



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

Southwestern
Region



Environmental Assessment for Buckhorn Allotment Watershed and Wildlife Habitat Improvements

**Red Rock Ranger District
Coconino National Forest**

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TTY). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 – Purpose and Need.....	1
Document Structure.....	1
Background.....	1
Purpose of and Need for Action.....	2
Proposed Action.....	3
Public Involvement.....	4
Issues.....	4
Decision Framework.....	5
Chapter 2 – Alternatives.....	6
Alternative A – No Action.....	6
Alternative B – Proposed Action.....	6
Alternative C – Action Alternative Modified to Address Issues.....	11
Alternatives Considered but Not Developed in Detail.....	11
Mitigation Measures for Action Alternatives.....	11
Monitoring.....	12
Comparison of Alternatives.....	13
Chapter 3 – Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences.....	14
Applicability of the Forest Plan, Laws, Regulations, Policies	14
History of Human Use.....	16
Historical Land Use and Effects.....	18
Soils.....	20
Water.....	25
Air Quality.....	27
Vegetation and Invasive Species.....	28
General Wildlife Species.....	30
Special Status Species.....	34
Bald Eagle.....	35
Peregrine Falcon.....	35
Arizona Night Lizard.....	36
Invertebrates.....	37
Plants.....	34
Management Indicator Species.....	38
Mule Deer.....	38
Antelope.....	39
Juniper Titmouse.....	40
Herbicides in the Environment.....	40
Cultural Resources.....	42
Recreation.....	45
Range Management.....	46
Environmental Justice.....	47
Costs.....	47

Chapter 4 – Consultation and Coordination.....	48
Preparation.....	48
Consultation.....	48
Chapter 5 – References Cited.....	50
Appendix A. Mitigation Measures.....	55
Map 1.....	60

List of Tables

Table 1 – Comparison of Alternatives.....	13
Table 2 – Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, Sensitive and Management Indicator Species.....	34

Chapter 1 – Purpose and Need

Document Structure

This Environmental Assessment has been prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other relevant federal and state laws and regulations. It discloses the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects that would result from the proposed action and alternatives, including no action. It is organized into the following chapters:

- Chapter 1. *Purpose and Need*: This describes the reason for the proposal and the actions and analysis which led to it. It also describes public involvement and the results of that involvement, including significant issues which led to development of alternatives. Finally, it specifies the decision to be made and the official who will make the decision.
- Chapter 2. *Alternatives*: This chapter describes in more detail the proposed action as well as alternatives, including no action. It also discusses mitigation measures for each alternative and includes a summary comparison of the environmental consequences of each alternative.
- Chapter 3. *Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences*: This chapter briefly describes the affected environment and the environmental effects of each alternative. Within each section, e.g., soil, water, wildlife indicator species, the affected environment is described first, followed by the effects of the No Action and action alternatives.
- Chapter 4. *Consultation and Coordination*: This chapter provides a list of preparers and the agencies and organizations contacted during the development of the environmental assessment.
- Chapter 5. *References Cited*
- *Appendices*: The appendices provide more detailed information to support the analyses presented in the environmental assessment.

Additional documentation, including more detailed analyses of project area resources, may be found in the project planning record located at the Red Rock Ranger District Office in Sedona.

Background

The M Diamond Ranch, grazing permittee on the Buckhorn Range Allotment on the Coconino National Forest, has proposed a group of erosion control and wildlife habitat improvements within the allotment. These would be accomplished using grant funds from the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality for nonpoint source pollution control and from the Arizona Game & Fish Department through their Habitat Partnership program. The improvements would be located within the Wickiup, Winter, Boulder, Bald Hill, Indian Flat, Painted Tank, and Buckhorn Pastures of the allotment. All are within the Red Rock Ranger District. Map 1 illustrates the general area and location of proposed treatments. This portion of the allotment is located immediately north of West

Clear Creek and extends east-west over about 12 miles, beginning about 7 miles east of Camp Verde.

The project area is located within three Management Areas (MA) of the Coconino National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan:

- MA 7 – Pinyon-juniper woodlands on slopes less than 40 percent
- MA 10 – grassland and sparse pinyon-juniper
- MA 11 – Verde Valley

The Mogollon Rim passes through the area from southeast to northwest. The Wickiup and Winter Pastures are below the rim and the other five pastures in the project are above it.

Purpose of and Need for Action

An assessment of existing and potential conditions has determined that improvement practices are needed to meet the direction in the Coconino National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan).

In the pastures below the Mogollon Rim much of the area has been found to have impaired or unsatisfactory soil and watershed condition. As a result the ability to grow and maintain vegetative ground cover has been compromised. Areas which formerly sustained a vegetative community of grasses, forbs, shrubs and scattered trees now have limited perennial grasses and forbs and the increase of juniper and pinyon trees and, in some areas, mesquite shrubs contributes to this condition. With little vegetation on the soil surface the increased runoff from thunderstorms has led to on-site soil erosion and gully erosion with subsequent transport of sediment to the Verde River through West Clear Creek and tributaries. There are a number of headcuts (abrupt vertical walls in the flow pattern of channels) which are advancing through deep erosive soils. (A more detailed description of the current condition, its causes, and its effects is included in Chapter 3, *Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences*).

Proposed treatment area 2 was predominantly a grassland but has a high percentage invaded by deep rooted mesquite shrubs. As these shrubs continue to grow and the root systems expand, the ability of grass and herbaceous plants to become established and grow is diminished. As a result there is more bare soil susceptible to surface runoff and erosion. This area still has enough topsoil to produce a healthy grass and herbaceous plant community which can then be maintained by proper range management and periodic prescribed fire. However, there are some areas within the allotment, but outside this project proposal, dominated by mesquite shrubs where enough topsoil has been lost that it is unlikely that a herbaceous plant cover can be reestablished. Mesquite can be treated mechanically by root plowing at a depth of 12 inches or more to uproot the root crown which will sprout if left in the soil. However, this soil has calcareous material within the profile and tilling is likely to bring the calcareous material to the surface and hinder plant establishment.

There are a large number of rock and wire check dams constructed in gullies which appear to have been in place for a number of decades. Many appear to have been constructed by the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) during the 1930's; however, documentation is lacking and it is possible some may have been constructed by subsequent Forest Service programs (in this document they will be referred to as "CCC era"). Over the years many have been washed out or around; however, there are a number still functioning but in need of maintenance to continue their usefulness.

Above the Mogollon Rim, areas which once were a savannah-like vegetative community have become crowded with young juniper and pinyon trees encroaching into areas previously supporting a much more diverse vegetative community. Some of the areas treated to create seral grasslands in the 1960's and 70's have since been encroached upon by junipers and pinyons reducing their value as antelope habitat. Antelope depend on visibility in order to evade predators and the young invading trees provide potential screening for predators and reduce the habitat suitability for antelope. In areas more important for mule deer habitat the existing browse is limited. Competition from pinyon and juniper trees, exclusion of fire, and decades of heavy use by grazing and browsing animals, combined with the effects of recent severe drought, have resulted in recent overuse by grazing ungulates and deterioration of the limited browse resource.

Proposed Action

The proposed action is a combination of treatments intended to restore ecosystem conditions and move from the existing conditions toward desired conditions as specified in the Coconino National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. Three different treatment objectives for different areas are included:

- Reduction of nonpoint source pollution through reduction of sheet and channel erosion, and moving treated areas from unsatisfactory or impaired to satisfactory watershed condition
- Maintenance and improvement of antelope habitat
- Improvement of mule deer habitat.

There are expected to be some corollary benefits to habitat for elk and Coues whitetail deer. Improved range condition for permitted livestock is expected as an additional benefit, with varying time frames to achieve this benefit.

A detailed description of the proposed action by treatment area is given in Chapter 2, Alternatives, along with coordination and mitigation measures. The following description summarizes the proposed action.

Erosion control measures are the focus in treatment areas 1 through 4. Sheet erosion measures are intended to increase the protective cover of vegetation and plant litter by increasing grass and forb composition. Reduction of encroaching juniper and pinyon into previous grassland and savannah will be done mechanically by saw and/or tree shears, accompanied by seeding with native grass and forbs. Slash (limbs and tops) will be lopped and scattered over the seeded areas to reduce surface temperatures, provide

protection for new plant seedlings and eventually add to organic matter available for incorporation into the soil. This will be accompanied by protection from livestock grazing until monitoring determines that management objectives have been reached and a specified amount of grazing can occur. In treatment area 2 mesquite shrubs will also be cut and the cut stumps painted with herbicide to prevent sprouting. Headcuts in channels will be treated with rock and wire check dams and some will have headcut armoring (sloping to a gentler slope and lining with rock to prevent further advancement of the headcut). Existing rock and wire check dams which are still functioning will receive maintenance as needed, primarily in extending or raising the keyways into the channel banks.

Antelope habitat is the emphasis for treatment areas 15 through 17. Areas 16 and 17, totaling about 285 acres, were previously treated and will receive maintenance through cutting of encroaching young junipers and pinyons with hydraulic tree shears attached to a small tractor. The resulting slash will be lopped to 24 inches or less in height to maintain visibility for antelope for protection from predators. Area 15 is new clearing of about 25 acres to extend seral grassland from the adjacent Walker Basin allotment and expand the area available for antelope use.

Mule deer habitat will be emphasized in areas 5-14 and 18-22. Increased growth of browse and forbs is the objective. Areas 5-9, 13, 14, and 18 are the highest priority due to soil capability and the need for increased browse in these general areas. They comprise a total of about 900 acres, of which about 280-330 acres is proposed for treatment.

Areas 10-12 and 19-22 are medium priority, comprising a total of about 535 acres with about 385 acres proposed for treatment. Maintenance of a savannah aspect, along with increased growth of browse and forbs is the objective. In areas 21 and 22 there is an additional objective to add cool season herbaceous forage.

Public Involvement

The Proposed Action was distributed for review and comment to 30 organizations, agencies, or individuals by letter of Feb. 23, 2005. Two written responses were received. Both expressed concurrence with two of the tentative issues included with the distributed Proposed Action. One disagreed with the purpose and need for the project, the other recommended detailed analysis plus the inclusion of cost information.

Issues

Issues associated with the proposed action were developed by the interdisciplinary team using both the external responses and knowledge of the project proposal. Potential issues were identified and analyzed to evaluate which were significant in the context of NEPA (40 CFR, 1500.4[g]), i.e., that they:

- are within the scope of the analysis
- are not already decided by law, regulation, the Coconino National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, or previous decision

- are related to the decision to be made
- can be supported by scientific analysis rather than conjecture
- are not limited in extent, duration, or intensity

The following issues were identified:

Issue 1

The proposed action includes application of a herbicide, triclopyr, to the cut stumps of mesquite shrubs in treatment area 2. Herbicides in the environment may have effects on soil, water, vegetation and fauna.

Alternative C was developed to address this issue. A number of mitigation measures to reduce the likelihood of effect on non-target organisms are included as a part of the Proposed Action.

Issue 2

The soil and vegetation disturbance may result in spread of non-native plant species in the area to the detriment of native species.

Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, addresses this issue. There are mitigation measures included as a part of Alternatives B and C to reduce the likelihood of this occurrence.

Issue 3

The closure of areas 1-3 and the seeded portion of 4 to motorized off-road vehicle use will restrict some opportunities for dispersed recreation. It will also restrict opportunities for hunters to retrieve downed game via off-road use.

The No Action Alternative addresses this issue. However, the five forest environmental analysis and plan for off-road vehicle use, currently in process, may very likely have the same effect by closing areas except for designated routes.

Non-significant issues included the effects of past and continued livestock grazing. Permitted livestock grazing and its terms -- numbers, seasons of use, management system, etc. -- is outside the scope of this analysis. However, a part of the mitigation built into the action alternatives is exclusion from livestock grazing of areas seeded for erosion control until monitoring determines that vegetative recovery has been achieved and a specified amount of grazing use is acceptable.

Decision Framework

The District Ranger of the Red Rock Ranger District is the official responsible for deciding whether or not to approve vegetative and structural treatments on the Buckhorn Allotment. He may decide to select the No Action Alternative, either of the two action alternatives or a modification of either.

CHAPTER 2 – ALTERNATIVES

This chapter displays, describes, and provides a summary comparison of the alternatives. They include:

Alternative A – No Action or no project

Alternative B – the Proposed Action, including mitigating features

Alternative C – an alternative action developed to respond to issue 1

Alternative A – No Action

This alternative is the required no action alternative. There would be no project. Current conditions and effects of this alternative are described in detail in Chapter 3.

Alternative B – Proposed Action

This alternative was developed to meet the purpose and need.

EROSION CONTROL TREATMENTS

Sheet Erosion

- Removal of invading or encroaching woody vegetation, lop, scatter & leave slash (limbs and tops) on soil surface or incorporate into surface of soil. Removal to be by mechanical means – i.e., Agra-axe (tree shears), chain saw, brush saw, and/or hand pruners.
- Site preparation of soil surface to increase irregularity, increase infiltration of rainfall, and provide an adequate seedbed. This will be done mechanically by use of some combination of harrow, dixie harrow, or similar item pulled behind a tractor and/or ATV.
- Seeding with appropriate native herbaceous species to include both warm and cool growing season species. Soil testing will be done and the results used in selecting species to plant, especially in the soils high in calcium carbonate.
- Application of compost mats incorporating mulch, fertilizer, and seed in specific areas where topsoil has been seriously compromised.
- Closure of specific areas to off road vehicle travel, including construction of physical barriers, signing, and enforcement.
- Exclude livestock use from seeded areas until recovered.
- In Treatment Area 2 mesquite shrubs will be cut and the cut stumps painted with herbicide to prevent sprouting.

Channel Treatments

- Construction of rock and wire check dams in first order channels (Heede 1976, 1977).
- Headcut armoring by sloping headcut to approximately 3:1 slope and armoring with rock.
- Maintenance of existing and partially functional rock and wire check dams.

Refer to Map Exhibit for Treatment Area locations.

Area 1. Wickiup Pasture. Thinning of junipers and pinyons to return to savannah aspect with lopping and scattering slash, site preparation, and seeding on approximately 90 acres of Terrestrial Ecosystem Survey (TES) units 385 and 381 and on about 100 to 120 acres of TES unit 447, with small inclusion of TES unit 402. Stabilization on approximately 1.5 miles of channels. This includes repairing CCC era check dams using comparable rock. Construct approximately 15-20 new rock and wire check dams. Headcut armoring on one headcut approximately 1.5 feet deep by 50 foot perimeter. Treat one large headcut that is 8 feet deep by 50 feet wide at head by either headcut armoring and toe check dams, check dam of gabions, or compacted earth detention dam. Close area to off road travel, sign, and construct physical barrier along key areas of perimeter where entrance likely.

Area 2. Wickiup Pasture. Treat approximately 30 acres where mesquite is dominant woody plant, plus 50 acres where juniper is dominant with scattered mesquite shrubs, essentially all on TES unit 381. Removal of mesquite shrubs and majority of junipers to reduce competition with herbaceous plants and increase protective ground cover. Mesquite treatment by sawing or clipping stems and applying the herbicide triclopyr to cut stems to prevent sprouting. Retain mesquite which is tree size and which is adjacent to Wickiup Draw. Juniper treatment via saw or tree shears. Lop and scatter slash, scarify soil, seed with mix of native warm and cool season grass, forbs & shrubs. Control channel headcuts with rock & wire check dams, headcut armoring and maintenance of CCC era check dams. Armor one major headcut approximately 6' deep by 30' perimeter. Construct rock and wire check dams on small headcuts on first order channels. Close area to off road travel, and construct off road travel barrier and/or fence paralleling FR 618.

Area 3. Winter Pasture. Removal of small junipers and pinyons with lop and scatter of slash, site preparation, and seeding on approximately 100-120 acres on TES units 381 and 403. Repair CCC check dams using comparable rock. Construct new rock and wire check dams to protect integrity of functioning CCC era dams and in additional areas on first order drainages with active headcuts. Apply compost mats with seed in selected areas where topsoil has been severely depleted. Close area to off road vehicle use, sign, and construct barrier paralleling FR 618. Construct electric fence to protect seeded area until full recovery has been achieved.

Area 4. Winter Pasture. TES units 403 and 404. This area is the most complex and diverse of the four treatment areas. Channel treatments will include a number of small rock and wire check dams on headcuts in first order channels, including several just downstream from Hollingshead Tank plus maintenance on several CCC rock and wire check dams. Juniper thinning with lop and scatter of slash, including some placement as filter strips paralleling drainages, and seeding will be done on approximately 80 acres within this area.

WILDLIFE HABITAT IMPROVEMENTS

Area 5. Boulder Pasture, emphasis on mule deer habitat. Within this 80 acre area of past fuelwood sales, treat about 40 acres On an opportunity basis – i.e., where there are clumps or groups of browse plants of sufficient number and size to warrant treatment -- do mechanical disturbance to existing browse plants, primarily turbinella oak and silktassel, using crushing or clipping. Remove competing small junipers and use slash to protect browse plants during initial recovery and resprouting.

Area 6. Boulder Pasture, emphasis on mule deer habitat. Within this 115 acre area of old fuelwood sales, treat about 30 acres of deeper, less rocky soils similar to Area 5.

Area 7. Boulder Pasture, emphasis on mule deer habitat. Enhance browse in areas having some already present by thinning young pinyon and juniper to reduce competition. These are generally some of the rockier soils. Stimulate browse growth by treatments of mechanical brush crushing, clipping and/or jackpot burning during the dormant season. Silktassel and turbinella oak are the most common browse plants, with secondary amounts of mountain mahogany. A few areas where cliffrose is established but has grown out of reach and decadent will be treated by cutting the primary stems to within a few feet of the ground and placing pinyon and/or juniper slash from removed nearby trees as protection so that new growth can become well established without being immediately consumed by browsing ungulates. Because of cliffrose's sensitivity to fire it will not be burned. Within an overall area of about 140 acres treat approximately 40-50 acres.

Area 8. Boulder Pasture, emphasis on mule deer habitat. Same as Area 7. Within an overall area of about 60 acres treat about 20-30 acres.

Area 9. Bald Hill Pasture, emphasis on mule deer habitat. Past fuelwood sales are less open than in Areas 5 and 6 in the Boulder Pasture. Treatments are generally similar to those in the Boulder pasture for browse stimulation and forage enhancement. Out of an overall area of about 200 acres approximately 60-80 acres will be treated, predominantly with the same treatment as Areas 7 and 8. A small portion on some of the deeper, less rocky soils adapted to grassland or savannah vegetative composition will have site preparation with dixie harrow or equivalent and seeding with native cool season herbaceous species in order to reduce spring browsing on the limited browse resource.

Area 10. Indian Flat Pasture, emphasis on mule deer habitat. In this 7 acre past fuelwood sale area remove enough small pinyon and junipers remaining after past activities to

maintain a savannah aspect, using Agra-Axe or saw. On an opportunity basis mechanically stimulate existing browse – primarily turbinella oak and skunkbush, with occasional mountain mahogany – with crushing or clipping. Any mountain mahogany to be protected with slash from removed junipers. The size and configuration is such that a browsing animal will not be more than 5 chains from cover.

Area 11. Indian Flat Pasture, emphasis on mule deer habitat. Similar to Area 10 with similar treatment. Acreage about 15 acres.

Area 12. Indian Flat Pasture, emphasis on mule deer habitat. This is a more recent fuelwood area that was burned and seeded to weeping lovegrass, comprising about 25 acres. There is only a very limited amount of young juniper and pinyon and maintenance will be primarily along the north edge, nearer to the large seral grassland on the adjacent Walker Basin Allotment. On an opportunity basis existing browse will be mechanically stimulated as in Areas 10 and 11.

Area 13. Indian Flat Pasture, emphasis on mule deer habitat. This area of about 110 acres will include treatments to return to a savannah aspect on areas with predominantly young junipers. About 30-50 acres will be treated with Agra-Axe and/or saw to remove junipers on soils most adapted to browse. Layout will be such that a browsing animal is always less than 10 chains from effective hiding cover. Where there is no existing browse there will be seeding with native browse and forbs, and slash will be lopped and scattered over the seeding to protect seedlings from browsing.

Area 14. Indian Flat Pasture, emphasis on mule deer habitat. Similar to Area 13. Approximately 30-50 acres treated within an overall area of about 100 acres.

Area 15. Indian Flat Pasture, emphasis on antelope habitat. This will be an expansion of existing seral grassland on the adjacent Walker Basin Allotment to the north by treating an existing sparse stand of pinyon and juniper. It comprises approximately 25 acres and is on soils suitable for seral grassland. Some past fuelwood sales have resulted in thinning the stand. Slash will be lopped to within 24 inches of the ground to maintain visibility for antelope. A few large pinyon and or juniper trees with self pruned crowns that would not significantly affect visibility will be left. Herbaceous species desirable for antelope forage will be planted.

Area 16. Painted Tank Pasture, emphasis on antelope habitat. Maintenance of past treatment to achieve a seral grassland by removing small junipers and pinyons with Agra-Axe and/or saw on about 170 acres. Lop slash to within 24 inches of ground. Large portions of area have very few junipers due to soil characteristics. Clear an additional area, expected to be less than 2 acres, to increase visibility for antelope watering at Bessie Tank. On an opportunity basis, i.e., the next time it is dry, clean Bessie Tank.

Area 17. Painted Tank and Buckhorn Pastures, emphasis on antelope habitat. Maintenance similar to Area 16 on about 115 acres. Major portions of area have very few junipers.

Area 18. Buckhorn Pasture, emphasis on mule deer habitat. Within this area of about 90 acres there will be treatments of about 30-40 acres to develop new forage in the midst of an area of pinyon-juniper southwest of Buckhorn Tank No. 3. Areas will be treated with the Agro-Axe to return to a savannah aspect, leaving any large alligator juniper – larger than 12 inches trunk diameter. Layout will be such that an animal will be no more than 10 chains (660 feet) from hiding cover at any point within the treated area. Seeding will then be done with a mixture of native cool season grass, forbs, and appropriate browse species. Browse seeding will be protected by slash lopped and left over it.

Area 19. Buckhorn Pasture, emphasis on mule deer habitat. This small 8 acre area was previously treated. It is along the access route for Area 18. Treatment similar to Areas 10 and 11, i.e., remove small pinyon and junipers remaining after past activities enough to maintain a savannah aspect, using Agra-Axe or saw. On an opportunity basis mechanically stimulate existing browse – primarily turbinella oak and skunkbush, with occasional mountain mahogany – with crushing or clipping. Any mountain mahogany to be protected with slash from removed junipers.

Area 20. Buckhorn Pasture, emphasis on mule deer habitat. This area was previously treated to return it to a savannah aspect, leaving the larger alligator junipers and some groups of junipers. Within the portions where browse is found do mechanical disturbance to existing browse plants -- primarily turbinella oak, skunkbush, and mountain mahogany -- using crushing or clipping and remove small junipers or pinyons competing with the browse. Use slash from nearby small junipers to protect browse plants during initial recovery and resprouting. In other parts of the area having more productive soils for herbaceous vegetation conduct maintenance by removing smaller junipers and pinyons in order to maintain a savannah aspect. The total amount to be treated is approximately 200-250 acres of the 370 acres in this area. Layout of areas to be treated will be to achieve a pattern where a browsing animal would be within 10 chains of cover throughout the treated area.

Area 21. Buckhorn Pasture, emphasis on mule deer habitat. Maintenance on past pinyon-juniper removal treatments to continue a savannah aspect. In addition site preparation and seeding with cool season herbaceous plants to reduce spring browsing on the east and northeast side of Buckhorn Mountain. Treatment of about 50 acres within this 70 acre area.

Area 22. Buckhorn Pasture, emphasis on mule deer habitat. Same treatment as Area 21 with treatment of about 30 acres of the 40 acre area.

A part of the ranch's cost share in habitat improvement will be the work necessary to ensure that fences meet standards and guidelines for antelope habitat in the pastures with antelope use. This includes removal of abandoned, unused fences and inspection and adjustment of any bottom fence wires to ensure meeting the requirements for smooth wire at the specified heights.

Alternative C – Action Alternative modified to address issue

Alternative C was developed as a result of issues raised by respondents, specifically that of the effects of herbicide use. In this alternative Treatment Area 2 would not have the cutting of mesquite and herbicide application to the cut stumps. All other treatments remain the same as Alternative B.

Alternatives Considered but Not Developed in Detail

The alternative of mechanical treatment of mesquite in Area 2 was considered. However, as stated in Purpose and Need in Chapter 1, the soil in this area has calcareous material within the profile and root plowing to eliminate sprouting would bring calcareous material to the surface and hinder plant establishment. Thus it would not adequately meet the purpose and need of the project.

Mitigation Measures for Action Alternatives

For both Alternatives B and C there are a number of mitigation measures which would be a part of the implementation. The Soil and Water Conservation Practices Handbook (FSH 2509.22) was developed in concert between the Forest Service, Southwestern Region, and the Departments of Environmental Quality from Arizona and New Mexico. It contains a number of specific best management practices (BMP's) designed to prevent or reduce nonpoint source pollution to the level compatible with water quality goals. In addition the following specific mitigation measures apply to both Alternatives B and C.

Conduct archaeological surveys prior to land disturbing treatments. Identify and protect sites as specified in the project clearance. This may mean total avoidance by mechanized equipment. In other instances it may mean hand clearing and lopping of slash, and seeding with herbaceous species only and will not allow surface soil scarification for site preparation.

In revegetation use only certified weed-free seed of native species. Use seed from local sources where available; otherwise use that from the closest environmental conditions to the project area, i.e., soil moisture and temperature regimes and associated vegetation. The identified invasive weed species will comply with the State of Arizona Department of Agriculture 2005 weed list.

Prepare and implement an invasive species prevention plan which includes survey, appropriate mitigation and/or avoidance, and cleaning of any project equipment entering area which could potentially transport seed of invasive species.

Protect erosion control seeded areas from livestock grazing until monitoring determines that vegetation is established to soil protection standards and that a specified grazing use may occur.

Minimize impact of vehicular access during project implementation. Clearing and surface disturbance to be done only enough to allow safe and efficient access for high clearance vehicles used in the project. Any disturbed areas used for access to be restored

at conclusion of use for project access. Limit the number of vehicular trips off road to the minimum needed.

In maintenance of CCC era check dams use native rock similar to that used in original structures, i.e., sandstone or basalt. Sources are available within the pastures containing treatment areas.

In Areas 5 and 6 maintain existing screening from Forest Road 214 to reduce disturbance to browsing animals.

In areas 7, 8, and 9 any jackpot burning (burning of individual trees or small groups) will be done in the dormant season to minimize damage to featured browse plants. No burning will be done where cliffrose is present.

Protect agave plants from ground disturbing activities.

For Alternative B additional specific mitigation requirements are related to the use of herbicide in Treatment Area 2. A herbicide application plan will be prepared by a Coconino National Forest botanist certified in pesticide application and will be implemented. Specific BMP's are detailed in the Soil and Water Conservation Practices Handbook (FSH 2509.22). They include following all label instructions and legal requirements. Label directions are detailed and specific and include legal requirements for use. Other BMP's covering monitoring and evaluation, spill contingency plan, and cleaning and disposal of herbicide containers will be incorporated.

More detailed and specific explanation of BMP's for herbicide use management and coordination, and for integrated weed management practices are included in the appendix.

Monitoring

Before the start of project implementation a detailed monitoring plan will be prepared and approved by the Red Rock District Ranger. Monitoring will be designed to evaluate and document:

Degree of achievement of objectives, both for erosion control/nonpoint source pollution prevention plus maintenance and improvement of habitat featuring antelope and mule deer

Compliance with mitigation measures including

- Archaeological site protection

- Herbicide handling and application according to label requirements and herbicide application plan

- Prevention of spread of invasive species through project activities

Comparison of Alternatives

Table 1 compares alternatives in relation to the objectives and issues identified in Chapter 1.

Table 1. Comparison of Alternatives in Relation to Objectives and Issues

Objective/Issue	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C
<i>Objective</i> Reduce nonpoint source pollution	No change from current condition	Sheet erosion treated on 505 acres. Channel stabilization on 3.8 miles	Sheet erosion treated on 425 acres. Channel stabilization on 3.8 miles.
<i>Objective</i> Maintenance & improvement of antelope habitat	Slow degradation of antelope habitat by encroachment of junipers	Maintenance & improvement of 285 acres of previously treated area. New treatment on 25 acres	Same as Alt. B
<i>Objective</i> Improvement of mule deer habitat	No change from current condition. Continued slow degradation of limited browse resource	Direct treatment of 400 acres to increase browse and herbaceous forage production. Maintenance of 275 acres past treatments	Same as Alt. B
<i>Issue</i> Herbicide effects in the environment	No herbicide used	Herbicide triclopyr applied on cut stumps of mesquite within 80 acre Treatment Area 2, following all BMP's.	No herbicide used.
<i>Issue</i> Potential for invasive plant species to increase	Invasive plant, red brome, common in the project area. Presence may slightly expand or contract depending on weather patterns and opportunity for expansion into areas not having perennial herbaceous plants.	Establishment of cool season grasses & forbs should reduce opportunities for expansion of red brome in treated areas and may result in some reduction of area occupied.	Same as Alt. B, except that the 80 acre Area 2 will have much less establishment of perennial herbaceous plants.
<i>Issue</i> Off road vehicle recreation opportunities	Areas will remain open until completion of multi-Forest off road vehicle use plan (in progress). At that time routes not designated as open will be closed.	Approximately 700 acres will be closed to off road vehicle use at the time of implementation.	Same as Alt. B

CHAPTER 3 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Introduction

This chapter describes the environment being affected by the alternatives described in Chapter 2 and documents the scientific and analytical basis for the comparisons made between the alternatives. It also briefly describes the history of human use with reference to its effect on current conditions which led to the purpose and need for the project.

Applicability of the Forest Plan, Laws, Regulations, Policies and Other Direction

Plans of Other Agencies

The Council for Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA require a determination of possible conflicts between the Proposed Action and the objectives of federal, state, and local land use plans, policies, and controls for the area. The Buckhorn Allotment Nonpoint Source Pollution Control and Habitat Partnership projects do not conflict with objectives of other Federal, State, and local land use plans, policies and controls for the area. Instead they help to implement policies and plans of the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality and the Arizona Game and Fish Department.

Forest Plan Management Direction and Consistency

This document tiers to the Final Environmental Impact Statement and the Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) for the Coconino National Forest (Record of Decision, 1987) and all subsequent amendments. The Forest Plan provides direction for all resource management programs, practices, uses, and protection measures for the Coconino National Forest. The action alternatives are consistent with the direction listed in the Forestwide standards and guidelines, and with the standards and guidelines for Management Areas (MA) 7 Pinyon Juniper on Less than 40% Slopes, MA 10 Grassland and Sparse Pinyon Juniper, and MA 11 Verde Valley.

The proposed action and action alternatives are consistent with the Coconino National Forest Plan. The following standards and guidelines (S&G's) are specifically addressed as a part of this project, both as Forestwide S&G's and those for individual Management Areas.

Forestwide -

- Maintain current satisfactory watershed conditions and improve any unsatisfactory conditions to satisfactory by 2020.
- Implement resource improvement projects that are cost-effective and/or are beneficial for maintaining and improving water quality, quantity, and soil productivity.

Buckhorn Allotment Projects, Environmental Assessment – Chapter 3

- Evaluate the need for closures or restrictions on off-road driving on soils that are receiving damage to the extent that soil productivity will be significantly impaired. Close when adverse resource impacts are occurring.
- Cooperate with the Arizona Game & Fish Department (AGFD) to at least achieve habitat management goals and objectives specified in the Arizona Wildlife and Fisheries Comprehensive Plans and strategic plans.
- Manage forage to increase threatened and endangered species and management indicator species where it is determined appropriate through the IRM and NEPA process.

Management Area 7 – area above rim in Boulder, Bald Hill, and Indian Flat Pastures, untreated areas in Painted Tank Pasture and portions of Buckhorn Pasture.

- Manage for the indicator species of plain titmouse, mule deer, and elk.
- Areas needing additional forage for elk and mule deer are given first priority in wildlife habitat improvement projects, with emphasis to areas away from intensive development and high road densities.
- Where seral grasslands are maintained eliminate invading vegetation on a maintenance schedule averaging once every 25 years.

Management Area 10 – Previously treated areas in Painted Tank and Buckhorn pastures.

- Manage for the indicator species of antelope.
- Maintain a seral grassland state on previously treated areas except where corridors of cover are needed. Maintain seral grasslands in a savannah-like state that emphasizes a diversity of habitats to enhance forage for livestock and wildlife. Retreatment on approximately a 25 year schedule.

Management Area 11 – Wickiup and Winter Pastures

- Where watershed condition is unsatisfactory plan, design, and implement projects by the end of the second decade following watershed condition inventory and subsequent prioritization.
- Stabilize gullies, scarify the soil, and seed disturbed soils with a species mix tailored for the site, emphasizing high production, shade tolerant, and multi-growing season species. Control livestock grazing through management and/or fencing to allow for adequate revegetation.

History of Human Use

The following briefly summarizes the known information on prehistoric and somehistoric human use of the area and is an overview of human occupation.

Paleo-Indian Period

Little archaeological evidence of Paleo-Indian (12,000-8,000 B.C.) use of the Verde Valley has been recorded; however, Pleistocene megafauna, including horse, mastodon, and mammoth, have been found along the Verde (Tagg 1986). Given the recent alluvial deposition in the valley, evidence of Paleo-Indian use of the area is most likely deeply buried.

Archaic-Dry Creek Phase

Evidence of Archaic Period (8,000 B.C. – A.D. 1) occupation of the Verde Valley is more abundant. The Dry Creek Site, believed to date to the late Archaic, is located just west of Sedona (Pilles and Stein 1981:608; Shutler 1950). Dry Creek phase sites have been identified along Dry Creek, Spring Creek, Oak Creek, and Coffee Creek; most of them reflect hunting and plant gathering activities. Artifact assemblages include ground stone, scrapers, choppers, knives, and hammer stones. Oval one-hand manos and basin metates, as well as small less formal ground stone implements, are ubiquitous on these late Archaic sites. No Archaic-period structures have been identified.

Squaw Creek Phase

Breternitz (1960) has suggested that shallow pit houses and surface dwellings were first built in the Verde Valley during the Squaw Creek phase (A.D. 1-800). Associated material culture resembles artifacts from San Pedro Cochise and Basketmaker II sites. Ceramics, which appear for the first time in this area at the end of the Squaw Peak phase, include Snaketown and Gila Butte Red-on-buff, Lino Gray, and Lino Black –on-gray. The shift from small basin metates and one-hand manos to larger manos and trough metates near the end of the phase has been attributed to a shift to a more sedentary life style and a greater reliance on agricultural products (Pilles 1981a:8).

Immigration into the region by Hohokam people, may have contributed to dramatic cultural changes that occurred in the Verde Valley around A.D. 700 (Pilles and Stein 1981:8-12). Hohokam Buff Ware and Pimeria Brown Ware ceramics, shell bracelets, clay figurines, and stone palettes, as well as Hohokam-style ballcourts, houses, cremation burials, and irrigation technology have been identified. Other studies suggest that the presence of Hohokam material culture should be attributed to intensive trade rather than immigration (Fish and others 1980).

Camp Verde Phase

Many sites dating to the Camp Verde phase (A.D. 800-1125) have been located in the Upper and Middle Verde Valley. These sites are generally thought to have been occupied by the Southern Sinagua, and extension of the Sinagua cultural tradition identified in the area around Flagstaff. The Southern Sinagua were sedentary farmers of corn, beans, squash, and cotton. Pottery manufactured by the Southern Sinagua was

primarily undecorated Alameda Brown Ware, constructed with a paddle and anvil technique.

Two site types have been identified for this period: 1) small sites at elevations between 4,500 -5,000 ft. and 2) larger sites on the floodplain (Macnider and others 1991:5). The floodplain sites are often very large and include ballcourts, mounds, and other public architecture. The early Camp Verde phase is characterized by Kana'a Black-on-white, Santa Cruz Red-on-buff, and Deadmans Black-on-red ceramics.

The late Camp Verde phase (A.D. 1000-1125) is marked by continued Hohokam influence in the Middle Verde Valley including red-on-buff ceramics, shell and stone ornaments, and clay figurines. Larger sites also often include Hohokam style houses, ballcourts, cremation burials, and adobe-capped mounds (Fish and Fish 1977; Pilles 1976). In the Upper Verde Valley, Hohokam influence seems to have ended by this period. Imported ceramics include mainly Winslow and Kayenta types, while plain wares are almost entirely Alameda Brown Ware (Fish and Fish 1977).

Honanki Phase

The Honanki phase (A.D. 1125-1300) is marked by changes in settlement patterns, architecture, and material culture. Sites dating to the Honanki phase tend to be located at higher elevations than sites from earlier phases and consist of small pueblos and cliff dwellings, pit houses, and contiguous masonry rooms. Hilltop sites, often with thick outer walls, also occur during the Honanki Phase, and some researchers believe them to be defensive sites or forts (Fish and Fish 1977; Wilcox and others 2001). Hohokam ceramics do not appear in assemblages from Honanki-phase sites.

Tuzigoot Phase

During the Tuzigoot phase (A.D. 1300-1425) the previously dispersed population aggregated; as may as 40 pueblos with at least 35 rooms each have been recorded. Tuzigoot, Montezuma Castle, and Hatalacva are the three largest sites attributed to this phase (Jackson and Van Valkenburgh 1954; Spicer and Caywood 1934). Trade and influence in the Verde Valley seems to be mainly from the Flagstaff, Kayenta, and Winslow areas. Trade wares include Tusayan Black-on-white, Jeddito Black-on-yellow, and later proto-Hopi and Hopi wares. Wilcox (2001:158) has posited a Verde Confederacy, an alliance of large sites that stretched from Perkinsville to Davenport Wash along the Verde River, which was formed to protect the region against potential aggression by inhabitants of Perry Mesa. Wilcox (2001) also includes three pueblo sites located along Fossil Creek in the Verde Confederacy.

Protohistoric Yavapai

Until recently, the Verde Valley was thought to have been abandoned about A.D. 1425, but the Yavapai had obviously entered the Verde Valley prior to A.D. 1540 and perhaps as early as 1300 or before. Five protohistoric Yavapai sites have been reported from the Jacks Canyon area near the Village of Oak Creek (Logan and others 1996:1108-1109). Yavapai sites are likely underrepresented in archaeological site inventories, as they are difficult to identify. Yavapai material culture was easily transported and mostly

perishable. Structures consisted of brush wickiups with rock placed outside the circle of brush; once the superstructure has disintegrated little would remain other than a small cleared area and possibly an arc or circle of rocks. A single course of rock is easily disguised by erosion, alleviation, or trampling by grazing herbivores. Don Keller and Pat Stein (1995) documented a twentieth-century Yavapai wickiup site near Prescott, Arizona. Even with archival data, historic photographs, and informant consultations, Keller and Stein (1995:4) had trouble distinguishing the structures.

Agave was a Yavapai staple, and roasting pits were constructed to cook it. Agave was also a staple of the Southern Sinagua, and roasting pits not directly associated with diagnostic artifacts have seldom been the subject of detailed studies that might determine cultural association.

Historic Yavapai and Apache

Historic use of the Middle Verde and Fossil Creek drainages included both Yavapai and Apache groups. Fur trappers observed the Southeastern (Kewevkapaya) and Northeastern (Wipukpaya) Yavapai and Northern Tonto Apache in the Verde Valley (Basso 1983; Khera and Marella 1983). Both Yavapai and Apache followed a pattern of seasonal encampments located near ripening plant foods, and both groups supplemented their diets with agricultural crops. Ceramics from this period consist of Tizon Brown Ware, and projectile points are small triangular points referenced as Desert Side-notched (Fish and Fish 1977; Pilles 1981A: 168-170).

In 1871, the Camp Verde Indian Reserve was established along the Verde River near present day Camp Verde; in 1875, the Federal government forcefully moved the Yavapai and Apache people then living in the Verde Valley to San Carlos (Stein 1981:23). The original Camp Verde Indian Reserve was simply eliminated, and Anglo settlers and miners laid claim to the lands. In the early 1900s, the Yavapai and Apache were allowed to return to the Verde Valley and in 1910, the Camp Verde Reservation was established (Munson 1981).

Euro-Americans

The first incursion into the Verde Valley by Europeans was Espejo in 1583. The Espejo Expedition traversed the Middle Verde River and portions of central Arizona in search of minerals (Whittlesey et al. 1997:283). Limited, brief forays up the Verde River were made by explorers and fur trappers in the 1820's (Schroeder 1974:106), but it wasn't until the 1860's that the mining boom and the passage of the 1862 Homestead Act resulted in significant Euro-American occupation of the Valley (Macnider et. al 1989:35). Mining, ranching, and farming were the primary activities of the early settlers and communities were established at Camp Verde in 1865, Sedona in 1876, Jerome in 1876, Cottonwood in 1887, and Clarkdale in 1912.

Historical Land Use and Effects

A discussion of land use and the occurrence of flooding and erosion events in the Verde Valley in the late 1800's and early 1900's is included in Barnett and Hawkins (2002). European settlement of the Verde Valley began in the 1860's and by the mid 1870's

settlers had begun to import large numbers of domestic livestock. Numbers generally increased through the 1880's with the majority of land used for grazing being public domain (federal) as well as checkerboard railroad grant sections. Some estimate the number of cattle in the Verde Valley and associated side drainages as high as 40 thousand by about 1890 (Munson, 2000). By 1888 the Prescott livestock newspaper *Hoof & Horn* warned:

“Many portions of the Territory are now overstocked to an alarming extent, and the continual driving of stock here places the future pasturage for stock in a very important condition. All available ranges where a natural supply of water can be had are now located and settled upon, and those seeking ranges are compelled to either buy or intrude on other parties' property” (Cline, 1976).

The natural cycles of drought and floods in the late 1800's had superimposed upon them the most widespread human impacts in recent history with livestock using and overusing virtually all of the available rangeland. Settlers who had moved to the Southwest from more humid environments were generally not prepared for the intensity of the “boom and bust” cycles of precipitation and plant growth. Although large floods were documented in the 1860's and 1870's prior to large numbers of livestock, the impacts of grazing combined with drought were cited as the reason for flooding and channel cutting in the 1890's by many early settlers, e.g., Willard (1975). Arroyo cutting in ephemeral drainages such as Wickiup Draw probably began during the period of 1880 to 1910 which included both very severe droughts and the largest measured flood (1891) in more than 100 years of record on the Verde River.

At about the turn of the 20th century much of the public domain land was withdrawn as Forest Reserves. The Black Mesa Forest Reserve, withdrawn in 1898, included the area currently in the Buckhorn grazing allotment. In 1905 the area became National Forest. One of the early tasks of Forest Service Rangers was to issue grazing permits, generally based on historic and existing area use. Groups of livestock owners grazing a general area in common continued until the early 1920's when assignment of allotments to individual ranches, and development of fences to separate allotments began. The open-range situation was gradually eliminated. The 50 year permittee on the Buckhorn Allotment, Irvin Walker, began livestock operations on the Coconino National Forest in 1905 dealing with wild horses, continuing until 1915 when he was issued a grazing permit for cattle.

At the time the National Forests were established it was recognized that the ranges had been greatly overstocked in the 1880's and 1890's resulting in damage to both the vegetation and soil. As a result there was an emphasis on reducing numbers of livestock permitted in order to achieve vegetation and soil recovery. However during World War I, and again in World War II, there was a national directive to increase production of food and fiber from public lands and many previous reductions were reversed.

Fires which had occurred both naturally from lightning and, to some degree, from Native American ignitions, virtually ceased in the late 1800's. Heavy livestock grazing removed the herbaceous fuels that had carried fires. Subsequently, the emphasis on fire suppression by the Forest Service and settlers allowed more tree seedlings and saplings to

become established and eventually grow into denser overstory stands where this had not been the case at the time of European settlement. As the canopy cover increased, many trees and shrubs outcompeted the native grasses and forage production decreased. Once established with their deeper root systems the trees and shrubs continued to outcompete native grasses.

Following World War II, as a part of the post-war boom (1950's to 1960's), rangelands throughout the West were mechanically treated to reduce the pinyon-juniper woodland overstory and to restore areas which had once been grasslands or grassland savannahs. These efforts to restore and maintain these vegetative communities in a mid-seral condition improved forage conditions dramatically. This, coupled with implementation of rest rotation grazing systems and construction of more stock waters, allowed the Forest Service to grant small increases in livestock numbers on many allotments. Many thousands of acres were treated on the allotments to the north and south of the Buckhorn Allotment. On the Buckhorn Allotment about 300 acres were treated in the same manner as areas on the adjacent allotments. Subsequent treatments through fuelwood harvest were done on another approximately 600 acres; however, the degree of treatment toward mid-seral stage was substantially less.

Soils

Soil characteristics and conditions are discussed in detail in the Project Assessment of watershed conditions. Soil and watershed condition was refined from that displayed in the Coconino National Forest TES report by expanding to include three components – hydrologic function, stability, and nutrient cycling. Stability was expanded to include on-site visually identifiable indicators of water erosion, in addition to the modeled existing and tolerable rate of erosion. The categories of condition are:

Satisfactory - Indicators signify that soil function is being sustained and the soil is functioning properly and normally. The ability of the soil to maintain resource values and sustain outputs is high.

Impaired - Indicators signify a reduction of soil function. The ability of the soil to function properly and normally has been reduced and/or there exists an increased vulnerability to degradation. An impaired category should indicate to land managers that there is a need to further investigate the ecosystem to determine the cause and degree of decline in soil functions. Changes in land management practices or other preventative actions may be appropriate.

Unsatisfactory - Indicators signify that loss of soil function has occurred. Degradation of vital soil functions result in the inability of the soil to maintain resource values, sustain outputs or recover from impacts. Soils rated in the unsatisfactory category are candidates for improved management practices or restoration designed to recover soil functions.”

Satisfactory – Inherently Unstable - These soils have calculated natural erosion exceeding tolerable limits. Based on the Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) these soils are eroding faster than they are renewing themselves but are functioning properly and normally. Almost all acreage in this class occurs on slopes greater than 40 percent

Because field review found a high percentage of the analyzed area rated as impaired, a modifier of plus and minus was used where conditions were borderline between categories.

Because of their significantly different characteristics the soils are discussed separately for the treatment areas below the Mogollon Rim (areas 1-4) and those above the Rim (areas 5-22).

Below Rim

Affected Environment

In the Wickiup and Winter Pastures there are approximately 1400 acres in TES units of less than 15 percent slope, or that which is generally considered suitable for treatment. The majority are derived from the Verde Formation of Tertiary age. Most are highly calcareous lake bed deposits interbedded with some volcanic deposits such as ash, tuff, etc. Calcic and Calciorthidic Ustochrepts make up the majority of the acreage proposed for treatment and surface soil textures are generally loams and sandy loams. Watershed condition is generally impaired, with some inclusions of unsatisfactory along channels where active gully erosion is occurring. Acreages of conditions include:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>TES Units</u>
Impaired -	510	385, 402, 403
Impaired	468	381, 383, 417
Impaired +	420	447, 462

Current vegetative ground cover is significantly less than the soils are capable of producing and maintaining. Following a wet winter and/or spring season annuals such as filaree and red brome may appear to be abundant; however, they dry, wither and provide little effective cover by the time the summer monsoon season occurs. Litter is present under portions of the canopy cover of individual juniper or pinyon trees. However, the interspaces, which make up the majority of the soil surface, have very limited herbaceous growth or litter. For example TES Unit 381 can naturally support 30-35 percent ground cover; however field measurements in treatment Area 2 found only 10-15 percent. As a result there is evidence of increased surface runoff, sheet erosion and channel headcutting from high intensity storms.

In limited areas there has been some personal use woodcutting with direction to lop and scatter slash. Where the slash has been lopped and scattered evenly, rather than simply thrown out of the way, there has been a response with new herbaceous growth under the slash. Both annuals and perennials – where natural seed is still present and viable – are present.

Erosion is currently active in a number of the channels. Within the Wickiup Pasture Wickiup Draw is incised below the level of adjacent terraces. Some sections of the channel banks are actively eroding on the outside of meanders with alternate block slumping and removal of the material by subsequent storm flows. Other portions appear to be healing with lower side slopes approaching the angle of repose and vegetation

partially stabilizing the slope. Many tributary and smaller drainages have active headcuts, varying from 1-2 feet deep and wide to as much as 8 feet deep and 50 feet across. Downstream from the project area on the adjoining Walker Basin Allotment Wickiup Draw has some very large headcuts in a discontinuous gully system.

Environmental Effects

The following table compares the predicted effects of the three alternatives on soil and watershed condition over a ten year period.

Acreege by Condition Class of Treated Portions of Areas 1-4

Condition Class	Current Condition	Condition after 10 Years		
		No Action	Alt. B	Alt C
Unsatisfactory	0	295	0	0
Impaired -	270	90	0	0
Impaired	115	0	0	0
Impaired +	120	120	0	80
Satisfactory	0	0	505	425
Total Acres	505	505	505	505

Opportunities for improvement of soil condition are not equal for all TES units. Soil characteristics of depth, texture, structure, profile development, organic matter, fertility, alkalinity, etc. affect the soil’s basic potential. When combined with existing conditions the opportunity for improvement is determined. Proposed treatments have been selected based on physical/biological opportunity for improvement combined with management feasibility.

No Action – The no action alternative will have no immediate effect. Over time the existing situation will continue with accelerated soil erosion and increased surface runoff from intense rainfall events, primarily summer thunderstorms. With the advantage of the woody vegetation – juniper, pinyon, and mesquite – in outcompeting herbaceous vegetation for soil moisture and nutrients, this will continue and slowly increase in effect. Long-term soil and vegetative productivity, composition and diversity will remain static or decline in both the short and long-term. The channel headcuts will continue to advance episodically with sediment transported through channels, eventually to the Verde River. Some portions of Treatment Areas 1 and 4 are expected to move from current Impaired Minus to Unsatisfactory due to continued headcut advancement and lateral expansion to additional first order channels. Area 2 would move from Impaired to Impaired Minus. In considering cumulative effects, the impacts of increasing off road motorized use, already causing an effect, would be expected to contribute to moving Area 3 from Impaired and Impaired Minus to Unsatisfactory. Although the multi-Forest off road vehicle management plan may eventually preclude this the easy access and established use will make protection difficult.

Alternative B – The soil scarification for seeding will break up the existing surface crust and will make soil particles vulnerable to displacement by raindrop impact for a brief period of time. However the increased surface roughness and irregularity

caused by the scarification should compensate for this by reducing the slope length for surface runoff to a very short distance. Placement of lopped and scattered juniper and pinyon branches (and mesquite branches in Area 2) will intercept some of the raindrop impact and will provide shade and wind reduction at the soil surface, aiding seedling establishment. Germination and growth of herbaceous vegetation will begin to provide some soil protective cover by the following season. The lopped and scattered slash will be visible for several years and will break down and organify into the soil over time. The proposed action will result in reduced competition for soil moisture and increased herbaceous plant growth and litter production. Growth of native perennial grasses & forbs will result in improved soil and watershed condition. Headcut treatment should stabilize the channels treated and reduce the amount of sediment available for transport downstream. Protection from off road motorized vehicle use, especially in Areas 2 and 3 will aid in achieving increased ground cover. The area directly treated should reach satisfactory condition. There should be some indirect effects on adjacent areas. For example in Treatment Area 1 the gentler slope ridgetops of TES Unit 447 will be treated but the adjacent side slopes will not. Reduced surface runoff from monsoon storms will reduce overland flow and sheet erosion on these adjacent untreated areas which make up about an equal area with that treated. Approximately 3.8 miles of channels will be stabilized and/or maintained through maintenance of old structures and construction of new check dams & headcut armoring. Other factors outside the scope of this project which could affect soil function and condition include dispersed recreation use, e.g., horseback riding and hunting, plus grazing/browsing use by wildlife, e.g., elk. Monitoring will be needed to ensure that they do not reduce the project recovery. The magnitude of the current and expected effects of these uses on vegetative plant cover and soil condition is much less than the expected improved conditions from the treatments so that it will not contribute to a significant cumulative effect.

Application of the herbicide triclopyr is planned for the 80 acres in Treatment Area 2 at a rate of 0.033 to 0.23 pounds per acre acid equivalent, and a mean of 0.11 pounds/acre, based on varying densities of mesquite. Triclopyr is absorbed through the cambium layer of the cut stems and translocated to the root system within the soil. It is hydrolyzed to triclopyr acid after entering plant tissue. Any which reaches the soil is also degraded to triclopyr acid which is reported to have an average half life within soil of 30 days (Tu 2001). Higher temperatures increase the rate of decomposition and reduce the residence time. Risk assessment models, based on application via spraying, calculated that 1 pound per acre application with 15 inches annual rainfall would produce an amount in the soil two to three orders of magnitude lower than that which had been found to affect soil fungi (USDA 2003). Consequently, no effect on soil function is expected and it would not contribute to cumulative effects.

Alternative C – The effects are the same as for Alternative B, with the exception of not scarifying and seeding areas with the more dense stands of mesquite shrubs and not lopping and scattering the mesquite branches and treating cut stumps with herbicide. The expected benefits in Treatment Area 2 will be reduced due to less herbaceous ground cover. Headcut treatment will enable Area 2 to improve from Impaired to Impaired Plus.

Above Rim

Affected Environment

The five pastures above the rim comprise about 7200 acres, of which about 4700 are in TES units of less than 15 percent slope. They are derived primarily from basalt flows. Typic Haplustalfs and Argiustolls are the most common, with clay loam and clay textures. The Argiustolls are higher in organic matter in the soil profile, indicating that they developed in conjunction with grassland and/or grassland savannah vegetative condition. Current conditions vary from Impaired Plus to Satisfactory. TES unit 462, the most common, is classified as Impaired, Impaired Minus, and Impaired Plus, varying with mapping unit component and location, as well as past treatment and management. The primary impairment is due to reduced hydrologic function of infiltration and permeability. It has a vegetative cover of juniper, with some pinyon – though much of the pinyon has been killed by drought and bark beetles in the last few years, and has limited herbaceous ground cover. By contrast, TES unit 466, which was treated to create a seral grassland, is in satisfactory condition. Increased ground cover provides more soil surface protection and greater organic matter in the surface soil results in more soil pores and improved infiltration and permeability. TES unit 492, in Treatment Areas 18-22, is the highest elevation and most productive. It is currently partly in Satisfactory condition and partly in Impaired Plus, again due to hydrologic function rather than stability.

Environmental Effects

The following table compares the predicted effects of the alternatives on soil and watershed condition over a ten year period.

Acreage by Condition Class of Treated Portions of Areas 5-22

Condition Class	Current Condition	Condition after 10 Years	
		No Action	Alt. B & C
Unsatisfactory	0	0	0
Impaired -	125	125	0
Impaired	70	150	0
Impaired +	405	325	170
Satisfactory	440	440	870
Total Acres	1040	1040	1040

No Action – There will be no immediate effect. However, over time Area 9 will shift from Impaired Plus to Impaired as canopy cover of junipers continues to expand at the expense of herbaceous vegetation. Areas 7 and 8 are also currently in Impaired Plus; however, they are located on rockier soils and the surface rock fragments will continue to provide enough soil protection so that the threshold of condition class will not be crossed. Areas 13-15 will continue as Impaired Minus. The existing tree canopy in the other areas is not currently at the stage where expansion in the next 10 years is expected to increase enough to cause the areas to cross a threshold of condition class. Other factors which may contribute to a cumulative effect include use by grazing ungulates, both permitted livestock and elk, plus increased off road vehicle recreation use (until such time as a multi-Forest management plan is completed and implemented)..

Alternatives B and C – These two alternatives would be the same for the above the Rim treatment areas. Scarification for seeding would be done in Treatment Areas 15, 21, 22 and a few acres in Area 9. Equipment movement and distribution of slash would provide some short-term surface soil disturbance in Areas 7-9, 13, 14, and 18. However, the amount of surface rock in these soils, the surface roughness, and the cohesiveness of the clay loam will limit the displacement of soil particles.

In the long-term treated areas currently in Impaired and Impaired Plus condition are generally expected to reach satisfactory condition due to improved soil hydrologic function and more herbaceous and litter ground cover. Treatment areas 13, 14, and 15 are currently in Impaired Minus condition. Area 15 would be improved to Satisfactory as treatment is to move it to a seral grassland comparable to the adjacent area. Areas 13 and 14 will have a treatment emphasizing browse and forbs in a savannah. Improvement to Impaired Plus in these two areas is expected within ten years.

As in the No Action alternative, other factors affecting soil function and condition include the grazing of ungulates and recreational off road vehicle travel which could potentially operate in the opposite direction of the treatments. The magnitude of the current and expected effects of these uses on vegetative plant cover and soil condition is much less than the expected improved conditions from the treatments so that it will not contribute to a significant cumulative effect.

Water

Affected Environment

The project area is within the Verde watershed, with all but one treatment area being totally within the West Clear Creek 5th code watershed. The northern portion of area 1 drains to Wet Beaver Creek via Russell Wash; however, it is managed within the same pasture as Area 2 and is separated by only a very flat drainage divide. Treatment Areas 2, 4, and the southern part of 1 drain to Wickiup Draw, an ephemeral tributary of West Clear Creek which enters within the eastern portion of Camp Verde. Area 3 and Areas 5-8 drain to Hance Spring Draw which enters West Clear Creek just upstream from the West Clear Creek Campground. Areas 9-22 drain to West Clear Creek via a number of ephemeral tributaries which drop into West Clear Creek above Bull Pen and the USGS stream gage.

Water yield from portions below the Mogollon Rim is predominantly a result of storm runoff, both summer monsoon storms and winter frontal storms which are less intense but much longer in duration and greater in areal extent. Above the Rim, precipitation increases with increasing elevation to the east and water yield increases as well. In addition to surface runoff from rainfall events, some groundwater recharge occurs through fractures in the underlying volcanic strata. The low density of drainage common to the basalt flows suggests that snow melt and low intensity rainfall events make some contribution to eventual ground water in the portion above the Rim.

West Clear Creek is a perennial stream above irrigation diversions within the Camp Verde Town limits. West Clear Creek has water quality standards for the designated uses of Aquatic & Wildlife – warmwater fishery, Fish Consumption, Full Body Contact, Agricultural Irrigation, and Agricultural Livestock Watering. The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality 2004 Assessment of Water Quality classified it as “inconclusive” meaning that information is insufficient to assess it as “attaining”, “threatened”, “impaired”, or “not attaining”. The monitoring locations specified are upstream from the confluence with Wickiup Draw. The Verde River downstream from West Clear Creek was previously identified as having exceedances of turbidity (ADEQ 2002). The standard for turbidity has been replaced by suspended sediment and not enough data has been collected to determine compliance. The portion of Beaver Creek downstream from the point at which Russell Wash enters was also previously identified with turbidity exceedances and is currently listed as “inconclusive”.

The project watershed assessment documented the fact that current conditions result in more frequent peak flows of the same magnitude than would occur under the conditions of vegetative ground cover which the sites can support. For example a small watershed in treatment area 2 is currently producing specific size peak flows about three times as frequently as would occur under “natural”, rather than degraded, conditions. The effect of the more frequent storm flows is reflected in accelerated channel erosion with accompanying sediment transport to West Clear Creek and the Verde River.

Environmental Effects

No Action Alternative – Under this alternative existing contributions to suspended sediment will continue in the lower portion of West Clear Creek, Beaver Creek downstream from Russell Wash, and downstream reaches of the Verde River.

Alternative B - Improvement of water quality through reduction of nonpoint source pollution is the primary objective of treatments in areas 1-4 and, to a lesser degree, is expected to be a secondary benefit from treatments in areas 5, 6, 13, 14, 15, 18, 21, 22, and a portion of 9. Sheet erosion will be reduced in all of these treatment areas, with the most reductions in areas 1-4. Channel erosion, primarily from advancing headcuts and lateral bank cutting, will be reduced in areas 1-4. There will be some indirect effects in the portion of Wickiup Draw downstream from the project area due to reduced peak flows from summer thunderstorms and lessened energy of storm flows for headcutting.

Herbicide treatment in Area 2 is not expected to affect water quality. Methods of reaching water would be primarily by surface runoff from thunderstorms shortly after application. This would require the washing off of triclopyr from mesquite stumps before it could be absorbed into the wood and before dissipation by photodegradation, volatilization or other mechanisms. With no shading photodegradation would maximize. Under midsummer sun photolysis has been found to reduce the half-life of triclopyr acid to two hours. Leaching of triclopyr through the soil to ground water is not expected. The depth to ground water in the treatment area is predicted to be approximately 60-100 feet based on the nearest wells. Because of the low precipitation ground water recharge is not

expected in the area where mesquite stumps will be treated. Therefore no direct or cumulative effect to water quality is expected from this application.

No significant change in water quantity is expected. Research from the nearby Beaver Creek Watershed found no significant increases in water yield by mechanical removal of pinyon and juniper trees (Clary, et al 1974). Removal of the mesquite shrubs in Treatment Area 2 is not expected to increase water yield as they are not in a riparian position such as mesquites in mesquite bosques which often have their roots reaching the water table.

Alternative C – Effects will be slightly less than Alternative B as the reduction of sheet erosion in Treatment Area 2 will be less. However, the reduction due to channel headcut treatment will be present.

There are many factors affecting turbidity and suspended sediment in the Verde River and in the lower reaches of West Clear Creek and Beaver Creek. The Verde River watershed upstream from the USGS stream gage located below the confluence of West Clear Creek is more than 4,600 square miles in area. The West Clear Creek watershed above the USGS stream gage is 240 square miles. All of the land uses contributing sediment to the creeks and river upstream aggregate to the sediment load and the amounts which are transported and/or deposited. The treatment effects from this project are expected to reduce suspended sediment reaching these streams during periods of storm flow; however because of their relative magnitude compared to the watershed totals and because they are reducing adverse effects they are not expected to contribute to a significant cumulative effect.

Air Quality

Affected Environment

The Yavapai-Apache Reservation is a Class 1 Airshed under the Clean Air Act and is protected from significant deterioration in visibility. It is located approximately 7 miles to the west. The West Clear Creek Wilderness is a Class 2 area by its designation as wilderness. The prevailing winds across the project area are from the southwest, away from populated areas. However, winter nighttime inversions can move from the project area to the lower elevations of the Verde Valley and to the Town of Camp Verde. The primary effect on air quality from the project area is the periodic addition of particulate matter from dust and pollen, especially juniper pollen, to which many individuals are allergic. However, the amount added is insignificant in relation to that in the airshed.

Environmental Effects

No significant effects on air quality are expected from any of the alternatives. A limited amount of dust and vehicular emissions will occur during project implementation but it is not expected to extend beyond the project area. However, this is not expected to be at times when temperature inversions would cause it to add to pollutants in the lower Verde Valley. A small area of jackpot burning may be done in Areas 7, 8 and 9. Best Management Practices and permitting requirements from the Arizona Department of

Environmental Quality should minimize smoke effects. There will be slight reductions in juniper pollen from the action alternatives but it will be insignificant in comparison to the overall amount available in the airshed.

Although there are many sources of particulate matter in the airshed in the Verde Valley, the distance of the project from the sensitive areas, the very limited amount of particulate matter produced and the general prevailing winds away from sensitive areas lead to the conclusion that it will not contribute to significant effects on the air resource. The airshed in this area is not close to the threshold for impairment. Thus it will not contribute to significant cumulative effects.

Vegetation and Invasive Species

Affected Environment

Vegetation within the project ranges from semi-desert shrub and grassland on the western end of the project area to alligator juniper on the eastern, higher elevation side.

Treatment Areas 1-4 are the lower elevation with Utah juniper, some pinyon pine, and velvet mesquite as the most common tree species. However, most of the mesquite is in locations where it does not reach the normal tree size of mesquite due to not being in riparian locations. Common shrubs and cacti include fourwing saltbush, catclaw, barberry (algerita), turbinella oak, skunkbush, desert ceanothus, mountain mahogany, cliffrose, crucifixion thorn, prickly pear, and banana and soap tree yuccas. Perennial herbaceous species are quite limited due to competition with the woody plants. Where present they include black grama, sideoats grama, tobosa, sand dropseed, three awn, needlegrass and snakeweed. The introduced annual species of red brome and filaree (aka stork's bill) are often the most obvious herbaceous plants in the spring.

In the treatment areas above the Mogollon Rim (5-22) the dominant trees vary from Utah juniper and pinyon pine on the western, lower elevation side to alligator juniper in the eastern edge of the Buckhorn Pasture. Turbinella oak is the most common shrub throughout these treatment areas. Skunkbush is also found throughout the areas. Silktassel is common in areas 5-9. Mountain mahogany is found in limited settings, usually on rocky sites, and cliffrose even more limited. All three of these latter species are heavily browsed and often decadent where present. The recent drought has affected woody species with mortality to a high percent of pinyon pines and some observed topkill of turbinella oak in drier exposures. Banana yucca is common and agave is present, particularly in dry, rocky sites. Past pinyon-juniper treatment via fuelwood sales and pushing, followed sometimes by burning, has created several areas of seral grassland and greatly reduced tree density in others. In the majority of the seral grassland area western wheatgrass, a cool season species (winter and spring grower), is dominant. In other portions blue grama, sideoats grama, and snakeweed are the most common herbaceous plants, along with some squirreltail, junegrass, and shrubby buckwheat. However, as the pinyon-juniper canopy increases, the herbaceous plant component is reduced until there is very little remaining. Red brome (aka foxtail) is common in disturbed areas with pinyon-juniper canopy where there is not an understory of native perennial grasses. However, it was not commonly observed in the seral grassland dominated by western wheatgrass. In Treatment Area 2 it was observed to be very common under clumps of mesquite shrubs.

A survey for invasive weed species was conducted and the report is included in the project record. Several non-native species were identified. Red brome (*bromus rubens*) is the only one included on the Coconino National Forest invasive weeds list. It is considered to be similar to cheatgrass (*bromus tectorum*), another introduced annual which is on the three forest list of weeds of concern, ranked 22nd in priority among 29 species (USDA 2005). The Coconino National Forest management objective is to contain, i.e., to contain spread to present population size or decrease population. Red brome is very widely distributed throughout the region, both on public and private land, as well as throughout much of the western United States. It is an opportunist, becoming established following fire and other disturbances. The increase in wet winters since 1976 has been reported to have contributed substantially to its spread (Betancourt 1996). Weakening of herbaceous plant communities through prolonged drought, followed by wet fall and winter seasons provides opportunity for its expansion.

Environmental Consequences

Alternative A, No Action – In treatment Areas 1-4 the existing herbaceous plant community will continue to be very sparse and slowly decline with the slow increase in canopy cover of pinyon-juniper (and mesquite in Area 2). The amount and condition of desirable browse plants in treatment areas above the Mogollon Rim are expected to continue at their current levels and possibly slowly decline under continued ungulate browsing.

With no action the existing populations of the invasive plant red brome will continue and possibly expand on an opportunistic basis if stressing dry periods alternate with wet winters.

Alternative B – In Treatment Areas 1-4 reduced competition from pinyon-juniper (and mesquite in Area 2), along with site preparation, seeding, and partial shading with slash will increase perennial herbaceous plant cover. Establishment of a mix of warm and cool species perennial herbaceous plants will reduce the available area for expansion of red brome and other non-native species such as filaree. Favorable establishment may reduce opportunities for these annuals to continue to reseed each year in some areas. Application of the BMP's for weed management will minimize the likelihood of introducing other species of weeds into the project area.

In the area above the Mogollon Rim browse plants should be increased in number and many of the existing mature and overmature plants stimulated to produce new growth, especially in Treatment Areas 5-9.

Use of the herbicide triclopyr in Area 2 will prevent sprouting of the cut mesquite shrubs and allow establishment of the seeded herbaceous species. This herbicide has little effect on grasses. Because of the cut stump method of application the four-wing saltbush plants scattered throughout this area will not be exposed to the herbicide.

Alternative C – Similar in effect to Alternative B except that the benefits in Treatment Area 2 will be greatly reduced. The current abundance of red brome under the canopy of mesquite shrubs will continue unless native perennial herbaceous species are able to outcompete it. With red brome's very early cool season growth and prolific seed production it is difficult for native species to compete.

Other methods of weed introduction include transport by vehicle from infested areas and dropping off along roadways (or off road from off road vehicles), being contained within hay accompanying recreational horses or mules, within sand, gravel or other borrow material brought into the area, etc. Activities which create bare soil areas without establishment of herbaceous vegetation provide an opportunity for existing weeds, e.g., red brome, to spread. Because the action alternatives are not expected to increase weeds they will not contribute to a cumulative impact.

Wildlife and Sensitive Species

The affected environment and environmental consequences are described in detail in the Wildlife Specialist Report for Listed, Proposed, Sensitive, and Management Indicator Species; Neotropical Migratory Birds; and General Wildlife. This includes a detailed bibliography used for the analysis.

General Wildlife Species

Affected Environment

Game species in the Buckhorn project area include elk, mule deer, white-tailed deer, bear, mountain lion, bobcat, gray fox, coyote, javelina, cottontail and jackrabbits, and squirrels. Elk are primarily found in mixed conifer and ponderosa pine woodlands during the spring, summer and fall months but move into pinyon-juniper woodlands during the winter, especially when deep snows preclude access to forage in the higher country. Deer, mountain lion, bobcat, coyote, fox, javelina, cottontails and jackrabbits occur throughout the project area.

Non-game mammal species include chipmunks, mice, woodrats, voles, skunks, porcupine, and numerous species of bats. Hooded skunks occur primarily within desertscrub and grasslands. Cliff chipmunks, white-footed mouse, and white-throated woodrat are a few small mammal species that occur within the chaparral and pinyon-juniper habitats. Rock squirrel, cliff chipmunk, western harvest mouse, and brush mouse are other small mammals that likely occur in the Buckhorn project area.

Approximately 20 species of bats may occur in the Buckhorn project area. Roosts likely occur in natural structures such as underneath loose bark on snags, in tree and snag cavities, under rocks, in the cracks and crevices of cliffs. All of the bat species occurring or potentially occurring in the area are insectivorous. Water sources such as earthen stock tanks, springs, seeps, and streams are important for bat foraging due to the abundance of insects found flying above the water.

Various species of birds occur in the Buckhorn project area. The wildlife specialist report lists a number of species likely to be found within the project area. The majority

of these birds are passerines but other groups of birds include waterfowl, fowl-like birds, raptors, and various non-passerine birds such as kingfishers, doves, hummingbirds, and woodpeckers.

Many of the birds in the Buckhorn project area (14 of the 30 species listed in the specialist report) are neotropical migrants and spend only a portion of each year (spring and summer) in this area. These birds travel each year from their wintering grounds in Mexico, Central and South America, and the Caribbean to North America to breed during the spring and summer months. Precipitous declines in neotropical migratory bird populations have occurred due mainly to habitat loss and modification in the wintering grounds, breeding grounds, and along migrational routes.

Amphibian and reptiles in the Buckhorn project area include several species of toads, frogs, lizards, and snakes. Amphibians include canyon tree frogs and red-spotted toads. Numerous species of lizards occur in the area; collared, fence, earless, side-blotched, horned, and tree. Snake species that occur in the area include: various garter snakes such as the black-necked and wandering; whip snakes; king snakes; gopher (bull) snake; and rattlesnakes such as the Mohave and Western diamondback.

Environmental Consequences

Treatments occurring within the Buckhorn project area involve the use of machinery including chainsaws, agra-axe, brush saw, ATV or tractor to pull a harrow, heavy machinery to place boulder and create barriers, and limited jackpot pile burning. These activities can directly affect wildlife species when workers, vehicles, and machinery cause aural and visual disturbance to individuals that may be present in the project area. Most bird, mammal, reptile, and aerial invertebrate species are mobile and are capable of dispersing from disturbance, however disturbance that is frequent or of long duration can result in the abandonment of the area, which is equivalent to loss of habitat. Individuals incapable of dispersal (nestling, terrestrial invertebrates, altricial young) or individuals unwilling to disperse (adults with immobile young) can experience negative affects such as: trampling and crushing; increased physiological stress; flushing of birds from incubating eggs thus increasing potential for eggs to become unviable; premature fledging of young from nests; and increased potential for predation. Proposed activities under the action alternatives can directly affect wildlife habitat through the loss, alteration, or fragmentation of vegetation. The timing of the work (August – December) will be after the primary nesting season for birds, thus reducing potential disturbance effects on reproduction.

The no action alternative will have no impact on wildlife species.

Alternative B includes treating mesquite shrubs in the 80 acre Treatment Area 2 with the herbicide triclopyr on cut stumps. Triclopyr is a moderately toxic compound. The oral LD50 levels in rats have been reported in the range of 630 to 729 mg/kg (OSU 1996). Acute toxicity LD50 values for mammals are reported to be 310 to 713 mg/kg, and ducks were reported to have an oral LD50 of 1,698 mg/kg (Infoventures, 1995). The acute dermal LD50 has been reported to be >2,000 mg/kg in rabbits. Triclopyr is considered to be a slight irritant to the skin and eye.

Studies summarized in OSU (1996), Infoventures (1995), and USDA FS (1996) indicated that triclopyr does not pose a carcinogenic, mutagenic, reproductive, developmental risk to animals or humans at doses anticipated for this project.

Human health and ecological risk assessments for the application of herbicides to control noxious weeds and other unwanted vegetation have been prepared for the Forest Service most recently during the period 1992 through 2003. These risk assessments evaluate the potential for impacts on terrestrial wildlife from exposure to herbicides. There are difficulties in assessing possible risks because toxicity testing is often performed on laboratory animals, which may not be representative of free-ranging wild animals or only a few wildlife species are tested. Also, the controlled exposures in the laboratory may not resemble the conditions under which wildlife might be exposed. Possible routes of exposure of terrestrial wildlife to herbicides include direct contact (spray), ingestion of contaminated food items and water, grooming, or indirect contact with contaminated vegetation or substrate.

Given these limitations, ecological risk assessments typically employ exposure estimates that yield conservative assessments of possible risk (i.e., overestimate the potential exposure). The available risk assessments for triclopyr generally conclude that under recommended application rates and conditions, the potential risks to individual wildlife are low.

According to a 1992 risk assessment (USDA FS 1992), estimated exposures exceed high risk only under extreme assumptions for one species, the long tail vole, during the use of 2,4-D, dicamba, and triclopyr (USDA FS 1992). The wildlife risk assessment was considered to overstate potential risks from pesticide exposure because many of the assumptions used were quite conservative. For instance, no degradation of herbicides was assumed to occur and all sprayed herbicide was assumed to be biologically available. Doses were calculated based upon multiple exposure routes including oral, dermal, and through inhalation. Typical dose estimates triclopyr and carriers/additives were below USEPA low risk criterion (less than 1/5 LD50) for all species. The risk assessment concluded that the low probability of extreme exposures and rapid degradation of the herbicides in the environment preclude the possibility of significant adverse effects on wildlife populations or communities.

Small mammals consuming vegetation contaminated with triclopyr immediately after application could suffer impaired kidney function (USDA FS 1996). These extreme-exposure cases are unlikely and there are no available data to determine their feasibility. Because the only vegetation receiving triclopyr would be the cut stumps of mesquite shrubs, with no application to the foliage or fruits, exposure would be very minimal.

Risks to birds are primarily through consumption of contaminated vegetation and contaminated insects. Since mesquite stumps are the only contaminated vegetation, this is not expected to create an effect. Contaminated insects, normally contaminated by being sprayed or coming in contact with sprayed foliage, would have to become contaminated by crawling over the cut stumps before the solution was absorbed and/or dried. The number of ants or other insects which might be contaminated would not

provide enough diet to produce either an acute or chronic exposure above the No Observed Adverse Effect Level. No effect is expected.

The honey bee is the standard test organism for assessing the potential effects of pesticides on terrestrial invertebrates. Acute contact toxicity studies on honey bees reported LD50 values of over 100 µg/bee. As a result the EPA has classified triclopyr as practically non-toxic to bees. No effect is expected.

In summary, risk assessments suggest that wildlife, including amphibians, will not be affected by the herbicide triclopyr at the expected exposure levels. Also, there will be a buffer zone around water (such as intermittent drainages that have water and stock tanks) where herbicides will not be applied. This mitigation will minimize the potential for amphibians to be exposed to herbicides, during sensitive developmental stages. Because there are no direct or indirect effects there will be no cumulative effects.

Special Status Species

Rare wildlife species that are known to occur, or have existing or potential habitat within the project area include 1 Federally listed species, 11 Forest Service sensitive species, and 3 Forest Service Management Indicator Species (MIS) (Table 2).

Table 2: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, Sensitive, and Management Indicator Species for the Buckhorn Project Area.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status
Federally Listed (End, Thr, Proposed) (1)		
Bald Eagle	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	T,WC,Sen,MIS
Sensitive Birds (1)		
American Peregrine Falcon	<i>Falco peregrinus anatum</i>	WC, Sen
Sensitive Reptiles (1)		
Arizona Night Lizard	<i>Xantusia vigilis arizonae</i>	Sen
Sensitive Invertebrates (6)		
Freeman’s Agave Borer	<i>Agathymus baueri freemani</i>	Sen
Neumogen’s Giant Skipper	<i>Agathymus neumogeni</i>	Sen
Aryxna Giant Skipper	<i>Agathymus aryxna</i>	Sen
Early Elfin	<i>Incisalia fotis</i>	Sen
Comstock’s Hairstreak	<i>Callophrys comstocki</i>	Sen
Spotted Skipperling	<i>Piruna polingii</i>	Sen
Sensitive Plants (3)		
Tonto Basin Agave	<i>Agave delamateri</i>	SC, Sen
Hualapai Milkwort	<i>Polygala rusbyi</i>	Sen
Verde Valley Sage	<i>Salvia dorrii mearnsii</i>	Sen
Management Indicator Species (3)		
Antelope	<i>Antilocapra americana</i>	MIS
Mule Deer	<i>Odocoileus hemionus</i>	MIS
Juniper Titmouse	<i>Baeolophus ridgwayi</i>	MIS

Table Legend

- E** = Federally listed as Endangered under Endangered Species Act (ESA)
- EXNE** = Federally Endangered, Experimental, Non-essential
- T** = Federally listed as Threatened under ESA
- P** = Federally Proposed for listing under the ESA
- C** = Federally designated as Candidate for listing
- WC** = Wildlife of Special Concern in Arizona (AGFD draft 3/16/96)
- Sen** = On Regional Forester’s Sensitive Species List (7/21/99)
- HP** = High Priority Species; “at high risk of imperilment” (Western Bat Species Regional Priority Matrix (1998)
- MIS** = Tonto and Coconino Management Indicator Species from the Respective Forest Plans
- SC** = Federal Species of Concern (former C2 species).

Bald Eagle (T, WC, Sen, MIS)

Affected Environment

Nesting bald eagles do not occur within the project area. The nearest nesting bald eagles occur along the Verde River over seven miles away. Although nesting bald eagles could forage this distance from their breeding area, nesting bald eagles are likely to remain closer to the Verde corridor while foraging.

Wintering bald eagle populations tend to be scattered and highly mobile, usually foraging and roosting in small groups. Wintering eagles tend to concentrate in areas of plentiful food resources, usually near water, although individual or small groups of eagles occur in terrestrial habitats not associated with water, especially when lakes freeze over.

Mid-winter surveys were conducted on the Coconino National Forest in 1979-1985 and 1992- present. The Beaver Creek route occurs along Wet Beaver Creek from the gauging station down to the confluence with the Verde. Survey results for the Beaver Creek route show that an average of one bald eagle is sighted along the route each year. Wintering bald eagles are found in more abundance on Cedar Flat, particularly during the hunting seasons. Multiple bald and golden eagles, along with numerous ravens, have been seen foraging on elk carcasses and gut piles.

There are no ponderosa pine or mixed conifer stands within the project area that may support bald eagle roosts. However, due to the density of wintering bald eagles on Cedar Flat, it is likely they use pinyon and juniper trees to roost overnight. These trees would not likely support communal roosts, but may be used by single birds for night roosts.

Environmental Consequences

The no action alternative will not affect the bald eagle. Since there are no nesting bald eagles within seven miles of the project area, neither alternative B nor C will affect nesting bald eagles. Wintering bald eagles may occur throughout the project area while foraging, but foraging conditions are most suitable on Cedar Flat when hunters leave behind animal carcasses and gut piles. Vegetative treatment activities proposed under alternatives B and C may result in aural and visual disturbance to wintering bald eagles. Treatments are scheduled to occur before wintering bald eagles arrive in mid-October. However, should treatment activities occur between October 15 and April 15, when wintering bald eagles are present, there could be short-term disturbance to wintering bald eagles resulting in temporary displacement from individual gut piles of harvested elk or deer. The herbicide application, called for under alternative C, will occur on mesquite below the rim in the Wickiup area. Since the concentration of foraging bald eagles occur on Cedar Flat, herbicide application on mesquite will not affect the bald eagle.

American Peregrine Falcon (WC, Sen)

Affected Environment

The essential habitat for peregrine falcon includes rock cliffs for nesting and a large foraging area. Suitable nesting sites on rock cliffs have a mean height of 200 to 300 feet.

Peregrines prey mainly on birds found in wetlands and riparian areas within a 10 to 20 mile radius from the nest site. Prey items include mainly birds, especially passerines, doves, and small raptor, as well as bats, and other mammals. Although there are no known nesting peregrine falcons and suitable cliffs for nesting are not within the project area, foraging peregrine falcons may occur within the project area.

Environmental Consequences

The no action alternative will not affect the peregrine falcon. Since there are no nesting peregrine falcons in the project area, neither alternative B nor C will affect nesting peregrines. Foraging peregrines may occur throughout the project area and vegetative treatment activities proposed under alternatives B and C may result in aural and visual disturbance to foraging peregrines. Peregrine falcons have large foraging areas and treatment activities will occur in such a small portion of a peregrine foraging range, the potential for disturbance is anticipated to be minimal, of short duration, and inconsequential. Although peregrines may forage in Wickiup draw, the herbicide application to mesquites, called for under alternative C, will not impact the peregrine.

Arizona night lizard (Sen)

Affected Environment

Habitat for this secretive lizard is arid or semiarid lands, where it lives beneath fallen branches of Joshua trees, dead clumps of various other species of *Yucca*, *Nolina*, *Agave* and cardons and is also found in rock crevices, beneath cow chips, soil-matted dead brush and other debris, and beneath logs (Stebbins 1985). Arizona night lizards are seldom found in the open away from cover (Stebbins 1985).

No surveys have been done in the project area for this species and there are no known records of its occurrence. However, it is listed as a fairly common, permanent resident of desert scrub and grasslands on the Coconino National Forest and suitable conditions for hiding cover occur within the project area.

Environmental Consequences

Project activities associated with both alternatives B and C may impact this species where present by; trampling or driving over individuals, crushing, or burning substrate underneath which these lizards hide. The herbicide treatment under Alternative C will not impact this lizard.

Special Status Invertebrates

Affected Environment

Six species of special status invertebrates may possibly be present within the project area, all within the general category of butterflies and each associated with specific vegetative species and/or communities. The Freeman's agave borer, Neumogen's giant skipper, and Aryxna giant skipper are associated with agave plants. Treatment areas on the western part of Cedar Flat, i.e., areas 5-15 have agave plants, with greater density in the westernmost areas. They are potential habitat for these three giant skippers.

The early elfin (aka desert elfin) is found with the host plant, cliffrose, and its projected range in Arizona may be restricted to the northern portions of Coconino County (Wallasz 1999), making its presence in the project area unlikely, however, no surveys have been conducted for this species.

The Comstock's hairstreak has been confirmed from Navajo and Mojave Counties in Arizona. No surveys within the project area have been done; however, the widespread presence of several species of buckwheat (*Eriogonum*), which is the host for larva, suggests that there could be possible habitat within the project area.

The habitat of the spotted skipperling consists of moist meadows and streamsides in low to mid elevation mountains. The species has been seen congregating on moist cliffsides. Orchard grass (*Dactylis glomerata*) is a strongly suspected food plant. There is no known orchard grass within the project area.

Environmental Consequences

Special status invertebrates such as the agave borer, elfin, hairstreak, skipperling, and two skippers can be equally affected by project activities proposed under alternatives B and C when these activities modify vegetation, especially those host plant species upon which these invertebrates are dependent. The herbicide application on mesquites in Alternative C will have no additional impacts to these species or their host plants, since best management practices will preclude the potential for drift to occur and the target plant, mesquite, is not a host plant for any of the special status invertebrate species. A mitigation measure for both of the action alternatives requires the avoidance of agave plants and will therefore minimize impacts to the agave borer and two skippers. The no action alternative will not impact any of the special status invertebrate species.

Special Status Plants

Affected Environment

There are three special status plant species which may have some potential habitat within the project area – Tonto Basin agave, Hualapai milkwort, and Verde Valley sage. The Tonto Basin agave is often found in association with archeological features. It has been primarily reported between the elevations of 2,800 and 3,400 feet. The Cedar Flat area with known agave populations is above 5,000 feet. Both the Hualapai milkwort and Verde Valley sage have been found in other parts of the Verde Valley on limestone from the Verde Formation. Areas 1-4 may contain some potential habitat for these two species.

Environmental Consequences

Terrestrial special status plants such as the Hualapai milkwort and Verde Valley sage can be affected by activities described in both action alternatives when proposed activities destroy or modify individual milkwort and sage plants, should they occur in the area. A mitigation measure for both of the action alternatives requires the avoidance of all agave plants; therefore none of the alternatives will impact Tonto Basin agave. Since the use of

herbicide, as called for in alternative C, will not be conducted under conditions that will allow for drift and mesquite is the only target plant, none of the sensitive plant species will be affected by herbicide application.

Management Indicator Species

Management Indicator Species (MIS) are defined as those plant and animal species, communities or special habitats selected for emphasis in planning and which are monitored during forest plan implementation in order to assess the effects of management activities on their populations and the population of other species with similar habitat needs that they may represent.

The Coconino National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, as amended, identifies 17 Management Indicator Species. Three of these represent habitats within the project area., mule deer, pronghorn antelope, and juniper titmouse.

Mule Deer (MIS)

Affected Environment

The mule deer was selected as an indicator species of early-seral stages of aspen and pinyon-juniper woodlands. Early-seral stages of ponderosa pine, mixed-conifer, and chaparral habitats are also important for this species. Mule deer are browsers and prefer herbaceous, green shoots and fruits of shrubs and trees, and also also feeds on forbs and grasses. Habitat for mule deer occurs though out the project area. Treatments in units 5-14 and 18-22 will specifically benefit mule deer. Of the 1434 acres in these units, up to 715 acres will be treated. Treatments are tailored to increase growth of browse and forbs.

A declining population trend has been observed on the Coconino National Forest over the period of 1985-2001. In good years, fawn production has been at levels minimal to sustaining populations, but in poor precipitation and forage years, fawn production has not kept up with mortality rates. This general trend has also been seen in game management unit (GMU) 6A, which contains the project area.

Vegetation components are analyzed in addressing habitat condition and trend. Although age class distribution has remained relatively stable in pinyon-juniper, the vigor of understory components such as grasses, forbs, and browse species continues to be affected in dense areas. Loss of an herbaceous understory and vegetative ground cover has resulted in accelerated sheet and rill erosion.

Although an indicator of early seral aspen and pinyon-juniper, mule deer also use ponderosa pine, and treatments in the ponderosa pine have favored grazers over browsers both in the scale of treatment and in the degree of openness of the treatments. Where grazing has reduced vegetative diversity, elk have been favored over deer.

Mule deer populations have not done well on the Coconino since plan implementation, possibly due to many factors, such as disease, poaching, climatic conditions, and habitat

changes. Creation of early seral aspen and pinyon-juniper has not occurred at a sufficient scale to positively influence browse production that would benefit mule deer.

Environmental Consequences

The no action alternative will result in no change to the forest wide trend for mule deer. Alternatives B and C will treat up to 715 acres of mule deer habitat to enhance forage production and will have a positive result for the species. Because of the interspersing of cover with the areas of forage enhancement, the actual acreage of habitat affected will be considerably more. Therefore alternatives B and C will contribute to the forest-wide goal of an increasing trend for mule deer on the Coconino National Forest.

Antelope (MIS)

Affected Environment

Pronghorn antelope are a management indicator species for early and late seral grassland type in the Coconino National Forest Plan. A number of factors have been identified that affect pronghorn including severe weather, amount and timing of precipitation, long-term climatic trends, habitat fragmentation, diet overlap with other grazers, reductions in fawn hiding cover, woody vegetation encroachment, fences, human disturbance and development, water availability, predators, parasites and diseases, and nutritional concerns. Antelope occur on Cedar Flats but mostly north of the project area. Antelope habitat is the emphasis in treatment areas 15-17.

On the Coconino National Forest current grassland condition trends vary greatly, with an overall trend since completion of the Forest Plan in 1987 of stable to declining. Cool season grasses and species diversity have increased. Tree encroachment, increasing canopy cover, fire suppression, long-term climatic changes, short-term drought, and ungulate grazing are mainly responsible for declining trends. These same factors are present within the project area and the adjacent antelope habitat to the north.

Although absolute population numbers of antelope are too variable and do not give a true account of population trend, the fawn-doe ratios and number of sightings of antelope in regular surveys indicate a slow decline in population throughout the majority of the Coconino National Forest suitable habitat, including GMU 6A. In particular, fawn-doe ratios below the break-even point of 20-35 fawns per 100 does is a concern because of its influence on long term productivity of a population and its ability to maintain itself.

Environmental Consequences

The no action alternative will have no impact on the forest-wide trend for antelope. Implementation of either action alternative would remove encroaching juniper trees in the grassland ecosystem, improving habitat for pronghorn. Up to 310 acres of antelope habitat will be enhanced, ultimately expanding suitable habitat further south on Cedar Flat. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a positive affect on antelope that exist on Cedar Flat and will therefore contribute to the goal of increasing the trend for antelope on the Coconino National Forest. When combined with the planned maintenance treatment on a much larger area on the adjacent Walker Basin Allotment the

cumulative effect will be a very positive increase in area of contiguous antelope habitat with visual security, i.e., vision unrestricted by vegetation over 24 inches in height.

Juniper Titmouse (MIS)

Affected Environment

Juniper titmice are indicators for late seral pinyon-juniper, particularly the snag component. They are year round residents of Arizona and are obligate inhabitants of pinyon-juniper woodlands. Juniper titmouse breeding bird density has been documented to decrease with increased tree density, increasing total bird densities, increasing proportion of junipers in a stand, and increasing canopy cover. Habitat for the juniper titmouse occurs throughout the project area.

The age class distribution of pinyon-juniper has been relatively stable throughout the plan implementation period. Some change in pinyon-juniper has probably been from tree growth and increased density or infill, although tree growth is relatively slow, so change has not been great since signing of the Forest Plan. The vigor of understory components decreases as density increases. Some encroachment and re-growth of pinyon-juniper has occurred into grasslands/pushes. Within the pinyon-juniper matrix, older pinyon pine trees are dying out in many areas due to drought conditions and resulting insect outbreaks. This has been observed in much of the project area.

The Forest-wide trend for the juniper titmouse is stable to slightly decreasing. Analysis done at the time of the original Forest Plan, predicted slight declines in habitat capability for the Juniper titmouse as a result of implementing the Plan. This was the only MIS where trends were predicted to decrease. Old age classes of pinyon-juniper were expected to decrease as treatments were implemented to increase the amount of early successional habitat.

Environmental Consequences

The no action alternative will not affect the current forest-wide trend for juniper titmice. Because either of the action alternatives will result in the modification (reduction) of juniper over 1,493 acres, either of the action alternatives will contribute to the forest-wide trend for juniper titmice. However, the treatments planned are not aimed at the late seral stage of pinyon-juniper but rather the early and mid stages.

Herbicides in the Environment

The effect of herbicide application of triclopyr within the 80 acres of Treatment Area 2 in Alternative B has been specifically discussed for soil, water, vegetation, and wildlife. There is an additional area of analysis which is risk of human exposure. Effect of herbicides is discussed in the Wildlife Specialist Report and in the Herbicide Application Analysis. In addition the specific discussion of triclopyr and its characteristics, applications and risks in the recent three forest Noxious Invasive Weeds EIS (USDA 2005) is adopted and incorporated by reference, including discussion of cumulative effects.

Affected Environment

Currently there are no herbicides in use within the project area. Individuals who work or recreate within the project area may or may not have contact with herbicides in other locations, e.g., their yard and/or garden.

Environmental Consequences

Alternative A, No Action – The project area would have no herbicide application and there would be no human exposure to herbicides as a result of it.

Alternative B – The primary risk of exposure is to workers doing the handling and application of the herbicide. Following the required Best Management Practices, including wearing of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), will minimize potential for exposure. Risk analyses and actual studies have found that dermal contact is the most likely route of exposure. Because of application by the cut stump method, rather than spraying, potential exposure by dermal contact is much less than in studies that have been used to evaluate risks. Risk characterization developed from exposures via spray application, show that workers would have exposures less than the acute (one day) and chronic (many day) levels of concern. The chronic level of concern is 1/20 of the one day level. Only a few days of exposure are expected.

Adjutants and surfactants are commonly used with herbicides to aid in application. One of the inert ingredients accompanying the active ingredient triclopyr is kerosene. The risk assessment (USDA 2003) states that *“the acute lethal potency of kerosene is approximately 16 times less than the acute lethal potency of triclopyr.”* In regard to inhalation of kerosene while applying triclopyr via backpack sprayer the report says that *“plausible levels of exposure to kerosene during applications of Garlon 4 are approximately 30,000-100,000 below the NOEL [no observed effect level] for kerosene in experimental mammals.”* (USDA 2003, page 3-13).

Alternative C – There would be no herbicide application.

The risk of public exposure is very low. One of the Best Management Practices to be implemented is signing the treatment area to prevent public entry, including pets, during and immediately following the actual treatment. There are no roads within it and the season of treatment is not a time when there is normally significant recreation use within the area. Exposure would require dermal contact with treated cut stumps or clothing contact with dermal transfer. The small diameter would preclude attempting to sit or stand upon the stumps and the sharp edges of the cut stumps would discourage contact. No identifiable effect is expected.

Cultural Resources

The National Historic Preservation Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act require that the effects of any federal undertaking on cultural resources be examined. In addition, National Forest Service management policies and cultural resource management guidelines call for the consideration of cultural resources in planning proposals. Significant cultural resources exist within the project area and adjacent areas and could be affected by the alternatives. Therefore, analysis was performed for archaeological resources, ethnographic resources, and cultural landscape resources, including historic sites and structures.

Archaeological Resources

The methodology for assessing impacts to historic resources is based on the procedures outlined for cultural resources. This methodology includes: 1) establishing an Area of Potential Effect; 2) assessing the background information regarding historic properties within this area and conducting any necessary surveys, inventories, and resource evaluations; 3) comparing the location of the impact area with that of resources listed, eligible, or potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places; 4) identifying the extent and type of effects; 5) assessing those effects according to procedures established in the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's regulations; and 6) considering ways to avoid, reduce, or mitigate adverse effects.

Archaeological resources are typically considered eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places under criterion d of 36 Code of Federal Regulations Part 60, for the information they have or may be likely to yield. Any change in the physical attributes of an archaeological site is considered irreparable, adverse, and permanent. Adverse impacts to archaeological resources most often occur as a result of earthmoving activities within an archaeological site, soil compaction or increased erosion, unauthorized surface collection, or vandalism. Beneficial impacts to archaeological resources can occur when ongoing impacts, which would otherwise continue to degrade archaeological resources, are reduced or arrested due to changes in visitor use patterns or management practices in the vicinity of archaeological resources. Direct impacts can occur as a result of grading, trenching, or other activities that damage the structure of an archaeological site. Indirect impacts can occur as a result of increasing visitor or management actions in the vicinity of an archaeological site, leading to such occurrences as artifact collection, accelerated soil compaction, or erosion.

The intensity of impact to an archaeological resource would depend on the potential of the resource to yield important information, as well as the extent of the physical disturbance or degradation. For example, major earthmoving at an archaeological site with low data potential might result in a minor adverse impact. Negligible impacts would be barely perceptible and not measurable and would usually be confined to archaeological sites with low data potential. Minor impacts would be perceptible and measurable and would remain localized and confined to archaeological sites with low to moderate data potential. Moderate impacts would be sufficient to cause noticeable change and would generally involve one or more archaeological sites with moderate to

high data potential. Major impacts would result in substantial and highly noticeable changes involving archaeological sites with high data potential.

For archaeological resources, mitigation includes avoiding sites through project design or recovering information that makes the sites eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

Affected Environment

There are 149 previously identified archaeological sites that are located within the 1,545 acre Area of Potential Effect (APE)/project area. The site types include: agricultural sites, artifact scatters, bedrock milling stations, cavates, one cliff dwelling, historic erosion control structures, historic foundations, field houses, lithic scatters, pit houses, pueblos, a quarry, rock art, roasting pit, and a prehistoric wall. A project clearance document will be in place to insure that the as yet unsurveyed treatment areas within the APE will be surveyed by Cultural Resource Specialists prior to implementation and all archaeological sites flagged for avoidance. Additional sites are expected to be located during the upcoming archeological surveys of the portions of the project area that have yet to be surveyed.

Environmental Consequences

Alternative A (No Action) - Under Alternative A, no specific actions would be taken to change the existing conditions. Under this alternative, no effect is anticipated at any of the sites listed above, or any of the sites that may be located, as the existing conditions and settings would not change. Some sites would continue to experience negligible to minor impacts as a result of the further degradation of the herbaceous ground cover and continued erosion and compaction or deflation where the ground cover has been completely lost, and by continued use by recreationists and herbivorous animals. The evidence of thousands of years of human occupation would be unaffected. Overall, Alternative A would result in local, long-term, negligible to minor, adverse impact to archaeological resources.

Summary of Alternative A Impacts. There would be no change in the treatment and management of archaeological resources as a result of Alternative A. The impaired or unsatisfactory soil and watershed conditions would continue and could have a long-term adverse effect on archaeological resources within the proposed project area. Any site-specific planning and compliance actions would be performed in accordance with stipulations in the forest's Programmatic Agreement. Overall, Alternative A would result in local, long-term, negligible to minor, adverse impact to archaeological resources. Cumulative impacts to archaeological resources are based on analysis of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions in the project areas, in combination with potential effects of this alternative. Some sites would continue to experience impacts as a result of the ongoing degradation of the herbaceous ground cover and continued erosion and compaction or deflation where the ground cover has been completely lost, and by continued use by recreationists and herbivorous animals. The impaired or unsatisfactory soil and watershed conditions would continue and could have a long-term negligible to minor adverse effect on archaeological resources within the proposed project area.

Alternative B (Proposed Action) - Under Alternative B, the M-Diamond Ranch and Forest Service propose to implement a group of erosion control and wildlife habitat improvements within the Buckhorn Allotment. Each of the 22 treatment areas will receive one or several of the above treatments as specifically described in Chapter 2. All archaeological sites will be flagged by cultural resource specialists and avoided during project implementation by any mechanical treatments. Cultural resource specialists will periodically monitor any activities within archaeological site boundaries. There may be some hand thinning of brush on selected archaeological sites to remove heavy slash and debris that would put the archeological site at higher risk during wildfires, but no mechanical equipment will be allowed and nothing will be dragged away, any large slash would be carried away from the site. No seeding with other than herbaceous plants will be allowed.

Seeding of herbaceous plants (grasses and forbs) will take place with no soil preparation on archaeological sites which will reduce the efficacy of the seeding but will allow for some minor improvement in soil stabilization. There may be beneficial effects to proposed treatments of the area, a reduction in erosion and stabilization of the soils on the sites with the increase in ground cover.

Burning of slash piles would take place outside the site boundaries of any archaeological site. All slash will be hand carried from archaeological sites to the pile areas for burning.

Channel stabilization treatments will not take place within any archaeological sites. It is expected that reduction in water velocity and headcutting will protect archaeological sites both upstream and downstream from the proposed treatments by reducing the possibilities of channel related erosion if the soil and watershed impairments continue.

Since no ground disturbing activities will be allowed within or immediately adjacent to any archaeological sites, there should be No Adverse Effect to cultural resources.

Ground disturbing activities would not be allowed on any archaeological sites. Any thinning or seeding activities on select archaeological sites would be done by hand and monitored by a Cultural Resource Monitor. The impaired or unsatisfactory soil and watershed conditions would improve and could have a long-term beneficial effect on archaeological resources within the proposed project area. Any site-specific planning and compliance actions would be performed in accordance with stipulations in the forest's Programmatic Agreement. Overall, Alternative B would result in local, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impacts to archaeological resources.

The cumulative effects of the proposed project activities will result in an increase in grazing area for both domestic and wild herbivores and a reduction in both sheet and channel erosion. The overall effect of treatment should result in a reduction in erosion across treatment areas resulting in less erosion on the individual archaeological sites. Alternative B would result in local, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impacts to archaeological resources.

Alternative C - Alternative C is identical to Alternative B with the exception of removal of the herbicide Treatment proposed for Treatment Area 2 from the selection of treatment options. The effects on archaeological resources are similar to Alternative B in that it would result in local, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impacts to archaeological resources.

Because it is not anticipated that this alternative would lead to disturbance of archaeological resources, the cumulative impact analysis for archaeological resources in Alternative C is the same as described under Alternative B. See the discussion of cumulative impacts under Alternative B.

Recreation

Affected Environment

Dispersed recreation use within the project area includes camping, hunting, hiking, horseback riding, firewood gathering, searching for shed elk and deer antlers, some off-road vehicle travel, and driving for pleasure. There are no developed recreation sites within the area. The trailhead for Trail 17, which enters the West Clear Creek Wilderness, is near Treatment Area 9 and is accessed by a primitive road. There is an increasing trend of motorized recreation as the population of the Verde Valley increases and more visitors from the metropolitan Phoenix area use the area. On the adjacent Walker Basin Allotment off road vehicle use has greatly increased in the last few years and increases have been observed in the project area, especially in Treatment Areas 3 and 2. Some personal use fuelwood harvest has recently occurred in Treatment Area 1.

Environmental Consequences

Alternative A, No Action – The existing dispersed recreation would continue to increase with increased population pressures. Off road vehicle (ORV) use is expected to expand, especially in Treatment Areas 2 and 3, until the multi-Forest Off Road Vehicle management plan (ORV Plan) is completed and implemented. Currently in draft form, this would restrict ORV use to designated routes or areas. The current proposal does not include routes or designated open areas in these two Treatment Areas.

Alternative B – ORV use in Treatment Areas 1-4 would be restricted upon implementation of the project. This would include physical barriers at strategic locations to prevent unauthorized ORV access. Restrictions would occur earlier than expected under the multi-Forest ORV Plan. The lop and scatter of pinyon and juniper would result in scattered branches and small tree skeletons across the treatment areas that would persist for several years. Eventually these tree remnants would break down and organify into the soil and/or be hidden from view by grasses, other herbaceous plants, and shrubs, depending on the specific sites and treatment emphasis.

Alternative C – Similar to Alternative B. In addition Treatment Area 2 would be signed to restrict entry during and immediately following the application of herbicide to mesquite cut stumps. Expected restricted entry is one week or less. This Treatment Area contains no roads and does not commonly receive recreation use during the late summer season when the treatment will occur.

Range Management

Affected Environment

The project is located within portions of 7 of the approximately 20 pastures within the Buckhorn Range Allotment. These are the Wickiup and Winter Pastures below the Mogollon Rim and the Boulder, Bald Hill, Indian Flat, Painted Tank, and Buckhorn Pastures above the Rim. It is managed under a deferred rotation system. The majority of the pastures are used each year and a few are rested for an entire year. For calendar year 2005 the grazing schedule includes approximately 35 percent of the total use within these seven pastures, almost half of that is within the large and productive Buckhorn Pasture. By contrast the small Wickiup, Indian Flat and Painted Tank Pastures each constitute between 2 and 4 percent of the year's grazing. The large Winter Pasture is scheduled for about 8 percent. Neither the Boulder nor Bald Hill Pastures are scheduled for grazing during 2005; however, both were grazed in 2004, providing about 3 and 14 percent, respectively, of that year's grazing. For approximately half of the year the small bull herd is grazed separately from the main cow herd, necessitating use of a different pasture. Some grazing occurs on the Ranch's headquarters private land.

Environmental Consequences

Alternative A, No Action – Under this alternative the existing deferred rotation system would continue. Each pasture would be grazed with monitoring by the Ranch and Forest Service personnel to assure meeting the specified allowable use percentage.

Alternative B – Areas seeded in Treatment Areas 1-4 would require exclusion from livestock grazing until vegetation is well established and monitoring determines that a specified amount of grazing may occur. Treatment Areas 1 and 2 are within the Wickiup Pasture and constitute a major portion of its capacity. This pasture would be expected to be rested from grazing for 2-3 years, with the possibility that it could be longer if drought conditions resume. Areas 3 and 4 are within the Winter Pasture. The seeded portion of Area 3 will be protected by construction of a fence to exclude it from grazing during recovery. Area 4 includes the small "Wickiup Trap" pasture which has frequently been used as a horse pasture. This will be rested during recovery. Although the Wickiup Pasture and the portions of the Winter Pasture which will be protected from grazing during recovery make up a relatively small portion of the allotment grazing capacity, it may be necessary for the Ranch to reduce the amount of livestock grazing on National Forest during the winter seasons through the recovery period, particularly if drought conditions as experienced in recent years recur.

Treatment Areas 13-15 within the Indian Flat Pasture will require protection from livestock until seeding is successful. This pasture is used twice yearly in moving cattle between winter and summer grazing. During the one to two seasons expected for recovery livestock will need to be herded through the pasture to avoid the newly seeded areas.

Over the mid to longer term, range condition is expected to improve as a result of the treatments, especially in areas 1-4.

Alternative C – Similar to Alternative B, except that improvement of range condition in Treatment Area 2 will be less.

Environmental Justice

The Forest Service looked at the social, economic, and environmental impacts of this project and determined that none of the alternatives considered in this analysis would have a disproportionate impact on any minority population in the immediate area, within the surrounding counties or in the Northern Arizona region. This includes any effects on dispersed recreation.

Costs

The direct costs budgeted for the project are approximately \$365 thousand. Of that amount approximately \$224 thousand is a 319(h) grant from the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, and grants from the Habitat Partnership program of the Arizona Game and Fish Department comprise about \$59 thousand. The Ranch is responsible for the majority of the remaining \$82 thousand. The University of Arizona Cooperative Extension Service and School of Natural Resources both are providing support in terms of technical and professional services.

Following the implementation of the project the Ranch will have significant costs for subsequent monitoring. In addition they may have costs for purchase of forage during periods when treated areas are being excluded from grazing and other forage is not available within the range allotment.

CHAPTER 4 – CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

Preparation

The following individuals participated in the preparation and/ or provided contributions to the environmental assessment:

Red Rock Ranger District

Jerry Bradley, Range Conservationist, Interdisciplinary Team Leader
Judy Adams, NEPA Coordinator
Janie Agyagos, Wildlife Biologist
Sharyn Blood, Archaeologist
Jack Norman, Soil Scientist

Coconino National Forest Supervisor's Office

Debra Crisp, Botanist
Laura Moser, Botanist
Rory Steinke, Soil Scientist

M Diamond Ranch

Loyd Barnett, Hydrologist

Consultation

The preparation of this EA required communication and consultation with various agencies, organizations and citizens. The following list summarizes the agencies and organizations contacted during the preparation of the Buckhorn Allotment Watershed and Wildlife Improvements EA.

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
Arizona Game and Fish Department
Arizona State Land Department
University of Arizona Cooperative Extension
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Verde Natural Resource Conservation District
Rocky Mountain Research Station

Apache Maid Ranch
Arizona Antelope Foundation
Arizona Mule Deer Association
Arizona Wildlife Federation
Bar D Ranch
Bar T Bar Ranch
Center for Biological Diversity
Crooked H Ranch
Forest Conservation Council
Forest Guardians
Muleshoe X Cattle Company

Buckhorn Allotment Projects, Environmental Assessment – Chapter 4

The Nature Conservancy

Sierra Club, Plateau Group

V Bar V Ranch, University of Arizona Agricultural Experiment Station

Ward Trust & 13 Mile Rock Ranches

Wildlife Society, Arizona Chapter

Windmill Ranch

Chapter 5 – References Cited

The following are the references specifically cited in the EA. The specialists' reports listed in this chapter and located in the project record contain many more cited references. However, those are not repeated here.

- Agyagos, Janie. 2005. Wildlife Specialist Report for the Buckhorn Allotment Improvement Projects. Project Record.
- Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. 2002. The Status of Water Quality in Arizona – 2002, Arizona's Integrated 305(b) Assessment and 303(d) Listing Report. Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Phoenix, AZ.
- Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. 2004. The Status of Water Quality in Arizona – 2004, Arizona's Integrated 305(b) Assessment and 303(d) Listing Report. Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Phoenix, AZ.
- Barnett, Loyd O. and Richard H. Hawkins. 2002. Reconnaissance watershed analysis on the upper and middle Verde watershed. School of Renewable Natural Resources, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ. Prepared under Agreement 23934 with Arizona Department of Water Resources.
- Barnett, Loyd. 2005. Project Assessment for the Buckhorn Allotment Watershed and Wildlife Habitat Improvement Projects. Project Record.
- Barnett, Loyd. 2005. Herbicide Application Analysis for the Buckhorn Allotment Watershed and Wildlife Habitat Improvement Projects. Project Record.
- Betancourt, Julio L. 1996. *Long- and short-term climate influences on Southwestern shrublands.* In: Barrow, Jerry R.; McArthur, E. Durant; Sosebee, Ronald E.; Tausch, Robin J., compilers. *Proceedings: shrubland ecosystem dynamics in a changing environment; 1995 May 23-25; Las Cruces, NM.* Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-GTR-338. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station: 5-9.
- Basso, Keith H. 1983. Western Apache. In *Southwest*, edited by Alfonso Ortiz, pp. 462-488. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 10, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Cline, Platt. 1976. *They Came to the Mountain, The Story of Flagstaff's Beginnings.* Northern Arizona University with Northland Press, Flagstaff, AZ
- Clary, W.P., M.B. Baker, Jr., P.F. O'Connell, T.N. Johnsen, Jr., and R.E. Campbell. 1974. *Effects of pinyon-juniper removal on natural resource products and uses in Arizona.* USDA Forest Service, Research Paper RM-128.

- Crisp, Debra. 2005. Noxious Weed Survey, Buckhorn Allotment. Project Record.
- Ferg, Alan and D. Tessman. 1997. The Beginning of Western Apache Ethnoarchaeology: The Goodwin and Sayles 1937 Verde Survey. In *Vanishing River: Landscapes and Lives of the Lower Verde Valley: The Lower Verde Archaeological Project: Overview, Synthesis, and Conclusions*, edited by Stephanie M. Whittlesey, Richard Ciolek-Torrello, and Jeffrey H. Altschul, pp. 216-240, 279. SRI Press, Statistical Research, Inc., Tucson, Arizona.
- Fish, Paul R. and Suzanne K. Fish. 1977. Verde Valley Archaeology: Review and Prospective. Museum of Northern Arizona Research Paper No. 8, Flagstaff.
- Fish, Paul R., Peter J. Pilles, Jr. and Suzanne K. Fish. 1980. Colonies, Traders, and Traits: The Hohokam in the North. In *Current Issues in Hohokam Prehistory: Proceedings of a Symposium*, pp. 151-175, edited by David Doyle and Fred Plog. Arizona State University Anthropological Research Papers no. 23, Tempe.
- Gifford, E.W. 1936. Northeastern and Western Yavapai, University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 34. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Gilpin, Dennis, Jean Ballagh, Lynn Neal, Louise Senior, and Linda Martin. 2003. Fossil Creek Cultural Landscape Study Phase 1 – Ethnographic Overview. SWCA Cultural Resources Report No. 02-121. Ms. On file, Coconino National Forest Supervisor's Office, Flagstaff.
- Heede, B.H. 1976. Gully development and control: the status of our knowledge. USDA Forest Service Research Paper RM-169. 42 p. Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Fort Collins, CO.
- Heede, B.H. 1977. Designing gully control systems for eroding watersheds. *Journal of Environmental Management*. 2(6):509-522.
- Infoventures. 1995. Triclopyr: Pesticide Fact Sheet. Prepared for the USDA Forest Service by Information Ventures, Inc.
- Jackson, Earl, and Sallie Pierce Van Valkenburgh. 1954. Montezuma Castle Archaeology, Part I: Excavations. Southwestern Monuments Association, Technical Series 3(1).
- Keller, Donald R. and Pat Stein. 1995. Archaeological Study at Three Twentieth Century Yavapai Wickiup Sites, Prescott, Arizona. Museum of Northern Arizona Research Paper, Flagstaff.

- Khera, Sigrid and Patricia S. Mariella. 1983. Yavapai. In *Southwest*, edited by Alfonso Ortiz. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 10, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Logan, Noel, and Sarah Horton. 1996. Archaeological Excavations of Eleven Sites in Jacks Canyon, Near the Village of Oak Creek, Sedona Ranger District, Coconino National Forest. Ms. On file, Coconino National Forest Supervisor's Office, Flagstaff.
- Macnider, Barbara S., Richard W. Effland Jr., and George Ford. 1989. Cultural Resources Overview: The Prescott National Forest. Cultural Resources Report No.50. Archaeological Consulting Services, Ltd., Tempe.
- Macnider, Barbara S., Richard W. Effland, Jr., and Ann Valdo-Howard. 1991. An Archaeological Assessment of Arizona Public Service Company's Childs and Irving Hydroelectric Facilities, Coconino National Forest, Beaver Creek Ranger District. Archeological Consulting Services, Ltd., Cultural Resource Report No. 55, Flagstaff.
- Munson, Robert W. 1981. Territorial Verde Valley. In *Plateau* 53(1):6-17.
- Munson, Robert. 2000. Park Manager, Fort Verde State Park, Arizona State Parks. Personal communication.
- North, Chris D., Louise Senior, and Michael S. Foster. 2002. An Archaeological survey and Ethnohistoric Study of the Verde Wild and Scenic River Corridor. SWCA Cultural Resources Report No. 02-415, Phoenix.
- Oregon State University (OSU). 1996. (Extonet) Extension Toxicology Network, Pesticide Information Profiles. Triclopyr
- Pilles, Peter J., Jr. 1976. Sinagua and Salado Similarities as Seen From the Verde Valley. in *The Kiva* 42(1):113-124.
- Pilles, Peter J., Jr. 1981. The Southern Sinagua. In *People of the Verde Valley*. *Plateau* 53(1):6-17.
- Pilles, Peter J., Jr. and Pat Stein. 1981. A Cultural Resources Overview of the Coconino National Forest. Ms on file, Coconino National Forest Supervisor's Office, Flagstaff.
- Schroeder, Albert H. 1974. A Study of Yavapai History: In *Yavapai Indians*, by A.H. Schroeder and A.B. Thomas, pp.23-354. *Garland American Indian Ethnohistory Series*, D.A. Horr, general editor. Garland, New York.

- Shutler, Richard, Jr. 1950. The Dry Creek Site: A Pre-pottery Lithic Horizon in the Verde Valley, Arizona. Plateau 23(1):6-10.
- Spicer, Edward H., and Louis R. Caywood, 1934. Tuzigoot, A Prehistoric Pueblo of the Upper Verde Valley, The Kiva 42(1-2):26-38
- Stebbins, Robert C. 1985. A field guide to western reptiles and amphibians. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, Massachusetts. 336 pp
- Stein, Pat, 1981. The Yavapai and Tonto Apache, Plateau 53(1):18-23.
- Tagg, Martyn D. 1986. The Tuzigoot Survey and Three Small Verde Valley Projects: Archaeological Investigations in the Middle Verde Valley, Arizona. Western Archaeological and Conservation Center Publications in Anthropology 40, Western Archaeological and Conservation Center, National Park Service, Tucson.
- Tu, M., Hurd, C., & J.M. Randall, 2001. Weed Control Methods Handbook, The Nature Conservancy, <http://tncweeds.ucdavis.edu>, Version: April 2001, updated Dec. 2003.
- USDA Forest Service. 1987. Coconino National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. USDA Forest Service Regional Office, Albuquerque, NM.
- USDA, Forest Service. 1992. Watershed management practices for pinyon-juniper ecosystems. Southwestern Region, Albuquerque, NM. 77 p
- USDA Forest Service. 1995. Terrestrial Ecosystems Survey of the Coconino National Forest. USDA Forest Service Southwest Regional Office, Albuquerque, NM.
- USDA Forest Service. 1996. Selected Commercial Formulations of Triclopyr-Garlon3A and Garlon 4 Risk Assessment, Final Report. Syracuse Environmental Research Associates Inc., Fayetteville, NY.
- USDA Forest Service. 2003. Triclopyr – Revised Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessments Final Report, Syracuse Environmental Research Associates Inc., Fayetteville, NY.
- USDA Forest Service. 2005. Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Integrated Treatment of Noxious or Invasive Weeds, Coconino, Kaibab, and Prescott National Forests. USDA Forest Service, Williams, AZ.
- Vannette, Walter M. and Alison Feary. 1981. Navajo Sacred Places and Resource Use in and Near the Coconino, Kaibab, and Apache-Sitgraves National Forests. Ms. On file, Coconino National Forest Supervisor's Office, Flagstaff.

Whittlesey, Stephanie M., Richard S. Ciolek-Torrello, and Jeff Altschul. 1997. Yavapai and Western Apache Archaeology of Central Arizona. In *Vanishing River: Landscapes and Lives of the Lower Verde Valley*, edited by Stephanie M. Whittlesey, Richard S. Ciolek-Torrello, and Jeff Altschul, pp. 185-2214. SRI Press, Tucson.

Wilcox, David R., Gerald Robertson, Jr., and J. Scott Wood. 2001. Organized for War: The Perry Mesa Settlement System and its Central Arizona Neighbors. In *Deadly Landscapes: Case Studies in Prehistoric Southwestern Warfare*, edited by Glen E. Rice and Steven A. LeBlanc, University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.

Willard, Charles D. 1975. Looking Back at the Verde Valley. Printed in the Verde Independent, Cottonwood, AZ Aug. 20, 1975. (From writings in the 1950's).

APPENDIX A – MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures are listed in more detail than in Chapter 2, Alternatives.

PESTICIDE USE MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION.

The Forest Service uses pesticides very judiciously, safely, and effectively. Base actual use and recommended use on analysis of effectiveness, specificity, environmental impacts, and economic efficiency. The Forest Service may use only pesticides registered or otherwise permitted in accordance with the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended.

Pesticide Application According to Label Directions and Applicable Legal Requirements.

1. Objective. To avoid water contamination by complying with all label instructions and restrictions.
2. Explanation. Directions found on the label of each pesticide are detailed and specific, and include legal requirements for use.
3. Implementation. Constraints identified on the label and other legal requirements of application are incorporated into project plans and contracts. For in-service projects, responsibility for ensuring that label directions and other applicable legal requirements are followed rests with the Forest Service's project supervisor who shall be a certified commercial applicator. For contracted projects, it is the responsibility of the Contracting Officer or the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) to ensure that label directions and other applicable legal requirements are followed.

Pesticide Spill Contingency Planning.

1. Objective. To eliminate contamination of water that may occur from accidental spills.
2. Explanation. The Forest Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan prepared by each Forest consists of predetermined actions to be implemented in the event of a spill. The plan lists who will notify whom and how, time requirements for the notification, guidelines for spill containment, and who will be responsible for cleanup. Site-specific planning that involves hazardous substances requires a spill plan which is contained in the project safety plan. Guidance on pesticides spill prevention and planning can be obtained in the FSH 2109.12.
3. Implementation. Spill contingency planning is incorporated into the Project Safety Plan. The environmental analysis process provides the means for including public and other agency involvement in plan preparation. The plan will list the responsible authorities.

Cleaning and Disposal of Pesticide Containers.

1. Objective. To prevent water contamination resulting from cleaning or disposal of pesticide containers.

2. Explanation. The cleaning and disposal of pesticide containers must be done in accordance with Federal, State and local laws, regulations, and directives. Specific procedures for the cleaning and disposal of pesticide containers are documented in State and local laws and in the Pesticide Storage, Transportation, and Spills Handbook, FSH 2109.12.

3. Implementation. The Forest or District Pesticide Use Coordinator will approve proper rinsing procedures in accordance with State and local laws and regulations, and arrange for disposal of pesticide containers when the pesticide is applied by in-service personnel. When the pesticide is applied by a contractor, the contractor is responsible for proper container disposal in accordance with label directions and Federal, State, and local laws.

WEED PREVENTION PRACTICES



Objective	Best Known Practice
<p>1. Incorporate weed prevention and control into project layout, design, alternative evaluation, and project decisions.</p>	<p>1.1 – Environmental analysis for projects and maintenance programs will need to assess weed risks, analyze potential treatment of high-risk sites for weed establishment and spread, and identify prevention practices. Determine prevention and maintenance needs, including the use of herbicides if needed, at the onset of project planning.</p> <p>1.2 – Coordinate with other agencies and adjacent landowners to prevent and control weeds. (CFR 222.8)</p>
<p>2. Avoid or remove sources of weed seed and propagules to prevent new weed infestations and the spread of existing weeds.</p>	<p>2.1 – Before ground-disturbing activities begin, inventory and prioritize treatment of invasive weeds in project operating areas and along access routes, or within reasonably expected potential invasion vicinity. Do a risk assessment accordingly; control weeds as necessary.</p> <p>2.2 – After completing “Practice 2.1” above, reduce risk of spreading and creating weed infestations. Plan operating areas and access routes to avoid heavy infestation areas, plan closure of access routes at finish of project, and/or begin project operations in uninfested areas before operating in weed-infested areas. Locate and use weed-free project staging areas. Avoid or minimize all types of travel through weed-infested areas, or restrict to those periods when spread of seed or propagules are least likely.</p> <p>Equipment Wash Station – Centralized wash station areas will be developed in several locations throughout the CNF. They must have a filter system, for example at least 6 inches of large cinder or gravel spread over an area 10' x 30'. Filter cloth may be used for temporary stations. The area will be a perched drainage to allow excess moisture to drain after being filtered and must be at least 200 yards from a natural drainage to avoid contamination. All wash station locations must be monitored annually and all weed materials removed as soon as possible.</p> <p>2.3 – Remove mud, dirt, and plant parts from project equipment before moving it into a project area. Determine the need for, and when appropriate, identify sites where equipment can be cleaned. Clean all equipment before entering National Forest System lands; a forest officer, in coordination with the unit invasive species coordinator, needs to approve use of on-forest cleaning sites in advance. This practice does not apply to service vehicles traveling frequently in and out of the project area that will remain on a clean roadway. Seeds and plant parts need to be collected when practical and incinerated.</p> <p>2.4 – If operating in areas infested with weeds, clean all equipment before leaving the project site. To minimize time spent cleaning equipment, time all work in infested areas last and concurrently, designate a “contaminated” parking lot where project vehicles working in the infested area may be parked for the duration of the project. This area should be monitored in followup mitigation and should be near a “clean” vehicle/equipment lot. Identify sites where equipment and vehicles can be cleaned before leaving the site at the end of the project. Seeds and plant parts need to be collected</p>

Objective	Best Known Practice
	<p>when practical and incinerated.</p> <p>2.5 – Workers need to inspect, remove, and properly dispose of weed seed and plant parts found on their clothing and equipment after being trained to recognize the priority species in the area. Proper disposal means bagging the seeds and plant parts and incinerating them.</p> <p>2.6 – Coordinate project activities between resources and between agencies (such as city, county, ADOT, ASLD) with any nearby weed treatments, including herbicide applications, to maximize cost effectiveness of weed treatments.</p>
<p>3. Prevent the introduction and spread of weeds caused by moving infested sand, gravel, borrow, and fill material in Forest Service, contractor and cooperater operations.</p>	<p>3.1 – Inspect material sources on site annually, and ensure that they are weed-free before use and transport. Treat weed-infested sources for eradication, and strip, stockpile, and treat contaminated material before using pit materials.</p> <p>3.2 – Inspect and document the areas where materials are used (including those from treated weed-infested sources) annually for at least 3 years after project completion to ensure that any weeds transported to the site are promptly detected and controlled.</p> <p>3.3 – Maintain stockpiled, uninfested material in a weed-free condition.</p> <p>3.4 – Work with the responsible transportation agencies to adopt these practices for maintenance of roads that cross National Forest System lands.</p>
<p>4. Avoid creating soil conditions that promote weed germination and establishment.</p>	<p>4.1 – Minimize soil disturbance to the extent practical, consistent with project objectives.</p> <p>4.2 – In those vegetation types that have relatively closed canopies as a natural condition, retain shade to the maximum extent possible to suppress weeds and prevent their establishment and growth in and around project activity.</p>
<p>5. Where project disturbance creates bare ground, establish vegetation to minimize favorable conditions for weeds.</p>	<p>5.1 – Treat disturbed soil (except surfaced projects) in a manner that optimizes native plant establishment for that specific site. Define for each project what constitutes disturbed soil and objectives for plant cover revegetation.</p> <p>5.2 – Revegetation may include topsoil replacement, native seedbank promotion, planting, seeding, fertilization, and/or weed seed-free mulching as necessary. Use local native material where appropriate and feasible (or specifically identify why not used). Always use certified weed-free and weed seed-free hay or straw. Always use certified materials in areas closed by administrative order. Where practical, stockpile weed seed-free topsoil from the project area and replace it on disturbed areas (e.g. road embankments, staging areas, wash stations, or landings).</p> <p>5.3 – Use local seeding guidelines to determine detailed procedures and appropriate mixes. To avoid weed contamination, a certified seed laboratory needs to test each lot against the all-State noxious weed list to Association of Seed Technologists and Analysts (AOSTA) standards, and provide documentation of the seed inspection test. Seed lots labeled as certified weed seed-free at time of sale may still contain some weed seed</p>

Objective	Best Known Practice
	<p>contamination.</p> <p>5.4 – Monitor and document all limited term ground-disturbing operations near weed infested areas for at least five growing seasons, or the documented seed viability for the species of concern following completion of the project. For ongoing projects, continue to monitor until reasonable certainty is obtained that no weeds have occurred. Provide for followup treatments based on inspection results.</p> <p>5.5 – Evaluate options, including closure, to minimize future infestations on sites where desired vegetation needs to be established.</p>
<p>6. Improve effectiveness of prevention practices through weed awareness and education.</p>	<p>6.1 – Provide information, training and appropriate weed identification materials to people potentially involved in weed introduction, establishment, and spread on National Forest System lands, including agency managers, employees, forest workers, permit holders, and recreational visitors. Educate them to an appropriate level in weed identification, biology, impacts, and effective prevention measures. Educate resource level managers to allow them to incorporate weed prevention practices in their planning of projects and daily activities.</p> <p>6.2 – Provide proficient weed management expertise at each administrative unit. Expertise means that necessary skills are available and corporate knowledge is maintained.</p> <p>6.3 – Develop incentive programs encouraging weed awareness, detection, reporting, and for locating new invaders.</p>

Buckhorn Grazing Allotment PROPOSED TREATMENT AREAS

MAP 1



Printed from TOPOI ©2001 National Geographic Holdings (www.topo.com)