

Uinta National Forest

State of the Forest Report For Fiscal Years 2001 and 2002

Based on the 1984 Land and Resource Management Plan, as Amended

September 2003

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 has completed the process of revising the Uinta National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan). Throughout the revision process, we continued to monitor and evaluate implementation of the 1984 Forest Plan, as amended. 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. The 2002 State of the Forest Report summarized information from the 1999 State of the Forest Report and the AMS, and summarizes monitoring and evaluation information for 2000 as well.

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) for 2001 and 2002. State of the Forest reports usually evaluate the need to amend or revise forest plans; however, revision of the 1984 Forest Plan was recently been completed. The Draft Revised Forest Plan and accompanying Draft Environmental Impact Statement were released for public comment and review in May 2001, and the final 2003 Forest Plan and accompanying Final Environmental Impact Statement were released in May 2003. Many of the needs for change identified in the AMS, and in the State of the Forest Report for Fiscal Years 1999 and 2000 were 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 revised Forest Plan. If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Reese Pope, Ecosystem and Planning Group 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.

This will be the final State of the Forest Report for the Uinta National Forest that will address the monitoring items herein. The 2003 Forest Plan revision identified new monitoring and evaluation items that will be addressed beginning with the 2003 State of the Forest Report.

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
RECREATION	
<p>RECREATION USER PREFERENCES - DISPERSED CAMPING (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>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Dispersed recreation use on the Forest, including dispersed camping, 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, and erosion). In response to these effects, 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 Mount Nebo National Scenic Byway (Nebo 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. 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>2001: Dispersed recreation use continues to exceed 1984 Forest Plan projections. Approximately 40 sites in Diamond Fork remain closed due to CUP construction activities. Inventory work was continued.</p> <p>2002: Dispersed recreation use continues to exceed 1984 Forest Plan projections. Approximately 40 sites in Diamond Fork continued to be closed due to CUP construction activities. Inventory work continued.</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>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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>2001: Construction of a group site(s) in the Diamond Fork area is being planned. The Lodgepole and Timpooneke Campgrounds were remodeled. INFRA (a database to track forest infrastructure) inventory work was continued.</p> <p>2002: INFRA inventory indicates that current capacity is approximately 31,300 PAOTS. Construction of a group site(s) in the Diamond Fork area is being planned. Current facilities consist of 29 campgrounds, 24 picnic areas/day use sites, 13 interpretive sites, 26 boating/fishing access sites, 62 developed trailheads/transfer stations, 14 scenic overlooks, 1 visitor center, 134 recreation residences, and 7 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>RECREATION USER PREFERENCES – MOTORIZED/NON-MOTORIZED ROAD- AND TRAIL-BASED RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES (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>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>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 27,894 in 2000. There are approximately 150 miles of groomed snowmobile trail and 14 trailheads designed to accommodate snowmobile use on the Forest. Construction of trailheads and most of the trail grooming has been partially funded through a partnership with the Utah State Division of Parks and Recreation. This partnership enables the State of Utah to utilize snowmobile registration fees for development and maintenance of snowmobile trails and parking facilities. Daniels Summit Lodge also assists in grooming trails on the Forest. The concessionaire for the developed recreation sites is responsible for plowing parking lots associated with the use of snowmobiles on the Forest. The Utah Department of Transportation assists in plowing some areas adjacent to highways, depending on the demand for snow removal on the highways.</p> <p>Non-motorized winter recreation use is also increasing. There are currently 15 miles of designated cross-country ski trails, which are not groomed, and 4 associated trailheads.</p> <p>Motorized and non-motorized road and trail-based recreation use is increasing. In particular, off-highway vehicle (OHV) use has also grown in popularity. OHV registrations in Utah increased from 30,858 in 1990 to 83,054 in 2000. Over the last several years, approximately 5 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 5 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>2001-2002: There are approximately 600 miles of inventoried trails (non-motorized 275, motorized 325) and 62 trailheads on the Forest. In addition, there are about 670 miles of road where use of high clearance vehicles is advised. This included 390 miles of road open to use by non-street legal OHVs. Approximately 500 of the 600 miles of trail meet appropriate maintenance standards. There are approximately 150 miles of groomed snowmobile trail and 14 trailheads designed to accommodate snowmobile use on the Forest. There are currently 15 miles of designated cross-country ski trails and 4 associated trailheads on the Forest.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p>RECREATION USER PREFERENCES BY RECREATION OPPORTUNITY SPECTRUM (ROS) CLASS (Supply versus Demand)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: Recreationists choose a setting and activity to create a desired experience. The Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) system describes different classes of outdoor environments, activities, and experience opportunities (see below):</p>
	<p>Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Classes and Settings</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 on-site controls; access and travel facilities are for intensified motorized use.</p>	

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS															
	<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 an maintained.</p> <p>The 1984 Forest Plan did not make any recreation opportunity allocation decisions, though the Strawberry Valley Management Area Amendment of 1990 did identify these allocations for the newly-acquired Strawberry Project lands. The 1984 Forest Plan did, however, estimate the mix of recreation opportunities that would be available through implementation of the Forest Plan. These projections (adjusted to reflect changes in land ownership) are shown in the following table:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1984 Projections of ROS Opportunities on the Uinta NF</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="898 743 1745 1015"> <thead> <tr> <th>ROS Classification</th> <th>Acreage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Primitive</td> <td>58,400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized</td> <td>390,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Semi-Primitive Motorized</td> <td>208,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Roaded Natural</td> <td>167,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rural</td> <td>73,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Urban</td> <td>1,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> 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;">Estimation of Existing ROS Opportunities on the Uinta NF</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">43,480</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="900 483 1507 516">Semi-Primitive Motorized</td> <td data-bbox="1507 483 1745 516">455,610</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="900 516 1507 548">Roaded Natural</td> <td data-bbox="1507 516 1745 548">338,220</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="900 548 1507 581">Rural</td> <td data-bbox="1507 548 1745 581">1,680</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	43,480	Semi-Primitive Motorized	455,610	Roaded Natural	338,220	Rural	1,680	Urban	0
ROS Classification	Acreage														
Primitive	58,400														
Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized	43,480														
Semi-Primitive Motorized	455,610														
Roaded Natural	338,220														
Rural	1,680														
Urban	0														
<p>SITE/FACILITY CONDITION HEALTH, SANITATION AND SAFETY</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Condition surveys are conducted annually at start-up. Sanitary surveys for water systems are completed every 5 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> <p style="text-align: center;">Uinta NF Bacteriological Water System Test Results – 1998 through 2002</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="768 1182 978 1219">Year</th> <th data-bbox="978 1182 1274 1219"># Tests</th> <th data-bbox="1274 1182 1575 1219"># Tests Passed</th> <th data-bbox="1575 1182 1877 1219">System Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="768 1219 978 1256">2001</td> <td data-bbox="978 1219 1274 1256">263</td> <td data-bbox="1274 1219 1575 1256">236</td> <td data-bbox="1575 1219 1877 1256">90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="768 1256 978 1294">2002</td> <td data-bbox="978 1256 1274 1294">268</td> <td data-bbox="1274 1256 1575 1294">249</td> <td data-bbox="1575 1256 1877 1294">93%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Vulnerability assessments and condition surveys for health and safety have been completed. 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</p>	Year	# Tests	# Tests Passed	System Score	2001	263	236	90%	2002	268	249	93%		
Year	# Tests	# Tests Passed	System Score												
2001	263	236	90%												
2002	268	249	93%												

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS									
	<p>remains. In 2001 one water system was partially reconstructed. In 2002 one system was completely reconstructed and a septic system was installed.</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. The inventory of administrative facilities and recreation buildings was completed and input into INFRA in 2002.</p>									
<p>SITE/FACILITY ACCESSIBILITY</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: Most administrative and recreation buildings on the Forest were constructed many years ago, 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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 2002, 100 percent of the 86 administrative and 219 recreation 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="682 1015 1900 1356"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="682 1015 808 1047">Year</th> <th data-bbox="808 1015 1186 1047">Building Status</th> <th data-bbox="1186 1015 1900 1047">Comments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="682 1047 808 1226">1998</td> <td data-bbox="808 1047 1186 1226"> 301 Buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 104 Accessible • 56 Useable • 141 Not Accessible </td> <td data-bbox="1186 1047 1900 1226"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built 5 new accessible recreation buildings • Replaced 8 recreation buildings with accessible buildings • Remodeled 1 restroom at an administrative site to make it accessible </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="682 1226 808 1356">1999</td> <td data-bbox="808 1226 1186 1356"> 301 Buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 106 Accessible • 55 Useable • 140 Not Accessible </td> <td data-bbox="1186 1226 1900 1356"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replaced 1 recreation building with accessible building • Remodeled 1 restroom at an administrative site to make it accessible </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Building Status	Comments	1998	301 Buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 104 Accessible • 56 Useable • 141 Not Accessible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built 5 new accessible recreation buildings • Replaced 8 recreation buildings with accessible buildings • Remodeled 1 restroom at an administrative site to make it accessible 	1999	301 Buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 106 Accessible • 55 Useable • 140 Not Accessible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replaced 1 recreation building with accessible building • Remodeled 1 restroom at an administrative site to make it accessible
Year	Building Status	Comments								
1998	301 Buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 104 Accessible • 56 Useable • 141 Not Accessible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built 5 new accessible recreation buildings • Replaced 8 recreation buildings with accessible buildings • Remodeled 1 restroom at an administrative site to make it accessible 								
1999	301 Buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 106 Accessible • 55 Useable • 140 Not Accessible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replaced 1 recreation building with accessible building • Remodeled 1 restroom at an administrative site to make it accessible 								

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS		
	2000	306 Buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 124 Accessible • 55 Useable • 127 Not Accessible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built 4 new accessible recreation buildings • Built 1 new accessible administrative facility • Replaced 13 recreation buildings with accessible buildings
	2001-2002	305 Buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 98 Accessible* • 92 Useable • 115 Not Accessible 	2001 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built 1 new accessible storage shed • Built 5 new accessible vault toilets 2002 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built 1 new accessible vault toilet
	<p>* Over the course of 2001 and 2002, several vault toilets were decommissioned. Additionally, prior to 2001 many recreation buildings had not been thoroughly surveyed. Changed/updated definitions of what is required for accessibility resulted in some buildings that had been listed as accessible being changed to usable.</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>OFF-ROAD VEHICLE IMPACTS (Compliance with 36 CFR 295)</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> The Uinta National Forest is closed to vehicle use unless designated open, except for the retrieval of legally taken game.</p> <p><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> 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</p>		

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>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>2001: See “Current Conditions and Trends.” According to the LAMARS database, about 868 violation notices, warning notices, or incident reports were issued in 2001. Eighty-two (82) of these were issued for illegal operation of OHVs in closed areas, or off-road.</p> <p>2002: See “Current Conditions and Trends.” According to the LAMARS database, about 1,198 violation notices, warning notices, or incident reports were issued in 2002. One hundred twenty-four (124) of these were issued for illegal operation of OHVs in closed areas, or off-road.</p>
<p>CULTURAL/HERITAGE RESOURCE PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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 and through heritage projects that involve volunteers. Through 2000, about 8 percent of the Forest (72,769 acres) had been surveyed for archaeological and historical sites and 362 sites had been documented.</p> <p>2001: An additional 12,023 acres of land were checked for heritage sites, bringing the total acres</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>surveyed to 84,792. The majority of these inventories were funded through environmental analyses for proposed prescribed fire projects. Thirty-nine new sites were documented, bringing the total number of sites on the Forest up to 401. Program highlights included the third year of a successful Passport in Time (PIT) volunteer archaeological program on the Vernon Unit. This year 14 new sites were documented and 330 acres surveyed by 10 PIT volunteers.</p> <p>2002: A total of 9,594 acres of land were surveyed this year, with the largest number of acres again being part of prescribed fire planning efforts. Cumulatively, a little over 10 percent of the Forest has been surveyed (94,386 acres). Twenty-nine new sites were recorded, including 3 sites which are on non-agency land, but were potentially affected by Forest actions such as proposed land exchanges. The total number of sites on the Forest is now 427. Program highlights include considerable progress in creating site and survey area layers in GIS. As a result, more accurate figures are expected next year for the total number of acres surveyed on the Forest.</p>
<p>VISUAL EFFECTS</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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>2001: 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>2002: Same as 2001.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
WILDERNESS	
<p>WILDERNESS CONDITION, USE, AND DISTRIBUTION</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: The Uinta National Forest contains 3 designated wilderness areas. Lone Peak Wilderness Area is about 31,165 acres in size and is shared with the Wasatch-Cache National Forest (20,829 acres on the Uinta, 10,336 acres on the Wasatch-Cache). This wilderness was established in 1978 and management direction for it was included in the 1984 Forest Plan. The Mount Timpanogos (10,518 acres) and Mount Nebo (27,070 acres) Wilderness Areas were each established in 1984 and are located entirely on the Uinta. These 2 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Recreation use in the 3 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 heavily impacted 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 activity has increased significantly in Lone Peak in the last 5 years. In</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>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 3 areas.</p> <p>A major wilderness-related law enforcement issue is motorized encroachment by ATVs and snowmobiles. Staffing and funding hampers enforcement. Other problems include illegal campfires, group size violations, and trail cutting.</p> <p>2001: Use data is not available. See “Current Conditions and Trends.”</p> <p>2002: Use data is not available. See “Current Conditions and Trends.”</p>
WILDLIFE, FISH, AND BIOTIC RESOURCES (MANAGEMENT INDICATOR SPECIES)	
<p>BIG GAME (Mule Deer and Elk) EARLY TO MID-SUCCESSIONAL (Aspen, Conifer, Mountain Brush, Sagebrush-Grass)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: Big game species were identified as Management Indicator Species (MIS) in the 1993 amendment to the 1984 Forest Plan. Most of the Uinta National Forest is considered summer range for big game species. The Forest provides crucial forage for big game species, in addition to important elk and moose calving and mule deer fawning habitat. Aspen forests are especially important for providing calving/fawning habitat, forage, and browse for elk, mule deer, and moose. Although the majority of big game winter range is located on private lands below the Uinta National Forest, lower-elevation areas on the Forest do provide important winter range, especially along the Wasatch Front.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Most critical winter range occurs off-forest. Much of this winter range has been impacted, primarily by urban growth and development. These impacts have increased the importance of winter range on the Uinta National Forest. Vegetative conditions are somewhat stable, but there is evidence that conditions are generally deteriorating and not meeting desired future conditions. Human disturbance affects habitat quality for big game species. Urbanization and the growing population along the Wasatch Front have led to increasing human disturbance to big game species, especially on their winter range. 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 UDWR. In addition to management of habitat on summer and</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>winter range, the Forest Service participates in management of big game species by providing input through the Central Region Regional Advisory Council.</p> <p>Winter range trend study sites have been established as part of a state-wide Forest Service/UDWR monitoring study. These sites are periodically monitored. Twenty-nine sites were evaluated in 2002. Soil conditions on 7 sites were found to have a downward trend, 9 were down slightly, 8 were stable, 4 were up slightly, and 1 was described as up. Browse conditions were described as down on 3 sites, slightly down on 5 sites, stable on 17 sites, up slightly on 3 sites, and up on 1 site. The herbaceous understory on 8 sites was down, 7 were down slightly, 12 were stable, and 2 were up slightly. Browse utilization was described as light at 4 sites, moderate at 3, moderate to heavy at 5, and heavy at 7 sites. Drought conditions and fires contributed to the increased number of sites with downward trends.</p>
<p>BEAVER (Riparian, Wetlands)</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> The American beaver was identified as an MIS in the 1993 amendment to the 1984 Forest Plan. Beavers play an important part in the overall stability and health of riparian ecosystems. Their dams provide natural flow control structures, maintain water levels, create or influence habitat for a wide variety of plants and animals, and help minimize erosion in riparian systems.</p> <p><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> Landscape assessments conducted on the Forest have indicated that a lack of beaver presence in certain drainages may be cause for concern for riparian functioning and health. Beaver activity and presence is monitored in conjunction with stream and aquatic biota surveys. These surveys indicate that beavers are relatively common and well distributed across the Forest. Additional surveys are being initiated to better determine beaver population trend across the Forest. 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, beaver populations are stable in some areas of the Forest and slowly increasing in others.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>2001: No surveys conducted.</p> <p>2002: Fifteen streams or portions of streams were surveyed for active beaver colonies: Indian Creek, Willow Creek, Mud Creek, Bryant’s Fork, Streeper Creek, Co-op Creek, Clyde Creek, Horse Creek, Bjorkman Hollow, Crooked Creek, Squaw Creek, Strawberry River, Diamond Fork, a portion of Wannhodes, and a portion of Sixth Water.</p>
<p>BALD EAGLE (Select Winter Roost Areas Along Riparian Areas)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: The bald eagle is currently classified as <i>threatened</i> under the Endangered Species Act. The bald eagle was petitioned in January 2001 to be taken off of the List of Threatened and Endangered Species. It was identified as an MIS in the 1993 amendment to the 1984 Forest Plan. Very few bald eagles have nested in Utah in recent years, and no nests have been located on or near the Uinta National Forest. Bald eagles do occur as migrants and winter residents on and near the Forest and are most commonly observed foraging and roosting along rivers between November and March. They are regularly seen during the winter in Heber Valley, the Vernon Unit, and in canyons along the Wasatch Front, including Provo, American Fork, Hobble Creek, White River, and Diamond Fork, and in the Nebo Unit along Salt Creek.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Bald eagle populations across North America continue to increase from lows in the 1970s that resulted from effects of pesticide use. Winter bald eagle surveys are conducted on parts of the Uinta National Forest by personnel from UDWR and the Forest. Bald eagle roost and nesting surveys, which occur primarily off-Forest, 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. An increase in sightings and use of the Forest has occurred concurrently with the overall increase in the population.</p> <p>2001: Bald eagle surveys conducted by the UDWR in Rush Valley (Tooele County) found several bald eagles around Rush Lake, which is located approximately 10 miles north of the Vernon Unit. The survey classified 17 adult and 3 immature eagles at the lake.</p> <p>2002: No bald eagle surveys were conducted.</p> <p>Data from UDWR for Rush Valley since 1986 shows counts ranging from 106 adult birds in 1986 to 8 adult birds in 1999 with no discernable trend. However, eagle population trends nationally are</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	continuing to move upward.
<p>PEREGRINE FALCON (Rock Outcrops, Cliffs)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: This species was formerly classified as <i>endangered</i> but was removed from the List of Threatened and Endangered Species in 1999. It is classified as <i>sensitive</i> by the Intermountain Region of the Forest Service and was identified as an MIS in the 1993 amendment to the 1984 Forest Plan. Historically, peregrine falcons nested on cliffs along the Wasatch Front within and below Uinta National Forest boundaries.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Similar to the bald eagle, peregrine falcon populations continue to increase across North America following population lows in the 1960s and 1970s that resulted from effects of pesticide use. Nesting surveys are conducted on parts of the Uinta National Forest along the Wasatch Front by personnel from UDWR and the Forest. One adult and tended greenery (start of a nest) were sighted in Little Rock Canyon in 2002. No young were seen. No nest has been found on the Forest in recent years, but an increasing number of nesting pairs are using artificial nest sites off of the Forest in Utah and Salt Lake Counties. As populations continue to increase, it is likely that peregrine falcon nests will again be found on the Uinta National Forest along cliffs in the canyons of the Wasatch Front.</p>
<p>GOSHAWK (Old growth [Douglas-fir, mixed conifer, and aspen])</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: The northern goshawk is classified as <i>sensitive</i> by the Intermountain Region of the Forest Service. It was identified as an MIS in the 1993 amendment to the 1984 Forest Plan. On the Uinta National Forest, goshawks typically nest in mature conifer, aspen, or mixed aspen/conifer stands. They prey on a wide variety of species, including woodpeckers, grouse, jays, red squirrels, and snowshoe hares.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Hawk Watch International conducts spring migration counts of raptors, including goshawks, near 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 UDWR.</p> <p>Goshawk population trend on the Forest is monitored by conducting annual surveys of territory occupancy. Between 13 and 19 goshawk territories have been monitored across the Forest</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>between 1996 and 2003. Additional goshawk territories undoubtedly occur on the Uinta National Forest. Territory occupancy has fluctuated greatly between years, but has been stable between 1996 and 2002. Goshawk nest surveys will continue to be conducted for projects that potentially impact nesting habitat, and territory occupancy will continue to be monitored at the Forest scale. Ongoing research in the national forests in Utah is evaluating goshawk migration and habitat use patterns.</p> <p>2001: Forest-wide goshawk territory occupancy surveys were conducted. Surveys indicated that only 1 of the 6 territories occupied in 2000 was occupied in 2001. A total of 6 active nests were located, with 10 fledglings.</p> <p>2002: Forest-wide goshawk territory occupancy surveys were conducted. Surveys indicated that 7 territories, including all 6 of the territories occupied in 2000, were occupied in 2002. A total of 7 active nests were located, with 10 fledglings.</p>
<p>SALMONIDS (Bonneville and Colorado River cutthroat trout) (Aquatic)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: The Uinta National Forest provides habitat for Bonneville and Colorado River 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 agreements 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 1984 Forest Plan included management direction emphasizing protection of riparian areas, watersheds, fish and wildlife habitat, and water quality.</p> <p>Bonneville cutthroat trout: 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, 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</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>streams in upper Diamond Fork. Past surveys indicate that self-sustaining populations of remnant Bonneville cutthroat trout are present in Tie Fork.</p> <p>Colorado River cutthroat trout: 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 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 River 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 White River and its tributaries. The UDWR suspects the Right Fork of White River contains a population of naturally reproducing Colorado River cutthroat trout.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</p> <p>2001: Conducted R1/R4 stream inventory in the South Fork Provo River, West Fork Duchesne, and Willow Creek (56 miles total). Pleasant Grove Ranger District – Conducted R1/R4 stream inventory on the North Fork of American Fork River above Dutchman Flat (22.5 miles). Spanish Fork Ranger District – Conducted R1/R4 stream inventory on First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Water Creeks, Tabbyune Creek, and Cottonwood Creek (62 miles total).</p> <p>2002: Conducted R1/R4 stream inventory on Strawberry River (62 miles). Conducted headwater surveys on all Bonneville and Colorado River cutthroat trout streams within the Forest boundary (100 miles total).</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p>SAGE GROUSE (Sagebrush [old growth and successional])</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> The greater sage grouse was classified as an MIS under the 1993 amendment to the 1984 Forest Plan. Sage grouse populations have been declining range-wide, and this species has been petitioned to be listed under the Endangered Species Act. There are only 2 known populations of greater sage grouse on the Uinta National Forest: one on the Vernon Unit of the Spanish Fork Ranger District, and one in Strawberry Valley on the Heber Ranger District.</p> <p><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> Lek counts have been conducted by the UDWR to monitor population trend for both sage grouse populations on the Forest. For the Vernon population, males have been counted on the Little Valley lek, which occurs on Forest Service land, since 1968. Numbers of males counted on this lek have varied greatly since 1968 but have not shown a clear negative or positive trend. Numbers of Mormon crickets have been very high on the Vernon Unit and surrounding West Desert rangelands in recent years. Most of the Vernon sage grouse range is actively grazed by livestock.</p> <p>Sage grouse leks on the Vernon Unit are located on Red Skin Knolls and near the Benmore guard station. Grouse utilize the area between the Red Skin Knolls and Benmore for nesting and brood-rearing habitat. Sage grouse also winter in the area. Another lek has been reported near Cherry Creek. The Utah Sage Grouse Conservation Plan indicates that the 10-year average lek count summaries for the Sheeprock Mountains in the Vernon area during the 1970s were about 64. This decreased in the 1980s to 46, and in the 1990s the 10-year average was 45. In 1999 the lek count increased to 80 (3 leks counted). In 2000 the lek count increased to 107 birds (4 leks counted). In 2001, the lek count was 90 birds (3 leks counted).</p> <p>The Strawberry Valley sage grouse population is estimated to have declined by about 90 percent between the late 1930s and 1970 when UDWR began counting male sage grouse on leks in Strawberry Valley. The Bureau of Reclamation built the original Strawberry Dam by 1915, and the reservoir was expanded in the 1980s. From the early 1900s to 1989, much of the land in Strawberry Valley was managed by a private water users association. The land was intensively managed for livestock grazing throughout this period. In 1988, management of nearly 57,000 acres of land previously managed by the water users association was transferred to the Uinta National Forest. These lands were in an environmentally degraded condition when the Uinta National Forest assumed management. Heavy livestock grazing and aerial herbicide application had resulted in serious erosion problems. The Uinta suspended livestock grazing on these lands in 1990 and began watershed restoration efforts that continue today. Under a cooperative agreement</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>between the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission, UDWR, the Uinta National Forest, and Brigham Young University, research has focused on identifying factors affecting the Strawberry sage grouse population. Research has indicated that high levels of predation by red foxes and nest predation by ravens are negatively affecting population recovery of sage grouse.</p> <p>The Uinta National Forest continues to coordinate with UDWR to promote sage grouse conservation within Strawberry Valley and the Vernon Unit.</p> <p>2001: Spring lek counts conducted in the Strawberry Reservoir area found 36 males; 90 grouse (32 males) were counted on the Little Valley lek on the Vernon Unit. Although the number of males observed at this lek was less than the previous year, it is attributed to the fact that grouse numbers were such that some birds dispersed and were observed using a satellite lek in the Benmore Pastures. No habitat improvement projects were conducted during this year.</p> <p>2002: Counts at 2 leks in Tooele County found 102 males. Counts at Strawberry identified 24 males.</p>
<p>THREE-TOED WOODPECKER (Snags, old growth, or decadent conifer and aspen)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: The three-toed woodpecker is classified as <i>sensitive</i> by the Intermountain Region of the Forest Service. It was identified as an MIS in the 1993 amendment to the 1984 Forest Plan. It is associated with mature to old conifer forest, especially spruce/fir forests, where it feeds on wood-boring beetles and their larvae and other insects. Forested stands recently killed by fire are also considered prime habitat for the species.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Project-level surveys indicate that this species is relatively common and widely distributed in spruce/fir forest types on the Uinta National Forest. Most of the spruce/fir forest type on the Uinta is classified as mature or old. As a result of reduced wildfire occurrence and natural succession, the area of spruce/fir forest is increasing as these conifer stands replace aspen stands in many parts of the Uinta National Forest. Increasing beetle infestations in the White River area have increased potential habitat for the woodpeckers.</p> <p>2001: Three Forest-wide Breeding Bird Survey routes were conducted. Three-toed woodpeckers have been identified on the Soapstone Breeding Bird Survey Route One. No nest sites were found. Two three-toed woodpeckers were also identified in the Bryant's Fork area. A three-toed</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>woodpecker was identified during project surveys in the White River area and 3 birds were identified outside the area. No associated nest sites were located.</p> <p>2002: Three Forest-wide Breeding Bird Survey routes were conducted. Two three-toed woodpeckers were identified on the Soapstone Breeding Bird Survey Route One. No nest sites were found.</p>
<p>MACROINVERTEBRATES (Water quality, sedimentation production)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: Macroinvertebrate species such as mayfly (<i>Ephemeroptera</i>), caddisfly (<i>Trichoptera</i>), stonefly (<i>Plecoptera</i>), dobsonfly (<i>Megaloptera</i>), dragonfly (<i>Odonata</i>), water beetles (<i>Coleoptera</i>), wasps (<i>Hymenoptera</i>), and parasites (<i>Diptera</i>) 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Macroinvertebrate samples are collected annually (17 streams sampled in 2001, 20 in 2002) for analysis. Results from the 2002 sampling have not been received yet. Results of samples obtained from 1998 through 2001 received an average rating of 71, which is in the Low-Fair range. Approximately 85 percent of the samples during this period were taken in the Strawberry Project lands and in the North Fork American Fork River. The remaining 15 percent were obtained in the West Fork of the Duchesne River drainage, the Provo River drainage, and in the Vernon Unit. The overall rating is lowered due to the large portion of samples obtained from the Strawberry Project lands and the North Fork American Fork River. Macroinvertebrate populations in the Strawberry Project lands were impacted as a result of rotenone treatments in 1990. Monitoring has shown improvement since the mid-1990s, but has not reached pre-rotenone conditions. Populations in the North Fork American Fork River continue to be affected by abandoned mine lands water quality impacts.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p>HABITAT DIVERSITY (How is diversity affected by planned acts?)</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> 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><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> <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 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>Aquatic and riparian ecosystems 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) appear 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 the 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</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>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>High elevation areas 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 caves and cliffs, 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> <p>Prior to the introduction of domestic sheep, tall forb dominated communities 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 tall forb types 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>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>Oak/maple stands 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 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>Pinyon/juniper 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 sagebrush across much of the Forest due to a</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>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 1,600 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 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. UDWR winter range monitoring includes 9 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 3 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 8 years. Similar trends are seen inside and outside of fenced exclosures at each of the 3 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</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>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 cottonwood gallery forests, 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 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 seral aspen stands 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 10 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 aspen. The</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>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 pressure on young aspen sprouts.</p> <p>Stable aspen stands 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>Douglas-fir/white fir stands 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 spruce/fir stands 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</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>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 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 spruce/fir, Douglas-fir/white fir, and aspen communities, 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 National Forest 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 spruce/fir type, 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</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>current harvesting activities may not have adequate amounts remaining.</p> <p>Several small, isolated groves of naturally occurring ponderosa pine occur on the Forest, 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 old growth 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>FISH/RIPARIAN HABITAT (Is fish/riparian habitat being maintained or lost?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Riparian monitoring has been conducted primarily</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>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 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>2001: A total of 11 miles of stream improvement/enhancement was completed. Approximately 3 miles of streambank stabilization work was completed on Nebo Creek in response to mitigating impacts from the Nebo Creek Fire. Cottonwood stakes were planted to shore up the streambanks in anticipation of increased runoff. Two culverts on the West Fork of the Duchesne at Harvey Meadows were cleaned and modified. One rock drop structure was repaired at Lowpass. Rebar and juniper revetment was removed from approximately 5 miles of Strawberry River upstream from the Strawberry Visitor Center. Five hundred willow, chokecherry, and dogwood bare-root stock were planted on Strawberry River at the visitor center and Trout Creek. One thousand willow were planted on Strawberry Reservoir shoreline (2 miles) from the ladders to Trout Creek. Large woody debris were identified and retained in American Fork River from the Forest boundary to South Fork confluence. One log drop structure at Springville Crossing that had failed was repaired and rebar and hardware cloth from a previous habitat project was removed. Five hundred willow and chokecherry were planted on Payson Lake shoreline (1 mile).</p> <p>2002: Habitat restoration work was completed on 5 miles of streams for Bonneville cutthroat trout. Two of the 5 miles were completed as part of rehabilitation efforts on the Nebo Creek Fire that burned in 2001.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p>UTE LADIES'-TRESSES</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> 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 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><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> 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, over 70 “colonies” have been identified, each occurring on a distinct depositional (flood-created) surface. In 1998, a year of record flowering in Diamond Fork, extensive surveys 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 6 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>2001: Forest and Boy Scout volunteers placed 20 boxes along Diamond Fork Creek as possible bumblebee nests to encourage these pollinating insects.</p> <p>2002: The Forest obtained updated monitoring maps from the Central Utah Water Conservation District and its contractor to update the Forest Ute ladies'-tresses GIS map layer.</p>
<p>CLAY PHACELIA</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> 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>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Surveys for the species were conducted on the Forest in conjunction with the study mentioned above, as well as with several project-specific analyses; no plants were found during any of these surveys or analyses. 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 efforts, both as a member of the recovery team and in implementing recovery tasks. The Fish and Wildlife Service plans to update the Recovery Plan for this species. The Forest is taking part in the development of the plan.</p> <p>Dr. Kim T. Harper of Utah Valley State College buried pots containing soil and seeds from an existing clay phacelia colony in 3 potential habitat areas on the Forest in the late 1990s. Two of these sites were revisited in 2002. No clay phacelia plants were found.</p>
RANGE MANAGEMENT	
<p>FORAGE UTILIZATION AND TIMING OF USE (Is forage utilization and time of use sustainable while maintaining or trending toward DFC?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: In 1993 the Forest Plan Rangeland Amendment was approved, establishing 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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 regard to stubble height, and monitored ocularly in regards to percent utilization. This monitoring is 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>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>2001: 16 allotments were administered to standard during 2001. Compared to prior years, increased monitoring activity was conducted due to potential for impacts from grazing during dry weather conditions. Approximately 32 percent of the National Forest System lands within active allotments were monitored, with the majority of these lands indicating conditions were meeting or moving towards Forest Plan objectives. Drought impacts were noted to be taking some toll on plant vigor.</p> <p>2002: Ten allotments were administered to standard during 2002. Drought conditions continued to impact vegetation production, especially on the Vernon Unit. Approximately 27 percent of the suitable rangeland within the grazed pastures within these 10 allotments was monitored for utilization. At Vernon, drought conditions were impacting trends in ground cover/soil stability as a result of reduced vegetative production. Plant vigor continued to show signs of drought impacts. Elsewhere across the Forest, conditions were generally stable.</p>
<p>CONDITION AND TREND OF SUITABLE RANGELAND AND RANGELANDS IN NEED OF REHABILITATION (Management affect on Condition and Trend)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: The Forest Plan Rangeland Amendment, approved in 1993, 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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>2001: Vegetation monitoring was conducted on 22 upland sites across the Forest. Conditions for the majority of these sites (70 percent) were considered to be mid-seral or better, with vegetation trends for approximately 60 percent of these sites considered to be stable or upward. Two new monitoring sites were established, for which no trend data was available.</p> <p>2002: Vegetation monitoring was conducted on 22 upland sites. Seven new sites were</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>established. Conditions on 50 percent of the sites monitored were considered to be mid-seral or better. 65 percent of the sites indicated an upward trend in conditions.</p>
<p>HABITAT DIVERSITY (Conserved By Management Prescription)</p>	<p>See “Habitat Diversity” under the “Wildlife, Fish, and Biotic Resources” section.</p>
<p>CARRYING CAPACITY (AUMs) (Is supply being maintained?)</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> 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 National Forest 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><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> 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>2001: There was no change in number of active allotments (71). The 2 vacant sheep allotments remained unstocked. Authorized use totaled 93,262 Animal Unit Months (AUMs) for permitted cattle and sheep. Drought conditions required some permittees to remove their livestock early from allotments, resulting in the reduced total AUM use on the Forest.</p> <p>2002: There was no change in number of active allotments. The vacant sheep allotments remained unstocked. Authorized use totaled 106,076 AUMs for permitted cattle and sheep.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p>RIPARIAN ECOLOGICAL STATUS (Effect of range management on attainment of riparian resources' DFCs?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: In 1993 the Forest Plan Rangeland Amendment was approved. This amendment placed an increased emphasis on management of activities within riparian areas, defined DFCs for riparian areas, and outlined time frames for meeting objectives for overall improvement and meeting the DFCs.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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 revisited. Several study sites are located to monitor conditions in problem areas, areas not representative of the surrounding area. Two riparian studies were read in 1998, 22 in 1999, and 5 in 2000. Data indicates that 55 percent of the greenlines (first vegetation encountered from the water course) studied, about 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>2001: Rangeland management specialists assessed riparian conditions on 12 streams in conjunction with forage utilization and long-term trend monitoring on allotments across the Forest. This monitoring judged about 80 percent of the riparian areas monitored to be at or moving toward DFC.</p> <p>2002: Rangeland management specialists assessed riparian conditions on 9 streams in</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>conjunction with forage utilization and long-term trend monitoring on allotments across the Forest. This monitoring judged about 50 percent of the riparian areas monitored to be at or moving toward DFC.</p>
<p>BIG GAME WINTER RANGE ECOLOGICAL STATUS (Vegetation condition?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: The UDWR monitors big game winter range trends state-wide, including several plots on the Uinta National Forest. The Uinta annually contributes funding toward this effort. Each plot is reread every 5 years. Plots 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 finding. 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 National Forest has partnered with the Forest Service Shrub Laboratory in conducting a detailed study of sagebrush communities at 3 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 8 years. Similar trends are seen inside and outside of fenced exclosures at the 3 sites, but more seedlings and young have been observed within the fenced plots.</p> <p>Twenty-nine winter range trend studies sites were evaluated in 2002. Soil conditions on 7 sites were found to have a downward trend, 9 were down slightly, 8 were stable, 4 were up slightly, and 1 was described as up. Browse conditions were described as down on 3 sites, slightly down on 5 sites, stable on 17 sites, up slightly on 3 sites, and up on 1. Trends for herbaceous understory was determined to be down on 8 sites, slightly down on 7 sites, stable on 12 sites, and up on 2 sites.</p>
TIMBER MANAGEMENT	
<p>LAND SUITABILITY CLASS (Are non-suitable lands now suitable?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: The Forest Plan allocated 20,900 acres of the Uinta National Forest as suited for timber management. These include 15,800 acres of conifer and 5,100 acres of aspen, mostly in</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>the Heber Management Area.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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 National Forest 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 emphasis for timber management on the Uinta. During 1998-2000, no adjustments to timber suitability classification were identified as needed, and no changes were made. Reevaluating timber suitability is required as part of forest plan revision.</p> <p>2001 and 2002: Timber suitability was reevaluated for revision of the Uinta National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. Total suitable timber acreage varied by alternative for the revision. For the preferred alternative (Alternative B), as identified in the Draft EIS for the revision, 32,260 acres were classified as suitable, with another 34,840 acres classified as capable. The FEIS preferred alternative, Alternative H, classified 39,315 acres as suitable, and another 132,710 acres classified as capable.</p>
<p>TIMBER RESOURCE SALE SCHEDULE (Do timber sales meet ASQ and TSPQ?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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 National Forest.</p> <p>The Forest Plan established an Allowable Sale Quantity (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 and the Forest sold an average of 1.362 MMBF chargeable against the ASQ. This was equivalent to 72 percent of the ASQ. 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS																																		
	<p>locally-owned, small, family-operated mills. Mill capacity for the four primary purchasers of Uinta National Forest sawtimber is between 6 and 10 MMBF. Volume offered in 2001 and 2002 reduced the planning period average (1991-2002) to 3.117 MMBF.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Timber Products Sold on the Uinta NF</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="682 427 1898 792"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="686 430 926 594">Year</th> <th data-bbox="930 430 1169 594">Total Sawtimber Offered (MMBF)</th> <th data-bbox="1173 430 1413 594">Sawtimber Offered - Chargeable Toward ASQ (MMBF)</th> <th data-bbox="1417 430 1656 594">Fuelwood Sold (Cords)</th> <th data-bbox="1661 430 1900 594">Christmas Tree Permits Sold (number of trees)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="686 597 926 630">1991-2000</td> <td data-bbox="930 597 1169 630">32.813</td> <td data-bbox="1173 597 1413 630">13.632</td> <td data-bbox="1417 597 1656 630">15,264</td> <td data-bbox="1661 597 1900 630">19,161</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="686 633 926 665">2001</td> <td data-bbox="930 633 1169 665">2.231</td> <td data-bbox="1173 633 1413 665">1.874</td> <td data-bbox="1417 633 1656 665">767</td> <td data-bbox="1661 633 1900 665">1,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="686 669 926 701">2002</td> <td data-bbox="930 669 1169 701">2.359</td> <td data-bbox="1173 669 1413 701">2.025</td> <td data-bbox="1417 669 1656 701">600</td> <td data-bbox="1661 669 1900 701">1,700</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="686 704 926 737">Total</td> <td data-bbox="930 704 1169 737">37.403</td> <td data-bbox="1173 704 1413 737">17.531</td> <td data-bbox="1417 704 1656 737">16,631</td> <td data-bbox="1661 704 1900 737">22,361</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="686 740 926 773">Annual Average</td> <td data-bbox="930 740 1169 773">3.117</td> <td data-bbox="1173 740 1413 773">1.461</td> <td data-bbox="1417 740 1656 773">1,386</td> <td data-bbox="1661 740 1900 773">1,863</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Fuelwood demand has dropped substantially and has ranged between 648 to 840 cords per year (0.324 to 0.420 MMBF/year) over the last three years. 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>					Year	Total Sawtimber Offered (MMBF)	Sawtimber Offered - Chargeable Toward ASQ (MMBF)	Fuelwood Sold (Cords)	Christmas Tree Permits Sold (number of trees)	1991-2000	32.813	13.632	15,264	19,161	2001	2.231	1.874	767	1,500	2002	2.359	2.025	600	1,700	Total	37.403	17.531	16,631	22,361	Annual Average	3.117	1.461	1,386	1,863
Year	Total Sawtimber Offered (MMBF)	Sawtimber Offered - Chargeable Toward ASQ (MMBF)	Fuelwood Sold (Cords)	Christmas Tree Permits Sold (number of trees)																															
1991-2000	32.813	13.632	15,264	19,161																															
2001	2.231	1.874	767	1,500																															
2002	2.359	2.025	600	1,700																															
Total	37.403	17.531	16,631	22,361																															
Annual Average	3.117	1.461	1,386	1,863																															
<p>TIMBER HARVEST AREA (Are harvest areas in compliance with Forest Plan/R4 standards?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Timber harvest areas complied with all Forest Plan standards. No clearcuts were conducted on the Uinta National Forest during 1998–2002 (see the table in the following section). No even-age harvests (i.e., clearcut or shelterwood cuts) exceeded</p>																																		

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>40 acres in size. The total acreage harvested each year is listed below.</p> <p>2001: Harvest activities were conducted on approximately 167 acres. Of this, all 167 were regeneration treatments (selection harvest).</p> <p>2002: Harvest activities were conducted on approximately 415 acres. Of this, about 303 acres (all selection cuts) were regeneration treatments, the remainder were sanitation-salvage harvests of insect impacted trees.</p>
<p>SILVICULTURAL PRACTICES (Are silvicultural practices in compliance with Forest Plan management direction?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: A variety of harvest methods have been employed on the Forest. Between 1998 and 2000 timber harvest on the Uinta National Forest 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>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS																																																												
	<p style="text-align: center;">Acres of Commercial Timber Harvest by Harvest Method</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="793 342 1354 375">Harvest Type\Year</th> <th data-bbox="1354 342 1455 375">1998</th> <th data-bbox="1455 342 1556 375">1999</th> <th data-bbox="1556 342 1656 375">2000</th> <th data-bbox="1656 342 1757 375">2001</th> <th data-bbox="1757 342 1850 375">2002</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="793 375 1354 407">Clearcut</td> <td data-bbox="1354 375 1455 407">0</td> <td data-bbox="1455 375 1556 407">0</td> <td data-bbox="1556 375 1656 407">0</td> <td data-bbox="1656 375 1757 407">0</td> <td data-bbox="1757 375 1850 407">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="793 407 1354 440">Shelterwood Harvest</td> <td data-bbox="1354 407 1455 440">26</td> <td data-bbox="1455 407 1556 440">34</td> <td data-bbox="1556 407 1656 440">0</td> <td data-bbox="1656 407 1757 440">0</td> <td data-bbox="1757 407 1850 440">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="793 440 1354 472">Selection Harvest</td> <td data-bbox="1354 440 1455 472">316</td> <td data-bbox="1455 440 1556 472">0</td> <td data-bbox="1556 440 1656 472">104</td> <td data-bbox="1656 440 1757 472">167</td> <td data-bbox="1757 440 1850 472">303</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="793 472 1354 505">Intermediate Thinning</td> <td data-bbox="1354 472 1455 505">0</td> <td data-bbox="1455 472 1556 505">0</td> <td data-bbox="1556 472 1656 505">0</td> <td data-bbox="1656 472 1757 505">0</td> <td data-bbox="1757 472 1850 505">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="793 505 1354 537">Sanitation-Salvage</td> <td data-bbox="1354 505 1455 537">0</td> <td data-bbox="1455 505 1556 537">416</td> <td data-bbox="1556 505 1656 537">91</td> <td data-bbox="1656 505 1757 537">0</td> <td data-bbox="1757 505 1850 537">112</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="793 537 1354 570">Total Commercial Harvest</td> <td data-bbox="1354 537 1455 570">342</td> <td data-bbox="1455 537 1556 570">450</td> <td data-bbox="1556 537 1656 570">195</td> <td data-bbox="1656 537 1757 570">167</td> <td data-bbox="1757 537 1850 570">415</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="793 570 1354 602">Precommercial Thinning/Release</td> <td data-bbox="1354 570 1455 602">85</td> <td data-bbox="1455 570 1556 602">424</td> <td data-bbox="1556 570 1656 602">185</td> <td data-bbox="1656 570 1757 602">62</td> <td data-bbox="1757 570 1850 602">99</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="793 602 1354 667">Site Preparation for Natural Regeneration</td> <td data-bbox="1354 602 1455 667">294</td> <td data-bbox="1455 602 1556 667">74</td> <td data-bbox="1556 602 1656 667">226</td> <td data-bbox="1656 602 1757 667">218</td> <td data-bbox="1757 602 1850 667">124</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="793 667 1354 699">Tree Planting</td> <td data-bbox="1354 667 1455 699">0</td> <td data-bbox="1455 667 1556 699">0</td> <td data-bbox="1556 667 1656 699">0</td> <td data-bbox="1656 667 1757 699">0</td> <td data-bbox="1757 667 1850 699">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Harvest Type\Year	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Clearcut	0	0	0	0	0	Shelterwood Harvest	26	34	0	0	0	Selection Harvest	316	0	104	167	303	Intermediate Thinning	0	0	0	0	0	Sanitation-Salvage	0	416	91	0	112	Total Commercial Harvest	342	450	195	167	415	Precommercial Thinning/Release	85	424	185	62	99	Site Preparation for Natural Regeneration	294	74	226	218	124	Tree Planting	0	0	0	0	0
Harvest Type\Year	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002																																																								
Clearcut	0	0	0	0	0																																																								
Shelterwood Harvest	26	34	0	0	0																																																								
Selection Harvest	316	0	104	167	303																																																								
Intermediate Thinning	0	0	0	0	0																																																								
Sanitation-Salvage	0	416	91	0	112																																																								
Total Commercial Harvest	342	450	195	167	415																																																								
Precommercial Thinning/Release	85	424	185	62	99																																																								
Site Preparation for Natural Regeneration	294	74	226	218	124																																																								
Tree Planting	0	0	0	0	0																																																								
<p>REFORESTATION – ADEQUATE RESTOCKING WITHIN FIVE YEARS OF HARVEST (Timber sale area compliance?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: Tree survival is monitored through 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Monitoring indicates harvested stands have been regenerated in accordance with National Forest Management Act requirements.</p> <p>2001: The 2001 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 218 acres (see the preceding section).</p> <p>2002: The 2002 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 124 acres (see the preceding section).</p>																																																												

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p>INSECT AND DISEASE ACTIVITY (Maintain numbers within endemic proportions?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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). 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 (<i>Anabrus simplex</i>), 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 National Forest.</p> <p>2001: Again, the Mormon cricket population expanded, and was estimated to cover approximately 622,000 acres in Tooele County, nearly one-third of the total Mormon cricket population estimated in the State of Utah (1,894,500 acres). This area included the Vernon Unit of the Uinta National Forest.</p> <p>2002: The USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) conducted control activities on the Vernon Unit, treating approximately 785 acres on the National Forest. This year more than 3.3 million acres were infested with Mormon crickets and grasshoppers in many of the state's 29 counties, primarily centered in Beaver, Juab, Millard and Tooele Counties.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS																																																						
	<p>The Utah Department of Agriculture and Food (UDAF), along with APHIS, estimate the 2003 Mormon cricket and grasshopper infestation in Utah will cover between 5 to 6 million acres--nearly double the area of last year's outbreak.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Number of Trees Killed on the Uinta National Forest</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="898 488 1745 781"> <thead> <tr> <th>Agent/Year</th> <th>1998</th> <th>1999</th> <th>2000</th> <th>2001</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mountain Pine Beetle</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Douglas-fir Beetle</td> <td>1,800</td> <td>3,100</td> <td>1,300</td> <td>5,368</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spruce Beetle</td> <td>1,100</td> <td>300</td> <td>300</td> <td>1,060</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fir Engraver Beetle</td> <td>0</td> <td>200</td> <td>0</td> <td>259</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Subalpine Fir Mortality</td> <td>100</td> <td>2,900</td> <td>900</td> <td>13,464</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fall Cankerworm</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>50</td> <td>n.r.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aspen Decline</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>1,500</td> <td>n.r.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Frost damage estimated to cover approximately 2,600 acres of aspen and over 4,000 acres of oak across the Forest. In 2001.</p> <p>No mortality numbers were provided by FHP in the 2002 report. Due to funding constraints, only the northeastern portion of the Pleasant Grove Ranger District was aerially surveyed in 2002.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Summary of Tree Mortality on the Uinta NF</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="802 1065 1780 1386"> <thead> <tr> <th>Agent/Year</th> <th>2002</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mountain Pine Beetle</td> <td>Increased activity on Heber RD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Douglas-fir Beetle</td> <td>Increased activity Forest wide</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spruce Beetle</td> <td>Decreased activity but still some large pockets of mortality on Heber RD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fir Engraver Beetle</td> <td>Increased activity on Spanish Fork RD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Subalpine Fir Mortality</td> <td>Increased activity Forest wide</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aspen Decline</td> <td>Dieback and defoliation observed on both Heber RD and Spanish Fork RD</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Agent/Year	1998	1999	2000	2001	Mountain Pine Beetle	0	0	0	37	Douglas-fir Beetle	1,800	3,100	1,300	5,368	Spruce Beetle	1,100	300	300	1,060	Fir Engraver Beetle	0	200	0	259	Subalpine Fir Mortality	100	2,900	900	13,464	Fall Cankerworm	0	0	50	n.r.	Aspen Decline	0	0	1,500	n.r.	Agent/Year	2002	Mountain Pine Beetle	Increased activity on Heber RD	Douglas-fir Beetle	Increased activity Forest wide	Spruce Beetle	Decreased activity but still some large pockets of mortality on Heber RD	Fir Engraver Beetle	Increased activity on Spanish Fork RD	Subalpine Fir Mortality	Increased activity Forest wide	Aspen Decline	Dieback and defoliation observed on both Heber RD and Spanish Fork RD
Agent/Year	1998	1999	2000	2001																																																			
Mountain Pine Beetle	0	0	0	37																																																			
Douglas-fir Beetle	1,800	3,100	1,300	5,368																																																			
Spruce Beetle	1,100	300	300	1,060																																																			
Fir Engraver Beetle	0	200	0	259																																																			
Subalpine Fir Mortality	100	2,900	900	13,464																																																			
Fall Cankerworm	0	0	50	n.r.																																																			
Aspen Decline	0	0	1,500	n.r.																																																			
Agent/Year	2002																																																						
Mountain Pine Beetle	Increased activity on Heber RD																																																						
Douglas-fir Beetle	Increased activity Forest wide																																																						
Spruce Beetle	Decreased activity but still some large pockets of mortality on Heber RD																																																						
Fir Engraver Beetle	Increased activity on Spanish Fork RD																																																						
Subalpine Fir Mortality	Increased activity Forest wide																																																						
Aspen Decline	Dieback and defoliation observed on both Heber RD and Spanish Fork RD																																																						

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
SOIL/AIR/WATERSHED RESOURCES	
<p>AIR QUALITY (Uses and activities comply with federal, state, and local air quality standards and airshed classifications?)</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> The entire Uinta National Forest 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.</p> <p>The Utah Division of Air Quality (UDAQ) currently monitors air quality at 28 stations, 5 of which are in Utah County. These stations are located where air quality problems are likely. No UDAQ sites are on the Forest, or in Wasatch, Juab, Duchesne, Summit, or Sanpete Counties. Six stations are near the Forest in urban areas of Utah County and one is in Tooele County, but distant from the Forest. Eight sites are also located in nearby Salt Lake County.</p> <p>The Uinta National Forest has supported annual lichen biomonitoring since 1998. These studies have noted elevated levels of lead, arsenic, chromium, and nickel in lichen tissue samples from 11 sites on the Uinta National Forest. The pattern and distribution of metals indicates Utah Valley as a source, even for samples collected at distant sites on the Manti-La Sal National Forest.</p> <p><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> The Uinta National Forest 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 exceedances of air quality standards.</p> <p>2001: The Interagency Monitoring of Protected Visual Environments (IMPROVE) site located on Timpanogos was removed. UDAQ monitoring data indicates no exceedances of any air quality standards at the stations near the Uinta National Forest in Utah County.</p> <p>2002: UDAQ monitoring indicates that there were no exceedances of air quality standards at the stations near the Uinta National Forest in Utah County.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p>WATER QUALITY/BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMPs) (Compliance with state water quality standards and adequacy of BMPs?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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 4 to 5-year rotation with 4 sites being monitored each year.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: In general, water quality monitoring conducted on the Forest is tied to a series of baseline sites that are monitored on a 4-year rotation and to sites monitored for specific resource related activities. Water quality data collection and monitoring activities have also been conducted in support of abandoned mine lands reclamation activities. Based on water quality monitoring results from baseline sites, Forest resource management activities are not impacting water quality. Abandoned mines are posing problems from leaching of heavy metals into ground water and streams. Water diversion activities administered by the Central Utah Project are impacting water quality in Sixth Water Creek and the Diamond Fork River.</p> <p>2001: Water quality monitoring consisted of water chemistry monitoring at 28 sites and macroinvertebrate sampling at 17 sites. Of the 28 sites sampled, 8 were Forest baseline sites, 9 were Wolf Creek Highway (Highway 35) sites, 8 were groundwater sites from the American Fork Canyon Abandon Mine Lands (AML) Project, and 3 were samples from Payson Lakes on the Nebo Unit. Three of the Forest baseline sites were meeting State of Utah water quality standards. Co-op Creek and Trail Hollow Creek did not meet standards for phosphorus although levels were reduced from 1997 levels. Strawberry River met all standards except for dissolved chlorine and phosphorus; however, phosphorus levels were reduced from 1997 results. Salt Creek met all</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>standards except for dissolved chlorine and total dissolved solids. Holman Creek met all standards except dissolved oxygen and dissolved chlorine. All Wolf Creek Highway sites met State of Utah water quality standards. Results from sites in American Fork Canyon indicate that dissolved aluminum, arsenic, copper, iron, lead, manganese, strontium, and zinc all exceeded State of Utah water quality standards. Two of the 3 sites in Payson Lakes did not meet water quality standards for dissolved barium and sodium and 1 site for phosphorus. These conditions are likely due to low water levels in the lakes which contributed to algae bloom as a result of drought conditions.</p> <p>2002: Water quality monitoring consisted of water chemistry monitoring and macroinvertebrate sampling at 20 sites. Of the 20 sites sampled, 7 were Forest baseline sites, 9 were Wolf Creek Highway (Highway 35) sites, and 4 were Vernon Cricket Control Project monitoring sites taken on the Vernon Unit of the Forest. All baseline sites met State of Utah water quality standards except for Indian Creek and Strawberry River. Results in these sites indicated elevated levels of dissolved chlorine, although they were reduced from 2001 results. All Wolf Creek Highway sites met State of Utah water quality sites. Sites in the Vernon Unit were sampled to monitor the effects of the application of carbaryl-treated grain through the Mormon Cricket Control Project on water quality. None of the chemicals found in carbaryl was found in any of the samples.</p>
<p>RIPARIAN AREAS, FLOOD PLAINS, WETLANDS (Effects on riparian values, soil and water quality, and streambank stability. Is mitigation adequate?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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 DFCs. 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</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>were judged to have moderate to excellent streambank stability.</p> <p>About 60 percent of the sites monitored during 2001 and 2002 indicated moderate to good streambank stability.</p>
<p>SOIL PRODUCTIVITY/SOIL CONSERVATION PRACTICES (Range and timber) (Changes/losses?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: Since 1984, Forest Plan direction on the rehabilitation of deteriorated or fire-impacted soils has been effectively implemented under the Burned Area Emergency Response 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road, trail, and landing construction, • Vegetation manipulation such as prescribed fire, timber harvest, and range improvements, • Dispersed recreation activities such as off-road vehicle use and camping, particularly in riparian areas, • Livestock concentration areas such as troughs, bedding grounds, and driveways, and • Catastrophic wildfires and the exclusion of fire, particularly in areas dominated by decadent sagebrush and juniper vegetation types. <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Analysis of the Forest Plan objectives for soil surveys indicate the following accomplishments and deficiencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 National Forest. • Detailed mapping of wetlands and riparian areas needed to support project level analysis exists for about 5 percent of the Forest land base. • 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. • Range condition and trend monitoring studies are conducted annually. In addition to evaluating condition and trend of rangelands, these studies also consider soil stability

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>trends. Four of the six sites where soil trend data was available in 1998-2000 indicate soil stability is stable or improving.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Range condition and trend data for site monitored during 2000 and 2001 suggests soil stability is stable to slightly down in areas impacted by a fifth year of drought, especially in the West Desert area at Vernon. Elsewhere, data indicates that soil stability is generally stable.
<p>WATERSHED CONDITION (Are watershed conditions trending toward the DFC within each NF watershed?)</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> 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 watershed conditions, have been made for a few watersheds across the Forest through development of landscape assessments.</p> <p><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> Nearly half the Forest has been included in landscape assessments. They include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vernon Area Assessment, Spanish Fork Ranger District (1996) • The White River Landscape Assessment, Spanish Fork Ranger District (1998) • The North End (northern Heber Ranger District) Landscape Assessment (1999) • The Diamond Fork Landscape Assessment, Spanish Fork Ranger District, completed in cooperation with the Utah Reclamation Mitigation Commission (2000) • The Mount Timpanogos, Lone Peak and Cascade Spring Area Assessment, Pleasant Grove Ranger District (2002) <p>These assessments have generally identified that vegetative conditions within each watershed are comprised of older age classes, and that 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 1999 a map identifying Class I (priority</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>watersheds – in need of restoration work) watersheds in Utah was released. Of the 8 watersheds on the Uinta National Forest, 2 were identified as Class I watersheds: Spanish Fork River and Provo River.</p>
MINERALS/ENERGY AND GEOLOGY	
<p>MINERAL AND ENERGY EXPLORATION (Adequacy of permitting process?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</p> <p>2001: Non-bonded non-energy operations processed..... 15 Bonded, non-energy operations processed 10 Energy operations processed 0</p> <p>2002: Non-bonded non-energy operations processed..... 10 Bonded, non-energy operations processed 11 Energy operations processed 1</p>
<p>COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS OF OPERATING PLANS (Is operation within range established by Forest Plan standards and guidelines?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: The amount of administration of energy and non-energy minerals operations depends upon the number of active operations on the Forest.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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>2001: Bonded non-energy operations administered to standard 9 Total energy operations administered to standard 0</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>2002: Bonded non-energy operations administered to standard 10 Total energy operations administered to standard 0</p>
<p>EXERCISE OF RESERVED AND OUTSTANDING RIGHTS BY MINERALS OWNER (Protection and maintenance of surface resources?)</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> 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> <p><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></p> <p>2001: 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>2002: Same as 2001.</p>
<p>PROJECT RECLAMATION (Effectiveness of work done?)</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> The Sheeprock Mountains and American Fork Canyon areas were actively mined from the 1800s until the early 1960s. Many of the mine sites in these areas are located on privately-owned inholdings; however, some are on lands now managed by the Uinta National Forest. 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-1990s 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><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></p> <p>2001: No reclamation work was accomplished. Data collection and survey work for project implementation for American Fork Canyon on Pacific Mine and Lower Boy Mine occurred. Inventory of abandoned mines as well as safety signs and barriers were put into place in the Sheeprock Mountains in the Vernon Unit of the Forest. Approximately 36 mines have been identified.</p> <p>2002: Contract preparation and award for cleanup of Pacific and Lower Boy Mines were put into place. Inventory and planning, including Threatened and Endangered species surveys associated with abandoned mines, were initiated for work in the Sheeprock Mountains.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
LANDS	
<p>ROAD AND TRAIL RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> There is demonstrated public interest and need to protect historic access (roads and trails) to the Forest. The Forest has 311 road segments intersecting the Forest boundary for which a right-of-way (ROW), easement, or prescriptive right needs to be identified. Additionally, data indicates that there are numerous trails for which ROWs are needed. Analysis to determine the exact number of trail related ROW needs has not been completed.</p> <p>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 National Forest, 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 ROWs within their jurisdiction.</p> <p><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></p> <p>2001: Two ROWs were acquired.</p> <p>2002: Four ROWs were acquired.</p>
<p>LAND EXCHANGE, ACQUISITION, PURCHASE</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> Landownership adjustments are undertaken to improve manageability of National Forest System lands, protect key resources, facilitate use, or a number of other purposes. Adjustments area also occasionally facilitated by acts of Congress (e.g., the Strawberry Lands transfer to the Uinta National Forest in 1988, and the 1999 State Land Exchange). The consummation of landownership adjustments often takes several years from initiation to title transfer.</p> <p><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u></p> <p>2001: About 65 acres in Grove Creek on the Pleasant Grove Ranger District were acquired through purchase.</p> <p>2002: Approximately 80 acres in American Fork Canyon and 40 acres in Battle Creek, both on the Pleasant Grove Ranger District, were acquired through purchase.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p>OCCUPANCY TRESPASS</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> Occupancy trespass cases (i.e., physical occupation of National Forest System 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><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> 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, residences, and out buildings. In the past, most occupancy trespasses are situations where National Forest System 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. Surveys of Forest boundaries adjacent to urban development continue to identify numerous additional trespass cases. In 2001 and 2002, work on several trespass cases continued, but no cases were resolved.</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 National Forest System lands located outside these areas.</p>
<p>LANDLINE LOCATION</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> 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><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> 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>2001: Four miles of landline maintenance were accomplished and 3 miles of boundary location were accomplished.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>2002: Approximately 12.8 miles of landline maintenance were accomplished and 6 miles of boundary location were accomplished.</p>
<p>SPECIAL USES APPLICATIONS</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> Occupancy and use of National Forest System 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><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> 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 as 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>2001: Ten applications were processed and a total of 178 special use permits were administered. Work continued on the applications for the relicensing of American Fork and Bartholomew Hydroelectric power permits. Additional Information Requests were addressed for Bartholomew.</p> <p>2002: Four applications were processed and a total of 175 special use permits were administered. Applications for relicensing were completed and 4(e) terms and conditions were drafted and completed. NEPA was completed on the Bartholomew 4(e) conditions; the process moved forward and was relicensed. PacifiCorp applied for decommissioning of the American Fork hydroelectric operation. Additional Information Requests were addressed for American Fork.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
FACILITIES	
<p>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM INVENTORY (Is transportation system inventory current and accurate?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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 led 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>Forest roads are also inventoried by surface type. Forest data in 2000 indicates there are 794 miles of native surface, 150 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>2001: INFRA inventory efforts continued. Inventory efforts included 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 total, about 1,120 miles occur on National Forest System lands. The remaining 150 miles of classified roads occur on lands non-National Forest System lands. Of the 1,120 miles of classified roads on National Forest System 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</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS										
	<p>miles of native surface, 18 miles of aggregate surface, and 30 miles of asphalt surface roads.</p> <p>2002: The Roads Analysis for the Uinta National Forest was completed. INFRA data indicates there are approximately 1,326 miles of classified. Approximately 86 miles are Maintenance Level 5 roads, 109 miles are Maintenance Level 4 roads, 192 miles are Maintenance Level 3 roads, 838 miles are Maintenance Level 2 roads, and 101 miles are Maintenance Level 1 roads.</p> <p>Forest roads inventory by surface type is 108 miles of asphalt, 42 miles of bituminous surface treated, 150 miles of crushed aggregate or gravel, 33 miles of improved native surface, and 993 miles of native surface.</p>										
<p>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ACCOMPLISHMENTS</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> 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><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> Historically, funding levels have been inadequate to maintain Forest roads to desired standards. Over the last few years, funding for road maintenance has increased, as has the amount of maintenance completed.</p> <p>2001: Approximately 440 miles of Forest Service roads were maintained as shown below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="684 1040 1959 1284"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="684 1040 1026 1110">Miles of Road Maintained</th> <th data-bbox="1026 1040 1959 1110">Maintained By</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="684 1110 1026 1146">132</td> <td data-bbox="1026 1110 1959 1146">Forest Service Force Account Crews</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="684 1146 1026 1214">234</td> <td data-bbox="1026 1146 1959 1214">Utah, Juab, Wasatch, and Tooele Counties under Forest Service Road Agreements</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="684 1214 1026 1250">56</td> <td data-bbox="1026 1214 1959 1250">Utah National Guard</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="684 1250 1026 1284">18</td> <td data-bbox="1026 1250 1959 1284">Timber Operators under contract</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Three road embankment failures were repaired across the Forest.</p>	Miles of Road Maintained	Maintained By	132	Forest Service Force Account Crews	234	Utah, Juab, Wasatch, and Tooele Counties under Forest Service Road Agreements	56	Utah National Guard	18	Timber Operators under contract
Miles of Road Maintained	Maintained By										
132	Forest Service Force Account Crews										
234	Utah, Juab, Wasatch, and Tooele Counties under Forest Service Road Agreements										
56	Utah National Guard										
18	Timber Operators under contract										

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS								
	<p>2002: Approximately 407 miles of Forest Service roads were maintained as shown below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="682 310 1902 516"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="682 310 1014 376">Miles of Road Maintained</th> <th data-bbox="1014 310 1902 376">Maintained By</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="682 376 1014 412">168</td> <td data-bbox="1014 376 1902 412">Forest Service Force Account Crews</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="682 412 1014 479">234</td> <td data-bbox="1014 412 1902 479">Utah, Juab, Wasatch, and Tooele Counties under Forest Service Road Agreements</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="682 479 1014 516">5</td> <td data-bbox="1014 479 1902 516">Timber Operators under contract</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Seven miles of the Cascade Spring Road was chip-sealed under a project agreement with Utah County. Five miles of the Squaw Peak road between Hope Campground and Rock Canyon Campground received a surface treatment by a portable rock crusher.</p>	Miles of Road Maintained	Maintained By	168	Forest Service Force Account Crews	234	Utah, Juab, Wasatch, and Tooele Counties under Forest Service Road Agreements	5	Timber Operators under contract
Miles of Road Maintained	Maintained By								
168	Forest Service Force Account Crews								
234	Utah, Juab, Wasatch, and Tooele Counties under Forest Service Road Agreements								
5	Timber Operators under contract								
<p>TRAFFIC USE (Rates and types of uses/seasons?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: The Forest normally does not conduct traffic counts. However, the Utah Department of Transportation does conduct traffic counts on some roads.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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, the West, and on the Uinta National Forest, outdoor recreation use is growing. This has generally resulted in increases in traffic on Forest roads.</p> <p>2001: Traffic counts were conducted in American Fork Canyon and Aspen Grove. The following data was obtained:</p>								

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS		
	2001 American Fork Canyon/Aspen Grove Traffic Counts		
	Dates of Traffic Count – 2001	Number of Incoming Vehicles	
		American Fork	Aspen Grove
	October	25,770	9,439
	November	6,390	1,540
	December	7,709	322
	January	8,322	2,031
	February	6,613	1,816
	March	7,950	2,041
	April	10,644	1,904
	May	27,446	6,412
	June	43,290	10,380
	July	40,678	12,463
	August	30,783	10,400
	September	44,628	16,142
	Total	220,354	63,589
	2002: The following traffic count data was collected:		
	Road	Total Vehicle Count	Dates of Count (Number of Days)
	Bear Canyon	7,600	05/16/02-08/07/02 (83 days)
	Co-op Creek	7,250	05/10/02-08/07/02 (89 days)
	Lake Creek	6,335	06/14/02-08/07/02 (54 days)
	Strawberry West Side (after Strawberry Bay Marina turnoff)	22,094	06/28/02-08/07/02 (39 days)

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS																																												
	<p style="text-align: center;">2002 American Fork Canyon/Aspen Grove Traffic Counts</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="835 310 1215 376" rowspan="2">Dates of Traffic Count – 2002</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1215 310 1803 342">Number of Incoming Vehicles</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="1215 342 1514 376">American Fork</th> <th data-bbox="1514 342 1803 376">Aspen Grove</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td data-bbox="835 376 1215 410">October</td><td data-bbox="1215 376 1514 410">21,027</td><td data-bbox="1514 376 1803 410">5,899</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="835 410 1215 444">November</td><td data-bbox="1215 410 1514 444">9,421</td><td data-bbox="1514 410 1803 444">3,238</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="835 444 1215 479">December</td><td data-bbox="1215 444 1514 479">8,855</td><td data-bbox="1514 444 1803 479">2,221</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="835 479 1215 513">January</td><td data-bbox="1215 479 1514 513">8,145</td><td data-bbox="1514 479 1803 513">1,894</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="835 513 1215 547">February</td><td data-bbox="1215 513 1514 547">6,271</td><td data-bbox="1514 513 1803 547">1,564</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="835 547 1215 581">March</td><td data-bbox="1215 547 1514 581">8,132</td><td data-bbox="1514 547 1803 581">3,304</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="835 581 1215 615">April</td><td data-bbox="1215 581 1514 615">9,983</td><td data-bbox="1514 581 1803 615">3,244</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="835 615 1215 649">May</td><td data-bbox="1215 615 1514 649">25,457</td><td data-bbox="1514 615 1803 649">6,840</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="835 649 1215 683">June</td><td data-bbox="1215 649 1514 683">42,404</td><td data-bbox="1514 649 1803 683">11,525</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="835 683 1215 717">July</td><td data-bbox="1215 683 1514 717">46,289</td><td data-bbox="1514 683 1803 717">12,872</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="835 717 1215 751">August</td><td data-bbox="1215 717 1514 751">39,796</td><td data-bbox="1514 717 1803 751">8965*</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="835 751 1215 786">September</td><td data-bbox="1215 751 1514 786">30,093</td><td data-bbox="1514 751 1803 786">11,260</td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="835 786 1215 834">Total</td> <td data-bbox="1215 786 1514 834">255,873</td> <td data-bbox="1514 786 1803 834">63,861</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Dates of Traffic Count – 2002	Number of Incoming Vehicles		American Fork	Aspen Grove	October	21,027	5,899	November	9,421	3,238	December	8,855	2,221	January	8,145	1,894	February	6,271	1,564	March	8,132	3,304	April	9,983	3,244	May	25,457	6,840	June	42,404	11,525	July	46,289	12,872	August	39,796	8965*	September	30,093	11,260	Total	255,873	63,861
Dates of Traffic Count – 2002	Number of Incoming Vehicles																																												
	American Fork	Aspen Grove																																											
October	21,027	5,899																																											
November	9,421	3,238																																											
December	8,855	2,221																																											
January	8,145	1,894																																											
February	6,271	1,564																																											
March	8,132	3,304																																											
April	9,983	3,244																																											
May	25,457	6,840																																											
June	42,404	11,525																																											
July	46,289	12,872																																											
August	39,796	8965*																																											
September	30,093	11,260																																											
Total	255,873	63,861																																											
<p>OHV USE (Potential effects of vehicle use off roads and on classified areas and trails?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: OHV user compliance and adverse impacts are discussed in the “RECREATION, OFF-ROAD VEHICLE IMPACTS” section of this report, and are therefore 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Demand for OHV use has grown rapidly over the last decade. Opportunities for OHVs 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, 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</p>																																												

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>focused on the higher standard roads (Maintenance Level 3, 4, and 5 roads).</p> <p>INFRA inventory efforts continued in 2001 and 2002. Inventory efforts included 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 390 miles of road open to use by non-street legal OHVs.</p>
<p>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION (Arterial, collector, and select local roads – accomplishment of DFC for roads?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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>2001: No significant activity occurred.</p> <p>2002: About 5.9 miles of the Teat Mountain road received surface and drainage treatment due to installation of a power line to the summit of Teat Mountain.</p> <p>A total of 11.7 miles of the Red Creek Mountain and Dip Vat roads on the Heber Ranger District received surface treatment with drainage dips installed.</p> <p>Approximately 0.4 miles along the Cold Spring road on the Heber Ranger District were reconstructed under the Rocky Top timber sale.</p>
<p>TRAIL SYSTEM CONSTRUCTION/RECONSTRUCTION (Accomplishment of DFC for trails?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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 been inventoried yet. INFRA data indicates there are about 590 miles of system trails and 51 trailheads on the Forest.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: During the early 1990s an average of</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS												
	<p>approximately 15 miles of trail were 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 5 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>2001: Eleven miles of trail were constructed/reconstructed.</p> <p>2002: One mile of trail was constructed/reconstructed.</p>												
<p>STRUCTURES (Condition of structures?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: The accessibility of buildings (Americans with Disabilities Act compliance) and energy, radon, and asbestos status are discussed in the “<i>RECREATION – SITE/FACILITY CONDITION HEALTH, SANITATION AND SAFETY</i>” section of this report, and are therefore not repeated here. This section discusses other aspects of buildings, in addition to dams and bridges on the Forest.</p> <p>The <i>1986 Facilities Master Plan</i> for the Uinta National Forest called for new Ranger District and Supervisor’s Offices. A new Heber Ranger District Office has been constructed.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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>2001: INFRA (a system for inventorying physical assets on the national forests) continues to be utilized to identify deferred and annual maintenance and improvement needs. Forest System dams, bridges, and buildings are included in the elements inventoried through INFRA.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Inventoried (in INFRA) Building Conditions on the Uinta NF</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="682 1242 1900 1388"> <thead> <tr> <th>Building Condition</th> <th>Administrative Buildings</th> <th>Recreation Buildings</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Poor</td> <td>15</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfactory</td> <td>77</td> <td>125</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Good</td> <td>17</td> <td>61</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Building Condition	Administrative Buildings	Recreation Buildings	Poor	15	15	Satisfactory	77	125	Good	17	61
Building Condition	Administrative Buildings	Recreation Buildings											
Poor	15	15											
Satisfactory	77	125											
Good	17	61											

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 venting systems. Other buildings, including the Spanish Fork and Pleasant Grove 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 tracts. This site has become functionally obsolete and is 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>2002: Same as 2001.</p>
<p>TRANSPORTATION/UTILITY CORRIDORS (Are needs and Forest Plan standards being met?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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 approximately 30 percent.</p>
<p>ROAD DESIGN (According to standards appropriate for planned uses?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: The Forest Service employs road standards designed to achieve the road management objective established for each road.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Many of these roads were built to standards not</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>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>2001: No transportation facilities design work was completed.</p> <p>2002: Construction documents, including drawing and specifications, were prepared for the reconstruction of the Rays Valley road east of Springville Crossing. The project length was approximately 3.5 miles.</p>
PLANNING	
<p>NATIONAL AND REGIONAL DIRECTION (Changes; Plan compliance?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: The <i>Uinta National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan</i> (Forest Plan) was approved in 1984. Through 2000, the Forest Plan had been amended eight times and corrected twice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Strawberry Valley Management Area Amendment</u>, 1990: Added management direction for the newly acquired Strawberry Project lands. • <u>Predator Control Amendment</u>, 1991: Approved a coordinated predator control program and provided direction on control methods, areas, and approval procedures. • <u>Rangeland Ecosystem Amendment</u>, 1992: Defined desired future conditions and associated standards and guidelines and monitoring requirements for rangelands. • <u>Forest Plan Implementation/Monitoring and Evaluation Program Amendment</u>, 1993: Redefined monitoring and evaluation requirements in the Forest Plan. • <u>Pleasant Grove Management Area Special Use Provision Amendment</u>, 1994: Eliminated provisions for a Special Use Permit for the proposed Seven Peaks Resort. • <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. • <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. • <u>Correction No. 1</u>, 1995: Simplified and clarified management direction for Mount Timpanogos and Mount Nebo Wilderness Areas. Management direction was not changed.

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Correction No. 2</u>, 1996: Corrected an editorial oversight in Correction No. 1. • <u>Goshawk Amendment</u>, 2000, Defined habitat requirements, outlined standards and guidelines and monitoring requirements for management of goshawk habitats. • <u>Utah Fire Amendment</u>, 2001: Clarified direction for application and use of wildland fire as a tool for managing hazardous fuels and vegetation • <u>Questar Pipeline Amendment</u>, 2001, site specific amendment modified the utility corridor alignment to allow expansion of facilities and avoid impacts to reservoir facilities on the Nebo Unit. <p><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> 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>National Roadless Area Conservation Rule: In October 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 issued a final rule on January 12, 2001. 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>Forest Road Management Policy and Rule: The Forest Service proposed to refine the agency’s road management policy. Public involvement for this proposal was initiated in January 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>Uinta National Forest Plan: 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 2000, and the Utah Fire Amendment was approved in May 2001. Another amendment, the Questar Pipeline Amendment, was a site-specific amendment approved in 2001</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>as part of the Questar Pipeline project.</p> <p>In response to National Forest Management Act requirements, and management issues and needs, the Uinta National Forest 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 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>Topics Which Must Be Addressed in the Forest Plan Revision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 3. Reevaluate lands suited for timber production as required by the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (NFMA). 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. <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>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>Topics Where the Current Forest Plan Insufficiently Articulates Management Intent: 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> <p>Topics Where Corrections Would Not Require Significant Revision Resources: 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> <p>2001: The Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Revised Forest Plan were released to the public for review in May 2001. Six alternatives were analyzed in detail for revision of the Forest Plan. Two alternatives were identified as preferred, Alternatives B and D. The comment period was extended twice, and over 1,200 individual letters/emails and form letters were received. The Utah Fire Amendment was completed and approved. Direction from this amendment was incorporated into the revised Forest Plan management direction.</p> <p>2002: Work proceeded on finalizing the EIS and revised Forest Plan. Content analysis of public comments resulted in development of two additional alternatives that were analyzed in detail, Alternatives G and H.</p>
<p>INFORMATION/RESOURCE CONDITIONS (Adequate? Effective? And valid? DFC being achieved?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: Information on resource conditions is needed to make informed decisions on land management activities. The 1984 Forest Plan recognized this need and established several objectives for completing inventory data.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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>2001: Inventory accomplishments included 104 miles of aquatic ecological unit inventory, 46,020 acres of terrestrial ecological unit inventory, 671 acres of vegetation inventory, 17,512 acres of</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>aquatic biota inventory/monitoring, and 141 miles of aquatic biota inventory. No heritage resource inventories were completed. As with 1998, efforts continued to incorporate this data into the Forest’s GIS data. Useable data layers were made accessible to internet users from the Forest’s website.</p> <p>2002: Inventory accomplishments included 110,977 acres of terrestrial ecological unit inventory and 977 acres of aquatic biota inventory/monitoring. 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>The INFRA database continued to be refined and, where possible, data from the inventory was incorporated into this database. In general, inventory was completed for all facilities in 2001.</p>
<p>REGION AND FOREST MANAGEMENT SITUATION (Forest management activities vs. local social values?)</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> 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 National Forest. The Forest Plan provides a general framework for forest management activities. Under the Forest Plan, most of the Forest 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><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> 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>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>Recreation/Recreation Access: Recreation is increasingly the predominant use of the Uinta National Forest. 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>Roadless/Wilderness: Approximately 58,000 acres, or 6 percent, of the Uinta National Forest has been designated as 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</i>, 2001, for more detail). 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>Biodiversity/Viability: 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>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>Air/Watershed/Water Quality: 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>Social/Economic: 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 National Forest 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>Monitoring/Evaluation: Some members of the public are concerned the Uinta National Forest is not monitoring the correct resources to determine if current management is adequately protecting or improving forest 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>Lands - Property Boundary Management: 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>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p>PUBLIC ISSUE RESOLUTION (Success of Forest Plan implementation in resolving/addressing issues, concerns, opportunities?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: The Uinta National Forest 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 have been litigated.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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>2001: One project level decision was appealed (36 CFR 215), and was remanded.</p> <p>2002: Three project level decisions were appealed (36 CFR 215). One decision was affirmed, one remanded, and one allowed to be implemented following appellants notification that no formal decision was made on their appeal.</p>
<p>EFFECTS ON LANDS WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO FOREST ADMINISTERED BY OTHERS (Forest Service management impacts of other lands and vice versa?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: The Uinta National Forest affects, and is affected by, land uses on neighboring lands. Unlike many national forests in the west, the Uinta primarily adjoins privately owned lands rather than lands managed by other federal agencies. The Uinta National Forest 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 National Forest System lands.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: There is growing pressure being applied to National Forest System 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>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>In addition to management of wildlands, the Uinta National Forest also has some administrative facilities located within municipalities. Some of these, including the 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, and is now named the Mount Nebo National Scenic Byway. Planning and implementation resulting from this designation is being accomplished in cooperation with Utah and Juab Counties and other federal, state, 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, Mount Nebo National Scenic Byway, 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.</p> <p>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 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>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>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</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>forested areas.</p> <p>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 National Forest System lands due to unacceptable cumulative effects.</p> <p>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 National Forest System 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>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 decrease adjacent to the Forest depending upon the quality of the scenery.</p>
<p>FOREST PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COSTS (As projected?)</p>	<p>This section is redundant with the “<i>GENERAL ADMINISTRATION, COST OF CARRYING OUT PLANNED MANAGMENT DIRECTION</i>” section of his document. Please refer to that section.</p>
<p>RESEARCH NEEDS</p>	<p>See the “<i>RESEARCH</i>” section later in this document.</p>
<p>PROTECTION</p>	
<p>SUPPRESSION POLICY AND FIRE INTENSITY (wildfire) (Is policy appropriate and being followed?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Fire suppression policy is being followed, but with increased human use of the Forest, the number of human-caused fires is rising. This together with increasing fuel levels has resulted in the growth of fire size and intensity.</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 updated policy emphasizes maintaining a core cadre of long-term fire fighters to manage and lead the primary fire fighting force. The Forest Plan contained numerous statements pertinent to the old policy.</p> <p>2001: In recognition of the change in fire policy, a forest plan amendment was approved in May 2001 (the Utah Fire Amendment). The Uinta National Forest experienced the most severe fire season in 10 years with 117 fires and 13,308 acres burned. The number of human-caused fires was high at 81 (69 percent of the total number of fires) and 11,354 acres burned (85 percent). The average fire size in 2001 was about 113.7 acres. The average size of human-caused fires was 140.2 acres and lightning-caused was 54.3 acres. Seventy-one percent of total fires were less than 0.5 acres in size (Class A), 25 percent were between 0.5 and 10 acres (Class B), and 4 percent were larger than 10 acres.</p> <p>2002: The Forest experienced a below average year with only 40 fires burning 2,362 acres. Thirty-three percent of these fires (13 fires) were human-caused. The average fire size was 59.1 acres. The average size of human-caused fires was 174.7 acres. The average size of lightning-caused fires was 3.3 acres. Most of the acres burned can be attributed to only 17 percent of ignitions (8 fires) as the majority of fires were kept under 1 acre in size (62.5 percent of fires were under 0.5 acres, 37.5 percent of fires were 0.5 to 10 acres, 12.5 percent of fires were over 10 acres).</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p>PRESCRIBED FIRE (Within and outside wilderness areas – does prescribed fire meet Forest objectives?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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 Particulate Matter 10 (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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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>2001: Approximately 4,080 acres were treated using prescribed fire.</p> <p>2002: No acres were treated though prescribed fire due to unfavorable conditions. Monitoring activities conducted on acres burned in 2001 indicate that fewer acres than desired had burned at an intensity sufficient to meet burn objectives. Results of this monitoring will be used to refine the development of future burn plans in terms of objectives, prescription parameters, techniques, timing, and monitoring design. Results will also be used to guide future decisions as to what vegetation types and objectives are best suited to the use of prescribed fire.</p>
<p>FUEL MANAGEMENT (Inventory within acceptable level of risk?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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>2001: Approximately 4,080 acres were treated for hazardous fuels.</p> <p>2002: No fuels treatments were completed in 2002 through prescribed fire primarily due to weather, fuel, and environmental conditions that did not meet burn prescription limitations for the planned prescribed fire treatments. Seventy-five acres were treated for harvest related fuels/brush disposal.</p>
<p>FIRE CONTROL OBJECTIVE</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: The Forest Plan contains a standard to detect and report wildfires 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 “<i>SUPPRESSION POLICY AND FIRE INTENSITY</i>” section of this document.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: Generally, the standards for detection and reporting of fires are easily met. With nearly all of the Forest visible by either major ground or air travel routes, most fires 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 1998 proposed removal of this standard. The final decision removing this standard was signed in May 2001.</p>
<p>INSECT, DISEASE, NOXIOUS WEEDS, AND UNDESIRABLE PLANTS (Within endemic proportions?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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 National Forest.</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>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
	<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><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> Twenty species of noxious weeds and other weed species of concern are known to occur on the Uinta National Forest 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 National Forest 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 that 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 efforts, the acreage infested by undesirable plants is slowly increasing.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS																																																																																																																																				
	Estimated Acres of Undesirable Plant Infestations and Treatments on the Uinta NF																																																																																																																																				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="842 360 1226 428" rowspan="2">Species/Year</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1230 360 1514 428">Estimated Acres Infested</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1518 360 1801 428">Estimated Acres Treated</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="1230 431 1373 461">2001</th> <th data-bbox="1377 431 1514 461">2002</th> <th data-bbox="1518 431 1661 461">2001</th> <th data-bbox="1665 431 1801 461">2002</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Musk thistle</td><td>16,195</td><td>18,000</td><td>755</td><td>1,558</td></tr> <tr><td>Canada thistle</td><td>4,850</td><td>5,300</td><td>161</td><td>248</td></tr> <tr><td>Scotch thistle</td><td>166</td><td>30</td><td>158</td><td>33</td></tr> <tr><td>Dyer's woad</td><td>95</td><td>30</td><td>4</td><td>3.5</td></tr> <tr><td>Squarrose knapweed</td><td>46</td><td>50</td><td>8</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>White top</td><td>540</td><td>1,000</td><td>159</td><td>383</td></tr> <tr><td>Dalmatian toadflax</td><td>941</td><td>1,500</td><td>162</td><td>60</td></tr> <tr><td>Leafy spurge</td><td>5</td><td>10</td><td>1</td><td>0.75</td></tr> <tr><td>Jointed goatgrass</td><td>55</td><td>60</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>Spotted knapweed</td><td>17</td><td>10</td><td>13</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>Houndstongue</td><td>155</td><td>2,000</td><td>124</td><td>15</td></tr> <tr><td>Common burdock</td><td>41</td><td>25</td><td>22</td><td>14</td></tr> <tr><td>Yellow star-thistle</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Russian knapweed</td><td>10</td><td>5</td><td>2</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>Perennial pepperweed</td><td>11</td><td>5</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Medusahead</td><td>--</td><td>5</td><td>--</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>Diffuse knapweed</td><td>--</td><td>10</td><td>--</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>Blue spurge</td><td>2</td><td>5</td><td>2</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>Russian olive</td><td>--</td><td>5</td><td>--</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>Tamarisk (salt cedar)</td><td>--</td><td>15</td><td>--</td><td>0.5</td></tr> <tr><td>Yellow sweetclover</td><td>--</td><td>150</td><td>--</td><td>0.5</td></tr> <tr><td>Poison hemlock</td><td>31</td><td>--</td><td>0</td><td>--</td></tr> <tr><td>Poison ivy</td><td>2</td><td>--</td><td>2</td><td>--</td></tr> <tr><td>Uinta NF Total</td><td></td><td>28,216</td><td></td><td>2329.25</td></tr> </tbody> </table>				Species/Year	Estimated Acres Infested		Estimated Acres Treated		2001	2002	2001	2002	Musk thistle	16,195	18,000	755	1,558	Canada thistle	4,850	5,300	161	248	Scotch thistle	166	30	158	33	Dyer's woad	95	30	4	3.5	Squarrose knapweed	46	50	8	2	White top	540	1,000	159	383	Dalmatian toadflax	941	1,500	162	60	Leafy spurge	5	10	1	0.75	Jointed goatgrass	55	60	0	0	Spotted knapweed	17	10	13	4	Houndstongue	155	2,000	124	15	Common burdock	41	25	22	14	Yellow star-thistle	0	1	0	1	Russian knapweed	10	5	2	0	Perennial pepperweed	11	5	1	1	Medusahead	--	5	--	0	Diffuse knapweed	--	10	--	0	Blue spurge	2	5	2	5	Russian olive	--	5	--	0	Tamarisk (salt cedar)	--	15	--	0.5	Yellow sweetclover	--	150	--	0.5	Poison hemlock	31	--	0	--	Poison ivy	2	--	2	--	Uinta NF Total		28,216		2329.25
Species/Year	Estimated Acres Infested		Estimated Acres Treated																																																																																																																																		
	2001	2002	2001	2002																																																																																																																																	
Musk thistle	16,195	18,000	755	1,558																																																																																																																																	
Canada thistle	4,850	5,300	161	248																																																																																																																																	
Scotch thistle	166	30	158	33																																																																																																																																	
Dyer's woad	95	30	4	3.5																																																																																																																																	
Squarrose knapweed	46	50	8	2																																																																																																																																	
White top	540	1,000	159	383																																																																																																																																	
Dalmatian toadflax	941	1,500	162	60																																																																																																																																	
Leafy spurge	5	10	1	0.75																																																																																																																																	
Jointed goatgrass	55	60	0	0																																																																																																																																	
Spotted knapweed	17	10	13	4																																																																																																																																	
Houndstongue	155	2,000	124	15																																																																																																																																	
Common burdock	41	25	22	14																																																																																																																																	
Yellow star-thistle	0	1	0	1																																																																																																																																	
Russian knapweed	10	5	2	0																																																																																																																																	
Perennial pepperweed	11	5	1	1																																																																																																																																	
Medusahead	--	5	--	0																																																																																																																																	
Diffuse knapweed	--	10	--	0																																																																																																																																	
Blue spurge	2	5	2	5																																																																																																																																	
Russian olive	--	5	--	0																																																																																																																																	
Tamarisk (salt cedar)	--	15	--	0.5																																																																																																																																	
Yellow sweetclover	--	150	--	0.5																																																																																																																																	
Poison hemlock	31	--	0	--																																																																																																																																	
Poison ivy	2	--	2	--																																																																																																																																	
Uinta NF Total		28,216		2329.25																																																																																																																																	

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p>LAW ENFORCEMENT (Are law enforcement goals being met? Is level appropriate?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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 been significantly reduced in recent years due to budget constraints, organizational changes, and management of many areas by concessionaires.</p> <p>There were four full-time law enforcement personnel on the Uinta National Forest during 2001 to 2002. In addition to these full-time law enforcement personnel, other Forest Service resource officers were utilized to conduct routine patrols, document incidents, and, where appropriate, 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.</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 funding to affected counties. 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 National Forest provided \$76,000 to Utah, Tooele, Wasatch, and Juab Counties. From 1999 to 2002, the amount of funding provided dropped to \$71,725 per year.</p>
RESEARCH	
<p>RESEARCH NEEDS</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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. Current research projects include identification of pure strain Bonneville and Colorado River cutthroat trout; regeneration of</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS																														
	sagebrush on winter range; restoration of wildlands burned by wildfire; habitat utilization by flammulated owls, bats, and Canada lynx; cultural resource excavations and evaluations; and biomonitoring air quality impacts.																														
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION																															
<p>COST OF CARRYING OUT PLANNED MANAGEMENT DIRECTION (Are budget requirements in keeping with management goals?)</p>	<p>BACKGROUND: 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 fiscal year using the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) Price Index values.</p> <p>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS: 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 84 percent (2002) 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;">Uinta NF Funding Levels for the 2001-2002 Time Period</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="930 914 1713 1282"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2001</th> <th>2002</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Forest Plan Budget</td> <td>\$13,226</td> <td>\$13,395</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Construction Funds</td> <td>\$4,938</td> <td>\$5,001</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Appropriated Monies</td> <td>\$8,288</td> <td>\$8,394</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Actual Budget</td> <td>\$10,036</td> <td>\$11,199</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Construction Funds</td> <td>\$2,854</td> <td>\$3,564</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Appropriated Monies</td> <td>\$7,185</td> <td>\$7,635</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percent Funded</td> <td>76%</td> <td>84%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Construction Funds</td> <td>58%</td> <td>71%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Appropriated Monies</td> <td>87%</td> <td>91%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2001	2002	Forest Plan Budget	\$13,226	\$13,395	• Construction Funds	\$4,938	\$5,001	• Appropriated Monies	\$8,288	\$8,394	Actual Budget	\$10,036	\$11,199	• Construction Funds	\$2,854	\$3,564	• Appropriated Monies	\$7,185	\$7,635	Percent Funded	76%	84%	• Construction Funds	58%	71%	• Appropriated Monies	87%	91%
	2001	2002																													
Forest Plan Budget	\$13,226	\$13,395																													
• Construction Funds	\$4,938	\$5,001																													
• Appropriated Monies	\$8,288	\$8,394																													
Actual Budget	\$10,036	\$11,199																													
• Construction Funds	\$2,854	\$3,564																													
• Appropriated Monies	\$7,185	\$7,635																													
Percent Funded	76%	84%																													
• Construction Funds	58%	71%																													
• Appropriated Monies	87%	91%																													

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS
<p>WORKFORCE MANAGEMENT (Is the present workforce representative of current and projected Forest Plan implementation needs?)</p>	<p><u>BACKGROUND:</u> 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> <p><u>CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS:</u> 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 National Forest 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 has averaged about 8,000 volunteers per year. These volunteers 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 enrollees available to the Forest has been reduced slightly each year, which has reduced the total HRP contribution.</p> <p>2001-2002: See the following table.</p>

ACTIVITY, PRACTICE, OR RESOURCE	MONITORING RESULTS																	
	<p>Uinta NF Workforce for the 2001-2002 Time Period</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="751 326 1892 537"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="751 326 1434 362">Type</th> <th data-bbox="1438 326 1663 362">2001</th> <th data-bbox="1667 326 1892 362">2002</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="751 365 1434 401">Permanent</td> <td data-bbox="1438 365 1663 401">80 FTEs</td> <td data-bbox="1667 365 1892 401">89 FTEs</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="751 404 1434 440">Other Employment</td> <td data-bbox="1438 404 1663 440">62 FTEs</td> <td data-bbox="1667 404 1892 440">62 FTEs</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="751 443 1434 479">Total Employment</td> <td data-bbox="1438 443 1663 479">142 FTEs</td> <td data-bbox="1667 443 1892 479">151 FTEs</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="751 482 1434 537">Human Resource Program (Volunteers, Hosts, etc.)</td> <td data-bbox="1438 482 1663 537">18,300 Hours</td> <td data-bbox="1667 482 1892 537">19,120 Hours</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="764 581 1020 610">* Full-time Equivalent</p>			Type	2001	2002	Permanent	80 FTEs	89 FTEs	Other Employment	62 FTEs	62 FTEs	Total Employment	142 FTEs	151 FTEs	Human Resource Program (Volunteers, Hosts, etc.)	18,300 Hours	19,120 Hours
Type	2001	2002																
Permanent	80 FTEs	89 FTEs																
Other Employment	62 FTEs	62 FTEs																
Total Employment	142 FTEs	151 FTEs																
Human Resource Program (Volunteers, Hosts, etc.)	18,300 Hours	19,120 Hours																

LIST OF PREPARERS	
Name	Subject Area(s)
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
Chad Hermandorfer	Watershed
Denise Van Keuren	Ecology, Noxious Weeds, Special Ecosystems, Botany, Rare Plants
Ron Smith	Aquatic Biota
Karen Hartman	Terrestrial Wildlife
Antoinette SittingUp	Terrestrial Wildlife
Jeffrey Waters	Terrestrial Wildlife
Marlene DePietro	Planning, Rangeland Management, Noxious Weeds, Watershed
Barbara Ott	Budget, Writer-Editor, Social Science
Chuck Wentlender	Fire
Kevin Draper	Visuals, Recreation
Ken Burton	GIS
Vicki May	Human Resources
John Logan	Recreation, Lands, Wilderness
Doug Page	Forestry, Timber Management
Jim Gibson	Forestry, Timber Management
Randy Miles	Budget

REVIEW/CONCURRENCE BY:	
Name	Uinta National Forest Leadership Team Position
Pete Karp	Forest Supervisor
William Ott	Spanish Fork District Ranger
Pam Gardner	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