



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

March 2008



Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Long Term Special Use Authorization for Wyoming Game and Fish Commission to Use National Forest System Land for their Winter Elk Management Programs

Bridger-Teton National Forest Jackson and Sublette Counties, Wyoming



The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

**Long Term Special Use Authorization for Wyoming Game and Fish
Commission to Use National Forest System Lands for Their Winter Elk
Management Programs**

**Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Jackson and Sublette Counties, Wyoming**

Lead Agency: USDA Forest Service

Cooperating Agency: Wyoming Game and Fish Commission

Responsible Official: Carole ‘Kniffy’ Hamilton
Bridger-Teton National Forest
340 N. Cache, P.O. Box 1888
Jackson WY 83001

For Information Contact: Greg Clark, Big Piney District Ranger
315 South Front Street, P.O. Box 218
Big Piney, WY 83113
307-276-3375

Abstract: The WGFC has requested authorization to use the National Forest System (NFS) lands within the Bridger-Teton National Forest at Alkali Creek, Dog Creek, Fall Creek, Fish Creek, Muddy Creek, Patrol Cabin, and Upper Green River Feedgrounds to continue their winter elk management programs at these locations. Three alternatives were developed in response to the WGFC request. **No Action - No Special Use Authorization (Alternative 1)** would result in no permit issued; with the assumption the WGFC would continue to implement their winter elk management programs on other federal, state, or private lands. **No Change in Permitted Area (Alternative 2)** would permit the WGFC to use NFS lands at the existing locations with no change in facilities or feeding area. **The Proposed Action (Alternative 3)** is the Preferred Alternative and would permit the WGFC to continue to use NFS lands with the same facilities and feeding area at Alkali Creek, Dog Creek, Fall Creek, and Upper Green River; increase the feeding area at Fish Creek; allow one haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, horse corrals, water facilities, and additional feeding areas at Patrol Cabin Feedground; and increase the permitted area for the construction of a horse corral at Muddy Creek Feedground.

Reviewers should provide the Forest Service with their comments during the review period of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). This will enable the Forest Service to analyze and respond to the comments at one time and to use information acquired in the preparation of the final DEIS, thus avoiding undue delay in the decision making process. Reviewers have an obligation to structure their participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process so that it is meaningful and alerts the agency to the reviewers’ position and contentions. Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft stage may be waived if not raised until after completion of the final DEIS. City of Angoon v. Hodel (9th Circuit, 1986) and Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris, 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Comments on the DEIS should be specific and should address the adequacy of the statement and the merits of the alternatives discussed (40 CFR 1503.3).

Send Comments to:

Comments-intermtn-bridger-teton@fs.fed.us

**Carole ‘Kniffy’ Hamilton
Bridger-Teton National Forest
340 N. Cache, P.O. Box 1888,
Jackson, WY 83001**

**Date Comments Must Be Received: 45 days after publication of the Notice of Availability
in the Federal Register**

Summary

Supplemental feeding of elk in western Wyoming was initially implemented on an emergency basis to prevent large-scale die-offs due to the loss of winter ranges in the early 1900's. Today the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission (WGFC) provides feed for elk at 21 state operated feedgrounds and one staging area near the communities of Afton, Jackson, Pinedale, and Big Piney during the winter months to substitute for the loss of native winter range, minimize winter mortality, and maintain robust elk populations. Elk feedgrounds also reduce depredation of private haystack yards and pastures and decrease commingling of cattle and elk.

The Bridger-Teton National Forest (BTNF) proposes to continue to authorize the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission (WGFC) to use six sites on National Forest System (NFS) land for their winter elk management programs and to authorize use of one new site. The six existing sites are Alkali Creek, Dog Creek, Fall Creek, Fish Creek, Muddy Creek, and Upper Green River. The new site is Patrol Cabin. This action is needed because the six existing authorizations have expired or will expire within the next several years and because expansion from State managed lands onto NFS land is desired at Patrol Cabin. Issues concerning this proposal include:

Issue #1. High concentrations of elk on the feedgrounds during certain soil conditions could cause soil compaction and/or increased erosion.

Issue #2. Use of the feedgrounds concentrates the elk, which could result in impacts to vegetation from browsing and trampling causing changes in vegetation type and condition, especially in sagebrush, aspen and willow stands associated with riparian/wetlands.

Issue #3. Use of the feedgrounds concentrates the elk, which could reduce stream bank stability and result in impacts to stream channel function. Surface water quality and fish habitat may also be affected by bank instability via sediment delivery and increased water temperatures.

Issue #4. Use of the feedgrounds could impact elk, wolves, scavengers, and wildlife species that utilize sagebrush and riparian habitat.

Issue #5. Use of the feedgrounds concentrates the elk, which increases the risk of transmission of brucellosis from elk to elk. Alternatives are compared in this analysis by acres of feedgrounds by alternative and a narrative describing potential for interaction between livestock and elk.

Three alternatives, including the proposed action, were developed to address the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission's elk winter management program that takes place on National Forest System lands:

- **Alternative 1 – No Action - No Special Use Authorization:** This alternative would not permit the WGFC to conduct winter elk management programs on National Forest System lands but assumes elk winter management activities would be performed on other federal, state, or private lands.
- **Alternative 2 - No Change from Current Permitted Area:** This alternative would reissue authorization for continuation of use of National Forest System lands for WGFC winter elk management programs under the same terms at the six locations

where use occurred in the recent past: Alkali Creek, Dog Creek, Fall Creek, Fish Creek, Muddy Creek, and Upper Green River. A permit would not be issued for use of the Patrol Cabin area.

- **Alternative 3 - Proposed Action:** Under the Proposed Action Alternative, the Forest Service would authorize the long term special use of National Forest System lands for the WGFC’s winter elk management programs at seven locations on the forest. The specific areas included in this action are: Alkali Creek, Dog Creek, Fall Creek, Fish Creek, Muddy Creek, Patrol Cabin, and Upper Green River. This alternative also allows expansion of the winter elk programs at Fish Creek and Muddy Creek. See Table S-1 below.

Table S-1. Alternative Comparison Table

Acres			
	Alt 1: No Authorization	Alt 2: No Change from Current Permitted Area	Alt 3: Proposed Action
Alkali Creek	0	105	105
Dog Creek	0	80	80
Fall Creek	0	54	54
Fish Creek	0	121	168
Muddy Creek	0	19	20
Patrol Cabin	0	0	88
Upper Green	0	58	58
Total	0 acres	437 acres	573 acres
Facilities			
	Alt 1: No Authorization	Alt 2: No Change from Current Permitted Area	Alt 3: Proposed Action
Alkali Creek	None Authorized	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, corrals, tack shed, elk trap, and water development	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, corrals, tack shed, elk trap, and water development
Dog Creek	None Authorized	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, corral and tack shed	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, corral and tack shed
Fall Creek	None Authorized	None Authorized	None Authorized
Fish Creek	None Authorized	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, metal Quonset, horse corral, tack shed, and elk trap,	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, metal Quonset, horse corral, tack shed, elk trap, and water facilities
Muddy Creek	None Authorized	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, a permanent elk trap, a portable elk trap, and 0.5 miles of elk proof fence	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, a permanent elk trap, a portable elk trap, 0.5 miles of elk proof fence, horse corral and water facilities
Patrol Cabin	None Authorized	None Authorized	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, horse corrals and water facilities
Upper Green	None Authorized	3 haystack yards with 3 hay sheds, granary, tack shed, horse corral, elk trap, cabin & horse pasture	3 haystack yards with 3 hay sheds, granary, tack shed, horse corral, elk trap, cabin & horse pasture

Table S-2. Summary of Effects by Alternative.

	Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 No Change	Alternative 3 Proposed Action
Project Area - Acres Occupied by Winter Elk Management Special Use Permit	0	487 acres	573 acres
Analysis Area - Area Within 1 Mile of the Special Use Permit Area	0	15,907 acres	19,509 acres
Acres of Soil Surface Potentially Detrimentially Disturbed in the Project Area	0 acres after 10 to 20 years	27.13 acres	37.14 acres
Acres of Riparian Vegetation Potentially Affected in the Project Area	0 acres after 10 to 20 years	140 acres	152 acres
Acres of Willow and Riparian Herbland Potentially Affected in the Analysis Area	653 acres	1,393 acres	1,695 acres
Acres of Sagebrush Affected in the Analysis Area	3,432 acres	11,035 acres	11,515 acres
Acres of Aspen Affected in the Analysis Area	500 acres	997 acres	1,049 acres
Distance of Stream Channel Potentially Affected	0.64 miles	2.85 miles	4.26 miles
Potential Effects to Wildlife Species	Improves habitat for species dependent upon aspen, sagebrush, willow, and cottonwood	Maintains current amount degraded habitat for species dependent upon aspen, sagebrush, willow, and cottonwood	Increases amount of degraded habitat for species dependent upon aspen, sagebrush, willow, and cottonwood
Potential for Disease Transmission Elk-to Elk	Elk would be concentrated on 17 existing and 2 new State operated feedgrounds	Elk would be concentrated on 21 existing State operated feedgrounds	Elk would be concentrated on 21 existing State operated feedgrounds, with a total increase of 86 acres of feeding area
Potential for Disease Transmission Elk-to Cattle	The 2 new feedgrounds would be closer to private land than the existing feedgrounds, increasing potential for elk-to-cattle transmission	The existing feedgrounds (and other WGFC measures) would effectively prevent elk-to-cattle transmission	The existing and proposed feedgrounds (and other WGFC measures) would effectively prevent elk-to-cattle transmission

Soils in the Project Area and Analysis Area would be affected by compaction and erosion. Concentrated occupation of the feedgrounds by elk would cause compaction because their hooves have a relatively small area and therefore exert a high pressure. Feeding equipment, horses, and machinery also would create compaction. The potential impacts on soil resources were measured by comparison of expected amount of detrimental soil disturbance by alternative.

Natural vegetation at and near the feedground sites would be affected by this proposal by elk browsing on shrubs, trees, grass, and forbs, by increased fertilization of vegetation from concentrated elk feces, suppression of vegetation by accumulation of litter, and by soil compaction and erosion. Vegetation at the existing feedgrounds was inventoried and compared to sites that have not been impacted by feedground use. Where elk are fed, vegetation species richness and diversity are reduced, and occurrence and production of exotic grass species is increased. Shrubs of low palatability are typically killed and excluded from feedgrounds by repetitive crushing or trampling from trucks/trailers, horses/feed sleighs, and/or elk. When present, shrubs and trees of greater palatability are often stunted or killed from intense browsing and trampling. Accumulation of litter (feces, unconsumed hay) is sometimes present on various areas within feedgrounds, inhibiting vegetation diversity and productivity. Feedgrounds with relatively small feeding areas, high numbers of elk, and long feeding seasons typically have larger areas of deep litter accumulation. The impacts on vegetation resources were measured by comparison of the amount of acres of vegetation affected in each alternative, including total acres and acres of sagebrush, riparian vegetation, and aspen vegetation.

Stream banks would be affected by elk trampling the vegetation and creating erosion. Water quality would then be affected by sedimentation, which would affect fish reproduction. Existing feedgrounds were inventoried to determine the current status of resources; then alternatives were compared using miles of stream channel and acres of riparian vegetation affected.

Feedground operation would affect elk by supplementing their winter diet and altering their migration patterns. It would affect wolves by concentrating their prey species. It would affect other wildlife by altering their habitat – in particular, species dependent upon riparian habitat and sagebrush habitat. Brewer's sparrow, Boreal toads, and boreal chorus frogs are three ecological indicator species that would be affected. Sage grouse, cutthroat trout and Columbia spotted frogs are three Sensitive species that would be affected. This project may impact individuals or habitat but would not likely cause species to trend towards Federal listing or cause a loss of viability for these three species. Neotropical migratory birds would also be affected by impacts to riparian vegetation. Impacts to wildlife species were compared by alternative using acres of habitat affected.

Cultural Resources, Social Resources, and Economic Resources would not be affected by this proposal.

This Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available for public review and comment for 45 days after Notice of its Availability is published in the Federal Register. Comments will be considered and responded to and a final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) will be prepared. After reviewing the FEIS, the public comment, and the agency response to comment, the Forest Supervisor of the Bridger-Teton National Forest will decide whether or not to authorize, in whole or in part, use of specific

National Forest System lands by the WGFC for their ongoing winter elk management programs. A decision concerning this project is expected in May, 2008.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION 3

DOCUMENT STRUCTURE3

BACKGROUND.....3

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION.....8

PROPOSED ACTION.....9

DECISION FRAMEWORK.....9

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT9

ISSUES9

OTHER RELATED EFFORTS 12

CHAPTER 2. ALTERNATIVES, INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION 13

INTRODUCTION.....13

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL13

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED STUDY22

COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES23

CHAPTER 3. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 25

SOILS26

VEGETATION32

HYDROLOGY43

FISHERIES.....65

WILDLIFE68

CULTURAL RESOURCES.....87

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC87

SHORT-TERM USES AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY87

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE EFFECTS.....87

IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES88

OTHER REQUIRED DISCLOSURES.....89

CHAPTER 4. CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION 90

PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS90

DISTRIBUTION OF THE DEIS.....91

APPENDICES91

REFERENCES92

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1. Approximate number of trips to stock feedgrounds with hay.	7
Table 2. List of non-significant issues and reasons for elimination.....	10
Table 3. Alternative Comparison Table	17
Table 4. Summary of Effects by Alternative.....	23
Table 5. Percent of each disturbance class.....	30
Table 6. Information related to soils.....	31
Table 7. Information related to vegetation.....	41
Table 8. Stream Channel distance and acres.....	59
Table 9. Information related to watershed resources.....	63
Table 10. Wildlife MIS on the BTNF.....	68
Table 11. Threatened and Endangered Species.....	71
Table 12. Sensitive Fish and Wildlife Species.....	72
Table 13 Effects determinations for implementing Alternatives 2 or 3.....	82
Figure 1. Elk Feedground Locations	5
Figure 2. Proposed Feedground locations in Alternative 2	15
Figure 3. Proposed Feedground locations in Alternative 3	16
Figure 4. Alkali Creek Feedground.....	18
Figure 5. Dog Creek Feedground	18
Figure 6. Fall Creek Feedground	19
Figure 7. Fish Creek Feedground.....	19
Figure 8. Muddy Creek Feedground.....	20
Figure 9. Patrol Cabin Feedground.....	20
Figure 10. Upper Green River Feedground.....	21
Figure 11. Alkali Creek Feedground.....	28
Figure 12. Dog Creek Feedground	28
Figure 13. Fall Creek Feedground	29
Figure 14. Fish Creek Feedground.....	30
Figure 15. Muddy Creek Feedground.....	30
Figure 16. Patrol Cabin Feedground.....	31
Figure 17. Upper Green River Feedground.....	29
Figure 18. Alkali Creek Feedground.....	32
Figure 19. Dog Creek Feedground	33
Figure 20. Fall Creek Feedground	33
Figure 21. Fish Creek Feedground.....	34
Figure 22. Muddy Creek Feedground.....	34
Figure 23. Patrol Cabin Feedground.....	35
Figure 24. Upper Green River Feedground.....	35
Figure 25. Total Grass, Forb, and Shrub Species	37
Figure 26. Species Diversity	38
Figure 27. Mean Density of Shrubs	39
Figure 28. Alkali Creek Feedground and NWI Wetlands	45
Figure 29. Alkali Creek Feedground Concentration Area	45
Figure 30. Dog Creek Feedground and Riparian Vegetation.....	46
Figure 31. Fall Creek Feedground and Riparian Vegetation.....	48
Figure 32 Fall Creek Impacts	49
Figure 33. Fish Creek Feedground, Wetlands, Riparian Vegetation, and GPS/Photo Points	49
Figure 34. Unstable Banks, Shallow Vegetation Roots along the Gros Ventre River	50
Figure 35. Animal Trails, Failed Bank, and Hoofprints on the East Side of Fish Creek Feedground	51
Figure 36. Muddy Creek Feedground Riparian Areas and GPS Point.....	52
Figure 37. Muddy Creek Feedground Bank Trampling.....	53
Figure 38. View Toward Riparian Area from Hay Sheds	53
Figure 39. Patrol Creek Feedground Expansion Areas.....	54
Figure 40. Headcut in Lower Coal Mine Draw	55
Figure 41. Patrol Cabin Stream.....	55
Figure 42. Unnamed Channel in Patrol Cabin	56
Figure 43. Upper Green River Feedground	57
Figure 44. Upper Green River Trailing Trampling.....	58
Figure 45. Elk on Winter Range.....	69

CHAPTER 1. PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

Document Structure

The Forest Service has prepared this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) in compliance with the *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA) and other relevant Federal and State laws and regulations. This DEIS discloses the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts that would result from the proposed action and alternatives to the proposed action. The document is organized into four chapters:

- *Chapter 1. Purpose and Need for Action:* The chapter includes information on the history of the project proposal, the purpose of and need for the project, and the agency's proposal for achieving that purpose and need. This section also details how the Forest Service informed the public of the proposal and how the public responded.
- *Chapter 2. Alternatives, Including the Proposed Action:* This chapter provides a more detailed description of the agency's proposed action as well as alternative methods for achieving the stated purpose. These alternatives were developed based on significant issues raised by the public and other agencies. This discussion also includes mitigation measures. Finally, this section provides a summary table of the environmental consequences associated with each alternative.
- *Chapter 3. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences:* This chapter describes the environmental effects of implementing the proposed action and other alternatives. This analysis is organized by resource area.
- *Chapter 4. Consultation and Coordination:* This chapter provides a list of preparers and agencies consulted during the development of the DEIS.
- *Appendices:* The appendices provide more detailed information to support the analyses presented in the DEIS.

Additional documentation may be found in the project planning record located at the Forest Supervisor's Office at 340 N Cache, Jackson, WY 83001.

Background

Supplemental feeding of elk (*Cervus elaphus*) has been conducted in northwestern Wyoming since the early 1900's. The initiation of providing supplemental feed to elk was in response to large-scale winter die-offs, which were due in part to the loss of migration routes to suitable winter range and the direct loss of winter range due to rural development and fencing (Taylor 2001). Emergency feeding was documented as early as 1907 when a Pinedale game warden provided feed for 200 snowbound elk on Willow Creek; the Supervisor of the Teton National Forest secured funds to purchase the hay (Sheldon, 1927; Brown, 1947). A 1939 Wyoming statute designates the WGFC liable for damages caused by big game animals. Many feedgrounds were established in the 1940's and 1950's to prevent elk from entering private lands and damaging stored crops.

The WGFC's supplemental elk feeding program today is a daily activity during the winter months at 21 feedgrounds and one staging area. Figure 1 displays a map of the 21 WGFC managed feedgrounds, the staging area (North Piney) and the National Elk

Refuge. Eight of the 21 feedgrounds are on NFS lands: Alkali, Dell Creek, Dog Creek, Fall Creek, Fish Creek, Forest Park, Muddy Creek, and Upper Green River.

Forest Service regulations require authorization for use and occupancy of NFS lands. Although feedgrounds were initiated to maintain elk populations, they have become an effective tool in reducing damage to haystack yards and winter pastures on private lands (WGFD 2007). Elk feeding locations have been strategically placed with the National forest and near the National Forest boundary to effectively gather elk as they transition from summer ranges down to lower elevations, mostly preventing elk migrating through private lands en route to lower elevations.

This DEIS displays the analysis of the proposal to continue to authorize the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission (WGFC) to use six sites on National Forest System (NFS) land for their winter elk management programs and to begin authorizing use of one new site. The six existing sites are Alkali Creek, Dog Creek, Fall Creek, Fish Creek, Muddy Creek, and Upper Green River. The new site is Patrol Cabin. This action is needed because the six existing authorizations have expired or will expire within the next several years and because expansion from State managed lands onto NFS land is desired at Patrol Cabin. The two existing sites that are not studied in this analysis (Dell Creek and Forest Park) have existing authorizations that expire in 2016.

Alkali Creek, Fish Creek, and Patrol Cabin feedgrounds are located within the Gros Ventre drainage northeast of the city of Jackson within the Jackson Elk Herd Unit. Daily feeding at the three feedgrounds started in the mid 1960's (WGFD 2007). Facilities and feeding areas at Alkali and Fish Creek are located on NFS lands. Patrol Cabin Feedground is operated on state managed lands. Historically these feedgrounds were operated relatively independently of each other with little interchange of elk among the three feedgrounds. Feeding at Alkali Creek, Fish Creek, and Patrol Cabin prior to 1998 saw an average of 497, 764, and 490 elk at each feedground respectively. The average length of feeding was 98 days at Alkali and Fish Creek and 89 days at Patrol Cabin. Since that time, wolf activity has influenced elk distribution in the Gros Ventre, resulting in elk aggregating into one large group of up to 2,845 animals. These elk now typically congregate on one feedground, and move to another feedground in the drainage in response to wolf pressure. The Proposed Action includes an increase in authorized area on NFS lands at Patrol Cabin and Fish Creek to accommodate the larger number of animals and decrease the density of animals on the feeding area.

WYOMING FEEDGROUND LOCATIONS




Figure 1. Elk Feedground Locations

Dog Creek (Prichard) Feedground is located south of Jackson in the Fall Creek Elk Herd Unit. The Dog Creek Feedground was established in 1951 on NFS lands. A 32-year average of 809 elk have been fed 425 tons of hay for 120 days at this site each winter. Dog Creek Feedground is located north of Highway 26, and the facilities are located within a Forest Service administrative area used for housing, the Cottonwood Work Station. There are two feeding areas at this feedground; one located on NFS lands around the administrative area, and the other is a pasture located on private land. The WGFC continues to work towards obtaining a long-term agreement with the private landowner, but has only been able to secure yearly leases to date. There have been years when the agreement with the private landowner was not secured and all winter elk management programs were conducted on NFS lands alone. Because of the inability to secure a long-term agreement with the landowner, the WGFC seeks to maintain the authorization to conduct winter elk management programs on Forest Service lands.

Upper Green River Feedground is located northeast of Bondurant in the Upper Green River Elk Herd Unit. This feedground is managed to prevent starvation of elk in the Upper Green River drainage, and supplemental feeding has occurred here for approximately 75 years (WGFD 2006). A 32-year average of 508 elk have been fed 245 tons of hay for 118 days at this site each winter. All facilities and feeding areas are located on NFS lands, including a small cabin in which the feeder typically resides during winter. This feedground became supervised by the WGFD in the winter of 1961-62.

Muddy Creek and Fall Creek feedgrounds are located near Pinedale within the Pinedale Elk Herd Unit and both were initiated around 1951. The feeding area at the Fall Creek Feedground encompasses Bureau of Land Management (BLM), NFS, and State managed lands. No facilities are located on NFS lands. A 32-year average of 632 elk have been fed 312 tons of hay for 131 days at Fall Creek Feedground each winter.

At Muddy Creek Feedground, the feeding area and facilities are located on NFS lands. A 32-year average of 575 elk have been fed 323 tons of hay for 145 days each winter. During winter 2005-2006, a 5-year experimental pilot project was initiated at this site to measure the potential for reducing brucellosis exposure rates in elk. Trapped elk are tested for brucellosis and infected elk are removed. A large, portable elk trap was erected on NFS lands for this project and approximately 150 yards of Forest Service Road #869 is plowed to allow trucks and trailers into the feedground during winter months. Additionally, approximately 1/2 mile of elk fence was erected on NFS lands across Muddy Creek Canyon to prevent elk from moving onto private lands.

See Appendix I for detailed summaries of number of elk, tons and days fed, number of dead elk, cost/elk, and tons fed/elk for each year since 1975.

During summer, WGFD personnel typically conduct maintenance on various structures (i.e., stackyards, and elk traps) on several feedgrounds. During fall, stackyards are stocked with weed-free certified hay transported on semi-trucks from various producers throughout Lincoln and Sublette Counties in Wyoming and from producers in nearby Idaho locations. Table 2 displays the average amount of hay delivered to each feedground annually.

Table 1. Approximate number of trips to stock feedgrounds with hay.

Feedground	Tons of Hay 32 Year Average	Approximate Truckloads
Alkali Creek	184	9.2
Dog Creek	425	21.25
Fall Creek	312	15.6
Fish Creek	270	13.5
Muddy Creek	323	16.15
Upper Green River	245	12.25

The majority of activity on feedgrounds occurs during the winter months. As winter nears, teams of draft horses are hauled or walked into the feedgrounds, except at Muddy Creek where the feeder utilizes a tractor. Elk behaviors are regularly observed by WGFD personnel and contracted elk feeders beginning in November to determine when feeding should be initiated. Several factors are weighed before feeding actually starts, such as number of animals in the area, amount of natural vegetation present, the possibility for co-mingling and damage, and knowledge of past elk movements.

Once the decision has been made to begin feeding the elk, the feedground supervisor or manager contacts the feeders. Two to three feeders are typically hired to feed in the Gros Ventre area. These feeders typically reside in the WGFC cabin at Patrol Cabin and utilize snowmobiles or horse teams to access all three feedgrounds. The feeder at Upper Green River is also housed in a WGFC cabin on the feedground. The feeder at Dog Creek and Muddy Creek typically drive into the feedgrounds daily to feed elk.

Elk feeders typically follow a daily routine of harnessing a team of horses and attaching them to the sleigh. They then load the sleigh with hay; except at Muddy Creek where the feeder utilizes a tractor to load hay and pull the sleigh. The feeder drives the team out onto the feedground area and distributes the hay to the elk. This process is repeated until enough hay has been spread to feed the number of elk on the feedground. The 32 year average of daily hay consumption is 8.05 lbs/elk.

The WGFD utilizes the winter months to classify the elk on the feedgrounds. This activity typically occurs in late January to February and is conducted once per feedground. Department personnel count numbers of branch-antlered bulls, spikes, cows, calves and the total number of elk on the feedground. This information is used to determine hunting seasons.

Although feedgrounds have been very effective in preventing elk depredating private crops, the artificial concentration of elk during winter and early spring perpetuates the disease brucellosis, caused by the bacterium *Brucella abortus* (Thorne et al. 1978). Transmission of *Brucella* typically occurs orally when cattle and/or elk come into contact with infected aborted fetuses, fetal membranes and fluids, or uterine discharges (Thorne et al. 1982, Cheville et al. 1998). Brucellosis seroprevalence of elk on feedgrounds averages 25 percent, while elk adjacent to feedgrounds average 2.4 percent and elk completely independent of feedgrounds have no prevalence of the disease (WGFD 2007). Brucellosis infections in cattle can impact Wyoming's Brucellosis Free status, resulting in increased testing requirements and potential trade sanctions on Wyoming's cattle producers. A major role of elk feedgrounds today is to reduce the commingling of elk and cattle for concerns over elk-to-cattle brucellosis transmission. Thus, elk feedgrounds are

both the cause and solution to the brucellosis dilemma, maintaining the disease in elk while limiting elk-to-cattle transmissions at the same time. For further details see Appendix 2, “Elk Feedgrounds in Wyoming” (WGFD 2004).

Various disease management efforts are implemented on elk feedgrounds during winter. *Brucella* strain 19 vaccination of calves is conducted annually. Vaccination occurs in late January to March and is typically conducted by the feeder. Only calves are vaccinated and typically 100% of the calves on the feedground are inoculated. The WGFD also monitors the distribution and prevalence of brucellosis on 4-6 feedgrounds a year during winter. Permanent elk traps exist on Upper Green River, Alkali, Fish Creek, and Muddy Creek feedgrounds. Elk are trapped until a sufficient sample size for 85% confidence level for brucellosis exposure rate is reached. Since 2006 Muddy Creek Feedground has been used to initiate a pilot test and removal program recommended by the Wyoming Brucellosis Coordination Team. The program involves trapping large numbers of elk and removing sero-positive elk from the population.

Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD) has recently elicited more attention because of the concern that the disease will eventually affect elk wintering on feedgrounds in western Wyoming. CWD is a chronic, fatal disease of the central nervous system of captive and free-ranging mule and white-tailed deer, elk, and moose and belongs to a group of diseases called transmissible spongiform encephalopathies (TSEs). Research suggests CWD is transmitted by animal-to-animal contact or via contamination of feed or pasture with saliva, urine and/or feces. CWD has been documented in eight states and one Canadian province, including Wyoming. To date, CWD has not been observed in elk in western Wyoming. The WGFC conducts CWD surveillance annually and detected the disease in a mule deer in 2007 within 80 miles of an elk herd unit with feedgrounds. The WGFC's *Chronic Wasting Disease Management Plan* (2006) contains actions that will be implemented if CWD is identified in elk attending feedgrounds.

Purpose and Need for Action _____

The Forest Service received a request from the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission (WGFC) to continue to use facilities on NFS lands to conduct their elk winter feeding and related management programs. Under 36 CFR 251.50, authorization is required for all uses of NFS land. This action is needed, because six existing authorizations for feedgrounds have expired or will expire within the next several years and because an expansion onto NFS lands is proposed adjacent to an existing feedground on State managed lands. The six existing sites are Alkali Creek, Dog Creek, Fall Creek, Fish Creek, Muddy Creek, and Upper Green River. The new site is Patrol Cabin. Two existing sites that are not studied in this analysis (Dell Creek and Forest Park) have existing authorizations that expire in 2016.

This action responds to the goals and objectives outlined in the *1990 Bridger-Teton National Forest Land Use and Management Plan* (FLRMP). The proposed permit areas are found mostly (about 75 percent) within Desired Future Condition Area 12 (Backcountry Big Game Hunting, Dispersed Recreation, and Wildlife Security Areas) with the remainder within Desired Future Condition Area 3 (River Recreation).

Proposed Action

The Forest Service proposes to authorize the WGFC to continue the use and occupy their facilities and structures on NFS lands for their winter elk management programs. The specific areas included in this action include: Alkali Creek, Dog Creek, Fall Creek, Fish Creek, Muddy Creek, Patrol Cabin, and Upper Green River.

Decision Framework

The Forest Service decision here is limited to the determination of whether or not the WGFC should be authorized to use NFS land for its winter elk management programs at the seven proposed locations and if authorized, what terms and conditions should be included in the authorization. The primary considerations for the Forest Service are the potential effects to land under its administration and any potential conflicts the WGFC operation may have with public uses and other National Forest programs.

Public Involvement

The Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement was published in the Federal Register on July 23, 2007. The NOI asked for public comment on the proposal from July 23, 2007 to September 17, 2007. In addition, as part of the public involvement process, the agency mailed a scoping letter describing the proposed actions and requesting comments to approximately 75 people and organizations on July 18, 2007. A news release was published in the Jackson Hole News & Guide on August 8, 2007, describing the proposed use and inviting public comment. Public meetings were held in Jackson, Wyoming on August 28, 2007 and Pinedale, Wyoming on September 4, 2007. The scoping letter, mailing list, comments received, and summary of comments are in the project file.

Using the comments from the public, other agencies, and organizations, the interdisciplinary team developed a list of issues to address.

Issues

The Forest Service separated the issues into two groups: significant and non-significant issues. Significant issues were defined as those directly or indirectly caused by implementing the proposed action. Non-significant issues were identified as those: 1) outside the scope of the proposed action; 2) already decided by law, regulation, Forest Plan, or other higher level decision; 3) irrelevant to the decision to be made; or 4) conjectural and not supported by scientific or factual evidence. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA regulations explain this delineation in Sec. 1501.7, "...identify and eliminate from detailed study the issues which are not significant or which have been covered by prior environmental review...".

The Forest Service identified the following significant issues during scoping:

Issue #1. High concentrations of elk on the feedgrounds during certain soil conditions could cause soil compaction and/or increased erosion. Alternatives are

compared in this analysis describing the current percent of detrimental soil disturbance at the feedgrounds and comparing the potential number of acres affected by alternative.

Issue #2. Use of the feedgrounds concentrates the elk, which could result in impacts to vegetation from browsing and trampling causing changes in vegetation type and condition, especially in sagebrush, aspen, and willow stands associated with riparian/wetlands. Alternatives are compared in this analysis by a narrative describing the expected vegetation changes and by a comparison of acres affected by alternative.

Issue #3. Use of the feedgrounds concentrates the elk, which could reduce stream bank stability and result in impacts to stream channel function. Surface water quality and fish habitat may also be affected by bank instability via sediment delivery and increased water temperatures. Alternatives are compared in this analysis by considering the existing condition of stream banks within and adjacent to the feedgrounds, then comparing the extent of stream banks potentially affected by the alternatives.

Issue #4. Use of the feedgrounds could impact elk, wolves, scavengers, and wildlife species that utilize sagebrush and riparian habitat. Alternatives are compared in this analysis by a narrative describing the expected displacement and habitat changes by alternative.

Issue #5. Use of the feedgrounds concentrates the elk, which increases the risk of transmission of brucellosis from elk to elk. Alternatives are compared in this analysis by acres of feedgrounds by alternative and a narrative describing potential for interaction between livestock and elk.

Table 2 lists the non-significant issues and explains why they were eliminated from detailed study.

Table 2. List of Non-Significant Issues and Reasons for Elimination

	Issue	Reason
1	Identify and disclose historical and existing migration corridors used by elk; analyze threats to continued migration; analyze potential for restoration of historical migration.	WGFD would continue to feed elk on private, state, or other federal lands, even if permits are not issued for these 7 feedgrounds. Because this activity would continue outside the jurisdiction of the Forest Service, the FS does not have the ability to affect the migratory behavior of the elk herds with this decision.
2	Elk feeding operations could contaminate ground water with fecal coliform bacteria.	This issue is conjectural and is not supported by scientific or factual evidence.
3	The agencies should spend money improving habitat instead of feeding nonnative forage to elk.	The Forest Service is working with other agencies to improve habitat on National Forest System lands. This issue is outside the scope of this planning process but is being addressed in other projects.
4	Identify and assess the impact of livestock grazing upon elk transitional and winter range. Analyze forage availability and usage of forage by livestock and wildlife. BTNF must calculate the amount of forage on winter ranges available to cervids and the carrying capacity of the range: analyze if cattle allotments need to be adjusted	Because WGFD would continue to feed on private, state, and other federal lands even if permits are not issued for these 7 feedgrounds, elk will continue to congregate on State-managed feedgrounds and therefore continue to under-utilize transitional and winter ranges regardless of the amount of forage available. Adjustments in

	to leave more forage for cervids. Weigh the public interest against the special interests of a few ranchers, who benefit by having forage on the winter range over-allocated to cattle; wildlife should have priority over cattle on public lands.	cattle allotments are beyond the scope of this planning process.
5	Identify and analyze the threat of mineral development, especially natural gas on elk winter ranges.	This document analyzes the consequences of the proposed alternatives which are specific to 7 feedgrounds. Mineral development is not proposed on these feedgrounds. Therefore this comment is beyond the scope of this planning process.
6	WGFD should not have cooperating agency status. They are proponents of the project and are not objective.	CEQ regulations state that the Forest Service retains exclusive authority to make decisions on projects or programs for which it has responsibility by law. However it is appropriate that the FS grant cooperating status to State and local agencies due to complex jurisdictional and management issues related to federal lands and the fact that state and local governments manage lands and resources which are often near, adjacent to, or intermingled with federal land. Cooperating agency status is appropriate when a State agency, such as WGFC has specialized expertise with regard to any environmental issue. In this case, WGFC has specialized expertise concerning elk and other wildlife. The fact that WGFC is a proponent is immaterial since often the FS itself is the proponent of actions being considered in an EA or EIS.
7	Analyze the economic impacts on tourism, recreation, big game hunting, and livestock interests of closing the feedgrounds versus keeping them open; especially the economic impacts of a CWD epidemic	WGFC would continue to feed elk on private, state, or other federal lands, even if permits are not issued for these 7 feedgrounds. Because this activity would continue outside the jurisdiction of the Forest Service, the alternatives displayed in this analysis are not expected to vary concerning economic effects on tourism, recreation, big game hunting, and livestock interests.
8	Elk should be protected instead of grown for hunters to kill.	The WGFC has the authority, jurisdiction, and responsibility to manage, control, and regulate fish and wildlife population on NFS lands unless federal law specifically supersedes such authority. The Forest Service is responsible for the management of NFS lands in Wyoming and the fish and wildlife habitats on these lands (FS Agreement # 00-MU-11020000-052).
9	Slaughter of seral positive elk is an indirect effect of feedground permits and should be stopped.	Test and removal is an elk management program run by the WGFC. The WGFC has the authority, jurisdiction, and responsibility to manage, control, and regulate fish and wildlife population on NFS lands unless federal law specifically supersedes such authority. The FS is responsible for the management of NFS lands in Wyoming and the fish and wildlife habitats on these lands (FS Agreement # 00-MU-11020000-052).
10	A given population should be no larger than that which the habitat can support.	While the Forest Service manages habitat that supports wildlife the State of Wyoming manages elk herd numbers.

Other Related Efforts

Documents that address issues related to supplemental elk feeding including disease, habitat impacts, and effects on other wildlife include:

- U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife and National Park Service. 2007. Bison and Elk Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for the National Elk Refuge and Grand Teton National Park
- Wyoming Game and Fish Department. Brucellosis Management Action Plans located at <http://gf.state.wy.us/wildlife/Brucellosis/index.asp>.
- Wyoming Game and Fish Department. 2007. Pinedale Elk Herd Unit Test and Removal Pilot Project Year Two: Muddy Creek Feedground 2007. Compiled by: Brandon Scurlock, Brucellosis-Feedground-Habitat Program Supervisor; located at http://gf.state.wy.us/downloads/pdf/RegionalNews/TR_report_2007_Final.pdf.
- Wyoming Game and Fish Department, 2006. Chronic Wasting Disease Management Plan. Located at: <http://gf.state.wy.us/downloads/pdf/CWDPlanapprovedbycommission2-17-06.pdf>.
- Wyoming Game and Fish Department, 2004. Elk Feedgrounds in Wyoming. Located at: <http://gf.state.wy.us/downloads/pdf/elkfg83004.pdf>

The first four documents are incorporated by reference as part of this DEIS. The last document is appended to this DEIS as Appendix 2.

The *Bison and Elk Management Plan and EIS* describes the environmental effects of the elk management programs on feedgrounds on nearby Federal lands. Many of the issues and effects are similar to the proposed action on the BTNF. The *Brucellosis Management Action Plans, Test and Removal*, and *Chronic Wasting Disease Management Plan* provide supplementary information concerning the prevalence, risks and consequences of these diseases. Operating procedures and program history are described in *Elk Feedgrounds in Wyoming*.

CHAPTER 2. ALTERNATIVES, INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

Introduction

This chapter describes and compares the alternatives considered for the long-term authorization for Wyoming Game and Fish Commission to use NFS lands for their winter elk management programs. It includes a description and map of each alternative considered. This section also presents the alternatives in comparative form, sharply defining the differences between each alternative and providing a clear basis for comparison among options.

Alternatives Considered in Detail

The Forest Service developed the Proposed Action and two alternatives in response to issues raised by the interdisciplinary team and the public.

The seven feedgrounds considered in this document are located in the Jackson and Pinedale Ranger Districts, Bridger-Teton National Forest in Teton and Sublette Counties, Wyoming. Legal descriptions for the feedgrounds are as follows:

- **Alkali Creek:** Section 23, T42N, R113W, 6th PM.
- **Dog Creek:** SE of SE 1/4 of Section 31, and SW of SW 1/4 of Section 32, T39N, R116W 6th PM; NW of NW 1/4 of Section 5 and NE 1/4 of Section 6, T38N, R116W 6th PM.
- **Fall Creek:** located in NW 1/4 of Section 6, T33N, R107W and SW of SW 1/4 of Section 31, T34N, R107W, 6th PM.
- **Fish Creek:** SW of SE of Section 1, S 1/2 of SW 1/4 of Section 1, and E 1/2 of Section 12, T41N, R112W, 6th PM; W 1/2 of NW 1/4 of Section 7, T41N, R111W, 6th PM.
- **Muddy Creek:** NW 1/4 of Section 27, T31N, R105W, 6th PM.
- **Patrol Cabin:** W 1/2 of Section 28, SE 1/4 of Section 29, and NW 1/4 of Section 33, T42N, R112W, 6th PM
- **Upper Green River:** E 1/2 of NE 1/4 of Section 9, and W 1/2 of Section 10, T39N, R109W, 6th PM.

Alternative 1

No Action - No Special Use Authorization

Under the No Special Use Authorization Alternative, use of NFS lands for WGFC winter elk management programs would not be permitted at the seven locations studied in this proposal. WGFC would re-habilitate impacts on NFS lands at the six existing feedgrounds.

The WGFC has informed the Forest Service that under this alternative, they would continue to implement their winter elk management programs with facilities and

feedgrounds at other locations on federal, state, and private lands. This includes continued operation of two feedgrounds on NFS lands at Dell Creek and Forest Park that are not included in this analysis. It also includes continued operation of thirteen State operated feedgrounds that are not on NFS lands and the feedground at the National Elk Refuge.

The future scenario assumed to be most likely for the six existing feedgrounds, and therefore used for this analysis is:

- Alkali Creek and Fish Creek: Operations would move several miles to Patrol Cabin feedground on State lands within the BTNF.
- Dog Creek: Operations would continue on the private land portion of this feedground.
- Fall Creek: Operations would continue on the BLM and private land portion of this feedground.
- Muddy Creek: Operations would move away from the BTNF to an unknown location on private, state, or other federal lands.
- Upper Green River: Operations would move away from the BTNF to an unknown location on private, state, or other federal lands.

Alternative 2

No Change from Current Permitted Area

Under the No Change Alternative, Special Use Authorizations would be reissued for continuation of use of NFS lands for WGFC winter elk management programs at the six locations where use occurred in the recent past. The specific areas addressed in this action include: Alkali Creek, Dog Creek, Fall Creek, Fish Creek, Muddy Creek, and Upper Green River. A permit would not be issued for use of the Patrol Cabin area.

Winter Elk Management Programs include feeding, capturing, vaccinating, testing, and removing seral positive elk from the BTNF. Feeders are contract employees hired by WGFC. During the feeding season, feeders live on State lands at Patrol Cabin and on NFS lands at the Upper Green River feedground. Feeders at Dog Creek and Muddy Creek typically drive into the feedgrounds daily to feed elk. Feeders travel to the feedgrounds by truck when roads are passable and by snowmobile when roads are snowbound.

Elk feeders typically follow a daily routine of harnessing a team of horses and attaching them to the sleigh. They then load the sleigh with hay; except at Muddy Creek where the feeder utilizes a tractor to load hay and pull the sleigh. The feeder drives the team out onto the feedground area and distributes the hay to the elk. This process is repeated until enough hay has been spread to feed the number of elk on the feedground. The 32 year average of daily hay consumption is 8.05 lbs/elk.

Various disease management efforts are implemented during the winter. Calves are vaccinated with *Brucella* strain 19 and typically 100% of the calves on the feedground are inoculated. Occasionally, elk are trapped on NFS lands at Alkali Creek, Fish Creek, Muddy Creek, and Upper Green River Feedgrounds. Elk are trapped and adult females

are tested until a sufficient sample size for 85% confidence level for brucellosis exposure rate is reached. Since 2006 Muddy Creek Feedground has been used to initiate a pilot test and removal program recommended by the Wyoming Brucellosis Coordination Team. Test and removal was initiated at Fall Creek Feedground in winter 2007/2008, but this activity does not occur on National Forest System land. The program involves trapping large numbers of elk and removing sero-positive elk from the population. Approximately 150 yards of Forest Service Road #869 would continue to be plowed to allow trucks and trailers into this feedground during the winter months.

During summer, WGFD personnel typically conduct maintenance on various structures (i.e., stackyards, and elk traps) on several feedgrounds. During fall, stackyards are stocked with weed-free certified hay transported on semi-trucks from various producers throughout Lincoln and Sublette Counties in Wyoming and from producers in nearby Idaho locations.

Details concerning the past and current operation at each feedground are found in Appendix 2, Elk Feedgrounds in Wyoming. Acres, structures, and maps describing Alternative 2 for each feedground are displayed in Table 3 and Figures 4 through 10. Figure 2 displays a vicinity map of this alternative.




Figure 2. Proposed Feedground locations in Alternative 2

Alternative 3

The Proposed Action – The Agency’s Preferred Alternative

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, Special Use Authorizations would be issued for use of NFS lands for WGFC winter elk management programs at the six existing locations and one new location. The specific areas included in this action include: Alkali Creek, Dog Creek, Fall Creek, Fish Creek, Muddy Creek, Patrol Cabin, and Upper Green River. Figure 3 displays a vicinity map of this alternative.

Details concerning the past and current operation at each feedground is found in the Background Section of this DEIS and in Appendix 2, Elk Feedgrounds in Wyoming. The Proposed Action differs from Alternative 2 in that it proposes authorizing a larger feeding area and a water facility at Fish Creek; a haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, horse corrals, water facilities, and additional feeding areas at Patrol Cabin Feedground; and a slightly larger authorized area, a water facility, and a horse corral at Muddy Creek Feedground.

Acres, structures, and maps describing Alternative 3 for each feedground are displayed in Table 3 and Figures 4 through 10. Figure 3 displays a vicinity map of this alternative.




Figure 3. Proposed Feedground locations in Alternative 3

Table 3. Alternative Comparison Table

Acres			
	Alt 1: No Authorization	Alt 2: No Change in Permitted Area	Alt 3: Proposed Action
Alkali Creek	0	105	105
Dog Creek	0	80	80
Fall Creek	0	54	54
Fish Creek	0	121	168
Muddy Creek	0	19	20
Patrol Cabin	0	0	88
Upper Green	0	58	58
Total	0 acres	437 acres	573 acres
Facilities			
	Alt 1: No Authorization	Alt 2: No Change in Permitted Area	Alt 3: Proposed Action
Alkali Creek	None Authorized	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, corrals, tack shed, elk trap, and water development	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, corrals, tack shed, elk trap, and water development
Dog Creek	None Authorized	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, corral and tack shed	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, corral and tack shed
Fall Creek	None Authorized	None Authorized	None Authorized
Fish Creek	None Authorized	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, metal Quonset, horse corral, tack shed, and elk trap,	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, metal Quonset, horse corral, tack shed, elk trap, and water facilities
Muddy Creek	None Authorized	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, a permanent elk trap, a portable elk trap, and 0.5 miles of elk proof fence	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, a permanent elk trap, a portable elk trap, 0.5 miles of elk proof fence, horse corral and water facilities
Patrol Cabin	None Authorized	None Authorized	1 haystack yard with 2 hay sheds, horse corrals and water facilities
Upper Green River	None Authorized	3 haystack yards with 3 hay sheds, granary, tack shed, horse corral, elk trap, cabin and horse pasture	3 haystack yards with 3 hay sheds, granary, tack shed, horse corral, elk trap, cabin and horse pasture




Figure 4. Alkali Creek Feedground




Figure 5. Dog Creek Feedground




Figure 6. Fall Creek Feedground




Figure 7. Fish Creek Feedground




Figure 8. Muddy Creek Feedground




Figure 9. Patrol Cabin Feedground




Figure 10. Upper Green River Feedground

Action Common to All Alternatives

All feedgrounds are within designated winter range; therefore public access is restricted from December 1st through 8:00 a.m., May 1st of each year as displayed on the winter travel maps. Motorized recreation use restrictions would be maintained on designated routes adjacent to and within permit areas in all alternatives, including the No Action Alternative where no use is authorized.

Actions Common to Alternatives 2 and 3

1. In Alternatives 2 and 3, WGFC employees and contractors may be permitted to have vehicular access behind locked gates on closed roads during the early and late season of the winter travel period when the roads are free of snow.
2. In Alternatives 2 and 3, WGFC may be permitted to plow snow on roads to access feedgrounds used for testing and removal activities.

Mitigation and Monitoring Common to Alternatives 2 and 3

The following measures are part of the action alternatives. The analysis displayed in Chapter 3 assumes that these practices are implemented for both Alternatives 2 and 3.

- 1) WGFC would use weed free hay to minimize the potential introduction of noxious weeds. The operation would comply with county ordinance where applicable.

- 2) WGFC would be responsible for monitoring and treating of noxious and invasive weeds within the permit area. In areas adjacent to the permitted area, the Forest Service would treat cheat grass invasions with herbicide and reseed areas with native grass adjacent to feedgrounds where cheat grass is prevalent. Monitoring would occur annually.
- 3) Forest Service monitoring of soil disturbance class, percent detrimental soil disturbance, and streambank stability at each feedground would occur about every 5 years.

Mitigation in Alternative 3 Only

The following mitigation measures are found only in the Proposed Action, Alternative 3.

- 4) WGFC would avoid using wetland areas when ever possible when the ground is not frozen. The use of the word “avoid” is deliberate. The Forest Service recognizes that there may be times when it is necessary to use these areas when they are not frozen. The primary goal is that the soil and vegetation in these areas not be damaged and that wildlife that depend on wetlands and streams not be harmed by winter elk management activities. The Forest Service and WGFD share this goal. The Forest Service would expect the WGFC to exercise their best judgment when working around these sensitive habitats.
- 5) WGFC would avoid using areas within 200 feet of perennial stream banks in the early and late season of feeding when the ground is not frozen. Throughout the feedground, feeding operations would be conducted over frozen ground as much as possible to reduce the potential for soil compaction from tractors and hooved animals. See comment regarding “avoid” in #1 above.
- 6) The Forest Service and WGFC would reduce stream bank damage by identifying specific locations for stream crossings by tractors and horses with feeding equipment.

Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study

Federal agencies are required by NEPA to rigorously explore and objectively evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives and to briefly discuss the reasons for eliminating alternatives that were not developed in detail (40 CFR 1502.14). Alternatives can be eliminated for various reasons, including that they are outside the scope of the Forest Service’s authority or responsibility, duplicative of the alternatives considered in detail, or include components that would cause unnecessary environmental harm.

Public comments received in response to the Proposed Action did not provide suggestions for alternative methods for achieving the purpose and need except that many people wanted the Forest Service to eliminate all elk feeding, improve winter range on the BTNF, and restore historical migration routes.

The Forest Service considered and dismissed from detailed consideration the alternative of stopping all elk feeding because WGFD would continue to feed elk on private, state, or other federal lands, even if permits are not authorized for feedgrounds on NFS lands. Because this activity would continue outside the jurisdiction of the Forest Service, the

agency has no ability to affect several of the impacts associated with WGFC’s winter elk management programs, including prevalence of disease or disruption of elk migration and other movements. Winter feeding, test and removal, and brucellosis vaccination of elk are elk management programs conducted by WGFC who has jurisdiction over state wildlife. Under various State authorities, the State of Wyoming is also responsible for authorization of the taking of elk, whether it be for sport hunting, disease control for wildlife or agricultural purposes, or to reduce agricultural depredation and other damage to private property. The Forest Service does not have the legal authority to regulate these programs.

Comparison of Alternatives

This section provides a summary of the effects of implementing each alternative. Information in Table 4 is focused on activities and effects where different levels of effects or outputs can be distinguished quantitatively or qualitatively among alternatives.

Table 4. Summary of Effects by Alternative.

	Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 No Change	Alternative 3 Proposed Action
Project Area - Acres Occupied by Winter Elk Management Special Use Permit	0	487 acres	573 acres
Analysis Area - Area Within 1 Mile of the Special Use Permit Area	0	15,907 acres	19,509 acres
Acres of Soil Surface Potentially Detrimentially Disturbed in the Project Area	0 acres after 10 to 20 years	27.13 acres	37.14 acres
Acres of Riparian Vegetation Potentially Affected in the Project Area	0 acres after 10 to 20 years	140 acres	152 acres
Acres of Willow and Riparian Herbland Potentially Affected in the Analysis Area	653 acres	1,393 acres	1,695 acres
Acres of Sagebrush Affected in the Analysis Area	3,432 acres	11,035 acres	11,515 acres
Acres of Aspen Affected in the Analysis Area	500 acres	997 acres	1,049 acres
Distance of Stream Channel Potentially Affected	0.64 miles	2.85 miles	4.26 miles
Potential Effects to Wildlife Species	Improves habitat for species dependent upon aspen, sagebrush, willow, and cottonwood	Maintains current amount degraded habitat for species dependent upon aspen, sagebrush, willow, and cottonwood	Increases amount of degraded habitat for species dependent upon aspen, sagebrush, willow, and cottonwood

<p>Potential for Disease Transmission Elk-to Elk</p>	<p>Elk would be concentrated on 17 existing and 2 new State operated feedgrounds</p>	<p>Elk would be concentrated on 21 existing State operated feedgrounds</p>	<p>Elk would be concentrated on 21 existing State operated feedgrounds, with a total increase of 86 acres of feeding area</p>
<p>Potential for Disease Transmission Elk-to Cattle</p>	<p>The 2 new feedgrounds would be closer to private land than the existing feedgrounds, increasing potential for elk-to-cattle transmission</p>	<p>The existing feedgrounds (and other WGFC measures) would effectively prevent elk-to-cattle transmission</p>	<p>The existing and proposed feedgrounds (and other WGFC measures) would effectively prevent elk-to-cattle transmission</p>

CHAPTER 3. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

This Chapter summarizes the physical, biological, social, and economic environments of the Project Area and the Analysis Area and the effects of implementing each alternative on that environment. It also presents the scientific and analytical basis for the comparison of alternatives presented in Chapter 2. The **Project Area** considered for this analysis includes the area proposed to be permitted for the feedgrounds. Environmental effects are also described within the **Analysis Area**, which is the area within 1 mile from the feedgrounds.

Consideration of Available Science

The techniques and methodologies used in this analysis consider the best available science. The analysis includes a summary of the credible scientific evidence which is relevant to evaluating reasonably foreseeable impacts. The analysis also identifies methods used and references scientific sources relied on. The conclusions are based on the scientific analysis that shows a thorough review of relevant scientific information. For this analysis there was not any incomplete or unavailable information that would be necessary for this determination.

The relevant science considered for this analysis consists of several key elements:

- On-site data and history.
- Scientific literature.
- Modeling using currently acceptable analysis.
- The collective knowledge of the project area by ID Team members through integration of science with local conditions.
- Comparative analysis considering other local similar projects and past monitoring data.

The determinations reached in this analysis are based upon ground reconnaissance of the proposed project area, previous monitoring of similar types of activities on NFS lands, and a review of the literature that is cited in the specialist report. The project area was surveyed and data was collected in 2007 using water quality/watershed monitoring information, riparian inventory, vegetation inventory and soil survey information. The use of Best Management Practices to ensure water quality is protected is addressed in this analysis. Relevant literature indicates that BMP's are effective in protecting water quality and long term soil productivity. Experience gained from implementation of livestock grazing plans and through observations of impacts of elk feedgrounds over the past decades has been incorporated into the analysis. The affects to resources in other similar projects in the area have been considered in the analysis.

Resource specialists determined that the potential effects of this project are predictable and well documented with no significant scientific uncertainties or risks associated with this proposal.

Soils

A. Issues to be Addressed

Issue #1. High concentrations of elk on the feedgrounds during certain soil conditions could cause soil compaction and/or increased erosion. Alternatives are compared in this analysis describing the current percent of detrimental soil disturbance at the feedgrounds and comparing the potential number of acres affected.

B. Existing Conditions

Soil compaction. This impact occurs in response to pressure (weight per unit area) exerted by machinery or animals. The risk for compaction is greatest when soils are wet. Compaction negatively affects vegetation by reducing the uptake of water and nutrients, reducing plant vigor. Compaction also decreases infiltration and thus increases runoff and the hazard of water erosion (USDA 1996). Grazing by large animals such as elk and cattle can cause compaction because their hooves have a relatively small area and therefore exert a high pressure. Platy soil structure⁴ and high penetration resistance are the primary indicators of compaction. Soil scientists measured compaction on the feedgrounds by digging soil pits and observing soil structure, plant rooting, and penetration resistance, and collecting bulk density⁵ samples.

Active erosion. *Erosion* is the detachment and transport of individual soil particles, or aggregates of particles, by wind, water, or gravity. Management practices may increase the hazard of soil erosion when ground cover is removed and soil particles are detached. Surface or particulate erosion occurs as the loss of soil by gravity (dry ravel), by wind, or by gravity and water, including raindrop splash and overland flow (rill and/or sheet erosion). Mass wasting occurs when large masses of soil and/or rock

⁴ In platy soil structure, the soil units are flat and plate-like. They are generally oriented horizontally. Platy structure is usually found in subsurface soils that have been subject to leaching or compaction by animals or machinery. Platy structure tends to impede the downward movement of water and plant roots through the soil.

⁵ Soil weight is referred to as soil bulk density. Density is the mass of material contained within a given volume.

fall, slide, or flow down a slope. Indicators of erosion include pedestaling⁶ of plants, presence of rills and gullies, exposed roots and lichen lines on rocks.

Detrimental Soil Disturbance. Soils are considered detrimentally disturbed when one or more of the above indicators is rated unsatisfactory. Regional handbook guidelines state that no more than 15 percent of an activity area should have detrimentally disturbed soil after the completion of all management activities (grazing cycle). In other words, at least 85 percent of an activity area (feedground) should be in a non-detrimentally disturbed condition (FSH 2509.18 – R4 Supplement 2003).

Alkali Creek Feedground: At the Alkali Creek Feedground, sheds are located and direct feeding occurs on NFS land. The soil profile description was classified as a coarse-loamy, mixed, superactive, xeric haplocryalf. Soils at this and other feedgrounds are affected by compaction from elk, horse, and cross country use of the hay wagon. Detrimental soil disturbance in the activity area identified is 8 percent (80 percent confidence interval). Some level of compaction was identified in about one fourth of the area, but not all was severe enough to be considered detrimental. The main detrimental soil condition was compaction, identified by strong platy structure and verified by bulk density samples.



View of feedground, corral, and shed

View north of feedground

⁶ Pedestaling is a condition where the soil has eroded from around individual plants, leaving them on small pedestals of soil.



Figure 11. Alkali Creek Feedground

Dog Creek Feedground: At this site, sheds are located on-forest and direct feeding occurs both on- and off-forest. Effects to adjacent NFS land were assessed. The soil profile description was classified as a coarse-loamy over sandy skeletal, mixed, active, oxyaquic haplocryept. Detrimental soil disturbance in the activity area identified is 2 percent (80 percent confidence interval). Some level of compaction was identified in about one tenth of the area, but not all was severe enough to be considered detrimental. The main detrimental soil condition was compaction, identified by strong platy structure and verified by bulk density samples.



Feedground

Wetlands at Dog Creek

Figure 12. Dog Creek Feedground

Fall Creek Feedground: At Fall Creek Feedground, sheds are located off-forest and direct feeding occurs on NFS land and on adjacent properties. Effects of the presence of this feedground on NFS land, cumulative with all other uses, were assessed. The soil profile description was classified as a coarse-loamy, mixed, superactive, pachic argicryoll. Detrimental soil disturbance in the activity area

identified is 8 percent (80 percent confidence interval). Some level of compaction was identified in about one fifth of the area, but not all was severe enough to be considered detrimental. The main detrimental soil condition was compaction, identified by strong platy structure and verified by bulk density samples.



Sparse groundcover near boundary fence



Soil profile.

Figure 13. Fall Creek Feedground

Fish Creek Feedground: At the Fish Creek feedground, sheds are located and direct feeding occurs on NFS land. The soil profile description was classified as a fine-loamy, mixed, superactive, calcic argicryoll. Detrimental soil disturbance in the activity area identified is 8 percent (80 percent confidence interval). Some level of compaction was identified in about half of the area, but not all was severe enough to be considered detrimental. The main detrimental soil condition was compaction, identified by strong platy structure and verified by bulk density samples.



View from river across feedground to sheds



View from river up valley across feedground




Thick organic surface layer

Soil profile.

Figure 14. Fish Creek Feedground

Muddy Creek Feedground: At the Muddy Creek Feedground, sheds are located and direct feeding occurs on NFS land. Detrimental soil disturbance in the activity area identified is 2 percent (80 percent confidence interval). The main detrimental soil condition identified was compaction and the soil profile description was classified as a coarse-loamy, mixed, superactive, pachic haplocryoll. Cattle were present along the riparian area during the site visit, but bank disturbance was minimal (estimated to be less than 20 percent).



View of sideslope and dry tributary behind sheds

Soil profile

Figure 15. Muddy Creek Feedground

Patrol Cabin Feedground: At this site, facilities are located and direct feeding occurs on state land. Effects on adjacent NFS land were assessed. The soil profile description was classified as a coarse-loamy mixed, superactive, calcic argicryoll. Detrimental soil disturbance in the activity area identified is 7 percent (80 percent confidence interval). Some level of compaction was identified in about one third of the area, but not all was severe enough to be considered detrimental. The main detrimental soil condition was compaction, identified by strong platy structure and verified by bulk density samples.



Non-system route on NFS lands adjacent to feedground.

View across Gros Ventre River

Figure 16. Patrol Cabin Feedground

Upper Green River Feedground: At the Upper Green River Feedground, sheds are located and direct feeding occurs on NFS land. Detrimental soil disturbance in the activity area identified is 4 percent (80 percent confidence interval). The main detrimental soil condition identified was compaction. The soil profile description was classified as a coarse-loamy, mixed, superactive, pachic argicryoll.



Feedground sheds

Soil profile

Figure 17. Upper Green River Feedground

C. Effects of the Alternatives

1. Direct and Indirect Effects of Issuing No Special Use Authorization (Alternative 1)

With the removal of the feed and associated infrastructure, elk would no longer be attracted to these areas and the vehicular impacts of hauling the hay would cease. Soils within the Project Area would gradually recover over a period of 10 to 20 years. Compaction would dissipate over time and as the vegetation returned to its natural condition, the site would begin to stabilize, thus reducing erosion.

It is expected that winter elk management programs would continue to occur on state, private, and federal land adjacent to Dog Creek, Fall Creek, and Patrol Cabin Feedgrounds. Compaction would persist in the Analysis Area adjacent to these ongoing feedgrounds, however this amount is not significant. The amount of compaction in the Analysis Area was not measured because compaction measured within the feedgrounds was less than the Regional Handbook guidelines of 15%.

2. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 2 – No Change from Current Permitted Area

- Table 5 summarizes the results of soil disturbance transects established for each feedground.

Table 5. Percent of each disturbance class and percent detrimental disturbance at each feedground.

Feedground	Class 0	Class I	Class II	Class III	% Detrimental Disturbance	n @ 80% C.I.
Patrol Cabin	0	23	65	12	7	43
Alkai Creek	0	22	78	0	8	49
Fall Creek	0	48	50	2	8	49
Fish Creek	0	37	59	4	8.2	49
Dog Creek	0	20	70	10	2.2	30
Muddy Creek	0	56	42	2	2	30
Upper Green	0	40	54	6	4	30

The following “Disturbance Classes” are based on visual observations made at each point along each transect:

- Class 0 indicates that no disturbance has occurred
- Class I indicates that compaction in the surface layer is greater than that observed under natural conditions and erosion is minimal.
- Class II indicates that increased compaction is present in the 10–30 centimeter range, platy structure is generally continuous, large roots may penetrate the platy structure, but fine and medium roots may not.
- Class III indicates that compaction is continuous deep in the soil profile (more than 30 centimeters). Erosion and other signs of soil movement are evident. Platy structure is continuous and large roots do not penetrate. (R1 Soil Quality

Monitoring Protocol 2007). All seven feedgrounds analyzed in this document currently have less than 15 percent of their areas in a detrimentally disturbed soil condition (defined in FSH 2509.18 Chapter 2).

Detailed results for each transect within a feedground are available in the soils specialists report in the project record. Continuing winter elk management programs on the feedgrounds would likely maintain the current level of impacts. In Alternative 2, detrimental soil disturbance is expected on 27.13 acres.

All of the sites where feeding occurs directly on NFS lands had a noticeably thick organic surface horizon due to manure inputs. This layer ranges from about 6-10 centimeters and was noted, but not considered detrimental to soil resource condition. The soil resources in the activity areas are moderately compacted due to the current use as elk feedgrounds, plus cumulative effects from other uses such as cattle grazing. Some of the areas, such as Dog Creek and Upper Green River, are naturally more resistant to compaction than other sites due to inherent soil characteristics.

3. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 3 – Proposed Action

Under Alternative 3, increasing the size of Fish Creek and Muddy Creek feedgrounds and extending Patrol Cabin Feedground onto NFS land would extend the soil compaction impacts to 86 acres of land previously not directly used for elk management. The additional impacts are expected to be within acceptable ranges for soil compaction. Detrimental soil disturbance is expected on 37.14 acres in Alternative 3.

4. Cumulative Effects

Potential cumulative effects related to soil resources for the Winter Elk Management Program Special Use Permit Proposal were considered within the Analysis Area – the area within 1 mile of each feedground. This area was chosen for analysis of potential cumulative effects because resource specialists noted that the vegetative impacts of browsing were noticeable (in decreasing magnitude) up to 1 mile from the feedground. The area of vegetation impacts would correlate to the area of soil impacts, since soil impacts are related to compaction from concentrated elk use.

Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable management actions that could compact or erode soil resources in the Analysis Area include livestock grazing, vehicular use on roads, off road vehicle use, recreation trails, wildlife and livestock trailing, and dispersed camping. Table 6 displays data about management actions.

Table 6. Information Related to Soils Resources Considered in the Cumulative Effects Analysis

Acres of NFS lands within the Project Area	0 Acres Alt 1 487 Acres Alt 2 573 acres Alt 3
Acres of NFS lands within the Analysis Area	19,509 Acres
Authorized Feedgrounds within Active Grazing Allotments	Fall Creek, Muddy Creek, Patrol Cabin, Upper Green River Lakes
Acres of Active Grazing Allotments within the Analysis Area	15,603 Acres

Miles of Roads within the Analysis Area	69.1 Miles
Miles of Trail within the Analysis Area	15.6 Miles
Feedgrounds Popular For Dispersed Recreation and Camping or Used For Administrative Uses	Dog Creek, Fall Creek, Muddy Creek, Patrol Cabin

Detrimental soil disturbance is a concern because it reduces the productivity of the land and affects water quality. The detrimental soil disturbance analysis described in the existing conditions and alternative comparison sections of this report includes the combination of effects of all management actions within the Project Area. This includes impacts from winter elk management, livestock grazing, dispersed camping use, and motorized and non motorized travel on and off roads and trails. All of the Project Area met Regional Standards for detrimental disturbance of less than 15%. Impacts to soil resources decreased within the Analysis Area with increased distance from the feedground. Therefore, detrimental disturbance within the Analysis Area would be less than within the Project Area.


Vegetation

A. Issues to be Addressed

Issue #2. Use of the feedgrounds concentrates the elk, which could result in impacts to vegetation from browsing and trampling causing changes in vegetation type and condition, especially in sagebrush and in aspen and willow stands associated with riparian/wetlands. Alternatives are compared in this analysis by a narrative describing the expected vegetation changes and by a comparison of acres affected by alternative.

B. Existing Conditions

Alkali Creek Feedground: At the Alkali Creek Feedground, the vegetation community consists mainly of grasses and some scattered aspen, conifer, and sagebrush.



Effects on vegetation

Aspen stand in feedground

Figure 18. Alkali Creek Feedground

Dog Creek Feedground: At this site, the vegetation community contains an overstory of mature cottonwoods. Brome grass is the primary understory species, but willows, roses, serviceberry and cattails are present.



Aspen and cottonwood stand

View across feedground

Figure 19. Dog Creek Feedground

Fall Creek Feedground: At this site, the vegetation community consists mostly of brome grass and scattered sagebrush.



View of National Forest land adjacent to feedground.

Figure 20. Fall Creek Feedground

Fish Creek Feedground: At this feedground, the vegetation community primarily consists of elk sedge, brome grass, and scattered sagebrush and cinquefoil.



Near 100% ground cover.

View of sheds and corral

Figure 21. Fish Creek Feedground

Muddy Creek Feedground: At the Muddy Creek Feedground, the vegetation community consists primarily of a mix of brome grass, red top, basin wild rye, and crested wheatgrass. A few scattered annual mustard species are present. Aspen occurs along the creek, dying in a few places, but regenerating stems are also present.



View of sheds and corrals.

View upstream across feedground area.

Figure 22. Muddy Creek Feedground

Patrol Cabin Feedground: On the Patrol Cabin Feedground, the vegetation community consists primarily of basin big sagebrush and Idaho fescue.



View of feedground and barns.

View upstream of tributary to GrosVentre River

Figure 23. Patrol Cabin Feedground

Upper Green River Feedground: The vegetation community on the Upper Green River Feedground consists primarily of brome grass with scattered sagebrush and cinquefoil.



View across feedground, up the Green River valley. View across feedground.

Figure 24. Upper Green River Feedground

Plant Management Indicator Species

Management Indicator Species (MIS) are those species whose population changes are believed to reflect the effects of land management activities. Six Sensitive Plant Species and one Ecological Indicator Species (aspen) are considered MIS on the BTNF. The six sensitive plants are not known or suspected to occur in the Project Area. Quaking aspen is found throughout Wyoming’s major mountain ranges and makes up about 9 percent of the total forested land base on the BTNF. Aspen is

generally considered a seral species in the Rocky Mountain Region, rapidly pioneering disturbed areas, but eventually being replaced by more shade-tolerant conifers.

Aspen is found throughout the Analysis Area in small scattered stands consisting primarily of mature to over-mature trees with very little regeneration. About 985 acres of aspen are found within the Analysis Area (1 mile radius from the feedgrounds. Most aspen within the Analysis Area is impacted by elk (over-browsed and debarked trees).

C. Effects of the Alternatives

Assessments of vegetative impacts from winter elk management in the Project Area and in the Analysis Area suggest that where elk are fed, vegetation species richness and diversity are reduced, and occurrence and production of exotic grass species (e.g., smooth brome, *Bromus inermis*) is increased. (Dean and Hornberger 2006) Shrubs of low palatability (e.g., sagebrush, *Artemisia spp.*) are typically killed and excluded from feedgrounds by repetitive crushing or trampling from trucks/trailers, horses/feed sleighs, and/or elk. When present, shrubs (e.g., serviceberry, *Amelanchier alnifolia*) and trees (e.g., aspen, *Populus tremuloides*) of greater palatability are often stunted or killed from intense browsing and trampling. Although moderate accumulation of litter (feces, unconsumed hay) can fertilize and stimulate plant growth, deep accumulation is sometimes present on various areas within feedgrounds, inhibiting vegetation diversity and productivity. Feedgrounds with relatively small feeding areas, high numbers of elk, and long feeding seasons typically have larger areas of deep litter accumulation. Vegetative impacts are diminished on sites where winter elk management has been discontinued for 20 to 30 years (Dean and Hornberger 2006).

Species Richness and Diversity

High duration and/or high frequency grazing by native ungulates on herbaceous vegetation can alter species composition (Kay and Bartos 2000) and increase dominance by exotic grasses (Kay 1990, from Kay and Bartos 2000). Areas within any vegetation community that receives frequent disturbances typically have altered, often reduced, species richness and diversity (Dale et al. 2000). Although observed species richness did not statistically differ, there were greater numbers of grass, forb, and shrub species encountered on reference (undisturbed) sites than feedground (disturbed) sites (Figures 25 and 26). Species diversity indices indicated differences between feedground and reference sites on Dog Creek, Muddy Creek, and Upper Green River sites. These results suggest that increased levels of disturbance on feedground sites result in decreased species diversity.




Figure 25. Total grass, forb, and shrub species encountered on feedground and paired reference sites on USFS lands, western Wyoming. Species richness does not differ ($\chi^2_{2, 140} = 0.20, P = 0.90$) among categories between feedground and reference sites.




Figure 26. Mean Shannon-Wiener (A) and Simpson’s (B) species diversity indices on USFS lands of Alkali (Alk), Fish Creek (Fish), Patrol Cabin (PC), Dog Creek (DC), Fall Creek (FC), Green River Lakes (GRL), and Muddy Creek (MC) feedgrounds and respective paired reference sites within the Gros Ventre River drainage, south Jackson (S. Jack.) area, and Wind River Range, western Wyoming. Shannon-Wiener ($F_{13, 140} = 11.56, P < 0.001$) and Simpson’s ($F_{13, 140} = 9.00, P < 0.001$) indices differed among sites. “*” denotes difference ($P \leq 0.007$) between individual feedground and respective paired reference site.

Basal Ground Cover

Previous research has shown that on sites within aspen/sagebrush ecotypes, basal cover of litter (primarily plant matter) increases with exclusion of grazing/browsing by native ungulates and livestock (Kay and Bartos 2000). On feedgrounds, however, qualitative visual observations have suggested that areas on some feedgrounds have extreme loads of litter (i.e., elk feces, unconsumed hay) resulting from numerous years of deposition. Excessive deposits of litter may preclude growth of some vegetation species, reduce species richness and diversity, and provide conditions where some vegetation species (i.e., noxious and invasive weeds) can dominate (Dean and Hornberger 2006). These excessive deposits of litter due to winter elk management could exacerbate cumulative impacts from livestock grazing on riparian and adjacent areas (USDA Forest Service 1990, pp 334). Refer to technical report for basal ground cover specifics.

Shrub Densities and Composition

Qualitative visual assessment of impacts to shrub communities on feedgrounds has suggested that winter elk management operations reduce or completely exclude shrubs from most areas on feedgrounds (Dean and Hornberger 2006). Sagebrush communities that receive chronic disturbances at short intervals typically have low densities of young shrubs or no shrubs at all, and are often converted to vegetation communities dominated by herbaceous, primarily grass, species (Figure 27). The relatively high shrub densities observed on feedgrounds within the Gros Ventre River valley may be explained by minimal feedground operation disturbances on NFS lands encompassing those feedground areas.




Figure 27. Mean (+SE) density of shrubs encountered on USFS lands of Alkali Creek (Alk), Dog Creek (DC), Fall Creek (FC), Fish Creek (Fish), Muddy Creek (MC), Patrol Cabin (PC), and Green River Lakes (GRL) feedgrounds and respective paired reference sites within the Gros Ventre River drainage, south Jackson (S. Jack.) area, and Wind River Range, western Wyoming.

Assessments of indirect vegetative impacts to areas off of and adjacent to elk feedgrounds suggest that browsing of palatable shrubs and trees and consumption of herbaceous forage are extensive up to 1 mile from the feedground, often impacting the seral-stage of vegetation communities (WGFD, unpublished data). Vegetative impacts based on visual estimation are generally limited to 2 kilometers from feedgrounds (Dean and Hornberger 2006).

Aspen browse-use in treatment areas substantially decreased on transects greater than 1 mile from Soda Lake feedground near Pinedale, Wyoming (WGFD, unpublished data). Conversely, browse use on aspen stands 1.6 to 6.4 kilometers from Jewett Feedground along the Wyoming Range front show that use levels did not decrease. However, in most cases, based on visual estimates, vegetative impacts are limited to 2 kilometers from feedgrounds. Browse-use within this 2-kilometer range surpassed 20 percent, and production of new sprouts (suckers) did not exceed 2,361 stems/hectare; 83 percent of these stems are less than 1 meter in height, suggesting low regeneration (WGFD, unpublished data).

Effects on aspen stands in the feedgrounds' vicinities consist of over-browsed and debarked trees. These effects would continue under these two alternatives. Stands closest to the winter elk management areas would eventually be lost due to excessive use by elk. Aspen within 1 mile of the feedgrounds make up a small percentage of the amount of aspen in the affected watersheds. Therefore, local impacts (individual stands) are severe, but overall impacts to aspen on a landscape scale are small.

Noxious Weeds

Occurrence of noxious weeds on feedgrounds is currently minimal (Dean and Hornberger 2006), likely due to successful efforts by WGFC to identify and control weed infestations promptly. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Chapter 2 concerning weeds should result in continued minimal evidence of weeds.

1. Direct and Indirect Effects of Taking No Action (Alternative 1 – No Special Use Authorization)

If winter elk management is discontinued at Alkali Creek, Fish Creek, Muddy Creek, and Upper Green River feedgrounds, vegetation would increase in diversity and shrub densities. Observations on previously fed upon areas suggest that vegetation would revert to a more natural, pre-feeding condition after 20-30 years (Dean and Hornberger 2006).

Some of the aspen stands in the Analysis Area would recover over time, but given the current condition of the stands within 1 mile of the feedgrounds, some would never recover and would be lost as the stands die. The amount of currently decadent aspen that would be expected to die is extremely small and would not affect habitat requirements for any other species of plant or animal.

Winter elk management would continue to occur adjacent to NFS lands at Dog Creek, Fall Creek, and Patrol Cabin Feedgrounds, therefore vegetation effects would continue in Alternative 1 on NFS lands within 1 mile of these feedgrounds. These areas would also continue to be vulnerable to invasive species, however standard operating procedures in place by the WGFC are expected to be effective in controlling any infestation that occurs.

2. Direct and Indirect Effects under Alternative 2 – No Change from Current Permitted Area

The existing feedgrounds have been in operation for over 50 years. The impacts to the vegetation described earlier in this section are the result of that operation. The situation appears stable. No additional impacts are expected over time for the 467 acres in the existing feedgrounds and the Analysis Area surrounding them.

3. Direct and Indirect Effects under Alternative 3 – Proposed Action

Under Alternative 3 – the Proposed Action, 135 acres of NFS lands are added to the feed areas at Fish Creek, Muddy Creek, and Patrol Cabin feedgrounds. One acre is requested at Muddy Creek Feedground for the addition of a horse corral. Although these acres have already been affected by the winter elk management that has occurred over the past 50 years on adjacent lands, additional impacts would occur as feed is distributed over these new areas. Plant species diversity and shrub density would decrease in the long-term within the additional area to mimic that of existing conditions on areas where feeding has occurred for many years. A total of 573 acres would be affected within the Project Area for this alternative. A small amount of vegetation within the Analysis Area (1 mile) would have increased effects in relationship to this increased area.

4. Cumulative Effects

General impacts of winter elk management on vegetation communities are the conversion of sagebrush upland, aspen, and willow/cottonwood riparian ecotypes to those dominated by herbaceous species, primarily grasses, with reduced species richness and diversity. The potential for cumulative effects related to vegetation resources for the Winter Elk Management Program Special Use Permit Proposal was considered within the Analysis Area – the area within 1 mile of each feedground. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable management actions that could convert sagebrush uplands and willow/cottonwood riparian ecotypes in the Analysis Area include livestock grazing, sagebrush herbicide treatment (SPIKE), and prescribed fire. Wildfire is not a management action; however its effect is similar to prescribed fire. Table 7 displays data about wildfire and the management actions by Alternative.

Table 7. Information Related to Vegetation Resources Considered in the Cumulative Effects Analysis

Acres of NFS lands within the Project Area	0 Acres Alt 1 487 Acres Alt 2 573 acres Alt 3
Authorized Feedgrounds within Active Grazing Allotments	Fall Creek, Muddy Creek, Patrol Cabin, Upper Green River Lakes
Acres of NFS lands within the Analysis Area	19,509 Acres
Acres of active grazing allotments within the Analysis Area	15,603 Acres
Acres of Sagebrush Treatment within the Analysis Area	564 Acres (Spike near Fall Creek Feedground in 1998)

Acres of Wildfire within the Analysis Area within the past 30 years	6,717 Acres
Acres of Prescribed Fire within the Analysis Area within the past 30 years	1,868 Acres
Acres by Vegetation Type Within the Analysis Area	985 Acres Aspen 64 Acres Aspen/Conifer Mix 211 Acres Cottonwood 788 Acres Grassland/Forbland 11,515 Acres Mixed Sagebrush 126 Acres Mountain Shrubland 304 Acres Riparian Herbland 1,391 Acres Willow

All of the analyzed feedgrounds are located near water and in some locations typically experience an increase in herbaceous production from increased fertilization due to moderate accumulations of concentrated elk feces. These aspects contribute to make feedground sites attractive for cattle grazing. Four of the feedground Project Areas are within active livestock grazing allotments (Fall Creek, Muddy Creek, Patrol Cabin, Upper Green River Lakes). Alkali Creek, Dog Creek, and Fish Creek are not within active allotments, but livestock from adjacent allotments have been known to graze at Alkali and Fish Creek Feedgrounds. Thus, observed impacts to vegetation on feedgrounds are not entirely due to winter elk management operations alone. High duration and/or high frequency grazing by livestock can substantially alter vegetation communities (Belsky et al. 1999) and reduce species richness (Fleischner 1994).

The cumulative effect of livestock grazing in combination with continued heavy browsing by elk in the winters could prevent suppressed willow plants in wet meadow habitat from recovering to a healthy condition within and adjacent to feedgrounds. Approximately 1,400 acres of willow habitat are located within the Analysis Area (one mile radius) of the feedgrounds, but the most severe impacts would likely occur only within the 150 acres of riparian habitat that occur within and immediately adjacent to the Project Area. Past livestock grazing and elk feedground use has also cumulatively affect the suppression of sagebrush and other mountain shrubland growth within the Project Area and a small portion of the Analysis Area immediately adjacent to the Project Area. Approximately 86 acres NFS lands are proposed to be added to the Project Area in Alternative 3. Conversion from sagebrush, mountain shrubland, and willow habitat to grassland habitat would be expected on these acres as a cumulative impact of elk feedground use and livestock grazing.

The impacts to sagebrush created by herbicide treatments, wildfire and prescribed fire are temporary. Natural succession will result in treated or burned areas becoming vegetated with grass and forbs, then transitioning to sagebrush upland or willow/cottonwood riparian ecotypes over time. No cumulative effects are expected from the combination of winter elk management programs and past sagebrush conversion projects and past, present or future prescribed fire or wildfire events.

Hydrology

A. Issues to be Addressed

Issue #2. Use of the feedgrounds concentrates the elk, which could result in impacts to vegetation from browsing and trampling causing changes in vegetation type and condition, especially in sagebrush and in aspen and willow stands associated with riparian/wetlands. Alternatives are compared in this analysis by a narrative describing the expected vegetation changes and by a comparison of acres affected by alternative.

Issue #3. Use of the feedgrounds concentrates the elk, which could reduce stream bank stability and result in impacts to stream channel function. Surface water quality and fish habitat may also be affected by bank instability via sediment delivery and increased water temperatures. Alternatives are compared in this analysis by considering the existing condition of stream banks within and adjacent to the feedgrounds, then comparing the extent of stream banks potentially affected by the alternatives.

B. Existing Conditions

The hydrology Analysis Areas used for this project consist of the feedgrounds and nearby (generally within 200 feet) water bodies, riparian areas, and wetlands that may be affected by actions associated with the alternatives. Other activities within 1 mile of the feedgrounds are also considered if they may cumulatively impact streams, wetlands, and riparian areas.

Field visits were made to all the feedgrounds during fall 2007. Observations of riparian and stream channel conditions, along with photographs of conditions, provide the basis for information provided in this report.

Wetlands and riparian areas: Two data sources are used to show potential wet areas on maps in this report. The first data source is the Bridger-Teton National Forest 2007 vegetation map. Dominant land cover, canopy closure, and tree size classes are mapped to a scale of 1:100,000, based on field survey and remote sensing data. Riparian areas are mapped down to a minimum polygon size of two acres (upland vegetation is mapped down to five acres). Riparian map groups include areas dominated by cottonwoods, riparian herblands, and willows.

The second data source is the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI). The NWI was created, and is managed, by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which is the principal federal agency responsible for providing information to the public on the extent and status of the nation's wetlands. The NWI is comprised of maps showing different types of wetlands, based on USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle maps. Source imagery for the NWI is from the 1980's for the portions of the Bridger-Teton National Forest that have been mapped (most, but not all, of the forest has been mapped and digital data are available). Three main systems of wetlands occur in the feedground areas: the names of these wetland systems are displayed in the map legends in this report, but the systems are not differentiated. The systems are (Cowardin et al., 1979):

- ◆ Lacustrine: The lacustrine system includes lakes and reservoirs, including intermittent lakes and dammed river channels.
- ◆ Palustrine: The palustrine system includes wetlands traditionally called such names as marshes, swamps, bogs, fens, and prairies. It also includes small, shallow, permanent or intermittent water bodies (ponds). Palustrine wetlands may be shoreward of lakes or river channels, in floodplains, in isolated basins, or on slopes. They may occur as islands in lakes or rivers, too.
- ◆ Riverine: The riverine system is located in stream channels. Water is usually, but not always, flowing through this system.

Floodplains: Base (or 100 year) floodplains are mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and information is available on Flood Insurance RateMaps (FIRMs) which cover feedgrounds in Teton County (available at <http://www.bepreparedtc.com/Flood>). Feedgrounds in Sublette County are not covered by FIRMs: mapping excludes NFS lands.

Water Quality: There are no 303(d) listed streams associated with any of the feedgrounds. These are streams where the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality has determined that water quality is either impaired or threatened. The list is updated every two years as required by Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act. In addition, no municipal watersheds are associated with any of the feedgrounds. Water quality data cited in this document was collected by Sublette County Conservation District.

Alkali Creek Feedground: There are no perennial streams within the Alkali Creek Feedground and no intermittent channels were seen during the field visit. No base floodplains are affected by use of this feedground. Two areas totaling two acres were mapped as wetlands in the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI). (Figure 28).

The first mapped wetland is immediately north of the hay sheds. It is a grassed swale that may be a seasonal wetland; it was dry at the time of the field visit (September 12, 2007). Willow, sedges, and grasses are present here, and the wetland is in good condition. Vegetation is robust and there is no excessive erosion taking place. A second wetland is at the north end of the feedground. It is a dry depression without wetland characteristics where elk feed (hay) has been scattered. As a consequence of elk use in the winter and livestock use in the summer, vegetation in this area is trampled and large areas of bare soil are exposed. (Figure 29).

Figure 28. Alkali Creek Feedground and NWI wetlands





Figure 29. Alkali Creek Feedground concentration area

Dog Creek Feedground: This feedground is located in the Snake River Canyon, within the 100-year floodplain of the Snake River as mapped by FEMA on FIRMs. Mapped wetlands and riparian areas totaling 66 acres overall are shown in Figure 30.

Figure 30. Dog Creek Feedground wetlands and riparian vegetation



The northern portion of the feedground consists of abandoned Snake River stream channels that are now vegetated swales. Most of the area is vegetated with grasses and cottonwoods (many are decadent, although some sprouting is taking place) and is used as a horse pasture. Cottonwood regeneration is inhibited by browsing. One small wetland is located in the northwest portion of the feedground, in one of the old channels; it is about 400 square feet in size and is indicated in Figure 30. Mint and willow were found at the site, and the soils were very dark and moist on September 20, 2007. No trampling was evident at the wetland.

Another possible seasonal wetland was mapped in the National Wetlands Inventory. The vegetation consists of a large stand of reed canary grass (probable identity) and it is located in a low spot near the center of the feedground.

Wetlands exist throughout the southern half of the feedground area. These are associated with the open water along Pritchard Creek on the western edge of the feedground, extending well into the feedground boundary. Wetlands are also found

adjacent to scattered ponds near the southern tip of the feedground. No measurable impacts to these areas from elk were noted.

Pritchard Creek Pond and Pritchard Creek are both classified as Class 2AB waters by Wyoming DEQ (http://deq.state.wy.us/wqd/WQDrules/Chapter_01.pdf). Class 2AB waters are those known to support game fish populations or spawning and nursery areas at least seasonally and all their perennial tributaries and adjacent wetlands and where a game fishery and drinking water use is otherwise attainable. Class 2AB waters are also protected for non-game fisheries, fish consumption, aquatic life other than fish, primary contact recreation, wildlife, industry, agriculture and scenic value uses.

Water quality is not apparently being degraded by elk feedground operations. Riparian areas are in overall good condition. There are no visible signs of nutrient enrichment and elk do not appear to be congregating near open water bodies.

Fall Creek Feedground: There are no important water bodies within the feedground, however Fall Creek is just north of the feedground boundary (within 150 feet). Riparian vegetation and the feedground boundary are shown in Figure 31. The USFWS has not yet inventoried wetlands in this area. The only apparent wetlands observed during site reconnaissance for this project were along Fall Creek, outside the Project Area. FEMA has not mapped floodplains on the BTNF in this area, but mapping downstream from the BTNF boundary, adjacent to the feedground, shows no floodplains mapped along Fall Creek. The northern portion of the feedground may be within the 100-year floodplain.




Figure 31. Fall Creek Feedground and riparian vegetation

While Fall Creek has good bed armor from cobble- and coarse gravel-sized materials, the banks are mostly fine-grained and susceptible to damage from trampling. The combination of dispersed camping, associated roads, cattle use, and elk use are causing trampled banks and compacted riparian soils, resulting in a widened channel with poorly defined banks (Figure 32). This change in channel cross-section is reducing the ability of the channel to effectively carry water flows and sediment loads. As a channel becomes over-widened, discharges of water that normally maintain the channel’s shape (“bankfull” flows) are no longer as effective in maintaining the channel’s form. This reduces the ability of the channel to carry sediment loads being delivered to the channel. Overbank (flood) flows also become less common, reducing floodplain and riparian functions. Lack of well established riparian vegetation is contributing to poor streambank condition and poor stream cover along reaches of the stream that do not have a tree overstory. The riparian condition and stream channel condition are in a downward trend.


Fall Creek is not classified by the Wyoming DEQ, but a nearby lake, Burnt Lake, is a class 2AB water. See information under the Dog Creek feedground for a description of this classification.



Figure 32.
Fall Creek
impacts

Fish Creek Feedground: The Fish Creek Feedground is located on the Gros Ventre River and portions of it are within the 100-year floodplain, as mapped by FEMA. Locations of GPS/photo points, mapped NWI wetlands, and riparian vegetation are shown in Figure 33. Sixty-one acres of the current feedground are mapped as either wetland or riparian.

Figure 33. Fish Creek Feedground wetlands, riparian vegetation, and GPS/photo points



Most of the stream banks of the Gros Ventre River along the east side of the feedground are unstable. This appears to be due to a combination of animal use and the stream’s naturally dynamic nature. Observations within the current feedground area on September 10, 2007 found that there are long reaches of unstable (eroding) bank, and there is little instream cover from overhanging banks and from vegetation. Fish habitat surveys from 1998 stated that there were no more than 70% stable banks. 2003 fish habitat surveys in the same vicinity noted that 40% to 50% of the banks were stable. Comparison of these two surveys would indicate a downward trend in bank stability over time. The 2003 survey noted that grazing impacts from both elk and cattle were present.

Minor willow is present; it is very small in stature and very sparse. Vegetation roots are too shallow to hold banks effectively, especially on the outside of meanders (Figure 34). Point bars appear to be actively building, which is helping to maintain overall width-depth ratios as the banks erode.



Figure 34. Unstable banks, shallow vegetation roots, along the Gros Ventre River. East side of Fish Creek Feedground.

Cattle and wildlife trail along the top of the left bank (facing downstream). There appeared to be little current year trampling, but trampling from previous years was evident and several areas of failed bank were associated with hoof prints and trails (Figure 35).



Figure 35. Animal trails, failed bank (and bank likely to fail in the future), hoof prints evident. East side of Fish Creek Feedground.

An old meander near the corral, in the north-central portion of the current feedground area (shown in Figure 33), has characteristics of both riparian and upland communities. It is likely seasonally wet, but was dry at the time of the field visit. Elk pellets were plentiful in the meander, but it is in good condition with no noticeable bare ground and no accelerated erosion taking place.

The Gros Ventre River, along the northern edge of the current feedground area, appears similar to the stream on the eastern side of the feedground: actively eroding

banks, little cover, few willows, actively-building point bars. Trampling and vegetative damage from cattle and elk as well as natural stream characteristics, contribute to streambank instability.

An area adjacent to, but north of, the existing feedground is being proposed as an extension of the feedground (it is shown in Figure 33 as the polygon at the north of the feedground). It abuts the south bank of the Gros Ventre River downstream from the current feedground. Elk pellets were abundant in this area at the time of the field visit. As in the upstream reaches of the Gros Ventre River, banks were mostly unstable, there was little instream cover being provided by stream banks and vegetation, and there was little willow regeneration which is occurring primarily on point bars. The ground between the road and the river has been trampled while wet and, as a result, is very hummocky.

The abandoned meander south of the GPS point shown at the north end of the feedground in Figure 33, in the proposed expansion area, has sedge, grasses, and *potentilla anserina* (a weakly facultative⁷ wet plant that does not necessarily indicate riparian or wetland conditions). The abandoned meander may be seasonally wet but was dry at the time of the field visit.

The Gros Ventre River is classified as a Class 2AB water by Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality. See information under the Dog Creek feedground for a description of this classification. No water quality data is recorded for the Gros Ventre River in the Environmental Protection Agency's storage and retrieval database or in Forest Watershed data files. In addition, there is no information about water quality data in the *Teton Division Landscape Scale Assessment* or in The Teton Conservation District files. The beneficial uses of water associated with the 2AB classification are being supported according to WGFDD information available through the Bridger-Teton National Forest Fisheries department.

Muddy Creek Feedground: This feedground is located in a riparian area at the edge of the National Forest. It is long and narrow, concentrating use along Muddy Creek due to steep adjacent side slopes. Figure 36 shows riparian vegetation mapped by the Forest Service (a total of 6 acres); the USFWS has not inventoried wetlands in this area. No floodplains are mapped by FEMA on the National Forest in this area, but mapping immediately downstream from the Forest boundary does not indicate the presence of a notable floodplain along Muddy Creek.

⁷ A plant that can live in wetlands but may also occur in drier environments.




Figure 36.
Muddy Creek
Feedground,
riparian areas,
and GPS point

Livestock were present during the field visit on September 19, 2007. The stream channel was stable and riparian vegetation was robust upstream from (east of) the GPS point. At the GPS point, cattle grazing impacts started to become evident: bank trampling and use of herbaceous vegetation became noticeable. Bedding areas near the creek were also evident here. Moving further downstream, trampling became more noticeable—more so than riparian vegetation utilization (Figure 37). Approximately 25% of the length of stream banks downstream from the GPS point was trampled at the time of the site visit. Trampling is leading to channel widening and increased susceptibility of the channel to erosion during spring runoff.

Figure 37. Muddy
Creek Feedground,
bank trampling



Impacts to riparian shrubs and aspen are also evident in the riparian area. The aspens in Figure 37 show that elk have been browsing on them. Shrubs decrease in vigor (become more decadent) and abundance moving downstream from the GPS point to the hay sheds (Figure 38).

Figure 38. View toward riparian area from hay sheds



Muddy Creek has not been classified by Wyoming DEQ, but Muddy Lake (in the stream's headwaters) is a class 3B. According to State water quality standards, "Class 3B waters are tributary waters including adjacent wetlands that are not known to support fish populations or drinking water supplies and where those uses are not attainable. Class 3B waters are intermittent and ephemeral streams with sufficient hydrology to normally support and sustain communities of aquatic life including invertebrates, amphibians, or other flora and fauna which inhabit waters of the state at some stage of their life cycles." (available at http://deq.state.wy.us/wqd/WQDrules/Chapter_01.pdf) Muddy Creek appears to be supporting these designated beneficial uses, and so meets State water quality standards.

Patrol Cabin Feedground: The existing feedground is not on NFS land, but the two proposed additions are. Both sites were visited in 2007. The Project Area boundary, GPS points, National Wetlands Inventory wetlands, and riparian vegetation are shown in Figure 39. Three acres of the proposed addition south of the Gros Ventre River have riparian vegetation. The existing elk feedground includes a section of the 100-year floodplain of the Gros Ventre River, but both proposed additions on National Forest land are outside the floodplain.




Figure 39. Patrol Cabin Feedground expansion areas

In Figure 39, the channel of Coal Mine Draw shown in the northern parcel is an intermittent, incised channel in a deep draw. Discontinuous headcuts are present in the lower reaches of the draw (just above and below the road) (Figure 40). The lowermost portion below the road (on State managed land) is an alluvial fan. There is no riparian vegetation along the channel and no evidence of heavy animal use. Elk are trailing along the terraces above the draw: there are trails that lead off side slopes, across the draw, and other trails along the draw edge on the terraces which contribute to erosion.



Figure 40. Headcut in lower Coal Mine Draw

There is a spring-fed stream on the current feedground on State managed land. A stream survey was conducted there in 2007, approximately 100m west of the haysheds. The

channel is sinuous with a gentle gradient, having predominantly fine gravel sized bed materials, and having very low bankfull width/depth ratios (Rosgen, 1996). Vegetation is the main source of bank stability for these streams and bank materials are typically finer than bed materials. Figure 41 shows the surveyed channel reach on State managed lands.



Figure 41.
Patrol Cabin
stream –
surveyed
reach.

While channel dimensions are within the normal range for the stream type, there is evidence that animal trampling is affecting the channel. The channel is downcutting. Bank full channel widths along the length of the study reach range from 3.3 feet to 14.0 feet (median of 5.6 feet), indicating that some portions of the channel are widening. The sites having the greatest widening are associated with recent hoof shears or areas of unstable banks from past impacts. Channel widening is one of the first signs of a decrease in channel function and floodplain function. In the case of this stream, maintenance of local water tables would be the most important floodplain function lost with channel widening. Overall, this stream is still functioning, but its condition is declining due to bank trampling. Banks are destabilized and downcutting is leading to the loss of water table and riparian vegetation extent.

The proposed southern parcel on NFS lands has an active, intermittent channel that leads to the Gros Ventre River. The site was visited on October 25, 2007 and water from a recent snowfall was present in the channel. The stream channel originates upstream (southwest of) the road as an area of ponding and shallow channels. Silver sage is present along the upper end of the channel, indicating possibly moist conditions (Figure 42).



Figure 42.
Unnamed channel
in the Patrol Cabin
expansion, south
parcel

Large numbers of elk pellets, and some cattle droppings, were seen in the meadow where the stream flows. The area, including streambanks, is being trampled and the channel loses its form as it flows through the meadow. Just above the road, the channel becomes incised and develops multiple channels, due, in part, to the effect of the road. The lower (northern) reach of the channel is actively cutting and material is raveling off the channel banks and adjacent side-slopes.

Upper Green River Feedground: The Upper Green River Feedground consists of two areas on either side of the Green River (Figure 43).




Figure 43. Upper Green
River Feedground and
riparian vegetation

The USFWS has not yet inventoried wetlands in this area, however, the BTNF vegetation survey documents five acres of riparian vegetation. Floodplains have not been mapped by FEMA on the BTNF in this area. The local reach of channel appears relatively straight with a moderately confined channel, high width-depth ratio, and a gravel/cobble-dominated bed. Stream banks on the Green River are comprised of finer materials than the main bed of the stream.

There were approximately 30 cattle in the feedground area at the time of the field visit (September 18, 2007). A potential riparian area is shown at the GPS point indicated within the southern portion of the feedground in Figure 43. The vegetation in this area (some rushes, very coarse grass) had been lightly grazed: there was abundant high stubble remaining. The ground in this area was hummocked, but was dry at the time of the field visit.

Observations made at the GPS point on the south bank of Green River showed very little sign of elk (almost no pellets). The wet areas along the stream were hummocky and willows were browsed; this appeared to have been from cattle. Drier areas having shorter grasses, poa, cinquefoil, Artemisia, and buckwheat, were not hummocked, but had abundant animal trails in the riparian area, and further shrub browsing. Banks were quite uniformly and freshly trampled by cattle (Figure 44).



Figure 44. Upper Green River--trailing, trampling

On the north side of the river, the southeast portion of the feedground was mapped as having riparian vegetation by the Forest Service in 2007 (see Figure 43). This portion of the feedground area has quite a bit of hummocked ground, and was moderately grazed by cattle at the time of visit. The north bank of Green River is moderately unstable in this area.

Green River is a Class 1 water of the State from the mouth of New Fork River to the Wilderness boundary. Class 1, or Outstanding Waters “are those surface waters in which no further water quality degradation by point source discharges other than from dams will be allowed. Non-point sources of pollution shall be controlled through

implementation of appropriate best management practices. Pursuant to Section 7 of these regulations, the water quality and physical and biological integrity which existed on the water at the time of designation will be maintained and protected...” (WDEQ, 2001)

The Sublette County Conservation District (SCCD) has been sampling water quality on Green River and its major tributaries since 2001. The upstream-most sampling station, GR1, is located approximately 4.5 miles upstream from the project area, 0.5 mile downstream from the outlet of lower Green River Lake. A second sampling site, GR2, is located approximately 1.5 miles upstream from the National Forest boundary, downstream from Kendall Warm Springs and Stinky Spring, and approximately 12 miles downstream from the project area. Among other parameters, temperature, turbidity, total suspended solids (TSS) and nutrients (an indicator of fecal enrichment) were sampled. Sampling results for the stretch of the Green River on NFS lands indicate that management activities are not having a measurable impact on water quality, and water quality is meeting State standards.

C. Effects of the Alternatives

It is widely known that bank alteration by livestock trampling can be an important source of stream channel and riparian degradation (e.g., Clary and Webster, 1989, 1990; Belsky, et al., 1999). Impacts may include channel widening (and loss of ability of flood flows to access floodplains), loss of riparian vegetation (which then makes banks more vulnerable to further erosion), localized lowering of water tables in riparian areas (and loss of water storage in floodplains and stream channels), and changes in sediment transport capacity. Aside from one case study, cited below, no documentation of the effects of wildlife feedgrounds on aquatic and riparian resources could be found.

Effects attributed to operation of the feedgrounds as described below are based on observations of existing conditions and impacts, and information from WGFC on elk behavior in the feedgrounds. Effects of trampling and riparian vegetation use on stream channels are based on knowledge gained from grazing allotments (and other management activities) and cited in the literature, behavior of various stream types and their responses to management activities (as described in Rosgen, 1996), and observations made in the field. Water quality impacts are based on whether BMPs are being met. Where BMPs are effective in maintaining riparian conditions, water quality would be expected to follow suit. In the case of Green River, existing data are used to evaluate impacts to water quality. Table 8 displays the distance of stream channel and acres of riparian vegetation within the Project Area potentially affected by feedground use by Alternative.

Table 8. Stream Channel Distance and Acres of Riparian Vegetation in the Project Area on NFS lands Potentially Affected By Alternative

Feedground		Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3
Alkali Creek	Stream Distance	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet
	Riparian Vegetation	0 acres	2 acres	2 acres
Dog Creek	Stream Distance	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet
	Riparian Vegetation	0 acres	66 acres	66 acres
Fall Creek	Stream Distance	2,300 feet	2,300 feet	2,300 feet
	Riparian Vegetation	0 acres	0 acres	0 acres
Fish Creek	Stream Distance	0 feet	1 mile	2 miles
	Riparian Vegetation	0 acres	61 acres	70 acres
Muddy Creek	Stream Distance	0 feet	2,540 feet	2,540 feet
	Riparian Vegetation	0 acres	6 acres	6 acres
Patrol Cabin	Stream Distance	0 feet	0 feet	1,600 feet
	Riparian Vegetation	0 acres	0 acres	0.5 acres
Upper Green River	Stream Distance	0 feet	3,850 feet	3,850 feet
	Riparian Vegetation	0 acres	5 acres	5 acres
Total	Stream Distance	0.64 miles	2.85 miles	4.26 miles
	Riparian Vegetation	0 acres	140 acres	149.5 acres

1. Effects of Taking No Action (Alternative 1 – No Special Use Authorization)

Alkali Creek: There is no non-NFS land adjacent to this feedground. Therefore if the WGFC continued to feed elk on private, state, or other federal land, it would be far enough away that this area would no longer be affected. If use of this feedground was no longer authorized, riparian vegetation would recover on a one acre portion of the site that is currently trampled with bare soil exposed. There are no stream channels affected at this feedground.

Dog Creek: The only impacts due to current winter elk management on riparian areas or hydrological function at this feedground are in the northern portion of the feedground (old channels), where cottonwoods are damaged by elk browsing. Winter elk management would be expected to continue on private lands immediately north of the feedground, therefore impacts and resource condition trends would likely continue to reflect those that currently exist on this feedground. No measurable impacts to the wetland areas in the south end of the feedground from elk are expected.

Fall Creek: Winter elk management is expected to continue on Bureau of Land Management lands and State managed lands adjacent to (west of) the feedground; therefore riparian impacts due to animal use would continue, albeit at lower levels, due to the presence of hay nearby. This, in combination with continued road and dispersed recreation impacts, would lead to a continued downward trend in riparian area conditions. Potential impacts from winter elk management would continue along approximately 2,300 feet of Fall Creek channel within the Analysis Area, north of the Project Area. No riparian vegetation occurs within the Project Area.

Fish Creek: Eliminating feed here would reduce cattle attraction, and elk and cattle-related impacts, along the Gros Ventre River. Potential impacts would be eliminated along approximately 2.1 miles of channel within, and near, the boundary of the feedground.

Muddy Creek: Adverse impacts to Muddy Creek and its riparian area would be reduced if winter elk management ended. Potential impacts would be eliminated along approximately 2,540 feet of Muddy Creek channel within, and near, the boundary of the feedground. Six acres of riparian vegetation would improve in condition over time.

Patrol Cabin: In this alternative, no permit would be issued for a feedground on the National Forest at this location, so no additional impacts to stream channels or riparian vegetation would occur on National Forest lands.

Upper Green River: Impacts due to elk are combined with the effects of cattle grazing. If no winter elk management were permitted at this location stream bank stability would improve on the northern side of the river. Potential impacts from winter elk management would be eliminated along approximately 3,850 feet of channel between the two portions of the feedground.

2. Direct and Indirect Effects under Alternative 2 – No Change from Current Permitted Area

Alkali Creek: Elk would continue to congregate in the one area currently showing impacts. One acre of riparian vegetation would be affected.

Dog Creek: Winter elk management would not impair hydrologic or wetland function in the southern and central portion of the feedground. Cottonwoods on the north end of the feedground would continue to be damaged by browsing.

Fall Creek: Stream banks would be affected by animals (both cattle and elk). Bank stability would continue to degrade along Fall Creek as feeding continues to attract animals to this area. Riparian vegetation adjacent to the feedground would continue to be affected. Stream channel in Fall Creek would be affected for 2,300 feet.

Fish Creek: Impacts would occur on both sides of the Gros Ventre River and would include one mile of stream. The existing condition and trend of riparian and stream channel conditions would continue, with continued high streambank instability, exacerbated by ungulate trampling and river crossing (when frozen) by horse drawn feed wagons.

Muddy Creek: Stream channel stability would continue to decline as animals trample banks, and riparian shrubs would continue to decline in vigor. Six acres of riparian vegetation and 2,540 feet of stream channel would be affected.

Patrol Cabin expansion: In Alternative 2, no permit would be issued for a feedground on the National Forest at this location, so no additional impacts to stream channels or riparian vegetation would occur on NFS lands.

Upper Green River: Five acres of riparian vegetation would be affected. The banks of the Green River would be affected by feeding sleds crossing the river.

3. Direct and Indirect Effects under Alternative 3 – Proposed Action

Alkali Creek: Elk would continue to congregate in the one area currently showing impacts. One acre of riparian vegetation would be affected.

Dog Creek: Winter elk management would not impair hydrologic or wetland function in the southern and central portion of the feedground. Cottonwoods on the north end of the feedground would continue to be damaged by browsing.

Fall Creek: Stream bank stability would continue to degrade along Fall Creek as feeding continues to attract animals to this area. Riparian vegetation adjacent to the feedground would continue to be affected. Stream channel in Fall Creek would be affected for 2,300 feet. The mitigation measure avoiding feeding within 200 feet of channels when the ground is not frozen would reduce the potential for adverse effects under Alternative 3 but would not totally eliminate impacts. This would lead to reduced attraction of animals near the stream and reduced impacts to Fall Creek for 1,000 feet of channel.

Fish Creek: Feeding operations would be limited to the west side of the creek in Alternative 2 and would include two miles of stream. No river crossing by horse drawn feed wagons would occur in Alternative 3. WGFC would avoid feeding within 200 feet of perennial streams when the ground is not frozen. This measure would reduce the potential intensity of the impacts due to reduced attraction of animals to the stream. The existing condition and trend of riparian and stream channel conditions would continue, with continued high streambank instability, exacerbated by ungulate trampling.

Muddy Creek: Stream channel stability would continue to decline as animals trample banks, and riparian shrubs would continue to decline in vigor. Six acres of riparian vegetation and 2,540 feet of stream channel would be affected. The mitigation measure of avoiding feeding within 200 feet of channels when the ground is not frozen would reduce the potential for adverse effects under Alternative 3, but would not totally eliminate impacts. The addition on one acre within this feedground under Alternative 3 would not affect hydrologic resources.

Patrol Cabin expansion: Under Alternative 3, winter elk management would take place in the Coal Mine Draw and Yellowjacket Flat areas. Direct impacts to the channel in Coal Mine Draw would occur under Alternative 3, especially where there are existing headcuts. Direct and indirect impacts would also occur to riparian areas in the Yellowjacket Flat areas. Because the channel in this area is not perennial, the mitigation measure addressing channel protection would not apply and channel

trampling would occur with the additional attractant of feed. Three acres of riparian vegetation and 1,600 feet of stream channel would be affected under Alternative 3.

Upper Green River: Five acres of riparian vegetation would be affected. The banks of the Green River would be affected by feeding sleds crossing the river. Mitigation measure #5 of avoiding feeding within 200 feet of perennial stream banks when the ground is not frozen would reduce the potential for adverse effects from trampling under Alternative 3, but would not totally eliminate trampling impacts. Mitigation measure #6 requiring identification of specific locations for stream crossings would also protect streambanks and riparian vegetation. Feeding sleds do not cross the river when it is not frozen.

4. Cumulative Effects

Management actions that could contribute cumulative effects related to hydrology resources for the Winter Elk Management Program Special Use Permit Proposal were considered within the Analysis Area – the area within 1 mile of each feedground. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable management actions that could trample riparian vegetation, damage streambanks, affect channel function, and affect water quality include livestock grazing, vehicular use on road, off road vehicle use, recreation trails, wildlife and livestock trailing, and dispersed camping. One planned future project, enhancement of wetlands north of the Fish Creek feedground could also result in cumulative effects. This wetland enhancement project is designed to improve elk forage and swan habitat. Forage improvement in this area would lead to elk congregation, resulting in continued trampling and browsing impacts in the feedground, especially in the northern portion closest to the enhancement area.

Table 9 displays data about the management actions and resources considered for watershed cumulative effects by Alternative.

Table 9. Information Related to Watershed Resources Considered in the Cumulative Effects Analysis

Acres of NFS lands within the Project Area	0 Acres Alt 1 487 Acres Alt 2 573 acres Alt 3
Authorized Feedgrounds within Active Grazing Allotments	Fall Creek, Muddy Creek, Patrol Cabin, Upper Green River Lakes
Acres of Riparian Vegetation within the Project Area	0 Acres Alt 1 140 Acres Alt 2 152 acres Alt 3
Acres by Vegetation Type Within the Analysis Area	211 Acres Cottonwood 788 Acres Grassland/Forbland 304 Acres Riparian Herbland 1,391 Acres Willow
Distance of Stream Channel Potentially Affected	4.3 Miles
Acres of NFS lands within the Analysis Area	19,509 Acres
Acres of Active Grazing Allotments within the Analysis Area	15,603 Acres
Miles of Roads within the Analysis Area	69.1 Miles
Miles of Trail within the Analysis Area	15.6 Miles

Although off road motorized use is presently allowed in portions of the Analysis Area, actual use is light. The BTNF is presently developing a travel management plan that will restrict all motorized use to a designated road and trail system. This expected future action would reduce the potential for riparian area impacts from off road use. The limited amount of use on open roads and trails that would continue after the Travel Plan is approved is not expected to contribute to cumulative effects for watershed resources in the Project Area or Analysis Area.

Although the combination of livestock grazing, dispersed recreation use, and winter elk management programs has resulted in a downward trend in several riparian areas, as identified in this text, standards and guidelines in the FLRMP are currently being met.

Fisheries

Information provided in this DEIS about fisheries is excerpted from The Fisheries Report for the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission Winter Elk Management Program-Non-Recreation Special Use Permit Renewal by David Fogle and Joseph Neal, November 2007. The full text of this report is incorporated by reference.

A. Issues to be Addressed

Issue #3. Use of the feedgrounds concentrates the elk, which could reduce stream bank stability and result in impacts to stream channel function. Surface water quality and fish habitat may also be affected by bank instability via sediment delivery and increased water temperatures. Alternatives are compared in this analysis by considering the existing condition of stream banks within and adjacent to the feedgrounds, then comparing the extent of stream banks potentially affected by the alternatives.

B. Existing Condition

The elk feedgrounds are located in two major drainages that contain different species of native cutthroat trout. Both river basins have cutthroat trout species that are classified as game species and Species of Concern with the Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Management Indicator Species (Ecological) for riparian habitat in the *1990 Bridger-Teton National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan*, and Sensitive Species for the Intermountain Region of the Forest Service.

Alkali Creek, Dog Creek, Fish Creek, and Patrol Cabin feedgrounds are in the Upper Snake River drainage of the Columbia River and contain Snake River fine-spotted cutthroat trout (SRC). SRC are found throughout much of their original range in the Snake River portion of the Analysis Area (Van Kirk and Benjamin 2001). Muddy Creek, Fall Creek, and Upper Green River feedgrounds are in the Upper Green River drainage of the Colorado River system and are within the historic range of Colorado River cutthroat trout (CRT). CRT are limited in the Project Area streams from competition with non-native salmonids and habitat loss from water diversions. The streams within these feedgrounds contain primarily brook, brown, and rainbow trout. The Green River Basin also supports four endangered fish species, none of which are potentially impacted by the proposed special use permit.

Alkali Creek, Fish Creek, and Patrol Cabin feedgrounds are located in the upper GrosVentre River basin. The Gros Ventre River is generally stable but lacks suitable stream substrate for good trout reproduction (WGFD 2004). Dog Creek Feedground is located in the Snake River – Fall Creek basin. This feedground is located near the confluence of the Snake River and Dog Creek. Flows in the Snake River are regulated by Jackson Lake Dam and Dog Creek is free flowing. The Snake River and Dog Creek have relatively stable and healthy riparian vegetation but the fishery is limited by reduced winter flows from Jackson Lake Dam and tributaries with gradients too high for good trout reproduction (WGFD 2004).

The Fall Creek, Muddy Creek and Upper Green River feedgrounds are located in the upper Green River basin. The Upper Green River Feedground is on the Green River

and is impacted by dispersed recreation year around (camping, hunting, fishing, hiking, snowmobiling, etc.) as well as livestock grazing and timber harvest. Fall Creek Feedground is located on Fall Creek below Burnt Lake. The feedground is located on BLM, WGFC, and USFS lands. Feeding occurs only on NFS lands and impacts are due to the concentration of elk. Fall Creek is also impacted by dispersed recreation. The section of stream between the feedground and Burnt Lake is denuded of vegetation and the soil resources are affected by dispersed camping use. The Muddy Creek Feedground is located on Muddy Creek just inside the Bridger-Teton National Forest boundary. Access is through private land and the gate into the feedground is closed and often locked. Primary impacts to this area are livestock use and hunters during the fall season (reopening closed roads and driving off-road).

C. Effects of the Alternatives

1. Direct and Indirect Effects of Taking No Action (Alternative 1 – No Special Use Authorization)

Streams within and adjacent to the feedgrounds are generally frozen and are in low flow condition during the time winter elk management takes place. Timing (late winter) and conditions (snow cover) limit impacts to the fishery from stream bank and in-stream disturbance at most feedground locations in the Snake River drainage. Feeding takes place away from the river and streams at Dog Creek (Snake River) and Alkali Creek and does not have direct effects to the fishery. Fish Creek and Patrol Cabin feedgrounds are located near the Gros Ventre River and Fish Creek but no direct effects to stream channels have been observed in Stream Habitat Inventories (BTNF 2003).

At two feedgrounds in the Green River drainage (Muddy Creek, and Upper Green River feedgrounds) winter elk management is conducted on both sides of the flowing water. Crossing the streams with hay wagons and congregating the elk on the stream banks does create bank damage. Bank damage affects fish habitat by reducing vegetative cover, and adding sediment to the water which may increase stream temperature and affect fish reproduction. Closing the Muddy Creek and Upper Green River feedgrounds would have measurable positive effects on individual fish or fish populations in the Green River drainage.

Trails created by animals moving into and out of the feedgrounds provide a source of sediment to enter streams during the snow free times of the year, which would impact fish reproduction down stream from the feedgrounds. Elk also browse on willow and cottonwood vegetation and have impacted the age composition favoring mature plants and reducing regeneration. Stream Habitat Inventory for the Gros Ventre River at Patrol Cabin feedground indicates a higher rate of willow browsing inside the feedground than up or downstream. Stream bank vegetation benefits fish by providing shade that reduces water temperature. Discontinuing feeding in Fish Creek Feedground along the Gros Ventre River would improve riparian conditions and therefore improve fish habitat.

Winter elk management operations are expected to continue on private and BLM lands adjacent to Fall Creek and on state lands at Patrol Cabin. Effects on fishery resources on NFS lands near these two feedgrounds would continue under Alternative 1, affecting 0.64 miles of stream.

2. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 2 – No Change in Permitted Area

Under Alternative 2, there are no direct effects on fisheries due to continuing winter elk management at Alkali Creek, Dog Creek, and Fish Creek feedgrounds. See “Direct Effects of Alternative 1” above.

Continuing winter elk management would have measurable direct effects on fisheries in the Green River drainage. Operations at Fall Creek, Upper Green River, and Muddy Creek feedgrounds would negatively affect individual fish or fish populations due to stream bank damage caused by elk crossing the streams repeatedly and hay wagons crossing the stream at Muddy Creek and Upper Green River feedground.

Indirect effects of trails created by animals moving into and out of the feedgrounds would provide a source for sediment to enter streams during the snow free times of the year that would impact fish reproduction down stream from all of the feedgrounds. Elk also browse on willow and cottonwood vegetation and have impacted the age composition favoring mature plants and reducing regeneration along streams. In Alternative 2, a total of 2.85 miles of stream channel would be potentially affected.

3. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 3 – Proposed Action

Under Alternatives 3, there are no direct effects on fisheries due to winter elk management at Alkali Creek, Dog Creek, Fish Creek, and Patrol Cabin feedgrounds. See “Direct Effects of Alternative 1” above. Expanding the feedgrounds on Fish Creek and Patrol Cabin feedgrounds would have no measurable direct effects on fish populations.

Continuing winter elk management would have measurable direct effects on fisheries in the Green River drainage. Operations at Fall Creek, Upper Green River, and Muddy Creek feedgrounds would negatively affect individual fish or fish populations due to stream bank damage caused by hay wagons and elk crossing the streams repeatedly. Implementation of Mitigation Measure #6 (Identifying specific crossing locations) reduces but does not eliminate this impact. Under Alternative 3, expanding the area of feeding on Muddy Creek Feedground will not have a measurable direct effect on fish populations.

Indirect effects of trails created by animals moving into and out of the feedgrounds would provide a source for sediment to enter streams during the snow free times of the year that would impact fish reproduction down stream from all seven of the feedgrounds. Elk also browse on willow and cottonwood vegetation and have impacted the age composition favoring mature plants and reducing regeneration along streams. These impacts would continue under Alternatives 2 and 3. In Alternative 3, a total of 4.26 miles of stream channel would be potentially affected.

4. Cumulative Effects

The potential for cumulative effects related to fisheries resources for the Winter Elk Management Program Special Use Permit Proposal was considered within the Analysis Area – the area including and within 1 mile of each feedground. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable management actions that could affect fishery resources in the Analysis Area include livestock grazing, vehicular use on roads, off

road vehicle use, recreation trails, wildlife and livestock trailing, and dispersed camping. Please refer to the Cumulative Effects text in the Vegetation and Hydrology sections of this report for discussion of effects to riparian vegetation and stream health.

Within the Analysis Area, soil disturbance and riparian vegetation damage are also caused by livestock grazing, roads, recreation trails, off road vehicle use, and natural landslides. Four of the seven feedgrounds (Fall Creek, Fish Creek, Patrol Cabin, and Upper Green River) are within active grazing allotments and are affected by livestock grazing/browsing/trampling in addition to elk grazing/browsing/trampling. Effects of sediment entering streams, stream bank damage, and riparian vegetation reduction that could be negatively affecting fish habitat in the vicinity of feedgrounds are compounded by the presence of livestock.

As mentioned in “Existing Conditions”, the Upper Green River Feedground is also impacted by dispersed recreation year around (camping, hunting, fishing, hiking, snowmobiling, etc.), as well as firewood gathering and timber harvest nearby. Fall Creek feedground is impacted by campers on the forest in the summer and fall. The section of stream between the feedground and Burnt Lake is denuded of vegetation and the soil has been affected. Cumulative impacts to Muddy Creek Feedground include hunter-use during the fall season (reopening closed roads and driving off-road).

The operations proposed in Alternative 2 have been ongoing for over 50 years and no cumulative impacts to fisheries have resulted. The small amount of additional impact described in Alternative 3 is not expected to result in any additional cumulative impact.

Wildlife

A. Issue to be Addressed

Issue #4. Use of the feedgrounds could impact elk, wolves, and wildlife species that utilize sagebrush and riparian habitat. Alternatives are compared in this analysis by a narrative describing the expected displacement and habitat changes by alternative.

Issue #5. Use of the feedgrounds concentrates the elk, which increases the risk of transmission of brucellosis from elk to elk. Alternatives are compared in this analysis by acres of feedgrounds by alternative and a narrative describing potential for interaction between livestock and elk.

B. Existing Conditions

Management Indicator Species

Management Indicator Species (MIS) are those species whose population changes are believed to reflect the effects of land management activities. Four types of MIS are identified in the *1990 Bridger Teton National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan*; harvested species, ecological indicator species, Forest Service sensitive species, and federally listed threatened and endangered species. Twenty-

three MIS occur on the BTNF; seven mammals, four birds, three fish, two amphibians, and seven plant species.

The Project Area considered for this analysis includes the area proposed to be permitted for the feedgrounds. Environmental effects for some wildlife species are also described within the Analysis Area, which extends up to 1 mile from the feedgrounds. Only those wildlife species present or suspected in the Analysis Area will be carried further in the analysis (Table 10). The wildlife species that are not present or do not have habitat in the Analysis Area would not be impacted by this project and are not further discussed.

For population and habitat status for MIS across the Forest, refer to the BTNF MIS Report (2007) located in the project record.

Table 10. Wildlife MIS on the Bridger-Teton National Forest.

Common Name	Scientific Name	MIS type	Species Presence
Mammals			
Grizzly Bear*	<i>Ursus arctos horribilus</i>	Sensitive	Known
Elk	<i>Cervus elaphus nelsoni</i>	Harvest	Known
Mule deer	<i>Odocoileus hemionus</i>	Harvest	Known
Moose	<i>Alces alces shirasi</i>	Harvest	Known
Bighorn sheep	<i>Ovis canadensis canadensis</i>	Harvest/Ecological	Known
Pronghorn antelope	<i>Antilocarpa americana</i>	Harvest	Known
Pine marten	<i>Martes Americana origins</i>	Ecological	Not Suspected
Birds			
Bald eagle*	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	Sensitive	Known
Peregrine falcon*	<i>Falco peregrinus anatum</i>	Sensitive	Not Suspected
Whooping crane	<i>Grus americana</i>	T&E	Not Suspected
Brewer’s sparrow	<i>Spizella breweri</i>	Ecological	Suspected
Amphibian			
Boreal toad	<i>Bufo boreas</i>	Ecological	Suspected
Boreal chorus frog	<i>Pseudacris triseriata maculate</i>	Ecological	Suspected

*The grizzly bear, bald eagle, and peregrine falcon have been removed from the T&E Species list since they were designated as MIS on the BTNF. They are now managed as Sensitive Species. Refer to the Sensitive Species Section for further information.

Harvest MIS

Elk: Elk are habitat generalists. During the summer, they spend the majority of their time in alpine and subalpine habitats. During the winter, elk movements are restricted by forage availability and snow conditions. Elk migrate to lower elevations where snow depth is shallow, and typically inhabit coniferous forests interspersed with riparian areas as well as south-facing slopes with sagebrush and other shrubs and aspen forests. The majority of the elk in the affected herd units migrate to feedgrounds in the winter, depending on the severity of the weather. See Appendix 1 for historical data concerning feedground attendance.

The Analysis Area is located within four elk herd units (102-Jackson, 103-Fall Creek, 107-Green River, and 108-Pinedale). The population trend for the Jackson and Fall Creek herds has been above average with the Jackson Herd at a population estimate of 12,777 elk in 2006 and an objective of 11,029. The Fall Creek Herd had an estimated 2006 elk population of 5,528 elk with an objective of 4,400 elk.



Figure 45. Elk on Winter Range

The Green River and Pinedale elk herds have had stable population trends. The Green River herd had an estimated 2006 population of 2,567 elk with an objective of 2,500 elk. The Pinedale Herd had an estimated 2006 population of 1,953 elk with an objective of 1,900 elk. See Appendix I for WGFD feedground data for 1975/76-2006/07.

Mule Deer: Mule deer are habitat generalists. They are often associated with early-successional vegetation and use rocky and brushy areas, open meadows, open forests, and recent burns. In the winter when snow pack becomes deep, mule deer migrate to lower elevations. The Analysis Area includes about 5,000 acres of mule deer winter range, of which about 4,000 acres is critical winter range (WGFC database). The Analysis Area is located within one mule deer herd unit (104- Sublette). The mule deer population trend for this herd has been relatively stable, but is currently below management objectives. This herd had an estimated 2006 population of 26,474 deer with an objective of 32,000 deer.

Moose: Moose use a variety of habitats from dense coniferous, deciduous, or mixed forests to shrublands, open meadows, grasslands, and riparian areas. Moose typically move to lower elevation willow dominated riparian areas in the winter. The Analysis Area includes about 18,000 acres of moose winter range, of which about 5,000 acres is critical winter range (WGFC database). The Analysis Area is located within two moose herd units (103- Jackson, 105- Sublette). The Jackson moose population trend has been downward with an estimated 2006 population of 1,785 moose with an objective of 3,600 moose. The Sublette moose population has been trending slightly

downward with an estimated 2006 population of 4,066 moose and an objective of 5,500 moose.

Pronghorn Antelope: Pronghorn utilize sagebrush and grasslands in Wyoming. They are typically found in wide open areas where their vision is unrestricted.

Only a small portion of the lower elevation habitat on the BTNF is considered suitable for antelope. The majority of the suitable habitat for antelope in the Analysis Area is in the Gros Ventre watershed (Alkali Creek, Fish Creek, and Patrol Cabin feedgrounds). There is no winter range for pronghorn antelope within the Analysis Area (WGFC database). The Analysis Area is located within one pronghorn herd unit (401- Sublette). The population trend for this herd has been upward with an estimated 2006 population of 60,100 antelope and an objective of 48,000 antelope.

Bighorn Sheep: Bighorn sheep are found in a variety of habitats from alpine mountain meadows to desert grasslands. Sheep typically prefer high elevation alpine habitats with steep escape terrain adjacent to open foraging areas. Summer ranges are primarily at higher elevations in sub-alpine habitats, whereas winter ranges are generally at lower elevations, where precipitation is low, in areas dominated by sagebrush and grassland.

The Analysis Area is located within three bighorn sheep herd units (106- Targhee, 107- Jackson, 609- Whiskey Mountain). Currently population trend information for the Targhee herd is unavailable due to lack of data. Only a very small portion of the Analysis Area (Dog Creek) is within this herd unit.

The Jackson herd has been trending downward with an estimated 2006 population of 388 sheep and an objective of 500 sheep. The Whiskey Mountain herd has been trending downward with an estimated 2006 population of 583 sheep and an objective of 1,350 sheep.

There is about 3,100 acres of bighorn sheep winter range in the Analysis Area, of which approximately 700 acres is critical winter range. This winter range is within 1 mile of the Alkali Creek Feedground.

Ecological MIS

Brewer's Sparrow: The Brewer's Sparrow is an ecological indicator for sagebrush habitat and is a sagebrush-obligate, which is restricted to sagebrush habitats during the breeding season and perhaps year-round. They are likely a common summer resident where suitable sagebrush habitat is present in the Analysis Area.

Six of the seven feedgrounds are located in sagebrush habitats. About 5,452 acres of sagebrush/mixed shrub habitat is located within 1 mile (Analysis Area indirectly influenced by winter elk management) of these feedgrounds (See Vegetation Section.) Little to no sagebrush occurs within the existing winter elk management areas.

The Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory (RMBO) recently completed breeding bird surveys from 2002 to 2006 on the BTNF. During these 5 years of surveys, the RMBO observed a total of 369 sparrows along 22 survey routes. These surveys included Bureau of Land Management land adjacent to the BTNF along the "Piney Front".

A total of five North American Breeding Bird Survey routes occur on the BTNF. Species occurrence data collected from 1968 to 2003 was analyzed at the route level to determine species trend per route. Four of the routes showed a positive trend during this period (+3.3, +18.1, +8.8, and +29.1 percent increase in the number on each route). One route showed a negative trend of -16.2 percent/year (BBS GIS data). Transect data was not collected for every route during every year of the survey period and these surveys were not specifically targeting sagebrush habitat. Depending on the route, the number of years that survey data was collected ranges from 8 to 21 years. Regionally in Wyoming, Brewer’s sparrow population trends have been relatively stable with a -0.9 percent decrease in the occurrence of Brewer’s sparrows on survey routes from 1968-2005 (USGS 2007).

Boreal Toad and Boreal Chorus Frog: The boreal toad and boreal chorus frog are ecological indicator species for wetland habitat. The boreal toad is a Wyoming species of special concern.

The boreal toad occupies montane forest habitats between 7,500 and 12,000 feet and requires breeding ponds, summer range, and winter refugia at various stages of its life history. It inhabits marshes, wet meadows, and the margins of streams, beaver ponds, and glacial ponds.

The boreal chorus frog is found throughout Wyoming and across the BTNF. This frog inhabits non-flowing bodies of water such as marshes, ponds, and small lakes in all life zones, from lower elevation to alpine areas above timberline. They are rarely found far from permanent water.

Potentially suitable habitat for the boreal toad/chorus frog exists in riparian areas in and adjacent to the feedgrounds.

Threatened, Endangered, and Experimental Species MIS

This section identifies the existing condition of threatened, endangered, and experimental species within the Analysis Area. A detailed Biological Assessment for federally listed threatened and endangered species is located in the project record. T&E species that are found on the BTNF and are known or suspected to occur within the area of influence of the Analysis Area are shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Threatened, Endangered, and Experimental Species Known or Suspected to Occur Within the Area of Influence of the Analysis Area.

Species	Federal Status	Species Presence
Canada Lynx (<i>Lynx canadensis</i>)	Threatened	Known
Gray Wolf (<i>Canis lupus</i>)	Experimental	Known

Canada Lynx: Canada lynx inhabit high elevation areas where deep snow gives them competitive advantage over other predators. Mature or late-successional spruce-fir forests provide foraging habitat for lynx in the southern portion of their range.

These forests can support snowshoe hares (*Lepus americanus*), the primary prey species for lynx, as well as red squirrels, an important alternate prey species. Lynx habitat is closely associated with the habitat requirements of the snowshoe hare.

The Analysis Area is located within five Lynx Analysis Units (Fall Creek South, Upper Gros Ventre North, Roaring Fork West, Pole Creek, Muddy Creek South), but the Analysis Area does not contain any lynx habitat.

Gray Wolf: Gray wolves are native to the BTNF and were extirpated by humans by the late 1920’s. Wolves were reintroduced in Yellowstone in 1995-96. Populations became established within two years after reintroduction and have been increasing since the initial reintroduction. The total wolf population in Wyoming increased from 252 wolves in 2005 to 311 wolves in 2006. Wolf numbers outside of Yellowstone National Park increased from 134 wolves in 2005 to 175 wolves consisting of 23 packs in 2006 (USFWS et. al. 2007).

Abundant prey species consisting of elk, moose, and mule deer are found in the Analysis Area during various times of the year with elk being the primary prey species for wolves in the region. Multiple wolf packs and individual wolves are known to inhabit the Analysis Area during the winter months when elk are present, especially the Gros Ventre area.

Sensitive Species MIS

This section identifies the existing condition for sensitive species within the Analysis Area. The Biological Evaluation for sensitive species is incorporated into this document. The fish and wildlife species listed in Table 12 have been designated as Sensitive by the Intermountain Region of the Forest Service and may occur within the Analysis Area. Suitable habitat exists in the Analysis Area for these species. No sensitive plants are known or suspected to occur in the Project Area.

Table 12. Intermountain Region Sensitive Fish and Wildlife Species Known or Suspected to Occur Within the Area of Influence of the Analysis Area.

Species	Species Presence
Grizzly bear (<i>Ursus arctos</i> <i>horribilis</i>)	Known
Greater sage grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>)	Known
Bald Eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>)	Known
Cutthroat trout* (<i>Oncorhynchus clarki</i>)	Known
Columbia spotted frog (<i>Rana pretiosa</i>)	Suspected

* Two subspecies of cutthroat trout occur in the Analysis Area; Colorado River and Snake River fine-spotted cutthroat trout.

Grizzly Bear: Grizzly bears require cover for thermal, resting, and security cover. Optimum habitat consists of large areas with diverse vegetation communities, free from human disturbance. Grizzly bears are opportunistic feeders and will prey or scavenge on most available food, including ground squirrels, ungulates, carrion, and fish. In areas or times where high protein food sources are not available, grizzlies rely on the stems, leaves, roots, tubers, and bulbs of grasses and forbs, the berries of shrubs, and the cambium and pine nuts of conifers. Availability of specialized food sources such as whitebark pine stands, fish spawning streams, and ungulate winter ranges are seasonally important. Den sites are usually far away from human activity in mountainous terrain over 6,000 feet in elevation on steep slopes when deep snow accumulates.

The Analysis Area lies within the Greater Yellowstone Area (GYA). The GYA currently provides habitat for one of the five remaining populations of grizzly bears in the contiguous United States. Grizzly bears in this region were listed as Threatened under the ESA in 1975 and were de-listed in 2007.

Habitat for grizzly bears is present throughout the BTNF, with optimum habitat in the wilderness areas. Grizzly bears inhabit the Buffalo Ranger District and portions of the Jackson and Pinedale Ranger Districts. This species is known to occur in the Analysis Area in the Gros Ventre and Upper Green River areas. Although bears are present, the Analysis Area is outside of the Primary Conservation Area (PCA).

Greater Sage Grouse: The greater sage grouse is an upland bird that is entirely dependent upon sagebrush communities for all stages of its life cycle. Sage grouse have high fidelity to their seasonal habitats (breeding, late brood-rearing, and wintering habitats), and females commonly return to the same areas to nest each year. Seasonally important habitats include dense stands of sagebrush and riparian meadows.

The Analysis Area provides potential brood rearing habitat in the Gros Ventre watershed (Alkali Creek, Fish Creek and Patrol Cabin feedgrounds) and Upper Green River areas. One lek site, located in the Gros Ventre, is about 2 miles from the Patrol Cabin Feedground and about 3 miles from the Fish Creek Feedground. There are no lek sites in the Upper Green river area.

Bald Eagle: Bald eagles are closely associated with water, and their nest sites are commonly found less than 1 mile from a lakeshore or riverbank. Large trees are necessary to support eagle nests. Alternate nests are commonly found within, or in close proximity to, the stand containing the nest. Old-growth stands, with their structural diversity and open canopies provide important habitat for eagles because snags and open-canopied trees located near the nest site and foraging areas offer favorable perches. Bald eagles with access to open water or alternate food sources near their nesting territories may not migrate in winter; however, many eagles migrate southward to areas with available prey.

Two active eagle nests are located within close proximity of the Project Area. The Dog Creek nest is about one mile from the Dog Creek Feedground and the Upper Slide Lake nest is about one mile from the Patrol Cabin Feedground.

Cutthroat trout: See Fisheries section.

Columbia spotted frog: Columbia spotted frogs are found in areas where permanent, quiet water is present, such as marshy edges of ponds or lakes, algae-grown overflow pools of streams, or springs. Emergent and submergent vegetation and willows are considered important habitat features. Following the spring breeding season they may move considerable distances from water, often frequenting mixed conifer and subalpine forests, grasslands, and sagebrush if puddles, seeps, or other water is available. Potentially suitable habitat exists within the Project Area, especially in riparian areas.

Neotropical Migratory Birds

Neotropical migratory birds (NTMB) use a variety of habitats in the Analysis Area during the breeding season, including riparian, aspen, and sagebrush habitats.

Priority species for Wyoming have been identified in the Wyoming Bird Conservation Plan (Nicholoff 2003). Many of these birds are known to use habitats within the Analysis Area. Population trends for priority species have been estimated from the North American Breeding Bird Survey results and are available on the USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center website. Level I and Level II priority species in this plan are considered for this analysis and are defined as follows:

Level I: Priority bird species clearly needing conservation action. Declining population trend and/or habitat loss may be significant. This includes species which Wyoming has a high percentage of and responsibility for, the breeding population. Monitoring and the need for additional knowledge through research into basic natural history, distribution, etc. is necessary.

Level II: The action and focus for these species is monitoring. Declining population trends and habitat loss are not known to be significant at this point. Level II includes species which Wyoming has a high percentage of, and responsibility for, the breeding population. It also included species whose stability may be unknown, and species that are peripheral for breeding in the habitat or state, or for which additional knowledge may be needed.

Of the habitat types described in the Wyoming Bird Conservation Plan (Nicholoff 2003), five are considered the highest priority for Wyoming, including montane riparian, plains/basin riparian, shortgrass prairie, mid-elevation conifer and shrub-steppe. The shortgrass prairie type is essentially absent in the Project Area. Therefore, this habitat type and its associated birds are not further discussed. The Project Area only contains a negligible amount of mid-elevation conifer habitat, therefore this habitat type and its associated birds are not further discussed. Shrub-steppe habitat is present in the Project Area and is addressed under the greater sage-grouse and Brewer's sparrow. Potential impacts to other NTMBs associated with this habitat type would be similar to those described for these species. Riparian areas (including willow habitat) make up a small amount of the Project Area. However, because riparian areas appear to be inordinately important to, and commonly used by, NTMBs, the area of analysis for NTMBs is montane riparian habitat in the Analysis Area. The plains/basin riparian habitat type occurs at elevations generally lower than those in the Project Area, and is not further discussed.

Montane riparian areas provide habitat for numerous NTMBs. These areas are typically dominated by willows, alder, dogwood, Rocky Mountain maple, and water

birch, and can include narrowleaf cottonwood, spruce, and sedges and rushes at mid-to upper-elevations (Nicholoff 2003). The diversity of structure and cover provides nesting habitat, hiding and thermal cover, and food (insects, seeds and vegetation) for a variety of bird species. The water bodies provide a source of free water and food for aerial insectivores. Nine Level I and II priority bird species are associated with montane riparian areas, including the Calliope hummingbird, broad-tailed hummingbird, willow flycatcher, Hammond's flycatcher, American dipper, MacGillivray's warbler, Wilson's warbler, bald eagle, and harlequin duck.

Montane riparian habitat is limited in the Analysis Area, occurring primarily along the Upper Green River, Gros Ventre River, Fall Creek, Muddy Creek, Dog Creek, and their main tributaries, and the habitat has been influenced by past and current winter elk management practices. There are about 818 acres of willow habitat within 1 mile of the feedgrounds.

C. Effects of the Alternatives

Effects on Harvested Management Indicator Species

Harvested MIS species include elk, mule deer, moose, bighorn sheep, and pronghorn.

1. Direct and Indirect Effects Common to All Alternatives

Elk: Winter Elk Management Programs performed by the WGFC include feeding elk, which increases the winter survival rate. Feeding is expected to continue under all Alternatives, although in Alternative 1- No Action, activities would no longer occur on NFS lands in the Project Area.

The artificial concentration of elk during winter and early spring perpetuates the disease brucellosis, caused by the bacterium *Brucella abortus* (Thorne et al. 1978). Transmission of *Brucella* typically occurs orally when cattle and/or elk come into contact with infected aborted fetuses, fetal membranes and fluids, or uterine discharges (Thorne et al. 1982, Cheville et al. 1998). Brucellosis seroprevalence of elk on feedgrounds averages 25 percent, while elk adjacent to feedgrounds average 2.4 percent and elk completely independent of feedgrounds have no prevalence of the disease (WGFD 2007). Brucellosis infections in cattle can impact Wyoming's Brucellosis Free status, resulting in increased testing requirements and potential trade sanctions on Wyoming's cattle producers. A major role of elk feedgrounds today is to reduce the commingling of elk and cattle for concerns over elk-to-cattle brucellosis transmission. Thus, elk feedgrounds are both the cause and solution to the brucellosis dilemma, maintaining the disease in elk while limiting elk-to-cattle transmissions at the same time. For further details see Appendix 2, "Elk Feedgrounds in Wyoming" (WGFD 2004).

Various disease management efforts are implemented on elk feedgrounds during winter. *Brucella* strain 19 vaccination of calves is conducted annually. Vaccination occurs in late January to March and is typically conducted by the feeder. Only calves are vaccinated and typically 100% of the calves on the feedground are inoculated.

The WGFD also monitors the distribution and prevalence of brucellosis on 4-6 feedgrounds a year during winter. Permanent elk traps exist on Upper Green River, Alkali, Fish Creek, and Muddy Creek feedgrounds. Elk are trapped until a sufficient

sample size for 85% confidence level for brucellosis exposure rate is reached. Since 2006 Muddy Creek Feedground has been used to initiate a pilot test and removal program recommended by the Wyoming Brucellosis Coordination Team. The program involves trapping large numbers of elk and removing sero-positive elk from the population. In the winter of 2007-2008 at Muddy Creek Feedground, 357 elk were trapped, 154 female elk were tested, 21 elk tested sero-positive for brucellosis, 18 elk were transported to slaughter, and one trapping mortality was incurred during two trapping events.

The elk-to-elk brucellosis exposure rate would not change under any alternative because elk would continue to be fed and artificially concentrated during the brucellosis transmission period. In all alternatives, the WGFC continues to feed elk on federal or other managed lands and maintain elk population numbers according to their management plans. Brucellosis-induced abortions would likely continue and calf production would be reduced by up to 5%. (Oldemeyer, Robbins, and Smith 1993, as adjusted for lower seroprevalence in recent years). This translates to a small loss in elk numbers overall, as adults do not generally die from brucellosis (Dobson and Meagher 1996), and the herd itself has a high intrinsic potential to increase (Lubow and Smith 2004). No impacts on the distribution of elk on the BTNF are expected as the result of brucellosis under any alternative.

Brucellosis can cause lameness in chronically infected adult elk and may increase winter deaths of a small percentage of infected elk through predation or starvation (Thorne et al. 1982). Few, if any adult elk deaths related to brucellosis would be expected, and impacts on adult mortality would be negligible.

No direct impacts on elk mortality, production, and recruitment are expected under any alternative as a result of lungworm infection. Necrotic stomatitis is not a transmissible disease. Thus, transmission between elk would not occur under any alternative.

If chronic wasting disease is found in an elk in the Project Area, 50 elk would be removed within 5 miles of the index case. If another infected elk is found, another 50 elk would be removed within 10 miles of the positive case. This disease management strategy, as well as potentially decreasing densities through hunting or other means, would increase elk mortality under all of the alternatives.

Other Harvest MIS: mule deer, moose, bighorn sheep, and pronghorn: Brucellosis may be transmitted to other ungulates, but aside from bison, these species are most likely dead end hosts (Davis 1990; Thorne 2001). Brucellosis is not expected to directly adversely impact populations of these species (Thorne et al. 1982; Disease Expert Meeting 2002), and these species are not expected to transmit the disease to other species or conspecifics. Although bighorn sheep (BHS) are susceptible to brucellosis, elk to BHS transmission events are likely very rare (Kreeger et al. 2004). Some evidence suggests the BHS might not survive the disease (Kreeger et al. 2004) and therefore BHS to BHS transmission would be unlikely. Bison and elk do not interact on the feedgrounds studied in this analysis. Therefore, under all alternatives, no direct impacts to these species would occur as a result of brucellosis transmission from elk managed at these feedgrounds. Similarly, transmission of other diseases, including pasteurellosis, necrotic stomatitis, psoroptic

scabies, lungworm, and viral microparasites are not expected from elk to other ungulates in any alternative.

Chronic wasting disease, if it became established, could affect moose to some degree, but moose social behavior reduces its potential to contract the disease. Bighorn sheep and pronghorn would not be directly impacted under any of the alternatives because they do not seem to be susceptible (Williams, Kirkwood, and Miller 2001). Mule deer are susceptible to chronic wasting disease, which is always fatal (Williams and Miller 2002). It is possible that a high prevalence of chronic wasting disease in elk could result in increased transmission from elk to mule deer and/or increased environmental contamination, which could potentially increase the prevalence in mule deer. Further details about CWD are found in the WGFC's Chronic Wasting Disease Management Plan located at:

<http://gf.state.wy.us/downloads/pdf/CWDPlanapprovedbycommission2-17-06.pdf>.

2. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 1 – No Action - No Special Use Authorization

Elk: If winter elk management were discontinued at Alkali Creek, Fish Creek, Muddy Creek, and Upper Green River feedgrounds, elk would likely migrate to other nearby feedgrounds in winter, or the WGFC would establish alternative winter elk management locations off of USFS lands. Although winter elk management would be curtailed on NFS lands in Alternative 1, it is expected to continue to occur near Dog Creek, Fall Creek, and Patrol Cabin feedgrounds on lands adjacent to the BTNF. Because elk would continue to be fed somewhere, elk population numbers and health are not expected to be affected by closure of feedgrounds on NFS lands.

Although the elk-to-elk brucellosis exposure rate does not vary by alternative, the potential for elk-to-cattle brucellosis exposure does vary. In Alternative 1, the assumption is made that WGFC would relocate the Muddy Creek and Upper Green River Feedgrounds on private or other land outside the BTNF boundary. If the new location is near private land that supports a livestock operation, elk-to-cattle brucellosis exposure potential would be higher than described in Alternatives 2 and 3.

Other Harvest MIS: The very small amount of habitat in the Project Area and Analysis Area used by mule deer, bighorn sheep, and pronghorn antelope would be expected to improve over time. No direct or indirect effects are anticipated for these species by this improvement due to the very small amount of habitat suitable for Harvest MIS that is affected by this Alternative.

3. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 2 – No Change from Current Permitted Area

Continuing winter elk management operations at the existing locations (Alternative 2) would result in no direct effects to Harvest MIS since there is very little competition for forage or space between Harvest MIS in the Analysis Area.

Habitat conditions for Harvest MIS would remain in a degraded condition in the Project Areas. All habitat effects are at a very small scale compared to the available habitat in the surrounding area.

For moose, willow habitats in and adjacent to feedgrounds would continue to be degraded, primarily due to browsing/trampling of willows by elk. As stated earlier, these effects would be at a very local scale compared to the available willow habitat adjacent to the Project Area.

Indirect effects to bighorn sheep (BHS) are not expected. Even though the Alkali Creek Feedground is within WGFC delineated BHS winter range, BHS have never been observed to use the Project Area. Competition for forage and space is not expected.

For the remaining Harvest MIS, no measurable indirect effects are anticipated due to the very small amount of habitat in the Analysis Area compared to the available habitat in the surrounding area.

The potential for elk-to-cattle brucellosis transmission would be low because elk would be held on the BTNF, preventing intermingling with most private land livestock operations.

4. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 3 – Proposed Action

Expanding the feedgrounds (Alternative 3) would result in no direct effects to Harvest MIS since there is very little competition for forage or space between Harvest MIS in the Analysis Area.

Habitat conditions for Harvest MIS would remain in a degraded condition in the Project Areas. The proposed action would slightly increase the impacts to habitat on two feedgrounds, Patrol Cabin (+88 acres) and Fish Creek (+ 47 acres). All habitat effects are at a very small scale compared to the available habitat in the surrounding area.

For moose, willow habitats in and adjacent to feedgrounds would continue to be degraded, primarily due to browsing/trampling of willows by elk. As stated earlier, these effects would be at a very local scale compared to the available willow habitat adjacent to the Project Area.

Indirect effects to bighorn sheep (BHS) are not expected. Even though the Alkali Creek Feedground is within WGFC delineated BHS winter range, BHS have never been observed to use the winter elk management area. Competition for forage and space is not expected.

For the remaining Harvest MIS, no measurable indirect effects are anticipated due to the very small amount of habitat in the Analysis Area compared to the available habitat in the surrounding area.

The potential for elk-to-cattle brucellosis transmission would be low in Alternative 3 because elk would be held on the BTNF, preventing intermingling with most private land livestock operations. The potential for elk-to-elk brucellosis transmission and other disease transmission would be slightly lower than Alternative 1 and 2 because the Fish Creek and Patrol Cabin Feedgrounds are larger in Alternative 3, reducing concentration of elk. See the Elk-Cattle Separation discussion beginning on page 18 of Appendix 2, Elk Feedgrounds in Wyoming.

Effects on Ecological Management Indicator Species

Ecological MIS species include Brewer's sparrow, boreal toad, and boreal chorus frog.

1. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 1 – No Action - No Special Use Authorization

Habitat conditions in the Analysis Area would be expected to improve over time for all Ecological Indicator Species. This alternative would relocate most direct or indirect effects for Ecological Indicator Species to private, state, or other federal land.

2. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 2 – No Change from Current Permitted Area and Alternative 3 – Proposed Action

No direct effects to Ecological Indicator Species are anticipated since this project occurs in the winter when boreal toads/chorus frogs are dormant and winter elk management occurs outside of the Brewer's sparrows breeding season.

Indirectly, winter elk management affects habitat for Brewer's sparrow, boreal toad, and boreal chorus frog. In Alternative 2, sagebrush and riparian habitat in the Project Area (487 acres) and the Analysis Area (1 mile surrounding the feedgrounds) would continue to be degraded as described in the vegetation and hydrology sections of this report.

These feedgrounds are used during the winter when the ground is frozen which minimizes elk trampling impacts to riparian zones.

3. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 3 – Proposed Action

No direct effects to Ecological Indicator Species are anticipated since this project occurs in the winter when boreal toads/chorus frogs are dormant and winter elk management occurs outside of the Brewer's sparrows breeding season.

Indirectly, winter elk management affects habitat for Brewer's sparrow, boreal toad, and boreal chorus frog. In Alternative 3, sagebrush and riparian habitat in the Project Area (573 acres) and the Analysis Area (1 mile surrounding the feedgrounds) would continue to be degraded as described in the vegetation and hydrology sections of this report. Effects are at a very local scale compared to the available habitat adjacent to the Analysis Area.

These feedgrounds are used during the winter when the ground is frozen which minimizes elk trampling impacts to riparian zones. Avoiding using wetland areas and the areas within 200 feet of perennial streams early and late in the winter elk management season (Mitigation Measures #4 and #5) and identifying specific stream crossing locations (Mitigation Measure #6) further minimizes potential indirect effects to boreal toad/chorus frog habitat.

Effects to Threatened, Endangered, and Experimental Species

This section discloses potential effects to the Canada Lynx and Gray Wolf – the threatened, endangered, and experimental species potentially affected by this project. Potential direct and indirect effects are described by species, by alternative, and

cumulative effects are summarized by species category. Effects to species by alternative may be combined where appropriate due to similar impacts or no impacts. Further analysis of effects to T&E, including effects determinations, conservation strategies, and recovery guidelines and goals, is included in the Biological Assessment located in the project record.

1. Direct and Indirect Effects of All Alternatives

Elk make up a substantial portion of the prey base for wolves on the BTNF. If a new disease (e.g. bovine tuberculosis, bovine paratuberculosis, or chronic wasting disease) is introduced and reduces elk by a moderate or major amount, wolves could benefit in the short term due to a more vulnerable prey and more carcasses available for scavenging. In the long term, if CWD substantially decreases the population size of elk and deer, wolves could be negatively impacted due to a decrease in the numbers of available prey or carrion. The risk of this does not vary by alternative because all alternatives assume continued winter elk management by the WGFC on federal or other managed lands and all alternatives have an equal risk of disease introduction.

Wolves would not be impacted by contracting paratuberculosis, brucellosis, or chronic wasting disease under any of the alternatives because they are not known to be susceptible to these diseases (Williams 2001; Thorne et al. 1982).

In December, 2007, the WGFC released draft regulations for hunting wolves that would allow ranchers to kill the animals for livestock conflicts and wildlife managers to kill them for elk conflicts on State feedgrounds. These regulations would apply in the trophy game area in NW Wyoming, which includes Alkali Creek, Fall Creek, Fish Creek, Patrol Cabin, and Upper Green River Feedgrounds. In the rest of the state, including Dog Creek and Muddy Creek Feedgrounds, wolves could be considered predators and could be killed by any means without a license. No action has been taken to date to finalize these draft regulations.

If these regulations are finalized, wolf populations near feedgrounds would be affected. Since all alternative assume the continued use of feedgrounds as a winter elk management program by the state, the risk of this would not vary by alternative.

2. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 1 – No Action - No Special Use Authorization

No direct effects to lynx or wolves are anticipated from not issuing a special use permit because winter elk management would continue to occur on federal or other managed lands.

Indirectly, summer habitat for potential prey species (elk, deer, hare, other small mammals) on-forest would improve over time at Alkali Creek, Fish Creek, Muddy Creek and Upper Green River feedgrounds. Habitat would not improve at the remaining feedgrounds because winter elk management would continue on adjacent private, state, or other federal land.

Elk that frequented the Muddy Creek and Upper Green River feedgrounds would likely disperse to existing lower elevation feedgrounds and “historic” natural winter ranges. Increased use of natural winter ranges would alter the predator-prey condition from its current condition, where prey are concentrated, to a condition where prey would be distributed more across the landscape, which would decrease wolf hunting

success. Wolves would likely follow the elk from the BTNF to their new winter location, which may include increased hazards of interaction with human development. If the draft regulations for hunting wolves that would allow ranchers to kill the animals for livestock conflicts are finalized, there would be an increased risk to wolves in Alternative 1.

3. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 2 – No Change from Current Permitted Area

No direct or indirect effects to lynx are anticipated from implementing Alternative 2. This is due to the low occurrence of lynx in the area and that no lynx habitat occurs in the project area.

No direct effects to wolves are anticipated from implementing Alternative 2. Indirectly, continued winter elk management would likely benefit wolves by concentrating elk, their primary prey species and by keeping elk on the BTNF away from private land. If the draft regulations for hunting wolves are finalized, ranchers could kill wolves near private lands for livestock conflicts.

4. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 3 – Proposed Action

No direct or indirect effects to lynx are anticipated from implementing Alternative 3. This is due to the low occurrence of lynx in the area and that no lynx habitat occurs in the project area.

No direct effects to wolves are anticipated from implementing Alternative 3. Indirectly, continued winter elk management would likely benefit wolves by concentrating elk, their primary prey species and by keeping elk on the BTNF away from private land. If the draft regulations for hunting wolves are finalized, ranchers could kill wolves near private lands for livestock conflicts. The proposed expansion of the feedgrounds in Alternative 3 would not have any affect on wolves different than described for Alternative 2.

Effects to Sensitive Species

This section discloses potential effects to Sensitive Species. Potential direct and indirect effects are described by species, by alternative, and cumulative effects are summarized by species category. Effects to species by alternative may be combined where appropriate due to similar impacts or no impacts.

1. Direct and Indirect Effects of All Alternatives

Elk make up a portion of the prey base for grizzly bears and bald eagles on the BTNF. If a new disease (e.g. bovine tuberculosis, bovine paratuberculosis, or chronic wasting disease) is introduced and reduces elk by a moderate or major amount, grizzly bears and bald eagles could benefit in the short term due to a more vulnerable prey and more carcasses available for scavenging. In the long term, grizzly bears and bald eagles could be negatively impacted due to a decrease in the numbers of available prey or carrion. The risk of this does not vary by alternative because all alternatives assume continued winter elk management by the WGFC on federal or other managed lands.

Grizzly bears and bald eagles would not be impacted by contracting paratuberculosis, brucellosis, or chronic wasting disease under any of the alternatives because they are not known to be susceptible to these diseases (Williams 2001; Thorne et al. 1982).

2. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 1 – No Action - No Special Use Authorization

The elimination of the 6 existing feedgrounds on NFS lands would not affect grizzly bears or bald eagles. Sage grouse habitat would be improved by sagebrush recovery over time at Alkali Creek, Fish Creek, Muddy Creek and Upper Green River feedgrounds. Habitat would not improve at the remaining feedgrounds because winter elk management would continue on adjacent private, state, or other federal land. These effects result in a determination of “May impact individuals or habitat but not likely to trend towards Federal listing or cause a loss of viability” for greater sage grouse, cutthroat trout, and Columbia spotted frogs.

3. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 2 – No Change from Current Permitted Area

Grizzly Bear: No direct or indirect effects are expected from implementing Alternative 2. This is due to the project taking place during the winter when bears are inactive. No den sites are located near these feedgrounds. Also, the feedground areas are roaded so they do not provide secure habitat for bears during the summer. This would limit the use of the Project Area by bears during the summer season. In the spring, bears may feed on carrion at the feedgrounds; however, this opportunity is inconsequential.

Greater Sage Grouse: No direct effects are expected from implementing Alternative 2 because winter elk management activities take place outside of the sage grouse breeding season and the feedgrounds are not known to provide winter habitat for sage grouse. Indirectly, sagebrush stands within 1 mile of the feedgrounds in the Gros Ventre would continue to be impacted by elk. These impacts are at a very local scale compared to the available habitat in the surrounding area. The lek site is outside of this zone so it would not be affected. See the Brewer’s Sparrow Section for further analysis on impacts to sagebrush.

Bald Eagle: No direct or indirect effects are expected from implementing Alternative 2. For the most part, the project takes place outside of the bald eagle breeding season. Some elk feeding may take place in late winter/early spring which would overlap with the eagle breeding season, but the nearest feedgrounds are at least 1 mile from identified nest sites and are topographically screened or visually screened by vegetation. Eagles have successfully nested at these sites during the current winter elk management program, thus, no impacts to nesting eagles are expected. If eagles are in the area in the winter/early spring they may feed on carrion at the feedgrounds however, this opportunity is inconsequential.

Cutthroat Trout: See Fisheries section.

Columbia Spotted Frog: No direct effects are anticipated since this project occurs in the winter when Columbia spotted frogs are dormant and the ground is frozen which minimizes impacts to riparian soils and vegetation. Indirectly, elk contribute to detrimental soil disturbance near riparian areas in the Project Area which degrades

habitat for Columbia spotted frogs. There are 140 acres of riparian vegetation habitat in Alternative 2 that would be potentially affected.

Effects determinations for sensitive species for Alternative 2 are summarized in Table 13.

Table 13. Effects Determinations for Implementing Alternative 2 or 3 for Intermountain Region Sensitive Fish and Wildlife Species Known or Suspected to Occur Within the Area of Influence of the Project Area.

Species	Determination*
Grizzly bear	NI
Greater sage grouse	MIIH
Bald Eagle	NI
Colorado River Cutthroat trout	MIIH
Snake River Fine-Spotted Cutthroat Trout	NI
Columbia spotted frog	MIIH

* NI: No Impact

MIIH: May impact individuals or habitat but not likely to trend towards Federal listing or cause a loss of viability.

4. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 3 – Proposed Action

The effects described for grizzly bear, greater sage grouse, and bald eagle in Alternative 2 are the same for Alternative 3. The small amount of additional land occupied by winter elk management programs in Alternative 3 does not create any additional effects.

Cutthroat Trout: See Fisheries section.

Columbia Spotted Frog: No direct effects are anticipated since this project occurs in the winter when Columbia spotted frogs are dormant and the ground is frozen which minimizes impacts to riparian soils and vegetation. Indirectly, elk contribute to detrimental soil disturbance near riparian areas in the Project Area which degrades habitat for Columbia spotted frogs. There are 149.5 acres of riparian vegetation habitat in Alternative 3 that would be potentially affected. In Alternative 3, mitigation measures minimize potential indirect effects. These include: avoiding using wetland areas and the areas within 200 feet of perennial streams early and late in the winter elk management season (Mitigation Measures #4 and #5) and identifying specific stream crossing locations (Mitigation Measure #6). Effects are at a very local scale compared to the available habitat adjacent to the analysis area.

Effects determinations for sensitive species for Alternative 3 are summarized in Table 13.

Effects to Neotropical Migratory Birds

1. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 1 – No Action - No Special Use Authorization

No direct effects are expected from implementing Alternative 1. Indirectly, riparian habitat conditions for neotropical migrant birds in the Analysis Area would improve over time by closure of the Alkali Creek, Fish Creek, Muddy Creek, and Upper Green River feedgrounds. Winter elk management is expected to continue to occur at Dog Creek, Fall Creek, and Patrol Cabin feedgrounds on lands adjacent to the National Forest, resulting in continued effects to NTMB on NFS lands.

2. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 2 – No Change from Current Permitted Area

No direct effects are expected from implementing Alternative 2 because the winter elk management activities take place outside of the migratory bird breeding season.

Indirectly, 1,091 acres of willow habitat within the Analysis Area would continue to be degraded. Elk browsing primarily affects willow habitat by reducing willow cover to less than 2 meters in height (Anderson 2007). This would continue to negatively affect the relative abundance of willow-associated species, especially Willow Flycatchers, MacGillivray's Warblers, and Fox Sparrows (Anderson 2007) in the Analysis Area. Indirect effects to willow-associated species are at a very local scale (individual birds) and likely would not impact watershed or regional bird populations.

3. Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternative 3 – Proposed Action

No direct effects are expected from implementing Alternative 3 because the winter elk management activities take place outside of the migratory bird breeding season.

Indirectly, 1,391 acres of willow habitat within the Analysis Area would continue to be degraded. Elk browsing primarily affects willow habitat by reducing willow cover to less than 2 meters in height (Anderson 2007). This would continue to negatively affect the relative abundance of willow-associated species, especially Willow Flycatchers, MacGillivray's Warblers, and Fox Sparrows (Anderson 2007) in the Analysis Area. Indirect effects to willow-associated species are at a very local scale (individual birds) and likely would not impact watershed or regional bird populations.

Cumulative Effects to Wildlife

The potential for cumulative effects related to elk were considered within the herd management units areas described by the WGFC. Alkali Creek, Fish Creek, and Patrol Cabin feedgrounds are located within the Jackson Elk Herd Unit. Dog Creek (Prichard) Feedground is located in the Fall Creek Elk Herd Unit. Upper Green River Feedground is located in the Upper Green River Elk Herd Unit. Muddy Creek and Fall Creek feedgrounds are located within the Pinedale Elk Herd Unit.

The WGFC's supplemental elk feeding program is a cumulative action that is a daily activity during the winter months at 21 feedgrounds and one staging area. Although feedgrounds were initiated to maintain elk populations, they have become an effective tool in reducing damage to haystack yards and winter pastures on private lands

(WGFD 2007). Elk feeding locations have been strategically placed to effectively gather elk as they transition from summer ranges down to lower elevations, mostly preventing elk migrating through private lands enroute to lower elevations. Figure 1 in Chapter 1 displays a map of the 21 WGFC managed feedgrounds, the staging area (North Piney) and the National Elk Refuge.

Other than elk, the potential for cumulative effects to wildlife habitat for the Winter Elk Management Program Special Use Permit Proposal was considered within the Analysis Area – the area within 1 mile of each feedground. Wildlife habitat would be affected by the Winter Elk Management Program Special Use Permit Proposal by impacts to sagebrush habitat and riparian habitat. The cumulative actions that also affect these habitats are displayed and described in the Cumulative Effects Section for Vegetation and Hydrology in this report, most notably livestock grazing, and to a smaller extent fire, prescribed fire, and herbicide treatments. Please refer to those sections for detailed discussion.

The project activities take place during the winter when most wildlife species are inactive or have migrated out of the Analysis Area. No cumulative impacts are expected from the combination of elk related impacts with other impacts on wildlife that depend upon sagebrush and riparian habitats.

Elk, wolves, and carrion dependent wildlife would also be affected by the increased potential for disease transmission created by concentrating elk on feedgrounds during the winter. The seven feedgrounds considered in this analysis are part of a system of 21 WGFC managed feedgrounds and one staging area one federally managed feedground in northwest Wyoming, as displayed in Figure 1. Cumulative effects to elk populations as a result of winter elk management programs at all feedgrounds are discussed in the WGFC report “Elk Feedgrounds in Wyoming” in Appendix 2.

Other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable management actions that could affect wildlife resources in the Analysis Area include winter recreation. The feedgrounds are in closed winter range where no motorized vehicles, and/or no human presence (depending on the area), are allowed. Where designated snowmobile trails pass by the feedgrounds, snowmobilers are required to stay on the trail, follow a speed limit, and cannot stop. Elk are habituated to recreation users who follow these rules and therefore they are not affected by this activity. No cumulative impacts are expected from the combination of winter stress and recreation stress on elk in the Project Area or Analysis Area.

Cultural Resources

A Class III cultural resource survey was conducted at each feedground and reports detailing the results of these surveys have been submitted to the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Office. No historic properties were identified at any of the elk feedgrounds; however, historic properties have been identified adjacent to two of the feedgrounds. Historic properties, as defined in 36 CFR 800.16, which implements Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, means any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, of object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places.

Social and Economic

No social or economic effects are expected from implementation of the Proposed Action or any of the Alternatives. In all Alternatives, WGFC would continue to operate their winter elk management programs on private, state, and federal lands. Whether or not NFS lands are available, the program would continue with no expected change to the social or economic environment. Elk population numbers would not be affected by any actions described in the alternatives; therefore there would be no impacts to tourism or other wildlife related economies.

Short-term Uses and Long-term Productivity

NEPA requires consideration of “the relationship between short-term uses of man’s environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity” (40 CFR 1502.16). As declared by the Congress, this includes using all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans (NEPA Section 101).

Continued use and expanded use of NFS lands for WGFC’s winter elk management programs affects the long-term productivity of the riparian areas within the Project Area and in the portion of the Analysis Area immediately adjacent to the Project Area. As described in previous sections, riparian areas support a variety of wildlife and fish populations.

Concentrating large numbers of elk on feedgrounds could reduce the ability of the environment to support elk in the future if a disease, such as CWD, became established in the Analysis Area. Although the alternatives considered in this planning process would have no effect on whether or not CWD arrives in the Analysis Area, concentrating the elk would affect the speed at which the disease would spread and the prevalence it reaches in the population.

Unavoidable Adverse Effects

Feedground practices on adjacent land near Dog Creek and Fall Creek Feedgrounds and on State land at Patrol Cabin Feedground would create unavoidable impacts on the

National Forest in Alternative 1. Unavoidable impacts occur from use on the National Forest and from use on adjacent lands in Alternatives 2 and 3.

Detrimental soil disturbance would occur in all alternatives as a result of compaction and erosion caused by cross country travel by horses, machinery, and equipment and trampling by elk.

Vegetation species richness, diversity, and vigor would be affected in all alternatives.

Water quality would be affected by stream bank damage, erosion and sedimentation in all alternatives.

Wildlife would be affected by impacts to sagebrush, riparian, and aspen wildlife habitat in all alternatives.

Feedgrounds increase the probability of disease and parasite transmission among elk, including brucellosis, chronic wasting disease and other diseases.

Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources

Irreversible commitments of resources are those that cannot be regained, such as the extinction of a species or the removal of mined ore. Irretrievable commitments are those that are lost for a period of time such as the temporary loss of timber productivity in forested areas that are kept clear for use as a power line right-of-way or road.

Irreversible losses could occur in willow habitat within and adjacent to feedgrounds due to loss of root stock as continued heavy browsing by elk in the winters prevents suppressed willow plants in wet meadow habitat from recovering to a healthy condition. Irretrievable losses of aspen habitat could occur due to heavy browsing.

The potential exists for irretrievable commitments of both elk and deer resources if chronic wasting disease (CWD) became established in the Jackson Hole or Sublette County areas and substantially reduces these populations. While the arrival of CWD is beyond the control of wildlife managers, the potential effect would be greater under any alternative where large numbers of animals are concentrated on feedgrounds. The loss would be irretrievable because in addition to always being fatal to infected animals, chronic wasting disease contaminates the environment for long periods of time. Soil on the feedgrounds could become a reservoir of CWD that would continue to infect animals many years into the future. This is considered an irretrievable loss (loss for a period of time) rather than an irreversible loss (can not ever be reversed) because it is not known how long contamination of the environment would persist. Decontamination methods on game farms and research facilities have been unsuccessful and animals introduced to these facilities years after a chronic wasting disease outbreak and depopulation have subsequently become infected.

The potential exists for irretrievable commitments of predator and scavenger resources to occur if CWD became established and substantially reduced the elk population. (*U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service Bison and Elk Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (2007)*).

Other Required Disclosures _____

NEPA at 40 CFR 1502.25(a) directs “to the fullest extent possible, agencies shall prepare draft DEISs concurrently with and integrated with ...other environmental review laws and executive orders.”

- National Historic Preservation Act for causing ground disturbing actions in historical places: A cultural resource survey for each feedground has been reviewed by the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Office. A determination of no historic properties affected has been made for the winter elk management program and no further survey or mitigation is required.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in accordance with the ESA implementing regulations for projects with threatened or endangered species.

CHAPTER 4. CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

Preparers and Contributors _____

The Forest Service consulted the following individuals, Federal, State, and local agencies, tribes and non-Forest Service persons during the development of this environmental assessment:

ID TEAM MEMBERS:

Kate Belinda, WGFD, GIS/Writer-Editor
Pam Bode, USFS, Project Co-Leader
Joanna Behrens, USFS, Writer-Editor
Greg Clark, USFS, District Forest Ranger-Big Piney, Project Co-Leader
David Fogle, USFS, North Zone Fish Biologist
Gary Hornberger, WGFD, Feedground Supervisor
Eric Maichak, WGFD, Brucellosis Feedground Habitat Biologist
Cory Mlodik, USFS, Wildlife Biologist
Jared Rogerson, WGFD, Brucellosis Feedground Habitat Biologist
Jamie Schoen, USFS, Forest Archaeologist
Brandon Scurlock, WGFD, Brucellosis-Feedground-Habitat Supervisor
Ronna Simon, USFS, Forest Hydrologist
Scott Smith, WGFD, Wildlife Management Coordinator
Cindy Stein, USFS, Natural Resource Manager-Recreation/Wilderness
Eric Winthers, USFS, Soils Scientist

FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL AGENCIES:

Federal

Forest Service, Bridger-Teton National Forest (Lead Agency)
U.S. Department of the Interior, Grand Teton National Park
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Elk Refuge
Environmental Protection Agency

State

Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality
Wyoming Game and Fish Commission
Wyoming Game and Fish Department
Wyoming Office of State Lands and Investments
Wyoming State Historic Preservation Office
Wyoming Governor's Office

County

Sublette County Commissioners
Teton County Commissioners

Tribes

Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, Idaho
Eastern Shoshone Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyoming
Crow Agency, Montana
White Clay Society, Gros Ventre Tribes, Hays, Montana

Distribution of the DEIS _____

This DEIS will be distributed to individuals who specifically request a copy of the document and those who submitted substantive comments during scoping. In addition, copies have been sent to the Federal agencies, federally recognized tribes, State and local governments, and organizations listed above.

Appendices _____

Appendix 1 – Wyoming Game and Fish Feedground Data

Appendix 2 – Elk Feedgrounds in Wyoming, WGFD, August 30, 2004

References

- Anderson, Eric. 2007. "Changes in Bird Communities and Willow Habitat Associated with Fed Elk." *Wilson Journal of Ornithology* 119(3):400-409.
- Belsky, A. J., A. Matzke, and S. Uselman. 1999. "Survey of Livestock Influences on Stream and Riparian Ecosystems in the Western United States." *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, Vol. 54. pp. 419-431.
- Brown, R. 1947. The Jackson Hole Elk Herd, Wyoming Wildlife Volume XI, No. 12; 4-11, 29-32 pp.
- Clary, W. P. and B. F. Webster. 1989. Managing Grazing of Riparian Areas in the Intermountain Region. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-263. Ogden, UT; USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station. 11 p.
- Clary, W. P. and B. F. Webster. 1990. "Riparian Grazing Guidelines for the Intermountain Region." *Rangelands*, 12(4). pp. 209-212.
- Cheville, N.F., D.R. McCullough, and L.R. Paulson. 1998. Brucellosis in the Greater Yellowstone area. National Research Council, Washington D.C., USA.
- Cowardin, L. M., Carter, V., Golet, F. C. & LaRoe, E. T. 1979. Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States. US Fish and Wildlife Service FWS/OBS 79/31. 103 pp.
- Dale, V. H., S. Brown, R. A. Haeuber, N. T. Hobbs, N. Huntly, R. J. Naiman, W. E. Riebsame, M. G. Turner, and T. J. Valone. 2000. "Ecological Principles and Guidelines for Managing the Use of Land." *Ecological Applications* 10:639-670.
- Davis, D. S. 1990. "Brucellosis in Wildlife." In *Animal Brucellosis*, edited by K. Nielsen, J. R. Nielsen, and J. R. Duncan, 321-34. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Dean, R. and G. Hornberger. 2006. Effects of Feedground Elk on Vegetation. WGFD, Cheyenne, WY, 41pp.
- Disease Expert Meeting. 2002. Meeting of livestock and wildlife veterinarians from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the Wyoming Game and Fish Department, and the State of Wyoming, November 12-14, 2002, National Elk Refuge, Jackson, WY.
- Dobson, A., and M. Meagher. 1996. "The Population Dynamics of Brucellosis in the Yellowstone National Park." *Ecology* 77:1026-36.

- Elliot, W.J., D. Page-Dumroese and P.R. Robichaud. 1996. The Effects of Forest Management on Erosion and Soil Productivity. Symposium on Soil Quality and Erosion Interaction, July 7,1996. Soil and Water Conservation Society of America. Keystone, Colorado. 19 p.
- Fleischner, T. L. 1994. "Ecological Costs of Livestock Grazing in Western North America." *Conservation Biology* 8:629-644.
- Hincks, D. Personal communication, December 8, 2006.
- Kay, C. E. 1990. Yellowstone's Northern Elk Herd: A Critical Evaluation of the "Natural Regulation" Paradigm. Ph.D. Dissertation, Utah State University, Logan, UT, 490pp.
- Kay, C. E. and D. L. Bartos. 2000. "Ungulate Herbivory on Utah Aspen: Assessment of Long-term Exclosures." *Journal of Range Management* 53:145-153.
- King, K. 1993. A Bioassessment Method for Use in Wyoming Stream and River Water Quality Monitoring. Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality, Water Quality Division. Cheyenne, WY. 84p.
- Kingston, W. R., J.K. Morton, F.M. Blunt, and H.A. Dawson. 1978. "Brucellosis in Elk. II. Clinical Effects and Means of Transmission as Determined Through Artificial Infections." *Journal of Wildlife Diseases* 14:280-291.
- Kondolf, G.M. 1993. "Lag in Stream Channel Adjustment to Livestock Exclosure, White Mountains, California." *Restoration Ecology*, Vol. 1:226-230.
- Kreeger, T. J., Water E. Cook, W. H. Edwards, and T. Cornish. 2004. "Brucellosis in Captive Rocky Mountain Bighorn (*Ovis Canadensis*) Caused by *Brucella abortus* Biovar 4." *Journal of Wildlife Diseases* 40:311-315.
- Lubow, B. C., and B. L. Smith. 2004 "Population Dynamics of the Jackson Elk Herd." *Journal of Wildlife Management* 68 (4):810-29.
- Magilligan, F.J. and P.F. McDowell. 1997. "Stream Channel Adjustments Following Elimination of Cattle Grazing." *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. Vol.33, No. 4. pp.867-878.
- Nicholoff, S.H., compiler. 2003. Wyoming Bird Conservation Plan, Version 2.0. Wyoming Partners in Flight. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Lander, WY.
- Oldemeyer, J. L., R. L. Robbins, and B. L. Smith. 1993 "Effect of Feeding Level on Elk Weights and Reproductive Success at the National Elk Refuge." In *Proceedings of the 1990 Western States and Provinces Elk Workshop, Eureka, California*, edited by R. L. Callas, D. B. Koch, and E. R. Loft, 64–68. California Fish and Game Department, Eureka, CA.

President of the United States. 2001. Executive Order 13186. Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds. Federal Register, Volume 66, No. 11, January 17 2001.

Ricklefs, R. E. 2001. *The Economy of Nature*. W. H. Freeman and Co, New York, NY, 550pp.

Rosgen, D. 1996. *Applied River Morphology*. Wildland Hydrology, Pagosa Springs, CO. 380pp.

Ruediger, B; Claar, J.; Mighton, S.; Naney, B.; Rinaldi, T.; Wahl, F.; Warren, N.; Wenger, D.; Williamson, A.; Lewis, L.; Holt, B.; Patton, G.; Trick, J.; Vandehey, A.; and S. Gniadek. 2000. *Canada Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy*. USDA Forest Service. USDI Fish and Wildlife Service. USDI Bureau of Land Management. USDI Park Service. Missoula, MT.

Ruggiero, L.F., K.B. Aubry, S.W. Buskirk, G.M. Koehler, C.J. Krebs, K.S. McKelvey, and J.R. Squires. 1999. The scientific basis for lynx conservation: qualified insights. Chapter 16 *in* Ruggiero, L.F., K.B. Aubry, S.W. Buskirk, G.M. Koehler, C.J. Krebs, K.S. McKelvey, and J.R. Squires. *Ecology and Conservation of Lynx in the United States*. General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-30. USDA Forest Service. Rocky Mountain Research Station.

Sheldon, C. 1927. "The Conservation of the Elk of Jackson Hole, Wyoming." (Committee Report.) National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, Washington, D.C., USA.

Taylor, M. 2001. Project Seedskadee. Prepared for Wyoming Wildlife Federation, 38pp.

Thorne, E. T. 2001. "Brucellosis." *In* *Infectious Diseases of Wild Mammals*, edited by E. S. Williams and I. K. Barker, 3rd. ed., 372–95. Ames: Iowa State University.

Thorne, E.T. 1982. "Brucellosis." *In* *Diseases of Wildlife in Wyoming*, E.T. Thorne, N.

Thorne, E. T., E. Kingston, W. R. Jolley, and R. C. Bergstrom, editors. 1982. *Diseases of Wildlife in Wyoming*. 2nd ed. Cheyenne: Wyoming Game and Fish Department.

Thorne, E. T., J. K. Morton, F. M. Blunt, and H. A. Dawson. 1978 "Brucellosis in Elk. II. Clinical Effects and Means of Transmission as Determined through Artificial Infections." *Journal of Wildlife Diseases* 14:280–91.

USDA Forest Service and USDI. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2000. *Canada Lynx Conservation Agreement*. USFS Agreement #00-MU-11015600-013.

USDA Forest Service, BTNF. 2007. *Management Indicator Species for the Bridger-Teton National Forest*. BTNF, Jackson Wyoming.

USDA Forest Service, BTNF 2003. Bridger-Teton National Forest. Alkali Creek Stream Aquatic Habitat Inventory. Bridger-Teton National Forest, Jackson, Wyoming.

USDA Forest Service, BTNF. 2003. Bridger-Teton National Forest. Gros Ventre River Stream Aquatic Habitat Inventory. Bridger-Teton National Forest, Jackson, Wyoming.

USDA Forest Service, BTNF. 2003. Bridger-Teton National Forest. Fish Creek Stream Aquatic Habitat Inventory. Bridger-Teton National Forest, Jackson, Wyoming.

USDA Forest Service, BTNF. 2001. Bridger-Teton National Forest. Dog Creek Stream Aquatic Habitat Inventory. Bridger-Teton National Forest, Jackson, Wyoming.

USDA Forest Service, BTNF. 1990. Bridger-Teton National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. USDA Forest Service, Bridger-Teton National Forest. Jackson, Wyoming.

USDA Forest Service. 2007. The 2007 Northern Region Soil Quality Monitoring Protocol. U.S. Forest Service, Northern Region, version 3.1, Missoula, MT.

USDA Forest Service. 2004. Intermountain Region Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, and Sensitive Species List. Ogden, Utah.
http://fsweb.r4.fs.fed.us/unit/bpr/bpr_web/tes_pg.htm

USDA Forest Service. 2003. FSH 2509.18. Soil Management Handbook, Chapter 2 Soil Quality Monitoring, Forest Service Handbook Intermountain Region (Region 4), Ogden, Utah. Available on-line at http://www.fs.fed.us/cgi-bin/Directives/get_dirs/fsh/2509.18!r4_ALL

USDA-NRCS Soil Quality Institute. 2003. Soil Compaction: Detection, Prevention, and Alleviation. United States Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Research Service and Natural Resources Conservation Service. Available on-line at <http://soils.usda.gov/sqi/>

USDA-NRCS. 1996. Soil Quality Indicators: Organic Matter. Soil Quality Information Sheet Series. NRCS National Soil Survey Center in cooperation with the NRCS Soil Quality Institute, and the ARS National Soil Tilth Lab. Available online with updates at <http://soils.usda.gov/sqi/sqiinfo.html> (verified 15 Jan. 2003).

USDA Forest Service. 1989. Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Land and Resource Management Plan for the Bridger-Teton National Forest. USDA FS, Jackson, WY, 877pp.

USDI, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2007. Bridger-Teton National Forest Threatened and Endangered Species List. USDI, USFWS, Region 6, Denver Colorado.

USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, Nez Perce Tribe, National Park Service, Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, Idaho Fish and Game, and USDA Wildlife Services. 2007. Rocky Mountain Wolf Recovery 2006 Annual Report. C.A. Sime and E. E. Bangs, eds. USFWS, Ecological Services, 585 Shepard Way, Helena, Montana. 59601. 235pp.

U. S. Geological Survey (USGS). 2007. North American Breeding Bird Survey Trend Results – Wyoming. [Web page] Located at: <http://www.mbr-pwrc.usgs.gov/cgi-bin/atlas99.pl/WYO&2&05>. Accessed September 13, 2007.

Van Kirk and Benjamin. 2001. “Status and Conservation of Salmonids in Relation to Hydrologic integrity in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem.” *Western North American Naturalist* 61(3), pp 362.

Williams, E. S. 2001. “Paratuberculosis and Other Mycobacterial Diseases.” In *Infectious Diseases of Wild Mammals*, edited by E. S. Williams, and I. K. Barker, 361–71. Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Williams, E.S. and M. W. Miller. 2002 “Chronic Wasting Disease in Deer and Elk in North America.” *Rev. Sci. Tech. Off. Int. Epic* 21 (2): 305-16.

Williams, E. S., J. K. Kirkwood, and M. W. Miller. 2001. “Chronic Wasting Disease.” In *Infectious Diseases of Wild Mammals*, edited by E. S. Williams and I. K. Barker, 292–301. Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Williams, E.S., T. R. Spraker, and G. G. Schoonveld. 2001 Chapter 17: Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathies. In *Infectious Diseases of Wild Mammals*, edited by E. S. Williams and I. K. Barker, 292-301. Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality. 2001. Water Quality Rules and Regulations, Chapter 1. Wyoming Surface Water Quality Standards. 25pp plus appendices.

Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality. 1997. Grazing Best Management Practices. Wyoming Nonpoint Source Monitoring Plan. 49pp.

Wyoming Game and Fish Department. 2007. Jackson Elk Herd Unit (E102) Brucellosis Management Action Plan. Cheyenne, Wyoming.

Wyoming Game and Fish Department. 2006. Upper Green River Elk Herd Unit (E107) Brucellosis Management Action Plan. Cheyenne, Wyoming, USA

Wyoming Game and Fish Department. 2006. Chronic Wasting Disease Management Plan. Cheyenne, Wyoming, USA.

Wyoming Game and Fish Department. 2005. Snake River Basin (below Jackson Lake Dam) (4AJ) Jackson Fish Management Sub-Basin Management Plan.

Wyoming Game and Fish Department. 2005. Gros Ventre River Basin (4GV) Jackson Fish Management Sub-Basin Management Plan.

Wyoming Game and Fish Department. 2004. Elk Feedgrounds in Wyoming. Cheyenne, Wyoming, USA.

Wyoming Game and Fish Department. 2001. East Fork River Drainage (7EF) Basin Management Plan.

Wyoming Game and Fish Department. 2001. Green River (7GR) Basin Management Plan.

Wyoming Game and Fish Department. 2000. New Fork River Tributaries (7NT) Basin Management Plan.

Zar, J. H. 1999. Biostatistical Analysis, 4th edition. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 664pp.