

**United States
Department of
Region
Agriculture**

**Forest Service
Intermountain**

**Record of Decision
For the
Millville Peak/Logan Peak Road Relocation
Project**

**Wasatch-Cache National Forest
Logan Ranger District**

Cache County, Utah

December 2007

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

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326 – W. Whitten Building, 145th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20250-9410, or call 202-720-5964 (voice or TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

BACKGROUND

The State of Utah, Information Technology Services, owns a high voltage electrical power line buried beneath the surface of a public access roadway on the Logan Ranger District. The 16-mile power line was buried beneath the road through Cowley Canyon over twenty years ago to provide power to the State-owned radio communications facility on Logan Peak. Since 1986 when the cable was buried, normal vehicular and off-road recreational traffic, combined with irregular road maintenance and substantial seasonal erosion, have severely damaged the surface of portions of the roadway, exposing the power line at several locations along the 16-mile route. The exposure of the power cable presents a public safety hazard as well as a danger to State technicians who regularly travel this route to service the communications facility. After several efforts to repair the entire roadway and completely cover the exposed cable failed, the Forest Service and the State of Utah looked at other options for remedying the situation and eliminating this critical safety hazard.

The Forest Service proposes to relocate a total of 5.4 miles of the Millville Peak and Logan Peak Roads (Forest Road 20168 and 20042, respectively) to avoid areas where excessively steep road grades and substantial erosion are causing a high voltage power cable buried beneath the road to become increasingly exposed. Road repair and maintenance efforts on this portion of the 16-mile route were unsuccessful and too dangerous to continue due to close encounters with the exposed power cable. Portions of the route are too rocky to further bury the cable and other portions are too steep to hold additional gravel to sufficiently cover the cable for any length of time.

The analysis area is located approximately 5 miles east and south of Logan, Utah in Cache County. It is generally situated between Logan Canyon to the north, Cache Valley on the west, Millville Canyon on the south, and “Red Ridge” (just east of Millville Peak road) on the east.

DECISION

This Record of Decision documents my decision for selecting Alternative A.1 as described in the Millville Peak/Logan Peak Road Relocation Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). The selected alternative relocates portions of the Millville Peak and Logan Peak roads, removing them from the high voltage power cable. My decision also maintains motorized access to “Inspiration Point” by constructing a .25-mile high clearance vehicle route connecting the new road to the existing Top of Spring Hollow Road. Non-motorized access between the Dry Canyon Trail (#7017) and the Spring Hollow Trail (#7124) would be maintained on a trail along the old road (which would be closed to motorized traffic and decommissioned).

My decision includes a total of 5.6 miles of road construction and 6.3 miles road decommissioning. Relocation of degraded portions of the Upper Providence Canyon 4x4 and Millville Peak roads, and decommissioning of the Logan Peak-A road, located south of where the cable lies beneath the road, is also included in my decision. These sections are being decommissioned and relocated upslope and out of the stream channel to the west of the current location, to improve degraded resource conditions resulting from existing, poor road locations and to facilitate connecting to relocated sections of road to the north.

The FEIS discloses the results of a project level analysis. The scope is confined to issues and potential environmental consequences relevant to the decision over relocation of portions of the Millville Peak and Logan Peak roads to provide safe, ground access to the communications site on Logan Peak.

My conclusions are based on the scientific analysis (and supporting project record) that demonstrates a thorough review of relevant scientific information, a consideration of responsible opposing views, and the acknowledgement of incomplete or unavailable information. The analysis identifies techniques and methodologies used, considers the best available science, and references scientific resources relied upon. The analysis includes a summary of the creditable scientific evidence relevant to evaluating reasonably foreseeable impacts.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF MY DECISION, INCLUDING MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING

In order to relocate public access roads 20168 and 20042 off the high voltage cable which supplies power to the communications site at Logan Peak, Alternative A.1, my selected alternative, will construct and decommission the following segments within the analysis area (see attached map for locations):

- Millville Peak Road (20168) – Relocation of 2.7 miles and decommission of 2.7 miles of existing system road.
- Logan Peak Road (20042) - Relocation of 2.5 miles and decommission of 3.1 miles of existing system road.
- Logan Peak-A Road (20042A) - Decommission of .3 miles of existing system road.
- Upper Providence Canyon 4x4 Road (20022) - Relocation of .2 miles and decommission of .2 miles of existing 4x4 system road.
- Top Spring Hollow (20126) - Construction of about .25 miles of high clearance vehicle road to connect the new road (20168) to the existing route (20126), maintaining motorized access for high clearance vehicles to “Inspiration Point”.

The new roadway will be relocated away from the cable and designed to maintain a road grade primarily of 8% or less, with a few short segments of steeper grades where necessary for layout of the route. The new alignment will be less than one quarter mile from the existing roadway and will have a maintenance level of 2 (designed for high clearance vehicles) the same as the existing roads. The old roadways will be physically closed out (decommissioned), the old roadbed will be revegetated using native seed, and barrier rock and logs will be placed strategically along the route to prevent any further motorized use of the roadway.

There are approximately 8 locations where the newly constructed Forest Roads 20042 and 20168 will intersect portions of existing system roads that are to be abandoned. The decommissioning work to be done at these locations will include effective barrier placement to preclude future use of the abandoned road segments. The road decommissioning work will also include ripping the road surface, seeding (with native seed), and scattering of large woody debris on the visible portions of the abandoned segments to facilitate more rapid restoration. Large amounts of woody debris, stumps, and rock will be placed over the segments where the new road and old roads intersect to make certain there is no future travel over the power cable.

My decision authorizes the State to build a fence around the communications site if they deem it necessary for security purposes.

Guidance for what actions are prohibited in roadless areas is provided in the recently reinstated 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule (2001 Roadless Rule). The 2001 Rule established prohibitions to road construction/reconstruction and timber harvest in areas identified in the 2000 Roadless Area Conservation Final Environmental Impact Statement. However, exceptions to these prohibitions (such as road construction/reconstruction) are allowed in certain situations, including “where needed to prevent irreparable resource damage that arises from the design, location, use, or deterioration of a classified road that cannot be mitigated by road maintenance...only if the road is deemed essential for public or private access, natural resource management, or public health and safety”. Relocation of portions of the Millville Peak and Logan Peak roads is needed because damage to this classified road cannot be mitigated by road repair or maintenance (as detailed above) and because the route is essential for public health and safety, providing access to the vital communications facility used by numerous County, State, and Federal agencies on Logan Peak.

The Travel Management Rule (November 2005), characterizes roads by their “managed use”. Under this decision, Top of Spring Hollow road (20126) will remain a high clearance vehicle road and will be displayed as such on the Motorized Vehicle Use Map at the time it is prepared.

My decision necessitates a Forest Plan amendment to approve a one-time waiver to the management prescription standard S2.7 and standard S3.1W to allow road construction associated with this project. The management prescriptions within which a portion of the roads will be relocated, Management Prescriptions 3.1w (Watershed Emphasis) and 2.7 (Special Interest Areas), allow no road construction. Re-alignment of the road within the 3.1w or 2.7 management prescriptions will necessitate a non-significant amendment of the Forest Plan allowing a one-time waiver for reconstructing the road within these prescription areas.

This project will be implemented over the next 1-2 years.

MITIGATION

A key element of my decision includes the mitigation measures listed in Appendix A of this ROD. The list has been supplemented and clarified from those shown in the DEIS. These mitigating measures are important in protecting sensitive resources on the Forest. Standards and guidelines from the Revised Forest Plan shown in Appendix B are incorporated as well.

MONITORING

Also incorporated into my decision is a strong monitoring program outlined in Section 2.51 of the FEIS. These monitoring activities would be conducted by the Forest Service to evaluate effectiveness of mitigation measures and to ensure compliance with management requirements listed in Sections 2.5 of the FEIS. In summary, monitoring would include Forest patrols designed to enforce and evaluate compliance with the District Travel Plan and closure of the old roadways, inventory and treatment of noxious weed introductions, field reviews and evaluation of effects of construction activities on scenic integrity, monitoring of effects on soils and water quality, and wildlife monitoring to assess the effects of management activities on a range of wildlife species.

REASONS FOR MY DECISION

I have reviewed the current environmental conditions, and the direct, indirect and cumulative effects analyses for all actions proposed in each of the alternatives. I have also considered comments received from the public and other agencies.

Discussions regarding the management activities to be implemented in Alternative A.1 and my rationale for choosing them are presented in the following sections. The criteria I used in comparing the alternatives were:

- The degree to which each alternative met the purpose and need for action;
- The degree to which each alternative responds to significant issues; and,
- The degree to which the alternative is responsive to public concerns and comments on the DEIS

Relationship to the Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Millville Peak/Logan Peak road relocation project is for public safety through resource improvement to provide a safe, reliable, ground access route for maintenance of the vital, State-owned communications facility on Logan Peak.

The first two-thirds of the 16-mile roadway accessing the communications site has been repaired and maintained where the cable could be buried deeper and where the road would hold gravel and proper drainage could be installed. However, along the later section where the roadway gets excessively rocky and steep (road grades in excess of 20%), severe erosion has resulted in the cable becoming increasingly exposed. Travel on this section of the road is unsafe and limits access to the communications facility on Logan Peak.

The potential for death and serious injury is substantial around those locations where the cable has become exposed. The potential for long power outages at this critical public safety communications facility also places law enforcement, fire and emergency medical services, homeland security, and public transportation operations at risk.

Severe damage to the roadway also impacts the State technicians' accessibility to the communications facility at Logan Peak. While ground access to the site is a priority, the primary concern is with the rapidly deteriorating condition of the power line and the potential for death and serious injury. Liability with respect to power line safety is shared by the State and Forest Service as the power line is owned by the State of Utah, but utilizes an "open to the public" accessible right-of-way managed by the Forest Service.

This action is needed to eliminate the public safety hazard posed by the exposed electrical power cable and to improve ground access to this vital communications facility located on Logan Peak. This action responds to the goals and objectives outlined in the Revised Wasatch-Cache Forest Plan and helps move the project area towards desired conditions described in the plan. Forest Plan Guideline G86 provides for the continuation of the Logan Peak communications site for non-commercial use (page 4-55).

I did not select Alternative B which would gate this public access route to Logan Peak and close it to all but administrative use. This alternative would do nothing to eliminate the exposure of State technicians to the high voltage power cable beneath the road. Technicians travel over this route at least twice per month to service the communications site. They would continue to be exposed to the danger of driving over the cable. Any other person using the road for administrative use (such as fire suppression) would also continue to be exposed to the danger of the high voltage cable. In addition, this alternative would present a "potential" for unauthorized use on the closed road (and exposure to the cable), because it would only be gated closed, which is not as effective as decommissioning a road, as described in my decision, Alternative A.1.

I did not select Alternative C (No Action) because, similar to Alternative B, it continues use of the current access route, with the high voltage cable becoming increasingly exposed at several locations. However, as compared to Alternative B (closed to all but administrative use), there would be even more exposure to the high voltage cable, because the public would continue to have access in addition to the State technicians who regularly use the road. Continuation of current management of the road would lead to increased deterioration of the road surface and further exposure of the power cable. This is unacceptable in light of the extreme danger the high voltage cable presents.

I find that Alternative A.1 best responds to the purpose and need.

Response to Significant Issues

Using the Scoping comments from the public and other agencies, the Forest Service Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) developed the following list of significant issues, defined as those issues directly or indirectly caused by implementing the Proposed Action. Significant issues are issues used to formulate alternatives to the Proposed Action, prescribe mitigation measures, or analyze environmental effects.

My decision addresses and resolves the significant issues in the following ways:

- **Aquatic Resources** – The proximity of roads to streams and ponds can be an indicator of the roads’ impact on aquatic habitat quality.

Alternative A.1 will have the least amount of open road within Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas (RHCAs). Decommissioning old roads will reduce the amount of sediment currently entering ponds and reduce the impact on amphibian habitat (see FEIS Section 3.2.6.1.1).

- **Recreation** – Changes in the recreation experience and opportunities related to road closures or allowed uses was of concern to the public. The proposed location of the Millville Peak Road (20168) no longer intersected with the existing Top of Spring Hollow Road (20126) which raised a public concern.

Alternative A.1 will maintain public access to Logan Peak and will have only short-term loss of recreation opportunity during the construction phase.

My decision maintains access to the popular Top of Spring Hollow Road (20126) as a high clearance vehicle road. The effects analysis showed no unacceptable resource impacts from this use. The difference in acres affected between an ATV trail and a high clearance vehicle route was negligible (.94 acres). Therefore, my decision includes construction of the .25-mile connecting route for use by high clearance vehicles and maintains motorized access to “Inspiration Point” via Forest Road 20126 (see FEIS Section 3.3.6.1.1).

- **Roadless Areas** – A concern was raised that relocation of portions of the Millville Peak and Logan Peak roads within inventoried roadless areas may affect roadless area values of the Mount Logan North, Mount Logan South, and Mount Logan West roadless areas.

Given that road construction and road decommissioning alternate between the three areas, there will be no discernable difference in acres within the Mount Logan roadless area

complex (87 acres affected within 31,500 acres total); the acres will just shift from one area to another.

The Millville Peak/Logan Peak road relocation project will have no measurable effect on roadless area values. As described in the Revised Forest Plan FEIS, roadless area values ranged from low to high in the 1999 inventory (plant and animal diversity, semi-primitive experience, and scenic integrity rated high for Mount Logan North; all others rated low to moderate). Only 87 acres of the 31,500 total acres will be affected by either road construction or road decommissioning. Mitigation measures will be employed to assure complete closure of the old roadways. New road construction will be mitigated to maintain scenic integrity and protect plant and animal diversity. Consequently, roadless values will be maintained for all three roadless areas (see FEIS Section 3.4.6.1.1).

Guidance for what actions are prohibited in roadless areas is provided in the recently reinstated 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule (2001 Roadless Rule). Relocation of a portion of the Millville Peak and Logan Peak roads is needed to prevent irreparable resource damage and is essential for public health and safety (see FEIS Section 1.5).

- **Scenery** – A concern was raised that road construction and related activities (such as logging and vegetation removal, cut banks, fill slopes, and the closure of the old road with rocks and logs) associated with relocating new portions and closing old portions of the Millville Peak and Logan Peak roads may affect the scenic integrity of the viewshed.

With the implementation of mitigating measures (as described in Appendix A) my decision (Alternative A.1) will maintain a “natural appearing landscape” and the scenic integrity of the viewshed will be maintained. A scenic integrity level of “high” will be maintained on one-third of the proposed realignment. A scenic integrity level of “moderate” (resulting from construction on steeper slopes with sparse vegetation) will be maintained on the remainder of the proposed realignment.

The intersection of the proposed Top of Spring Hollow Road (20126) with the relocated Millville Peak Road (20168) may be dominant in the foreground and middle ground views until vegetation is established. Mitigation measures (as described in the FEIS Section 2.5) will facilitate the recovery of the roadways (see FEIS Section 3.5.6.1.1).

- **Soil and Water** – A concern was raised regarding the effects of roads and road construction on soil productivity and water quality. However, a concern was also voiced that there are some existing degraded road conditions within the analysis area that are causing impairment of watershed health and need to be improved.

Improvement in soil quality can be measured by the degree to which decommissioned (closed) roads are stabilized and soils are restored on existing roads made obsolete (decommissioned). The effect on water quality is the relative potential for sediment delivery from roads into stream channels and lakes (based on the width and ground cover quality of the vegetation buffer strip separating the roads and waterways).

My decision, Alternative A.1 will result in a long-term loss in soil productivity on about 9 acres due to road construction. However, it will also result in the long-term restoration of soil productivity on 9 acres due to road decommissioning.

Alternative A.1 will produce negligible erosion and sedimentation of water sources due vegetation buffers of greater than 200 feet and through the implementation of mitigation measures (as included in Appendix A). Implementation of Alternative A.1 will bring about a large improvement to water quality in Providence Lake and Providence Creek due to the decommissioning of nearby degraded roads (see FEIS Section 3.6.6.1.1).

- **Vegetation** – A concern was raised that the clearing of trees for the road relocation may affect the age-class distribution of forested cover types across the ecological section (Revised Forest Plan Standard S13, page 4-39, requires “at least 20% of each forested type by ecological section be maintained with old forest landscape structure”).

Alternative A.1 will have a negligible effect (1/100th of 1 percent) on the mix of age classes within the Overthrust Mountains Ecological Section (the ecological section within which the analysis area lies). The clearing of approximately 700 trees (the equivalent of 7 acres) for road relocation will have no discernable effect on the structure of the surrounding mature forested stand (approximately 400 acres). The old road will be decommissioned and eventually become a part of the forested stand (see FEIS Section 3.7.6.1.1).

- **Wildlife** - A concern was raised regarding the effects of the proposed road relocation project on wildlife species and their habitats. The project area supports a variety of wildlife species and habitats and is within a larger corridor that serves as linkage habitat for forest carnivores such as the Canada lynx.

Implementation of my decision (Alternative A.1) will have a negligible effect on wildlife species, populations, and their habitats. The total acreage affected by road construction is minimal, especially in comparison to the available habitat (see FEIS Sections 3.8.5 and 3.8.6.1).

Implementation of my decision will have no effect on the Canada lynx based on the following: 1) the project is located within “linkage habitat” (not in a Lynx Analysis Unit); 2) there is an insignificant amount of lynx habitat affected; 3) lynx have successfully moved through the Logan District (have not been impeded); and, 4) road density will not increase as a result of this project. Therefore, there will be no effect on Canada lynx. There will be no effect on any threatened or endangered wildlife species or habitat, as documented in the FEIS Section 3.8.

Because the amount of conifer habitat affected by Alternative A.1, is insignificant (7.15 acres) and road density will be slightly reduced (by road decommissioning), there will be no effect on any sensitive species habitat or populations. Neither will there be any effect on any of the Management Indicator Species (MIS) for wildlife including the northern goshawk, beaver, or snowshoe hare, and consequently no effect on population trends.

The total acres of habitat affected (30 acres) is insignificant relative to total available habitat for migratory birds and construction activities will be mitigated, resulting in a negligible effect on migratory birds.

I find that my decision, Alternative A.1, best addresses the significant issues.

Consideration of DEIS Comments in the Rationale for the Decision

Thirty six letters were received during the DEIS comment period, which ended on September 5, 2007. All letters were reviewed and summarized by the interdisciplinary team members. Individual letters and summarized comments are on file in the project record at the Logan Ranger District.

In reviewing the comments received on the DEIS, I believe that my decision addresses the concerns raised by the public. Of the 36 comment letters received some of the more primary concerns expressed were about maintaining public access to popular sites including Providence Canyon, Logan Peak, and Inspiration Point; effective closure of decommissioned roads and reduction of the power cable safety hazard; protection of the communications site; maintaining high clearance vehicle access on the Top of Spring Hollow Road; and, effects on roadless areas. Comments are further responded to in Chapter 7 of the FEIS.

Effective Closure of Decommissioned Roads and Elimination of the Safety Hazard -

A comment on the draft EIS was concerned that decommissioned roads would not be completely and effectively closed out and unauthorized motorized use might occur on these routes. An associated concern was that the cable would remain exposed and continue to present a safety hazard along the old route and at intersections of the new and old roads. This project includes several mitigation measures to ensure that the old roadways are completely closed out, including placement of barrier rock and large logs at intersections and along the roadway, scarifying the road surface, and native seeding the roadbed. To insure that the cable is no longer exposed along the old route, surplus road material and gravel will be placed at these locations to effectively cover the exposed cable. Additional material and gravel will be placed at the intersections of the old and new roads to further cover the cable. These areas are not as steep as the current road grade and will not experience the seasonal erosion that impacts the existing alignment.

Public Access -

Many of the comment letters expressed concern about losing public access to popular sites in the project area, including Providence Canyon, Logan Peak, and Inspiration Point as a result of road closures or changes in allowed use. Particular concern was raised over changing the existing Top of Spring Hollow Road (20126) from a high clearance vehicle road to an ATV trail. My decision provides safe public (and administrative) access to all of these popular sites by relocating the Millville Peak and Logan Peak roads off the high voltage power cable. My decision also allows continued use of Forest Road 20126 by high clearance vehicles by constructing a .25-mile road instead of an ATV trail (of the same length).

Protection of the Communications Site -

One comment letter expressed a view that public access to Logan Peak exposes the communication site to vandalism and is a national security concern. My decision includes provision for the State of Utah to construct a fence around the communication site if they determine it is needed.

Roadless Areas -

One comment letter expressed concern that the impacts of new road construction and resultant loss of acres to roadless areas could be significant and that if mitigation is not successful impacts to watersheds and roadless areas will be increased by the project. I am confident the mitigation measures included in my decision will effectively close and revegetate the old roadway. The analysis showed that the project would affect less than 1 percent of the 31,500 acre Mount Logan roadless area complex and that roadless area values will be protected.

Monitoring -

A comment on the draft EIS indicated a concern about monitoring of the effectiveness of the mitigation measures. This project includes a plan that monitors compliance with the district Travel Plan, inventories and treats weed infestations that may arise as a result of the road construction, evaluates the effects of the project on scenic integrity, monitors sediment and water quality, and reflects Forest Plan monitoring for MIS species. I believe these will be more than adequate for the purpose of monitoring this project and the effectiveness of the mitigation measures.

I find that my decision, Alternative A.1, best responds to public comments.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

On April 7, 2006, the Scoping Document outlining the Purpose and Need for Action and the Proposed Action was provided to about 150 individuals and organizations on the Logan District mailing list. A Notice of Intent (NOI) for the Millville Peak/Logan Peak Road Relocation Project was published in the Federal Register on April 12, 2006. The NOI asked for public comment on the proposal by May 12, 2006. In addition, as part of the public involvement process, a public information meeting was held on April 25, 2006. Eighteen responses were received during scoping. All of the letters and emails were read, individual comments were placed in general issue categories, and significant issues (as described above) were identified by the interdisciplinary team. A complete listing of the individual comments and issue categories are on file in the project record.

The DEIS for the Millville Peak/Logan Peak Road Relocation project was released for public review on July 9, 2007. A Notice of Availability was posted in the Federal Register on July 20, 2007. A legal notice was placed in the Salt Lake Tribune on July 24, 2007. Letters were sent to interested parties identified during the scoping process and to local, state and federal agencies notifying them the DEIS was available on the Forest website. Thirty six letters were received during the comment period, which ended on September 5, 2007. All letters were reviewed and summarized by the interdisciplinary team members. Individual letters and summarized comments are on file in the project record. Responses to comments are provided in Chapter 7 of the FEIS.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT STUDIED IN DETAIL

As a result of comments made during the initial scoping period, the following alternatives were considered but then dismissed from detailed analysis for the following reasons:

- Original Proposed Action (as described in the April 7, 2006 Scoping Letter)

A portion of the Logan Peak road would have been relocated across the mid-section of the steep slope to the east of Logan Peak. Upon further field reconnaissance by forest engineers in the summer of 2006, it was determined the road could not be located there, due to excessively steep, rocky, and undulating terrain. The engineering crew found a more plausible location for the road which became the new proposed action.

- Repair and maintain the current Millville Peak and Logan Peak roads

This alternative was considered but dismissed because it is not fully possible and it does not meet the purpose and need. Portions of the road have been maintained and repaired where it was physically possible and safe. Regularly scheduled road maintenance protected the integrity of the power cable on the portion of the road between Cowley Canyon and White Bedground for 10 years following the installation of the cable. However, Forest engineers determined that portions of the road beyond this point are too steep to hold enough gravel to safely cover the power cable for any length of time. Other portions of the roadway are too rocky and near bedrock so that the cable can not be buried any deeper.

- Consider an alternative source of power

This alternative was considered but dismissed because it is outside the scope of the decision. The communications facility is owned by the State of Utah and its administration is under their jurisdiction. However, the State of Utah has given consideration to other forms of power such as solar, wind, diesel, and propane. These forms of power were considered unreliable and presented safety and visual concerns and were dropped from further consideration.

- Consider an alternate location for the cable; consider other access routes

Other access routes such as Providence Canyon, Dry Canyon, and Mill Hollow were considered in the early 1980's during the initial environmental review and again given preliminary review in this analysis. Due to the steep, rocky terrain, greater distance, higher costs, and visual impacts, these routes were eliminated from further study.

- Relocate the road to the SSE of Logan Peak

The area to the south-southeast of Logan Peak was thoroughly examined in the field for all possible new road locations; it was determined to be too steep and rocky, with too many cliff areas to construct a new road for access to Logan Peak.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES STUDIED IN DETAIL

The EIS analyzes three alternatives in detail as summarized below. Table ROD-1 summarizes the differences in actions associated with each of the alternatives. Table ROD-2 provides a summary of the effects of implementing each of the alternatives.

Alternative A (Proposed Action) – the Proposed Action relocates portions of the Millville Peak and Logan Peak roads to remove them from a high voltage power cable buried beneath. The proposed action has two sub-alternatives as follows.

- **A.** Construction of a .25 mile, 50-inch-wide, ATV connector trail to access Inspiration Point via Top of Spring Hollow Road which would be converted to an ATV trail.
- **A.1** Construction of a .25 mile, 12-foot wide connector road to maintain high clearance vehicle access to Inspiration Point via Top of Spring Hollow Road. This alternative is described in detail as my decision.

Alternative B (Close Road - Administrative Use Only) – Portions of the Millville Peak and Logan Peak roads would be closed to all but administrative use. The State of Utah personnel would be allowed to travel the road to service the communication site at Logan Peak.

Alternative C (No Action) – Under continuation of current management there would be no road relocation or closing of roads. The cable would remain in place beneath portions of the Millville Peak and Logan Peak roads.

Table ROD-1 Comparison of differences among Alternatives A and A.1 (Proposed Action), B (Close Road), and C (No Action)

Indicators	Alternative A and A.1 (Proposed Action)	Alternative B (Close Road-Admin Use Only)	Alternative C (No Action)
Aquatics Miles of road within RHCA's	0.96 miles of open road within 50' of an ephemeral stream; .05 miles open road within 150' of a pond	1.61 miles of road within 50' of an ephemeral stream; .14 miles of road within 150' of a pond	Same as Alt B
Recreation Changes in recreation and access opportunities	Alt A would change Road 20126 from "high clearance vehicle" to ATV trail; some loss of "challenging terrain" for 4x4s with realignment of the steep, rocky pitches of roads 20168 and 20042. Alt A.1 would maintain road 20126 as a "high clearance vehicle" road.	Portions of 20168 and 20042 would be gated closed to the public motorized use; public motorized access to Logan Peak would be eliminated	Public access along roads 20168 and 20042 would continue; cable beneath the road would become increasingly exposed
Roadless Areas Miles of road constructed or decommissioned in each roadless area	Miles of road constructed: 5.2 miles in Mount Logan North and .2 miles in Mount Logan South; Miles of road decommissioned: 3.6 miles in Mount Logan North, 2.6 miles in Mount Logan South, and .2 miles in Mount Logan West. Alt A.1 would add .25 miles of high clearance road.	No roads constructed or decommissioned; roads gated closed to public motorized use	No roads constructed or decommissioned
Scenery Miles of road constructed within the viewsheds	Alt A would construct 5.4 miles and decommission 6.3 miles of road; Alt A.1 would add .25 miles of high clearance road.	No roads constructed or decommissioned	Same as Alt B

Indicators	Alternative A and A.1 (Proposed Action)	Alternative B (Close Road-Admin Use Only)	Alternative C (No Action)
<p>Soils</p> <p>Miles of road constructed and decommissioned and affected acres</p>	<p>5.4 miles of road construction (12-foot width); 6.3 miles of road decommissioned (12-foot width); and, .25 miles 50-inch motorized trail. Alt A.1 would add .25 miles of high clearance road (12-foot width).</p>	<p>No roads constructed or decommissioned; gates installed for road closure</p>	<p>No roads constructed or decommissioned</p>
<p>Water</p> <p>Proximity of roads to water resources (related to potential sediment delivery)</p>	<p>Relocated roads would range from 270 feet to 4300 feet from water resources</p>	<p>Existing roads range from 30 feet to 535 feet from water resources</p>	<p>Same as Alt B</p>
<p>Vegetation</p> <p>Conifer acres cleared for road construction</p>	<p>Cutting/removal of 7 acres of conifer trees for road construction (2% of 374-acre stand); Alt A.1 would not cut any conifer acres (just 1-2 trees).</p>	<p>No cutting or removal of trees</p>	<p>Same as Alt B</p>
<p>Wildlife</p> <p>Miles of road construction within habitat types and changes in road density</p>	<p>4.5 miles (21 acres) within shrub/grass type; 1.48 miles (7.15 acres) within conifer type; road density of 1.86 miles per square mile and 1.01 for Little Logan River and Card Canyon watersheds, respectively</p>	<p>4.6 miles (22 acres) within shrub/grass type; 1.5 miles (8 acres) within conifer type; road density of 1.15 miles per square mile and 0.80 for Little Logan River and Card Canyon watersheds, respectively (because roads would be gated closed)</p>	<p>Vegetation changes same as Alt B; road density is 1.90 miles per square mile and 1.02 for Little Logan River and Card Canyon watersheds, respectively</p>

Table ROD-2 Comparison of the effects of Alternatives A and A.1 (Proposed Action), B (Close Road), and C (No Action)

Issue	Alternative A and A.1 (Proposed Action)	Alternative B (Close Road- Admin Use Only)	Alternative C (No Action)
<p>Issue #1 – Aquatic Resources</p> <p>a. Effect on aquatic resources</p>	<p>Least amount of roads open within RHCAs; old roads would continue to contribute some sediment in the short-term until they are revegetated; relocating roads away from ponds would reduce sediment and reduce existing impact to amphibians at these sites</p>	<p>Same amount and location of roads open within RHCAs as Alt C (although less traffic); roads would continue to contribute sediment; in the long-term, Providence Lake would no longer be able to support amphibians</p>	<p>Same as Alt B</p>
<p>Issue #2 – Recreation</p> <p>a. Effect on recreation experience and access</p>	<p>Short-term loss of recreation opportunities during road construction; no loss of 4x4 high clearance vehicle experience in Alt A.1</p>	<p>Greatest short-term and long-term loss of recreation opportunities</p>	<p>Safety concerns would be greatest and road would eventually become impassible; eventual loss of recreation opportunities</p>
<p>Issue #3 – Roadless areas</p> <p>a. Effect on roadless area values</p>	<p>Road relocation would result in a net loss of 12 acres within the 19,200-acre Mount Logan North roadless area (less than 1 percent); a net gain of 17 acres within the 17,000-acre Mount Logan South roadless area; and a net gain of 2 acres in the 5,300-acre Mount Logan West roadless area. These negligible changes would have “no effect” on roadless area values</p>	<p>There would be no change to acres in any of the roadless areas; recreation opportunity (one of the roadless values) would be impacted by closure of the roads to motorized public use</p>	<p>There would be no change to roadless areas or roadless values from current</p>

Issue	Alternative A and A.1 (Proposed Action)	Alternative B (Close Road- Admin Use Only)	Alternative C (No Action)
<p>Issue #4 – Scenery</p> <p>a. Effect on the scenery of the area</p>	<p>Would maintain a “natural appearing landscape”; scenic integrity of “high” maintained on 1/3 of the proposed realignment; scenic integrity of “moderate” would result from construction on steeper slopes with sparse vegetation</p>	<p>Would maintain a “natural-appearing landscape” and a “high” scenic integrity</p>	<p>Same as Alt B</p>
<p>Issue #5 – Soil and Water</p> <p>a. Effect on soil productivity</p>	<p>Long-term loss in soil productivity on 8 acres due to road construction; long-term restoration of soil productivity on 9 acres due to road decommissioning; Alt A.1 would add .94 acres to area disturbed.</p>	<p>No improvement of any existing soil erosion and sediment delivery conditions; potential of people trying to drive around gates, causing isolated vegetation and soil damage</p>	<p>No loss of soil productivity; no improvement of any existing soil erosion and sediment delivery conditions;</p>
<p>b. Effect on water resources</p>	<p>Negligible erosion and sedimentation of water sources due vegetation buffers (greater than 200 feet) and mitigation measures; large improvement to water quality in Providence Lake and Providence Creek due to decommission of degraded roads; Alt A.1 same as Alt A.</p>	<p>No improvement of any existing erosion or sediment delivery conditions</p>	<p>No improvement of any existing erosion or sediment delivery conditions</p>
<p>Issue #6 - Vegetation</p> <p>a. Effect on relative mix of age classes across the ecological section</p>	<p>Negligible effect (1/100th of 1 percent) on the mix of age classes within the Overthrust Mountains Ecological Section; Alt A.1 same as Alt A.</p>	<p>No effect</p>	<p>No effect</p>

Issue	Alternative A and A.1 (Proposed Action)	Alternative B (Close Road- Admin Use Only)	Alternative C (No Action)
Issue #7 – Wildlife a. Effect on threatened and endangered wildlife species and their habitat	No T,E wildlife habitat except lynx, as follows: project located within linkage habitat (not LAU); insignificant amount of habitat affected; lynx have successfully moved through District; road density would not increase; therefore, no effect on Canada lynx or any other T,E wildlife species. Alt A.1 the same as Alt A.	Would reduce road density slightly; no effect on Canada lynx or any other T,E wildlife species	No changes in location or miles or roads and trails from current; no effect on Canada lynx or any other T,E wildlife species
b. Effect on sensitive wildlife species and their habitat	Because the amount of conifer habitat is insignificant (7.15 acres) and road density would slightly reduce, there would be no effect on any sensitive species habitat or populations. Alt A.1 same as Alt A.	No conifer habitat affected and roads would be gated closed; there would be no effect on any sensitive species habitat or populations	No conifer habitat affected; roads would remain open; there would be no effect on any sensitive species habitat or populations
c. Effect on Management Indicator Species (MIS)	Because the amount of conifer habitat is insignificant (7.15 acres) there would be no effect on the northern goshawk, beaver, or snowshoe hare, and consequently no effect on population trends. Alt A.1 same as Alt A.	There would be no effect on the northern goshawk, beaver, or snowshoe hare, and consequently no effect on population trends	There would be no effect on the northern goshawk, beaver, or snowshoe hare, and consequently no effect on population trends
d. Effect on migratory birds	Total acres of habitat affected insignificant (30 acres) relative to total habitat and construction activities mitigated; therefore negligible effect on migratory birds. Alt A.1 same as Alt A.	No effect on migratory birds	No effect on migratory birds

ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Alternative A.1 is the environmentally preferred alternative because it provides for public safety, maintains ground based access to the vital, State-owned communications site on Logan Peak while improving degraded road conditions that are causing impacts to watershed health. It continues to provide access to traditional public access points of interest without causing resource degradation. Concerns regarding impacts to aquatics, soils, water, wildlife, and scenery have been minimized through effective mitigation measures and monitoring.

SIGNIFICANCE OF FOREST PLAN AMENDMENT

The “significance” of an amendment must be determined. It is important to note that there is a difference between “significance” of the change to a forest plan and “significance” of the environmental impacts of the Proposed Action as defined by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). Determination of “significance” for a forest plan amendment is based on the following criteria defined in the Forest Service Manual 1926.5 (Regional Forester letter dated August 9, 2007).

Changes to the land management plan that are not significant can result from:

1. Actions that do not significantly alter the multiple-use goals and objectives for long-term land and resource management.
2. Adjustments of management area boundaries or management prescriptions resulting from further on-site analysis when the adjustments do not cause significant changes in the multiple-use goals and objectives for long-term land and resource management.
3. Minor changes in standards and guidelines.
4. Opportunities for additional projects or activities that will contribute to achievement of the management prescription.

Goals and Objectives

This amendment will not alter the multiple-use goals and objectives for long-term land and resource management established during the planning process (See the Final Environmental Impact Statement accompanying the Revised Forest Plan, 2003).

Management Prescription

Allowing this one-time waiver for road construction in this specific location within management prescriptions 3.1w and 2.7 (for the purpose of public safety) does not change or affect the management prescription for the rest of the Forest or for future projects in this same area. It does not alter management area boundaries.

Minor changes in Standards and Guidelines

This change is limited to only this project and is a waiver of standards S2.7 (Revised Forest Plan page 4-67) and S3.1W (Revised Forest Plan page 4-69). Because the waiver is limited in this way it is considered a minor change.

Opportunities for additional projects or activities that contribute to the achievement of the management prescription

This change will neither preclude nor necessitate additional projects. This change does not alter the ability to achieve the management prescriptions 2.7 or 3.1W. The area mapped as 2.7 will continue to be managed with a focus on its unique botanical qualities. The area mapped as 3.1W will continue to be managed with a watershed health emphasis

After reviewing the Forest Service manual direction, the proposed amendment for Alternative A.1 was found to be not significant in accordance with the requirements of sections 1926.51 and 1926.52.

FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH LAWS, REGULATIONS AND POLICY

Numerous laws, regulations and agency directives require that my decision be consistent with their provisions. My decision is consistent with all laws, regulations and agency policy relevant to this project. The following discussion is intended to provide information on the regulations that apply to areas raised as issues or comments by the public or other agencies.

The National Forest Management Act of 1976 (PL-94-588)

Management activities are to be consistent with the Forest Plan [p16 USC 1604 (i)]. The Forest Plan guides management activities [36 CFR 219.1(b)]. My decision to implement Alternative A.1 is consistent with the intent of the 2003 Revised Forest Plan's forest-wide goals, subgoals, and objectives and the desired condition of the Cache-Box Elder Management Area. The project incorporates applicable forest wide standards and guidelines from Chapter 4 of the Plan. The project is not consistent with the management prescriptions mapped for the area. Management prescriptions categories 2.7 and 3.1W do not allow road construction.

Therefore, my decision amends the Forest Plan for this project only, to allow road construction in this specific location within management prescriptions 2.7 and 3.1W (for the purpose of public safety) and does not change the management prescription for the rest of the Forest.

Endangered Species Act (ESA)

The Wasatch-Cache National Forest wildlife biologist, fisheries biologist, and plant ecologist evaluated Alternative A.1 with regard to threatened and endangered animal and plant species. Findings are summarized in Chapter 3 of the FEIS and in the Biological Assessment (BA). Based on the disclosure in Chapter 3 and the BA concerning threatened and endangered or proposed wildlife, plant or fish species, it has been determined there are no adverse effects to endangered, threatened, or proposed species of fish, wildlife and plants relative to this decision.

Executive Order 13186 of January 10, 2001

Based on the discussion in Chapter 3 and information in the project file concerning migratory birds, my decision is in compliance with this Executive Order for the Conservation of Migratory Birds.

Clean Water Act

The mitigating measures outlined in Appendix A attached to this ROD which I have adopted as part of my decision, are designed to minimize impacts to soil productivity and protect water quality. Based on these measures and the Soil and Water Quality analysis in Chapter 3, I have concluded that Alternative A.1 is consistent with the Clean Water Act.

National Forest Noxious Weed Management Policy (FSM 2080-2083)

Alternative A.1 is consistent with the National Forest Noxious Weed Management Policy, which requires district rangers to prevent the introduction and establishment of weeds, along with providing for the containment and suppression, of noxious weeds.

Environmental Justice and Civil Rights

Executive Order 12898, issued in 1994 ordered Federal Agencies to identify and address any adverse human health and environmental effects of agency programs that disproportionately impact minority and low-income populations. This project does not disproportionately impact any human populations. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides for nondiscrimination in voting, public accommodations, public facilities, public education, federally assisted programs, and equal employment opportunity. Title VI of the Act, Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2000d through 2000-d6) prohibits discrimination based on race, color or national origin.

American Antiquities Act of 1906 and National Historic Preservation Act of 1966

No cultural resources were identified as a result of a Class III pedestrian survey of the project area. The Forest Service has made the determination that this proposed undertaking will result in No Historic Properties Affected [36CFR 800.4(d) (1)]. In a letter dated October 18, 2006, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurred with the Forest Service finding and recommended no further action. In the unlikely event a cultural resource was encountered during a construction activity, that activity would be stopped and SHPO would be contacted. Construction would resume when the appropriate protective action had been taken.

Executive Order 13112, Invasive Species, February 3, 1999

This Executive Order directs Federal Agencies, whose actions may affect the status of invasive species, to (i) prevent the introduction of invasive species, (ii) detect and respond rapidly to, and control, populations of such species in a cost-effective and environmentally sound manner, as appropriations allow. My decision complies with this order.

Roadless Area Conservation Rule of January 12, 2001

The intent of the rule is to provide lasting protection for inventories roadless areas within the National Forest System in the context of multiple use management. The 2001 Rule established prohibitions to road construction/reconstruction and timber harvest in areas identified in the 2000 Roadless Area Conservation Final Environmental Impact Statement. However, exceptions to these prohibitions (such as road construction/reconstruction) are allowed in certain situations, including “where needed to prevent irreparable resource damage that arises from the design, location, use, or deterioration of a classified road that cannot be mitigated by road maintenance...only if the road is deemed essential for public or private access, natural resource management, or public health and safety.” Relocation is needed for portions of the Millville Peak and Logan Peak roads to prevent irreparable resource damage and is essential for public health and safety. My decision meets the exception to the Rule’s prohibitions and, therefore, complies with the Roadless Rule.

Executive Order 11644 (1972) and Executive Order 11989 (1977)

The purpose of the order is to establish policies and provide for procedures that will ensure that the use of off-road vehicles on public lands will be controlled and directed so as to protect the resources of those lands, to promote the safety of all users of the land and to minimize conflicts among the various uses of those lands. Mitigation measures included in my decision minimize potential for unauthorized use and promote compliance with the District Travel Plan.

Travel Management Rule of November 9, 2005 (36 CFR Parts 212 and 261)

The rule requires designation of roads, trails, and areas open to motor vehicle use. It prohibits the use of motor vehicles off the designated system. My decision complies with provisions in the Travel Rule.

IMPLEMENTATION AND APPEAL PROCEDURES

This decision is subject to administrative review (appeal) pursuant to 36 CFR Part 215. The appeal must be filed (regular mail, fax, email, hand-delivery, or express delivery) with the Appeal Deciding Officer at *Appeal Deciding Officer, Harv Forsgren, Regional Forester, 324 25th Street, Ogden, Utah 84401 fax 801-625-5277*. The office business hours for those submitting hand-delivered appeals are: 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, excluding holidays. Electronic appeals must be submitted in a format such as an email message, plain text (.txt), rich text format (.rtf), and Word (.doc) to *appeals-intermtn-regional-office@fs.fed.us*. In cases where no identifiable name is attached to an electronic message, a verification of identity will be required. A scanned signature is one way to provide verification.

Appeals, including attachments, must be filed within 45 days from the publication date of this notice in the Salt Lake Tribune, the newspaper of record. Attachments received after the 45 day appeal period will not be considered. The publication date in the Salt Lake Tribune, newspaper of record, is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an appeal. Those wishing to appeal this decision should not rely upon dates or timeframe information provided by any other source.

Individuals or organizations who submitted written comments or otherwise expressed interest before the close of the comment period specified at 215.6 may appeal this decision. The notice of appeal must meet the appeal content requirements at 36 CFR 215.14.

If no appeal is received, implementation of this decision may occur on, but not before, five business days from the close of the appeal filing period. If an appeal is received, implementation may not occur for 15 days following the date of appeal disposition.

CONTACT FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

For further information regarding this project contact Evelyn Sibbernsen, Environmental Coordinator on the Logan Ranger District, phone (435) 755-3620.

/s/ Faye Krueger

December 6, 2007

FAYE KRUEGER
Wasatch-Cache National Forest Supervisor

Date: _____

Wasatch-Cache Forest Plan

Amendment No. 4

Effective with the Decision for the Millville Peak/Logan Peak Road Relocation Project
2007

POSTING NOTICE:

Because this is a waiver there are no insert pages associated with this posting notice.

EXPLANATION:

The analysis to substantiate these changes in management prescriptions for the Cache-Box Elder Management area is found in the EIS for the Millville Peak/Logan Peak Road Relocation Project, December 2007.

Forest Plan standards (S2.7) in Management Prescription 2.7 (Special Interest Areas) and (S3.1W) in Management Prescription 3.1W (Watershed Emphasis) allow no road construction. Relocation of the Millville Peak and Logan Peak roads within 3.1W and 2.7 management prescriptions necessitates amendment of the Forest Plan, to allow a one-time waiver for reconstructing the road. Road relocation is needed for public safety; deterioration of the existing road is causing a high voltage power cable buried beneath the road to become increasingly exposed. The road can not be repaired or maintained in its current alignment to effectively cover the power cable. (See FEIS for the Millville Peak/Logan Peak Road Relocation Project for details.)

This amendment is a non-significant amendment to the Wasatch-Cache Forest Plan that amends standards (S2.7) in Management Prescription 2.7 (Special Interest Areas) and (S3.1W) in Management Prescription 3.1W (Watershed Emphasis) as they are applied to this specific project only. In other areas of the Wasatch-Cache where MPC 2.7 and 3.1W are applied, timber harvest, road construction, and new recreation development are not to be allowed.

APPENDIX A

Mitigation Measures and Management Requirements

The following mitigation measures, Best Management Practices (BMPs), and forest-wide standards and guidelines are included in all action alternatives. Research and information substantiating these requirements are found in the Revised Forest Plan and FEIS (USDA Forest Service 2003), and other resources as noted, available in the project file.

Aquatics

The following mitigation is recommended to reduce sedimentation, improve watershed conditions, and minimize impacts to aquatic resources.

- There should be no ground disturbance in wetlands or wet areas.
- Erosion control structures such as straw bails and sediment fence; or erosion control materials such as erosion matting or straw mulch should be installed to minimize erosion from areas of soil disturbance along water features.
- Equipment used in construction should be inspected for fluid leaks and fixed before being allowed to start construction. Fueling of equipment used in construction should occur outside of riparian habitat conservation areas (RHCAs).
- Include proper drainage into road design.
- Decommissioned roads and trails should be drained, scarified, and returned to contour. Where deemed necessary by the Forest Botanist, decommissioned roads will be seeded. If it is determined the decommissioned roads will seed in naturally, they will not need to be seeded. However, when seeding is done, it will be with native seed only.
- Designation of Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas (RHCAs) as described by the WCNF Revised Forest Plan (USDA Forest Service, 2003 p. GL-19) and by the Inland Native Fish Strategy (INFISH) is recommended for riparian areas within the analysis area. RCHAs include traditional riparian corridors, wetlands, intermittent streams, and other areas that help maintain the integrity of aquatic ecosystems by 1) influencing the delivery of coarse sediment, organic matter, and woody debris to streams, 2) providing root strength for channel stability, 3) shading the stream, and 4) protecting water quality. Definitions for RCHAs are provided in the Glossary.

Rare Plants

- No ground disturbing activities should occur on or near the site of *Eriogonum brevicaulum* var. *loganum* located near the toe of the slope before the road climbs up the hill to Logan Peak (in the NE ¼, ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 3, T11N, R2E).

Noxious Weeds

The following mitigation is recommended to reduce the potential introduction of noxious weeds associated with relocated and decommissioned roads in this project.

- Mud, vegetation, and debris should be thoroughly washed from all construction equipment prior to arrival on the worksite. If equipment leaves the Forest then it must be washed again prior to arrival back on the worksite.
- Inventory and treat any new weed infestations that may arise on the old road before it is closed out; treatment after the road is closed becomes more difficult because access must be on foot rather than by vehicle.

Recreation

- Decommissioning work on the old roads would include effective barrier placement to preclude future use of the abandoned road segments. The road decommissioning work would also include ripping the road surface, seeding (with native seed), and scattering of large woody debris on the visible portions of the abandoned segments to facilitate more rapid restoration. Large amounts of woody debris, stumps, and rock would be placed over the segments where the new road and old roads intersect to make certain there is no future travel over the power cable.

Scenery

The following mitigation is recommended to minimize visual impacts and maintain the scenic integrity of the affected viewshed.

- In areas where slash is burned, construct a burn pit of sufficient size to hold slash. Remove the top 6 inches of soil and stock pile away from pit to protect it from heat sterilization during the burning operation. Once all slash has been burned, scarify pit bottom and mix in ash between 6 to 12 inches in depth and replace topsoil over the pit area and seed with native plants.
- Within fill slopes between the toe of a 1 ½:1 slope and a 1:1 projected slope toe flush cut tree stems and large woody plants and do not remove the root balls.
- Use root balls for tree well construction, landscape rehabilitation, road reclamation, closing unauthorized trails and roads, and creating a natural appearing landscape. Place root balls with tree stems in the landscape to mimic blow down or other similar events as directed by the Forest Landscape Architect.
- Conifer stems will be decked, used in construction for cribbing, tree wells, landscape rehabilitation, road reclamation, closing unauthorized trails and roads

and creating a natural appearing landscape. Place the stems as directed by the Forest Landscape Architect.

Soil and Water

During construction of the new road and decommissioning of old roads, several mitigation measures will be practiced to improve watershed conditions by decreasing the effects of sedimentation from the road construction areas and road surfaces on water resources in the project area. The basic objective for mitigating sedimentation is to eliminate or minimize the direct connection between storm flow from the road and nearby streams, lakes, and springs.

- Avoid wet areas by moving segment of Forest Service Road 20168 from the saddle between Mill Hollow and Providence Canyon to the intersection of Forest Service Road 20042 out of the bottom of the drainage.
- Realigning Forest Service Road 20042 will remove the road sections and inherent road impacts of sedimentation in adjacent lakes.
- Put proper drainage into new road design, because existing road problems are mainly those of drainage and seasonal concentration of water in low areas.
- Provide for strips of vegetation (200') along the road to trap, filter, and infiltrate sediment laden runoff before it reaches the water feature. Apply BMPs 86, 87, 88 as presented in the General Technical Report INT-GTR-339, "Idaho forestry best management practices: compilation of research on their effectiveness" (Seyedbagheri, K. A. 1996).
- Forest Service Roads 20126, 20168, and 20042 should be properly drained and stabilized to prevent further erosion and sedimentation from closed roads by implementing road decommissioning work.
- There are approximately 8 specific locations where the newly constructed Forest Roads 20042 and 20168 will intersect portions of existing system roads that are to be abandoned. The decommissioning work to be done at these locations should include effective barrier placement to preclude future use of the abandoned road segments, and ripping/seeding/scattering of woody debris on the visible portions of the abandoned segments to facilitate more rapid restoration.

Vegetation

The following mitigation measures are designed to minimize the risk of a bark beetle infestation resulting from felling trees for road relocation.

- If trees are felled after the main flight period (July) for the beetles they will have time to dry out in the fall and winter and will be less attractive the following year.

In this case the boles should be spread out in more sun exposed locations to promote drying of the bark. Removal of limbs will also promote drying of the boles. Use of the boles for closure of the existing road will help with this spreading. Close monitoring should occur for two years and if any indications of beetle activity are observed, then suppressive action should be taken.

- If trees are felled early in the spring, before the flight (or just before snowfall) then application of MCH to the boles can be effective at deterring attack. MCH is an anti aggregating pheromone which signals the beetles that the trees are fully occupied and they should move on. Capsules of MCH should be stapled at about 10 foot intervals on the shady sides of the downed trees. One application the first year should be adequate to prevent attack on these stems. Trees should be monitored for two years.

Wildlife

The following mitigation measures are designed to minimize the effects on wildlife habitat or populations.

- Where possible, minor adjustments to road location should be made to avoid snags with existing cavities, to provide protection for cavity-nesting birds.
- To minimize effects to neotropical birds, road construction activities should be planned, where possible, to occur in the late summer or fall, after the active nesting season. Since the potential season of operation is so short at this high elevation, this may not be entirely possible to achieve.

APPENDIX B
Wasatch-Cache National Forest
Revised Forest Plan Guidance

Soil, Water and Aquatics

Standards and guidelines

Forestwide Standards and Guidelines enforced for maintaining and/or improving watershed, riparian, and aquatic habitat health are binding limitations to be placed on management activities of the Millville Peak/Logan Peak Road Relocation project. Also, RFP guidance relating to vegetation ground cover thresholds (S7) and area limitations on allowable amounts of soil disturbance (G4) are not applicable to a system road construction project such as this.

(S2) Apply runoff controls during project implementation to prevent pollutants including fuels, sediment, oils, from reaching surface and groundwater

(S3) Unclassified roads and trails will be administratively closed and rehabilitated.

(S17) All decommissioned roads/trails will be properly drained

(S20) When constructing or maintaining roads, trails, and facilities, use Best Management Practices to minimize sediment discharge into streams, lakes, and wetlands

(G9) Avoid soil disturbing activities (those that remove surface organic matter exposing mineral soil) on steep, erosive, and unstable slopes, and in riparian, wetlands, floodplains, wet meadows, and alpine areas.

(G11) Use Best Management Practices and Soil and Water Conservation Practices during project level assessment and implementation to ensure maintenance of soil productivity, minimization of sediment discharge into streams, lakes and wetlands to protect of designated beneficial uses.

(G12) Locate new actions (such as incident bases, fire suppression camps, staging areas, livestock handling facilities, recreation facilities, roads and improvements including trails) outside of Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas. If the only suitable location for such actions is within Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas, sites will be located to minimize resource impacts.

(G45) Access routes for heavy equipment should be selected to limit disturbance to riparian vegetation and to limit the number of stream crossings.

Recreation & Scenery

Standards for Road/Trail and Access Management

- (S17) All decommissioned roads and trails will be properly drained
- (S20) When constructing or maintaining roads, trails and facilities, use Best Management Practices to minimize sediment discharge into stream, lakes and wetlands

Guidelines for Road/Trail and Access Management:

- (G44) When constructing and reconstructing roads, trails, and facilities minimize potential effects on habitat of species at risk and key big game winter and spring ranges.
- (G45) Access routes for heavy equipment should be selected to limit disturbance to riparian vegetation and to limit the number of stream crossings.
- (G46) Specify and control locations for water supply points, service areas, and any other needs for road and facility construction projects.

Guidelines for Recreation Management:

- (G49) Manage recreation opportunities consistent with Management Prescriptions Categories (MPCs), Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Classes, Landscape Character Themes (LCTs), Scenic Integrity Objectives (SIOs), and in accordance with Winter Recreation Maps as well as District Travel Management Plans.
- (G50) Design, construct, and operate recreation facilities trails, and concentrated use areas to provide a beneficial recreation experience, reducing social conflicts and minimizing or avoiding adverse effects on watershed integrity, soil productivity, aquatic/riparian systems, terrestrial species and their habitats, and cultural resources.
- (G51) In Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized areas, use of motorized equipment may be approved for administrative purposes.

Standards for Scenery Management

- (S22) Management actions that would result in a scenic integrity level of Unacceptably Low (defined in Glossary) are prohibited in all Landscape Character Themes.

Guidelines for Scenery Management

- (G59) Manage Forest landscapes according to Landscape Character Themes, and Scenic Integrity Objectives as mapped. (See Chapter 4, A.7. Scenery Management for definitions).
- (G60) Resource management activities should not be permitted to reduce Scenic Integrity below Objectives stated for Management Prescription Categories.
- (G62) For management activities viewable from Concern Level 2: (defined site-specifically) use areas and travelways (viewshed corridors <1/2 mile) apply the Landscape Character Theme in which the management activity occurs and apply a Scenic Integrity Objective of at least moderate.
- (G63) Duration of visual impacts to allow for herbaceous and woody plants are established will be determined during project planning by the following criteria:
 - Capability of the landscape to recover
 - The relationship of management activity to the seen area of sensitive, use areas and travel ways.
- (G64) Establishment of herbaceous vegetation may extend to 3 years after project completion for foreground and middleground in Concern levels 1 and 2 use areas and travel ways. Consider immediate initiation of reseeding in these areas where natural recovery is questionable.

Vegetation

Standard and Guidelines

S13 - At least 20 percent of each forested cover type by ecological section (McNab and Avers 1994) shall be maintained with old forest landscape structure with patch sizes of at least 10 acres. These old forest areas are dynamic, changing location as disturbances occur.