

APPENDIX BB

The following corrections or clarifications are made to the EA:

Page 2-14:

The 2nd paragraph on page 2-14 is not clear where the direction adopted in this amendment would apply. The intent is that the direction applies in all goshawk habitat, except the exemption areas. “Exempted” is added to the first sentence in the 2nd paragraph so it reads,

“While the direction adopted in this amendment will only be applied when it does not conflict with the primary use of an *exempted* area”.

Page 3-27:

Paragraph 1: Ashley and Uinta NFs, sentence 3: reference should be USDA Forest Service 1997*b*.

Paragraph 2: Manti-LaSal NF, sentence 2: reference should be USDA Forest Service 1993*a*.

Page 4-57:

Bullet 2 in the middle of the page, procedures for permit modification should cite the Forest Service Handbook *FSH 2209.13, R4 Supplement* instead of FSM 2230.

Page A-7:

Examples of vegetative manipulation and a sentence has been added to standard s-9 to clarify that guideline g-21 applies to non-vegetative manipulation activities as follows:

(STANDARD) Prohibit forest vegetative manipulation (*timber harvest, prescribed burning, fuelwood, thinnings, weedings, etc.*) within active nest areas (approximately 30 acres; e.g-19) during the active nesting period. The active nesting period will normally occur between March 1st and September 30th. *For non-vegetative manipulation activities (such as road maintenance, oil and gas exploration, recreation sites, etc.), adjacent to a new nest site, or a new activity adjacent to an established nest, guideline g-21 applies.*

Some question was raised about what the term “restrict” means in guideline g-21 (also page A-7). For this definition, we go straight to Webster’s:

“restrict: to keep within limits, hold down, limit, confine.”

This is not the same as the language in the standard s-9 which prohibits. Guideline g-21 allows managers and biologists to assess individual situations and determine what restriction is necessary to avoid nest abandonment.

Page A-9:

The following additional information is provided related to guideline g-28, to help field personnel better understand the desired conditions for prey habitat:

Clarification of Desired Habitat Conditions for Prey Species
Especially related to ungulate grazing

Guideline g-28 (EA, page A-9) gives direction to use the landscape assessment process to identify plant communities important to prey species that contain **seed, mast and foliage components** needed. Overall, the greatest variety of species that can produce seed and mast are associated with mid-seral stages. Guideline g-29, then, directs that these components be maintained or restored. *The intent is to have utilization levels of grasses and forbs that maintain native foods and cover for prey species.*

Further components of desired habitat conditions for prey species from Reynolds' work, and the guidelines that address these components, include:

1. **Snags** for woodpecker feeding and nesting, mammal nests, and bird perches (g-9)
2. **Downed logs** for cover, feeding and nesting for a variety of prey (g-11)
3. **Woody debris** to provide cover and feeding for a variety of vertebrates (g-11)
4. **Openings** for food and cover (g-25 for PFAs)
5. **Large trees** for nesting, denning, feeding, roosting, cone production and hunting perches (g-15)
6. **Interspersion** (intermixing) of vegetative structures (g-7 & g-15)
7. Promotion of **aspen regeneration** (g-5) and growth of **native grasses** (g-4).

Herbaceous shrubs and intact forest soils, with emphasis on organic surface layers with natural turnover rates, are other identified components of desired habitat conditions for prey species that are not specifically included in the guidelines.

The direction in g-28 and g-29 is that, as part of the landscape assessment process and as grazing allotments are updated, all of these components be evaluated toward achievement of desired habitat conditions for prey species. Appropriate courses of action, such as a change in pasture rotation, shorter seasons of use, or reductions in numbers of livestock, would then be determined at the site-specific level. Additionally, if wild ungulate grazing is determined to be part of the problem, immediate contact with UDWR would be made for resolution.

Page G-6 (Glossary):

There is some confusion as to how the term stand is applied in the document, therefore the following definition from the Principles of Silviculture by Daniel, Helms and Baker (1979) is added to the glossary. The definition of stand that was used in this analysis and assessment is as follows:

“Stands are usually the management units that make up a forest. A stand is a reasonably homogeneous unit that can be clearly differentiated from surrounding stands by its age, composition, structure, site quality, or geography. There is no precise area implied by stand, and size may change as management intensifies. In addition, a stand’s particular condition may be repeated many times within a forest.

Appendix B:

Three of the task sheets (m-3, m-4, m-5) in the EA were mislabeled. They were corrected as follows:

Task Sheet for Monitoring Requirement m-3 is now m-4.

Task Sheet for Monitoring Requirements m-4 is now m-5.

Task Sheet for Monitoring Requirement m-5 is now m-3.