In terms of acres burned, the 1999 fire season was the most severe fire season since 1994. There were 62 human-caused and 19 lightning caused fires on the Uinta NF in 1999. These burned about 10,089 acres (10,073 acres human-caused including 10,042 acres by arson fires and 17 acres lightning-caused). The average fire size in 1999 was about 124.5 acres/fire (162.5 acres human-caused, 0.9 acres lightning caused). Eight fires grew to over 100 acres in size.</p> <p>FMA Zone 1 was identified in the monitoring plan but is no longer in existence. Two new FMA Zones have been established consisting of the approximate area initially identified in Zone 1.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> The 2000 fire season was another severe fire season. The fire season began in late April and the last fire started on October 9, 2000. There were 46 human-caused and 53 lightning caused fires on the Uinta NF in 2000. These burned about 3,813 acres (1,895 acres human-caused and 1,918 acres lightning-caused). The average fire size in 2000 was about 38.5 acres/fire (41.2 acres human-caused and 36.2 acres lightning caused). Eight fires grew to over 100 acres in size.</p>
<p><b>PRESCRIBED FIRE</b> (Within and outside wilderness areas – does prescribed fire meet Forest objectives?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Prescribed fire is often the most cost-effective tool available for achieving forest management objectives. Use of this tool is limited based on the desired outcomes, and on the fuel, weather, and environmental conditions. The primary activities on the Forest adversely impacting air quality are prescribed burns and wildfires. Increased use of prescribed fire could further impact the non-attainment status of Utah County for PM10 as well as new state standards for PM2.5. The Forest currently operates under a Memorandum of Understanding with the Utah Department of Environmental Quality that requires modeling of smoke dispersal and smoke emissions and monitoring of weather conditions prior to and during prescribed burning operations.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> Although use of prescribed fire on the Forest varies considerably from year to year dependent upon fuel, moisture and weather conditions; use of this tool is generally increasing.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> Due to limiting fuel, moisture and weather conditions, no prescribe fire treatments were conducted.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Beginning in 1999, all prescribed burns had to be permitted by the state on an individual basis. Approximately 2,100 acres were treated using prescribed fire. All prescribed fires were appropriately permitted by the State, and were conducted under carefully prescribed conditions. These fires</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>successfully complied with all resource constraints and informal monitoring indicates they achieved the desired land management objectives.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Approximately 12,000 acres were treated using prescribed fire. Results were similar to those achieved for 1999.</p>
<p><b>FUEL MANAGEMENT</b> (Inventory within acceptable level of risk?)</p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> Fuel loadings on the Forest are increasing. Much of this increase is due to the success of past fire suppression activities. As a result, fuel loadings in many areas and many fuel types are well outside the range of natural variability. Fuel treatments are being designed to address this need. Prescribed fire (management ignited fires) and wildland fire use (naturally ignited fires allowed to burn) are the most useful and by far, the most cost-effective fuels management tools available for many fuel types on the Forest. However, these tools can only be used under limited fuel moisture, weather, and environmental conditions. Activity fuels generated through management activities (most commonly timber harvest or road construction) are also treated, if fuel loadings warrant.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> This monitoring item was designed to monitor the effectiveness of fuel treatment projects as compared to a Regional standard; however, there is no Regional standard.</p> <p><b>1998:</b> No fuels treatments were completed in 1998, primarily due to weather, fuel and environmental conditions that did not meet burn prescription limitations for the planned prescribed fire treatments.</p> <p><b>1999:</b> Approximately 2,100 acres were treated for hazardous fuels reduction.</p> <p><b>2000:</b> Approximately 12,000 acres were treated for hazardous fuels reduction, and five acres were treated for harvest related fuels/brush disposal.</p>
<p><b>FIRE CONTROL OBJECTIVE</b> (Appropriate?)</p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> The Forest Plan contains a standard to detect and report wildfire within 10 minutes of ignition 95 percent of the time in Zone 1, and within 30 minutes 80 percent of the time in Zone 2. For more information on fire control efforts and success on the Forest, refer to the “SUPPRESSION POLICY AND FIRE INTENSITY” section of this document.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> The standards for detection and reporting of fires generally are easily met. With nearly all of the Forest visible by either major ground or air travel routes, most fires</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>are reported almost immediately. With the profusion of cell phones it is not uncommon for the dispatch office to receive over 20 calls within 30 minutes of a start. Though this standard has been met, it has not proven to be a good measure of on-the-ground fire control impacts. The 1998 AMS identified this standard as inappropriate. The Utah Fire Amendment initiated in October of 1998 proposed removal of this standard. A Pre-Decisional Environmental Assessment for the Utah Fire Amendment was released for public review and comment on October 25, 2000. The final decision was signed in May of 2001.</p>
<p><b>INSECT, DISEASE, NOXIOUS WEEDS, AND UNDESIRABLE PLANTS</b> (Within endemic proportions?)</p>	<p><b><u>BACKGROUND:</u></b> The situation relative to insects is described in the <i>“TIMBER MANAGEMENT, INSECT AND DISEASE ACTIVITY”</i> section of this document, and is not reiterated here. This section focuses on noxious weeds and undesirable plants. Noxious weeds can reduce site productivity, affect biodiversity in an area, and affect numerous resources. Noxious weeds are a serious forest health issue throughout the country, west, and on the Uinta NF.</p> <p>In 1994, the required use of certified weed-free hay on National Forest System lands in Utah was implemented and enforced. This policy should reduce future propagation of noxious weeds.</p> <p>Forest-wide surveys to identify noxious weed problems have not been conducted. Rather, infestations observed while implementing other management activities on the Forest are noted for future treatment.</p> <p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> Twenty species of noxious weeds and other weed species of concern are known to occur on the Uinta NF and are targeted for treatment. Musk thistle is most prevalent. Blue spurge, perennial pepperweed, Russian knapweed, Russian olive, spotted knapweed, and tamarisk occur as small, isolated populations. Several other noxious weeds are known to occur on lands near the Forest and can be expected to spread to the Forest in the next few years (black henbane, medusahead, purple loosestrife, and yellow star-thistle).</p> <p>To the extent funding allows, the Uinta NF aggressively treats weeds on the Forest. Biological, mechanical and chemical control efforts are employed. The Forest cooperates with counties, cities, the Utah Department of Transportation, grazing permittees, and others to maximize the amount of treatment possible given available funding. However, as can be seen in the following table, only a small portion of the infestations can be treated in any given year. In addition to control treatments, permit and contract provisions have been incorporated into most activities to require measures, which would reduce the amount of new infestations. The Forest has been actively participating in efforts intended to inform and educate the public about the problems weeds pose and to solicit their help in this. Despite all of these</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS																																																																																																																																										
	<p>efforts, the acreage infested by undesirable plants is slowly increasing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Estimated Acres of Undesirable Plant Infestations and Treatments on the Uinta NF</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="621 367 1881 1032"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Species/Year</th> <th colspan="3">Estimated Acres Infested</th> <th colspan="3">Estimated Acres Treated</th> </tr> <tr> <th>1996<sup>1/</sup></th> <th>1999</th> <th>2000</th> <th>1998</th> <th>1999</th> <th>2000</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Musk Thistle</td><td>15,410</td><td>16,113</td><td>16,120</td><td>N/A<sup>2/</sup></td><td>628</td><td>845</td></tr> <tr><td>Canada Thistle</td><td>4,700</td><td>4,850</td><td>4,850</td><td>N/A<sup>2/</sup></td><td>61</td><td>49</td></tr> <tr><td>Scotch Thistle</td><td>22</td><td>28</td><td>46</td><td>N/A<sup>2/</sup></td><td>21</td><td>30</td></tr> <tr><td>Dyer's Woad</td><td>84</td><td>94</td><td>93</td><td>N/A<sup>2/</sup></td><td>24</td><td>74</td></tr> <tr><td>Squarrose Knapweed</td><td>15</td><td>45</td><td>46</td><td>N/A<sup>2/</sup></td><td>22</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>White Top</td><td>512</td><td>536</td><td>540</td><td>N/A<sup>2/</sup></td><td>26</td><td>60</td></tr> <tr><td>Dalmatian Toad Flax</td><td>751</td><td>831</td><td>931</td><td>N/A<sup>2/</sup></td><td>26</td><td>35</td></tr> <tr><td>Leafy Spurge</td><td>5</td><td>5</td><td>5</td><td>N/A<sup>2/</sup></td><td>1</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>Jointed Goatgrass</td><td>30</td><td>55</td><td>55</td><td>N/A<sup>2/</sup></td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>Spotted Knapweed</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>4</td><td>N/A<sup>2/</sup></td><td>0</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Poison Hemlock</td><td>N/A</td><td>30</td><td>31</td><td>N/A<sup>2/</sup></td><td>20</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>Hounds Tongue</td><td>N/A</td><td>45</td><td>55</td><td>N/A<sup>2/</sup></td><td>12</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr><td>Common Burdock</td><td>N/A</td><td>21</td><td>31</td><td>N/A<sup>2/</sup></td><td>15</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Yellow Star Thistle</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>N/A<sup>2/</sup></td><td>0</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Russian Knapweed</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>N/A<sup>2/</sup></td><td>1</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>Perennial Pepperweed</td><td>0</td><td>4</td><td>11</td><td>N/A<sup>2/</sup></td><td>4</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>Uinta NF Total</td><td>21,531</td><td>22,659</td><td>22,820</td><td>1,107</td><td>861</td><td>1,137</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p><sup>1/</sup> 1997 and 1998 data not available.  <sup>2/</sup> Data on breakdown of individual species treated is not available.</p>							Species/Year	Estimated Acres Infested			Estimated Acres Treated			1996 <sup>1/</sup>	1999	2000	1998	1999	2000	Musk Thistle	15,410	16,113	16,120	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	628	845	Canada Thistle	4,700	4,850	4,850	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	61	49	Scotch Thistle	22	28	46	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	21	30	Dyer's Woad	84	94	93	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	24	74	Squarrose Knapweed	15	45	46	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	22	2	White Top	512	536	540	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	26	60	Dalmatian Toad Flax	751	831	931	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	26	35	Leafy Spurge	5	5	5	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	1	2	Jointed Goatgrass	30	55	55	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	0	0	Spotted Knapweed	2	1	4	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	0	1	Poison Hemlock	N/A	30	31	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	20	0	Hounds Tongue	N/A	45	55	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	12	20	Common Burdock	N/A	21	31	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	15	16	Yellow Star Thistle	0	0	1	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	0	1	Russian Knapweed	0	1	1	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	1	0	Perennial Pepperweed	0	4	11	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	4	0	Uinta NF Total	21,531	22,659	22,820	1,107	861	1,137
Species/Year	Estimated Acres Infested			Estimated Acres Treated																																																																																																																																							
	1996 <sup>1/</sup>	1999	2000	1998	1999	2000																																																																																																																																					
Musk Thistle	15,410	16,113	16,120	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	628	845																																																																																																																																					
Canada Thistle	4,700	4,850	4,850	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	61	49																																																																																																																																					
Scotch Thistle	22	28	46	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	21	30																																																																																																																																					
Dyer's Woad	84	94	93	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	24	74																																																																																																																																					
Squarrose Knapweed	15	45	46	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	22	2																																																																																																																																					
White Top	512	536	540	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	26	60																																																																																																																																					
Dalmatian Toad Flax	751	831	931	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	26	35																																																																																																																																					
Leafy Spurge	5	5	5	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	1	2																																																																																																																																					
Jointed Goatgrass	30	55	55	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	0	0																																																																																																																																					
Spotted Knapweed	2	1	4	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	0	1																																																																																																																																					
Poison Hemlock	N/A	30	31	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	20	0																																																																																																																																					
Hounds Tongue	N/A	45	55	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	12	20																																																																																																																																					
Common Burdock	N/A	21	31	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	15	16																																																																																																																																					
Yellow Star Thistle	0	0	1	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	0	1																																																																																																																																					
Russian Knapweed	0	1	1	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	1	0																																																																																																																																					
Perennial Pepperweed	0	4	11	N/A <sup>2/</sup>	4	0																																																																																																																																					
Uinta NF Total	21,531	22,659	22,820	1,107	861	1,137																																																																																																																																					
<p><b>LAW ENFORCEMENT</b> (Are law enforcement goals being met? Is level appropriate?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Public safety and resource protection are of critical importance. The Forest Service has long recognized the importance of law enforcement in achieving these goals; however, the agency's ability to provide law enforcement is limited by available funding and staffing.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> The needs for law enforcement are outpacing the agency's ability to respond. Urban influences have caused an increase in vandalism, which then necessitates increased maintenance and prevention efforts. Cooperation with local law enforcement agencies has helped but the combined effort is still less than desired. Forest Service presence in campgrounds has</p>																																																																																																																																										

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>been significantly reduced in recent years due to budget constraints, organizational changes, and management of many areas by concessionaires.</p> <p>There were three full-time law enforcement personnel on the Uinta NF during 1998 to 2000. In addition to these full-time law enforcement personnel, other Forest Service resource officers were utilized to do routine patrols, document incidents, and where appropriate, to issue violation notices. The number of these seasonal, or part-time law enforcement personnel (i.e. Level 2 officers) is not reported. The number of level 2 officers has varied from year to year dependent on funding levels. In 1999 and 2000, additional Level 2 officers were hired for the American Fork Canyon area through fee demo monies.</p> <p>The Forest Service also provides law enforcement through support from county sheriff departments. Through a cooperative law enforcement agreement, the Forest Service provides affected counties funding. The amount of funding provided is determined considering the funding available and language/limitations in the pertinent appropriations bill. In fiscal year 1998, the Uinta NF provided \$76,000 to Utah, Tooele, Wasatch, and Juab Counties. In 1999 and 2000, the amount of funding provided dropped to \$71,725.</p>
<b>RESEARCH</b>	
<b>RESEARCH NEEDS</b>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> Continuing research will always be needed to determine better ways to manage resources and land uses in the future, and to better identify the effects of management actions on the environment and other resources and land uses.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> The Forest has, and is continuing to cooperate with Forest Service Research, universities, and other national forests and agencies in conducting research to address management questions and needs. Some of the current research projects include identification of pure strain Colorado River and Bonneville cutthroat trout; regeneration of sagebrush on winter range; restoration of wildlands burned by wildfire; habitat utilization by flammulated owls, bats, and Canada lynx; cultural resource excavations and evaluations; biomonitoring air quality impacts; and air quality in Lone Peak Wilderness Area.</p>
<b>GENERAL ADMINISTRATION</b>	
<b>COST OF CARRYING OUT PLANNED MANAGEMENT DIRECTION</b> (Are budget requirements in keeping with	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The Forest Plan contained an estimate of the budget needed for implementation. The original Forest Plan costs were developed using 1978 dollars. In 1992, these costs were updated and these updated costs are used in this report. Costs have been converted from 1992 dollars to the relevant</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS																																								
management goals?)	<p>fiscal year using the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) Price Index values.</p> <p><b>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</b> The Forest has never received the funding required for full implementation of the Forest Plan. Since the Forest Plan was approved in 1984, funding ranged from 24 percent (1988) to 71 percent (2000) of plan levels. Not only has implementation of the Forest Plan not been fully funded, but the cost of doing business has often been higher than anticipated. Some resource areas have been funded more fully than others, resulting in inconsistent implementation.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Uinta NF Funding Levels for the 1998-2000 Time Period</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="764 581 1740 954"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1998</th> <th>1999</th> <th>2000</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Forest Plan Budget</td> <td>\$12,550</td> <td>\$12,720</td> <td>\$12,910</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Construction Funds</td> <td>\$4,680</td> <td>\$4,740</td> <td>\$4,820</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Appropriated Monies</td> <td>\$7,870</td> <td>\$7,970</td> <td>\$8,090</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Actual Budget</td> <td>\$6,685</td> <td>\$8,507</td> <td>\$9,229</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Construction Funds</td> <td>\$670</td> <td>\$2,153</td> <td>\$2,270</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Appropriated Monies</td> <td>\$6,015</td> <td>\$6,354</td> <td>\$6,959</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percent Funded</td> <td>53%</td> <td>67%</td> <td>71%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Construction Funds</td> <td>14%</td> <td>45%</td> <td>47%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Appropriated Monies</td> <td>76%</td> <td>80%</td> <td>86%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		1998	1999	2000	Forest Plan Budget	\$12,550	\$12,720	\$12,910	• Construction Funds	\$4,680	\$4,740	\$4,820	• Appropriated Monies	\$7,870	\$7,970	\$8,090	Actual Budget	\$6,685	\$8,507	\$9,229	• Construction Funds	\$670	\$2,153	\$2,270	• Appropriated Monies	\$6,015	\$6,354	\$6,959	Percent Funded	53%	67%	71%	• Construction Funds	14%	45%	47%	• Appropriated Monies	76%	80%	86%
	1998	1999	2000																																						
Forest Plan Budget	\$12,550	\$12,720	\$12,910																																						
• Construction Funds	\$4,680	\$4,740	\$4,820																																						
• Appropriated Monies	\$7,870	\$7,970	\$8,090																																						
Actual Budget	\$6,685	\$8,507	\$9,229																																						
• Construction Funds	\$670	\$2,153	\$2,270																																						
• Appropriated Monies	\$6,015	\$6,354	\$6,959																																						
Percent Funded	53%	67%	71%																																						
• Construction Funds	14%	45%	47%																																						
• Appropriated Monies	76%	80%	86%																																						
<p><b>WORKFORCE MANAGEMENT</b> (Is the present workforce representative of current and projected Forest Plan implementation needs?)</p>	<p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The number of persons utilized to manage the Forest is one barometer of the degree of Forest Plan implementation. As importantly, Forest Service personnel, like personnel from other employers, contribute substantially to the social and economic well being of communities. This is especially true in small communities.</p> <p>The Forest's Human Resource Program enhances our cultural diversity and provides meaningful opportunities for many people who would not otherwise have the opportunity to contribute to management of America's national forests. This program includes volunteers, Senior Community Employment Program (SCSEP), and Youth Conservation Corps (YCC) enrollees. The Uinta Forest Plan projected a workforce figure of 118 full-time equivalents (FTEs). This figure does not include Human Resource Program enrollees or personnel employed as emergency fire fighters.</p>																																								

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS																				
	<p><b><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></b> The Forest has never achieved the funding or staffing levels envisioned in the Forest Plan. It appears unlikely this will occur in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>The Uinta NF shares several personnel with the Wasatch-Cache and Ashley National Forests, and the Forest Service’s Geometronics Service Center in Salt Lake City. From 1992 through 1997, the Uinta averaged 75 permanent, full-time employees. Actual total (includes seasonal and part-time employees) FTEs (not including emergency fire fighters and HRP personnel) have ranged from 90 in 1988 to 116 in 1993. Since 1997, the reporting system has changed and numbers now include persons employed as emergency fire fighters. Because of this it is difficult to compare post 1997 data with pre-1997 data.</p> <p>Volunteers, YCC, and SCSEP enrollees supplement the Uinta National Forest work force. The Forest consistently leads the region and nation in its volunteer program. The Forest averaged about 8,000 volunteers per year, who have accomplished about \$1,500,000 of work annually. In addition the Forest has hosted an average of about 30 SCSEP enrollees per year over the last several years. This equates to about 10-15 person-years and a value of \$300,000 per year. Over the last three years the SCSEP available to the Forest has been reduced slightly each year, which has reduced the total HRP contribution.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Uinta NF Workforce (Full-Time Equivalents) for the 1998-2000 Time Period</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="709 919 1795 1133"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1998</th> <th>1999</th> <th>2000</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Permanent</td> <td>64</td> <td>66</td> <td>71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Employment</td> <td>40</td> <td>51</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Employment</td> <td>104</td> <td>117</td> <td>124</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Human Resource Program (Volunteers, Hosts, etc.)</td> <td>66</td> <td>63</td> <td>60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		1998	1999	2000	Permanent	64	66	71	Other Employment	40	51	53	Total Employment	104	117	124	Human Resource Program (Volunteers, Hosts, etc.)	66	63	60
	1998	1999	2000																		
Permanent	64	66	71																		
Other Employment	40	51	53																		
Total Employment	104	117	124																		
Human Resource Program (Volunteers, Hosts, etc.)	66	63	60																		



<b>LIST OF PREPARERS</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject Area(s)</b>
Kim Martin	Roads, Facilities, Water and Sanitary Systems, Minerals
Ryan Stone	Water and Sanitary Systems
Renee Flanagan	Roads and Facilities
Reese Pope	Planning, Writer-Editor, Watershed, Fish and Wildlife, Vegetation, Air
Bob Gecy	Watershed
Dea Nelson	Ecology, Noxious Weeds, Special Ecosystems, Botany, Rare Plants
Dave Fogle	Aquatic Biota
Karen Hartman	Terrestrial Wildlife
Antoinette SittingUp	Terrestrial Wildlife
Robbie McAboy	Recreation, Wilderness
Marlene DePietro	Planning, Rangeland Management, Noxious Weeds, Watershed
Barbara Ott	Budget, Writer-Editor, Social Science
Bret Ruby	Fire
Kevin Draper	Visuals, Recreation
Ken Burton	GIS
Vicki May	Human Resources
Clyde Lay	Recreation, Lands, Wilderness
Doug Page	Forestry, Timber Management
Jim Gibson	Forestry, Timber Management
Randy Miles	Budget

<b>REVIEW/CONCURRENCE BY:</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Uinta National Forest Leadership Team Position</b>
Pete Karp	Forest Supervisor
William Ott	Spanish Fork District Ranger
Robert Easton	Pleasant Grove District Ranger
Julie King	Heber District Ranger
Reese Pope	Ecosystem and Planning Group Leader
Loyal Clark	Public Affairs Officer
John Logan	Public Service Group Leader
Paul Gauchay	Administrative Officer
Kim Martin	Forest Engineer