

# **UTAH NORTHERN GOSHAWK PROJECT**

## **Environmental Assessment**

### **Deciding Official:**

*Jack A. Blackwell, Regional Forester  
USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Region (R-4)*

### **For further information contact:**

*Utah Northern Goshawk Project  
c/o Uinta NF  
PO Box 1428  
Provo, UT 84601  
Kathie Hauser, 801/625-5897  
E-mail: [goshawk3/r4\\_uinta@fs.fed.us](mailto:goshawk3/r4_uinta@fs.fed.us)  
Website: <http://www.fs.fed.us/r4/goshawk>*

### **ABSTRACT**

This action will amend the management direction established in current land and resource management plans for the Ashley, Dixie, Fishlake, Manti-LaSal, Uinta, and Wasatch-Cache National Forests. The direction will be in the form of goals, objectives, standards, guidelines, and monitoring requirements.

This is a programmatic environmental assessment that examines 6 alternatives (including No-Action) which address issues identified through the scoping and public involvement phases of the project. Alternative F has been identified as the agencies preferred alternative.

# Utah Northern Goshawk Project Environmental Assessment

## Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 1</b>	<b><i>Purpose of and Need for Action</i></b>	
1.1	Introduction	1-2
1.2	Background	1-2
1.3	Purpose and Need	1-6
1.4	Geographic Range and Scope	1-7
1.5	Summary of the Proposed Action	1-7
1.6	Decisions to be Made	1-9
1.7	Organization of the Document	1-9
<b>Chapter 2</b>	<b><i>Alternatives</i></b>	
2.1	Introduction	2-2
2.2	Public Involvement	2-2
2.3	Development of Alternatives	2-9
2.4	Alternative Comparisons	2-22
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b><i>Affected Environment</i></b>	
3.1	Introduction	3-2
3.2	Physical Components	3-2
3.3	Biological Components	3-4
3.4	Social Components	3-15
3.5	Economic Components	3-20
<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b><i>Environmental Consequences</i></b>	
4.1	Introduction	4-2
4.2	Physical Components	4-6
4.3	Biological Components	4-8
4.4	Social Components	4-48
4.5	Economic Components	4-52

### ***List of Preparers***

### ***References***

### ***Glossary***

### ***Appendices***

<i>Appendix A</i>	Detailed Description of Alternative Management Direction
<i>Appendix B</i>	Detailed Description of Alternative Monitoring Requirements
<i>Appendix C</i>	Exemption Maps, by Forest
<i>Appendix D</i>	Discussion of HRV versus PFC and Canopy Closure Relationships
<i>Appendix E</i>	Tables Referenced in Chapter 3
<i>Appendix F</i>	Goshawk Habitat Maps Referenced in Chapter 3
<i>Appendix G</i>	Biological Resources Cumulative Effects Map
<i>Appendix H</i>	Biological Assessments and Evaluations
<i>Appendix I</i>	Biological Pre-Field Survey Form

### ***List of Tables***

<i>Table 1:</i>	Acres by forest and exemption area	2-15
<i>Table 2:</i>	Applicable Goals (G), Guidelines (g), Standards (s), Objectives (o), and Monitoring Requirements (m) for Alternatives	2-21
<i>Table 3:</i>	Key Outcome Differences Among Alternatives	2-26
<i>Table 4:</i>	Acreage Under Oil and Gas Lease on Utah's National Forests	3-27
<i>Table 5:</i>	Acres Under Leases, Licenses, or Prospecting Permits for Other Leasable Minerals on NFS lands in the Project Area	3-28
<i>Table 6:</i>	Approximate Range of Stand Density Indices for Various Canopy Closures by Cover Type	4-16
<i>Table 7:</i>	Approximate Range of Basal Areas for Various Canopy Closures by Cover Type	4-16
<i>Table 8:</i>	Volume Reductions by Wood Product Appraisal Group for Alternative E.	4-53
<i>Table 9:</i>	Alternative Comparison of Increased Monitoring Costs Over that Which is Currently Required in Existing Forest Plans on the Six Affected National Forests.	4-64

### ***List of Figures***

<i>Figure 1:</i>	Project Area	1-8
<i>Figure 2:</i>	Minorities in Utah	3-16