RECORD OF DECISION
USDA, FOREST SERVICE
Dixie National Forest
Final Environmental Impact Statement
and Land and Resource Management Plan

Washington, Iron, Garfield, Kane, Wayne
and Piute Counties, Utah

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

This Record of Decision documents approval of the Land and Resource Management Plan (the Plan) for the Dixie National Forest (the Forest). The Plan provides for coordinated multiple-use management of outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, wildlife and fish, minerals, and wilderness resulting in sustained yields of goods and services for the benefit of Utah and the American people.

The Plan identifies resource management practices; projected levels of production of goods and services; and locations where various types of resource management activities are expected to occur. The Plan also provides broad direction for dealing with applications and permits for occupancy and use of National Forest System lands by the public and for management of impacts from mineral activities on the Forest.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) describes a proposed action (the Plan) and alternatives to the proposed action. It also describes the environment to be affected and discloses the potential environmental consequences of implementing the proposed action and alternatives.

This FEIS and Plan were developed under implementing regulations of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality, Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 1500-1508 (40 CFR 1500-1508); and the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 219 (36 CFR 219).

In publishing Land and Resource Management Plans, the Forest Service is seeking to satisfy two somewhat different purposes:

1. Compliance with the statutory mandate of NFMA to develop and maintain a management system so that an "interdisciplinary approach to achieve integrated consideration of physical, biological, economic, and other sciences" will be applied to all future decisions, 16 U.S.C. 1604(b), 1604(f), 1604(g), and 1604(c).

2. Linkage with the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resource Planning Act (RPA) Program and Assessment through current modeling techniques to make forecasts of outputs which could be produced under the Plan and alternatives to the Plan.

Forecasts of outputs which could be produced under the Plan and alternatives are useful in making comparisons among alternatives and the Plan. There is no assurance that the outputs will actually occur at the projected numbers. Limitations of modeling and projections; changes in on-the-ground conditions; changes in laws and regulations, and national and local economic conditions; and appropriate budget levels all affect actual outputs. As with management direction, projected outputs may be adjusted through rescheduling proposed implementation schedules (amendments) or revision. NFMA provides that Forest Plans be revised at least every 15 years.

Approval of this Plan marks the turning point from promulgation to implementation of the Plan. This does not mean that all decisions on issues are final. Public involvement will continue as the Plan is implemented.

Specific projects and activities will be examined in light of the Plan's direction, current conditions and situations, and public concerns. With participation of other federal agencies, state agencies, interest groups, and the public, Plan implementation and administration can realize the systematic integration of resources and their uses.

Features of the Plan:

1. Forest Condition

   The Plan identifies the desired future condition of the Forest. Goals are presented in Chapter IV of the Plan. Goals are timeless and they form the principal basis for developing management objectives (36 CFR 219.3).

2. Management Objectives

   The Plan identifies management objectives necessary for the Forest to achieve its goals. It also describes how resources are to be managed in order to attain these objectives. The objectives are presented in Chapter IV of the Plan. These objectives are depicted as annual levels of goods and services that ideally will be achieved during the 10- to 15-year planning period. Achievement of objectives is contingent upon many factors including appropriated level of funding, national and local economic factors, and dynamic natural and physical factors at work on the Forest.

3. Management Direction

   The Plan specifies management directions that control and govern how activities will be implemented on the Forest. The Plan includes Forest-wide standards and guidelines and management area prescriptions and direction (Chapter IV). Forest-wide standards and guidelines detail overall management direction during Plan implementation. The Forest-wide standards and guidelines are in addition to management direction for each management area prescription and direction, which are assigned by the Plan to specific land areas within the Forest. Mitigation measures to avoid or minimize environmental harm are part of management direction in Forest Direction and Management Area Prescriptions in Chapter IV of the Plan. Mitigation is also discussed in Chapter IV of the FEIS. The Plan Map displays locations where various Management Area prescriptions apply.

4. Monitoring and Evaluation

   The Plan contains monitoring and evaluation criteria to determine how well objectives, standards, and guidelines are met and how well standards and guidelines are applied. Monitoring procedures are displayed in Chapter V of the Plan.

5. Amendment or Revision

   The Plan establishes management direction for the next 10 to 15 years, when it will be revised. Short-term opportunities, problems, or con-

flicts may arise in managing the Forest that were not anticipated in the Plan. The Plan provides a framework for responding to unanticipated needs and can be adjusted, if needed, through rescheduling or amendment.

During implementation, when various projects are designed, more site-specific analysis may be required. These analyses may take the form of Environmental Assessments [40 CFR 1508.9 (1982)], Environmental Impact Statements [40 CFR 1508.11 (1982)], or categorical exclusions [40 CFR 1508.4 (1982)]. The Forest Supervisor may amend the Plan in accordance with 36 CFR 219.10(f). Any resulting documents will be tiered to the FEIS, pursuant to 40 CFR 1508.28 (1982).

II. THE DECISION

The decision is to approve the Forest Plan which accompanies the FEIS (referred to as Alternative "B," Composite, in the FEIS) for management of the Dixie National Forest.

In light of known needs and potential impacts, the Plan sets forth a strategy for managing the Forest. This is not a plan for day-to-day internal operations. It does not address administrative matters such as personnel, fleet equipment, and internal organizational changes, and does not emphasize all site-specific design decisions nor all specific resource outputs. Rather, the Plan prescribes general management practices for the Dixie National Forest. The intention is to achieve multiple-use goals and objectives with optimum economic efficiency. Work will be done in an environmentally sound manner to produce goods, services, and amenities providing long-term public benefits.

This decision is based upon a review of environmental consequences of alternatives disclosed in the final EIS. Particular attention was given to responsiveness of alternatives to public issues and management concerns identified through developmental phases of the Forest Plan, and more recently restated through public comment on the draft EIS and proposed Forest Plan. Public comments and Forest Service responses are included in Chapter VI of the FEIS.

Major aspects of the decision are:

Recreation

About 60 percent of developed site capacity would be managed at full service levels. The remainder would be at reduced service levels. New developed sites would be built at Deer Lake, Pine Valley, and Blue Spring Point to meet increased use and enhance dispersed recreation. The Forest would also rehabilitate and "harden" about 50 developed recreation site units per decade to protect investments. Expanded downhill ski area capacity by the private sector in the Brian Head and proposed Crystal Mountain area could occur.

Although demand on some of the more "popular" developed recreation sites presently exceeds capacity, Forest-wide capacity is not expected to be exceeded until about the year 2015.

The Plan provides for frequent maintenance of the more heavily used roads and trails. It also provides for sufficient parking and trailhead facilities to accommodate Forest user needs near wilderness areas and for winter recreation.

Dispersed recreation use capacity would not be exceeded Forest-wide during the planning period; however, "popular" sites may become overused. Construction of 11 trailhead facilities and maintenance of 320 miles of trails will help disperse use and increase quality of experiences.

Wilderness

All wildernesses, Box-Death Hollow, Ashdown Gorge, and Pine Valley Mountain, will emphasize semiprimitive wilderness settings. Management of Pine Valley Mountain Wilderness will be more intensive because it is heavily used has many trails. More trails and trailheads will be constructed to disperse use over more of the areas.

Fish and Wildlife

Habitat management would stress mitigation of land use activities to maintain viable fish and wildlife populations. An average of 2,670 acres and 165 structures for habitat improvement projects would be initiated annually during the planning period. Low-cost prescribed burning for vegetative manipulation and aspen cutting to stimulate sprouting would be emphasized. Protecting big-game winter range from livestock would receive emphasis where needed.

Habitat capability would gradually improve (approximately 10 percent) for many species because of general improvement in range and wildlife habitat conditions. Deer numbers would not be expected to increase on some herd units because of off-Forest development on critical winter range. Elk could continue to expand their range and population. Snag-dependent wildlife species could slowly decline on some areas (primarily the Cedar City Ranger District) because of increased public access and unauthorized snag cutting. Habitat diversity would improve somewhat as emphasis on timber harvest is shifted to spruce-fir and mixed conifer and some habitat improvement is directed at browse and aspen types. Fish habitat capability would increase slightly in streams and lakes; however, because of gradual eutrophication of Panguitch Lake, due to causes beyond Forest control, overall capability will decline until such problems are solved.

Range

Continuation of current grazing practices and livestock numbers is planned. Suitable range will be maintained in good condition, and 110,000 acres of poor condition range are expected to improve to at least fair condition. Projected budget levels would increase to provide essential maintenance of range improvement, particularly extensive crested wheat reseedings. Increased emphasis would be given to protecting riparian areas from unacceptable levels of grazing.

Timber

Timber sales for mountain pine beetle salvage or prevention will be completed by 1990, then the Plan allows continued offering of 26 million board feet (MMBF) with a high percentage of that volume coming from the mixed conifer and spruce types. Thereafter, conifer harvest volumes would decrease to reflect sanitation and partial cutting in leave strips adjacent to old clearcuts and small, scattered stands. Harvest of aspen trees would increase over current levels if market demand materializes. An average of 5,000 acres of TSI and 1,588 acres of reforestation would be done per year.

Soil and Water

Aggressive action would be taken to treat the watershed restoration backlog. Plans are to complete 725 acres of large-size projects. Unforeseen damaged watershed areas would be promptly treated.

Watershed conditions would improve significantly by the end of the planning period. Livestock use on riparian areas would be moderate. Existing management related water quality problems would be mitigated before the end of the planning period. No significant deterioration of water quality would occur. No significant change in water yield would occur.

Minerals

Production of oil and gas from National Forest lands is expected to remain at constant levels through the planning period. Declining oil field production near Upper Valley is expected to be replaced by new discoveries. Requests for mineral leases and permits will receive prompt responses.

Carbon dioxide (CO_2) has been discovered on National Forest land in several locations and may become a significant mineral resource in the future depending on market conditions.

Budget

Forest management activities, many of which are interdependent, may be affected by funding levels. The Plan will be implemented by various site-specific projects such as building a road, developing a campground, or selling timber. If funding is changed in any given year, projects scheduled for that year may have to be altered or rescheduled; however, goals, management priorities, and land-activity assignments described in the Plan will not change unless the Plan is revised or amended. If funding changes significantly over several years in a way that would alter basic management objectives, the Plan may have to be amended [36 CFR 219.10(e)(1982)]. Significance will be determined in the context of particular circumstances.

III. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Eight management alternatives have been developed in response to NEPA and NFMA requirements and public input. Alternatives are presented in detail in Chapter II of the FEIS. They are:

Alternative A - Current Program (No Action or No Change). Describes current management direction, budget, and expected Forest trends for the next 10 to 15 years.

Alternative B - Composite (Proposed Action). Combines portions of seven alternatives to form a preferred alternative. Budget provides for quality work and for facilities adequate to meet expected use.

Alternative C - Constrained Budget. Describes activities and outputs of goods and services that could be provided with a budget of 25 percent less than Forest's fiscal year 1982 budget with emphasis basically same as the Current Program Alternative.

Alternative D - Current Budget. Similar to Alternative A except that costs are slightly lower and constrained from increasing.

Alternative E - Nonmarket Emphasis. Emphasizes amenities of Forest (e.g., hiking, hunting, scenery, etc.) and deemphasizes market values (e.g., timber, grazing, etc.). Costs are not limited.

Alternative F - Market Emphasis. Emphasizes market values of Forest, (e.g., timber harvesting, livestock grazing, developed recreation, etc). Costs are not limited.

Alternative G - 1980 RPA Program. Responds to Dixie National Forest's share of 1980 RPA Program as identified in Intermountain Regional Guide.

Alternative H - High Productivity. Displays effects of emphasizing high outputs of livestock grazing and timber harvesting. Minimum environmental values would be protected. Budget is not limited.

IV. RATIONALE FOR THE SELECTED ALTERNATIVE

No single factor determined the decision. All factors were considered and weighed. Based upon consideration of all environmental, social and economic factors, the approved Plan sets a course of action that maximizes net public benefits and is consistent with the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.

Significant criteria forming the basis for decisions in the Plan are described in this section. These criteria relate to many laws and regulations and respond directly to public involvement and to issues, concerns, and opportunities identified for the Forest.

A. Issues, Concerns, and Opportunities, and Areas of Significant Public Interest:

Issues, concerns, and opportunities (ICO) identified during the planning process cover a full range of resources and management subjects. Points of view as to what constitutes ICO resolution also were equally diverse. Because of this, ICO's were formulated into questions which allowed each alternative to address each ICO, positively or negatively;

with each alternative having specific benefits and costs. Analysis of each alternative was based on management goals of optimizing net public benefits while providing a continuous flow of goods and services and maintaining or improving environmental conditions. The proposed action was identified as the management mix that best met these criteria.

Each of the alternatives addressed the ICO's in a slightly different way. The importance and validity of the ICO's guided the planning process. Chapter II of the FEIS is structured to respond to each of the ICO's by alternative (For a detailed description of the ICO's, see Appendix A of FEIS).

Management of resources was addressed according to output priorities in each alternative and the resource base available for management consideration.

The selection of the preferred alternative is based on how well that alternative responds to public issues and management concerns. Since many issues and concerns conflict, it is not possible to address all issues and concerns in a positive manner. Also, resolution of an issue or a concern is perceived differently by different people. Major issues of public concern are included in the discussion below. (For those readers interested in directly reviewing comments on these issues, see FEIS, Chapter VI.)

Recreation

Although many of the comments were of a general nature, some of the specific points included the following:

Some felt that off-road vehicle (ORV) use should be restricted from erosion sensitive areas especially riparian areas. The Plan provides the standards and guidelines for protecting these areas.

There was support to increase trail and trailhead maintenance. The Plan recognizes opportunities for increased use in dispersed low development areas. Trails and trailheads may be the only improvements needed to facilitate this use. Trail maintenance and construction have been programmed at higher than historical levels.

Some comments were received regarding use by large groups. These comments reflected dissatisfaction that groups were allowed to occupy developed sites designed for individual families. The Plan provides for group use separate from individual family-oriented campgrounds.

Some concern was expressed about National Forest developed facilities (campgrounds) competing with private sector campgrounds. The Plan makes some assumptions such as: (1) Private development would be encouraged and used first. (2) Forest facilities would be developed where private facilities were not available.

Areas Not Designated for Wilderness (Utah Wilderness Act of 1984)

Several expressed concern that areas on the Forest that are not roaded were assigned semiprimitive recreation management prescriptions which allow for some roads and other resource "activities." Also, concern was expressed that these areas were open to mineral leasing. A change was made in the final Plan to more clearly recognize the sensitivity of some of these areas through establishment of no surface occupancy stipulations for mineral activities. It is estimated that only 3 percent of these semiprimitive areas would be impacted by resource activities and 97 percent would retain their present qualities, during this planning period.

Fish and Wildlife

Many commented on the loss of old-growth habitat, particularly in the ponderosa pine zone. Other expressed concerns were: loss of habitat diversity due to timber harvest; conflicts with livestock; proliferation of roads; and loss of snags. The Plan provides for significant increases in funds for fish and wildlife projects, which should result in higher numbers of fish and wildlife.

Range

A number of comments indicated that the Plan was biased, favoring livestock over wildlife and that the range of livestock grazing alternatives was inadequate.

Management plans for all grazing allotments on the Forest have been completed. Most of these plans have been in effect long enough that the grazing capacity is verified. Animal use month (AUM) spread in various alternatives is narrow because previous range evaluations are sufficient and accurate enough to confirm that grazing capacity meets Forest objectives. The Forest Plan has not been biased in favor of livestock but to minimize conflicts with other uses and enhance cooperation.

Timber

The proposed Plan provides for the best management of the timber resource, contributing to the stability of local communities, providing for a continuing supply of Forest products demanded by the general public, and providing for the needs of other resources supplied through multiple-use forestry. When evaluating the timber harvest level of the preferred alternative and its effect on local community stability, cumulative effects of National Forest timber sale levels and private timber supplies were considered. Basic long-range objectives for timber management under the Forest Plan are: (1) Maintaining a balance of Forest age classes, (2) Creating and maintaining stand conditions that will minimize growth impacts and mortality from insects and disease, and (3) converting slow growing over-aged stands of mature trees to younger thrifty stands of desirable species. Attainment of these goals will, in the long run, minimize serious environmental impacts caused by natural disasters, such as insect epidemics, and provide a significant investment in future Forest resources that would otherwise be

foregone. These goals will be achieved where possible through commercial timber harvest. Additionally, other forms of vegetative manipulation, such as use of prescribed fire, were considered and will be applied when they best meet Forest objectives.

Comments received on the DEIS and Plan indicated some disagreement with the overall management prescription. One area of concern was "below cost" timber sales. This controversy centers around the fact that some timber sales lose money by costing more to prepare and administer than they return in receipts. Resolution has not been reached on accounting practices, sales policies, timber market conditions, and the role of National Forests in local dependent economies. While profit maximization is not a goal, economics as well as the other relationships were considered in reaching the final decision. Additionally, analysis in the DEIS was based on historical costs and the PNV of the proposed action may be increased by cost saving measures now being implemented such as; end product timber sales, lower cruising standards, optional removal of low value pieces, sale by area, and lower road costs.

Concern was also expressed that the timber resource was not being managed to maximize productivity and minimize losses by mortality and reduced growth rates at the proposed level. Increasing timber harvest beyond levels in the Forest Plan would not be compatible with other Forest goals, would increase community dependency on the timber industry, and would substantially decrease economic efficiency of timber management.

Under the Forest Plan, suitable timber base is composed of lands that are economically efficient in meeting timber production and other resource goals. A balance is struck between conflicting interests that best meet needs of Forest resources and those dependent on National Forest timber.

Minerals

Knowing which areas would be restricted with special stipulations or withdrawals was a prevalent concern. The draft Forest Plan has been revised to show areas with no-surface-occupancy. A matrix has also been prepared to explain which stipulations would be applicable to each area for oil and gas leasing.

Management direction and Forest-wide standards and guidelines for locatable, leasable, and common varieties minerals management in the Forest Plan were developed based on the 1872 Mining Law as amended, general mining laws, and other statutory and regulatory direction. Outside wilderness, National Forest lands are generally available for mineral exploration and development unless withdrawn. Minerals did receive equal consideration with other resources through analysis of mineral potential.

B. Factors Used in Evaluating the Selected Alternative (SA) (also known as Alternative B, the Preferred Alternative and the Plan).

Based upon issues, planning criteria, and constraints, 14 factors were identified that are relevant to the decision concerning the selected alternative: Economic stability, number of jobs; timber harvest, MMBF; wildlife and fish, benefit dollars, number of elk; livestock use, AUM's; protection of soil and water, tons/year; scenic values, acres by Visual Quality Objective (VQO); recreation, benefit dollars; and cost to government, total cost of programs.

Using these factors, an evaluation of advantages among alternatives was conducted. This evaluation followed a fundamental rule of decision-making; i.e., decisions should be based on the importance of advantages. Advantages are the positive differences between alternatives. The concept of "differences" is important in that it incorporates the idea that "similarities" should have no effect on the decision--the decision-maker is indifferent toward alternatives to the extent they are alike, but instead concentrates on the differences between them.

C. Environmentally Preferable Alternative (EPA)

Alternative E - Nonmarket is the environmentally preferable alternative. This alternative causes least damage to biological and physical environments and best protects, preserves, and enhances historic, cultural, and natural resources.

D. Alternatives with Higher Present Net Value (PNV)

The Selected Alternative has the highest PNV.

E. Comparative Discussion of the Selected Alternative (SA) and the Environmentally Preferred Alternative.

Timber Harvest and Road Construction. Alternative E - Nonmarket provides least land disturbance. Alternative B (SA) provides for higher levels of timber harvest, 26.4 MMBF, and associated road construction, as compared to 21.5 MMBF for Alternative E, causing a moderate increase in land disturbance over Alternative E.

Livestock Grazing. Alternative E - Nonmarket has the lowest grazing level (90,000 AUM's), with few capital investments that would disturb the land. Alternative B (SA) provides for improvement of ranges in poor condition to fair or better condition, with some capital investment projects proposed. Grazing level is 115,000 AUM's in the SA.

Soil and Watershed Management. Alternative E - Nonmarket maintains highest level of soil and watershed management. Alternative B (SA) is very similar. It has the same number of soil and water improvement acres, and meets state water quality standards, but could have a moderate increase in erosion due to higher timber harvest and road construction.

Cultural Resources. Alternative E - Nonmarket would impact cultural/historic resources least with lower levels of land-disturbing activities. Selected Alternative B (SA) has increased levels of

land-disturbing activities, which would increase need for cultural survey.

Wildlife. Timber, range, and minerals activities would have least impact on fish and wildlife indicator species in Alternative E - Nonmarket, although mineral activities could adversely affect some indicator species. Habitat diversity would be maintained at near optimum conditions. Effects to wildlife indicator species as a result of mineral activities are not expected to change under Alternative B (SA). Timber and range activities could adversely affect some indicator species in the short-term, but long-term adverse effects would not be expected.

Economic Effects

The table on the following page displays a comparison of economic effects of Alternative E (EPA) with Alternative B (SA). Alternative B has the highest PNV; hence, comparison only considered EPA and SA.

Selected alternative would provide greater overall net public benefit by:

Providing more jobs and income for local dependent communities. Lower levels of grazing and timber harvest provided by the environmentally preferable alternative would cause hardship in many small local communities as well as hardship to livestock and timber industry user groups.

Responding better to issues, concerns, and opportunities. Selected alternative responds more fully to timber harvest, grazing, mineral exploration and development, fuelwood, and socio-economic stability issues.

Providing good balance of high level environmental management as well as maintaining moderate level of resource outputs whereas the Environmentally Preferred and other alternatives emphasize either high levels of resource outputs or amenities or low budget costs. The Selected Alternative provides for high levels of environmental management by assigning more Forest areas to management prescriptions emphasizing environmental protection (e.g., wildlife habitat, riparian, and scenic emphasis areas).

Providing level of softwood sawtimber sale offerings for first decade of the planning period equal to recent actual sale levels (whereas EPA level of sale offerings is about 30 percent less). Economic stability of local communities dependent on viable timber industry would be adversely impacted by decrease in harvest levels. After the first decade, the level of softwood sawtimber sale offerings would drop dramatically in SA as well as in other alternatives due to lack of merchantable size timber for several decades; however, community stability will be less adversely impacted because communities will have had a decade to prepare for decline. Hardwood sawtimber sale offerings would be increased to offset decline if timber industry develops a market for this material.

Comparison of Selected Alternative
with Environmentally Preferable Alternative

Factors	Unit of Measure	Alternatives SA	EPA
TIMBER			
LTSYC*	MMBF/Year	41.0	30.0
ASQ*	MMBF/Year	26.4	21.5
Acres Regen.	Acres/Year	1,588	586
Fuelwood Harv.	MMBF/Year	10.1	7.5
DEVELOPED RECR.	M RVDS/Year	474	442
WILDLIFE HAB. IMP	Acres/Year	2,040	1,630
LIVESTOCK	M AUMs/Year	115	90
Range Condition	%Satis. Con	85	86
WATERSHED IMPROV	ACRES/Year	85	85
PRESENT NET VALUE (4% Disc. Rate)	MM$* 1982$	41.9	41.7
RETURNS TO U.S. (4% Disc Rate)	M$ 1982$	1,532	1,544
PROGRAM COST	M$	7,855	6,880
EMPLOYMENT	#Jobs/Year	1,576	1,418
INCOME	MM$/Year	21.0	18.9

* LTSYC = Long-term Sustained Yield Capacity
ASQ = Allowable Sale Quantity
MM$ = Millions of Dollars

V. MITIGATION AND MONITORING

Management constraints were imposed on the alternatives to ensure long-term productivity of the land and compliance with threshold soil and water requirements. These requirements are standards and guidelines applying to all management prescriptions within each alternative. Standards and guidelines act as mitigating measures to ensure sustained yields of renewable resources are maintained.

In the case of minerals, once the resource has been extracted, it is gone except where secondary recovery becomes feasible. Conservation of these resources might be defined as the planned rate of removal. Mitigating

measures involved in location, development, and removal of such nonrenewable resources are expressed as occupancy stipulations in mining plans, project level environmental documents, and in management area direction in the Plan.

Maintaining VQO's, viable populations of wildlife management indicator species, proper cover/forage ratios, and state water quality standards are all examples of standards and guidelines which act as mitigating measures prescribed in Chapter IV of the Plan.

Each resource has a minimum management requirement level that acts as the base upon which alternative management programs were developed. Management commitments below the minimum management level were not considered as options.

Stated as standards and guidelines, mitigating measures are intended to be adopted and enforced in all project-level activities. Mitigating measures for renewable resources are discussed in Chapter IV of the Plan. As long-term effects of planned management prescriptions on the various management areas are assessed and new research results and technology become available, some adjustments may be made to update prescribed standards and guidelines.

An aggressive implementation, monitoring, and evaluation program has been outlined in Chapter V of the Plan. The purpose of the program is to facilitate implementation of the Plan in an orderly manner while maintaining environmental safeguards.

Monitoring will help determine if prescriptions are being properly applied to management areas, provide for an evaluation of appropriateness of the Plan's management direction, and track condition trends of Forest resources. Evaluation data will be used to update resource inventories, fine-tune mitigation measures, and determine the need for amending or revising the Plan. The monitoring plan outlines data sources and monitoring techniques by resource element, establishes frequency of measurements, and details conditions that would initiate further evaluations.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION

The Plan will be implemented 30 days after the Notice of Availability of the Plan, FEIS, and Record of Decision appears in the Federal Register. Time needed to bring activities into compliance with the Plan will vary depending on types of projects.

The Forest Supervisor will assure that (1) annual program proposals and projects are consistent with the Plan; (2) program budget proposals and objectives are consistent with management direction specified in the Plan; and (3) implementation is in compliance with the Regional Guide and goals and objectives in 36 CFR 219.10(e), 36 CFR 219.11(d), and 36 CFR 219.27.

Implementation is guided by management requirements contained in Forest Goals and Objectives, Direction, Standards and Guides, and Management Area Prescriptions found in Chapter IV of the Plan. These management require-

ments were developed through an interdisciplinary effort and contain measures necessary to mitigate or eliminate long-term adverse effects.

Unavoidable adverse environmental effects, such as disruptive effects of vegetation manipulation on recreation or livestock grazing, will be temporary and will involve only a small percentage of the Forest at any one time. As can best be determined, all practical mitigating measures have been adopted and are included in Chapter IV of the Plan.

Proposals to use National Forest lands will be reviewed for consistency with the Plan. Management direction contained in Chapter IV of the Plan will be used to analyze any proposal. Permits, contracts, and other instruments for occupancy and use of the National Forest will be consistent with Management Direction in Chapter IV. This is required by 16 USC 1604 (i) and 36 CFR 219.10 (e).

VII. APPEAL RIGHTS

This decision is subject to appeal pursuant to 36 CFR 211.18. Notice of appeal must be in writing and submitted to:

J. S. Tixier, Regional Forester
Intermountain Region
USDA, Forest Service
Federal Building
324 25th Street
Ogden, Utah 84401

Appeal notice must be submitted within 45 days from the date of this decision. A statement of reasons to support the appeal and any request for oral presentation must be filed within the prescribed 45-day period.

J. S. TIXIER
Regional Forester

SEP 2 1986
Date