

# Contents

<b>Chapter 1 – Purpose of and Need for Action .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Introduction .....	1
Project Overview .....	2
Project Location .....	4
4FRI Background .....	7
Project Record .....	8
Purpose and Need for Action.....	8
Decision Framework .....	29
Public Involvement .....	34
Final Proposed Action .....	40
<b>Chapter 2 – Alternatives .....</b>	<b>47</b>
Alternative Development Process .....	47
Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study .....	48
Alternatives Considered in Detail .....	62
Comparison of Alternatives.....	95
<b>Chapter 3 – Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences .....</b>	<b>105</b>
Soils and Watershed .....	105
Vegetation.....	121
Fire Ecology .....	149
Air Quality.....	166
Terrestrial and Semiaquatic Wildlife and Plants.....	173
Aquatics.....	245
Noxious and Invasive Weeds.....	256
Heritage Resources.....	259
Tribal Relations .....	265
Socioeconomics.....	272
Recreation.....	284
Lands and Minerals .....	297
Scenery .....	301
Range.....	311
Transportation.....	318
Climate Change .....	321
Short-term Uses and Long-term Productivity .....	329
Unavoidable Adverse Effects .....	330
Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources.....	331
Cumulative Effects .....	331
Other Required Disclosures.....	331
<b>Chapter 4 – Consultation and Coordination.....</b>	<b>333</b>
Preparers and Contributors.....	333
List of Agencies, Organizations, and Persons to Whom Copies of the DEIS Were Sent ...	335
<b>Glossary .....</b>	<b>341</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>357</b>

**Appendix**

A – Map Packet .....437

B – Forest Plan Amendments .....439

    Alternative B – Coconino National Forest Site-Specific Nonsignificant Forest Plan  
    Amendments .....442

    Alternative B – Kaibab National Forest Site-Specific Nonsignificant Forest Plan  
    Amendments .....472

    Alternative C – Coconino National Forest Site-Specific Nonsignificant Forest Plan  
    Amendments .....498

    Alternative C – Kaibab National Forest Site-Specific Nonsignificant Forest Plan  
    Amendments .....535

    Alternative D – Coconino National Forest Site-Specific Nonsignificant Forest Plan  
    Amendments .....563

    Alternative D – Kaibab National Forest Site-Specific Nonsignificant Forest Plan  
    Amendments .....564

C – Design Features, BMPs, and Mitigation .....565

D – Alternative B Through D Implementation Plan .....601

E – Alternative B Through D Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan .....659

F – Cumulative Effects .....675

G – Bridge Habitat .....699

**Index ..... 715**

**List of Figures**

Figure 1. Four-Forest Restoration Initiative (4FRI) vicinity map..... 2

Figure 2. EIS project boundary on the Coconino and Kaibab National Forests ..... 3

Figure 3. Coconino NF and Kaibab NF ranger districts within the project area..... 4

Figure 4. Restoration units (RU) within the project area ..... 5

Figure 5. Restoration subunits within the project area..... 6

Figure 6. Existing canopy openness within the project area..... 10

Figure 7. Even-aged forest structure common throughout the project area..... 11

Figure 8. Ponderosa pine and pinyon-juniper stands that best meet old growth conditions ..... 17

Figure 9. Ponderosa pine overtopping of Gambel oak in the  
    Bar-M (Coconino NF) portion of the project area..... 19

Figure 10. Existing condition of aspen near Government Prairie, Kaibab NF ..... 19

Figure 11. Fern Mountain (Hart Prairie) Grassland circa 1880s..... 20

Figure 12. Fern Mountain (Hart Prairie) Grassland circa 1980s..... 20

Figure 13. Post-treatment pine-sage desired condition (Kaibab NF)..... 21

Figure 14. Current crown and surface fire potential in the project area ..... 22

Figure 15. Locations of resources at risk (for reference with figure 14) ..... 23

Figure 16. Degraded Babbitt Spring on the Coconino NF..... 26

Figure 17. Restored Hoxworth Spring ..... 27

Figure 18. Hoxworth Springs restoration..... 27

Figure 19. Degraded ephemeral/riparian stream (Coconino NF)..... 27

Figure 20. Restored Hoxworth Spring drainage immediately post-treatment  
    (photo on left) and 1 year post-treatment (photo on right) ..... 28

Figure 21. Forest plan management and geographic areas within the project area ..... 30

Figure 22. Final proposed action general locations  
    of mechanical and prescribed fire treatments ..... 43

Figure 23. Final proposed action general locations of road activities by RU ..... 44

Figure 24. Final proposed action general location of spring  
and ephemeral channel restoration actions by RU ..... 45

Figure 25. High surface fuel loadings in Mormon Mountain PAC (2001), Coconino NF..... 51

Figure 26. Alternative B general locations of mechanical and prescribed fire treatments ..... 73

Figure 27. Alternative B–D general locations of road treatments ..... 75

Figure 28. Alternative B–D general locations of spring and stream treatments ..... 76

Figure 29. Alternative B mechanical and prescribed  
fire treatments in goshawk and MSO habitat ..... 78

Figure 30. Alternative B–D ponderosa pine and pinyon-juniper old growth allocation..... 80

Figure 31. Alternative C mechanical and prescribed fire treatments..... 85

Figure 32. Alternative C mechanical and prescribed  
fire treatments in goshawk and MSO habitat ..... 87

Figure 33. Alternative D mechanical and prescribed fire treatments..... 92

Figure 34. Alternative D mechanical and prescribed  
fire treatments in goshawk and MSO habitat ..... 94

Figure 35. Stratification of ponderosa pine forested  
lands, other cover types, and nonforested land..... 123

Figure 36. Typical stocking of a 1-acre group to  
meet LOPFA canopy cover desired condition ..... 129

Figure 37. Typical stocking of a 1-acre group to meet PFA canopy cover desired condition..... 130

Figure 38. Existing fire potential in RU 1..... 150

Figure 39. Existing fire potential in RU 3..... 151

Figure 40. Existing fire potential in RU 4..... 152

Figure 41. Existing fire potential in RU 5..... 153

Figure 42. Existing fire potential in RU 6..... 154

Figure 43. Airsheds defined by the Arizona Department of Environment Quality..... 168

Figure 44. Emissions from surface fuels burning in wildfires after various treatments ..... 172

Figure 45. Mexican spotted owl habitat within the 4FRI treatment area..... 179

Figure 46. Race and ethnicity ..... 277

Figure 47. Carbon storage per acre comparing the no action baseline  
scenario with 10- and 20-year fire return intervals (Woods et al. 2012) ..... 324

Figure 48. Fifteen years after the Horseshoe Fire (photo from November 2011)..... 326

Figure 49. Healthy ponderosa pine forest ..... 326

Figure 50. Alternative B amendment 1 MSO PAC treatments ..... 454

Figure 51. Alternative B goshawk habitat subject to canopy cover  
requirements in VSS 4 and VSS 6 (Coconino and Kaibab NF) ..... 464

Figure 52. Alternative B general locations of savanna and grassland  
restoration treatments (Coconino NF and Kaibab NF)..... 465

Figure 53. Alternative B general location of goshawk habitat subject to canopy cover  
requirements in VSS 4 to VSS 6 (Coconino NF and Kaibab NF)..... 480

Figure 54. Alternative B general locations of savanna and  
grassland restoration treatments (Coconino NF and Kaibab NF)..... 481

Figure 55. Alternative B amendment 2 landscape target and threshold analysis..... 493

Figure 56. Alternative B–D MSO target and threshold habitat on the Kaibab NF ..... 494

Figure 57. Project-scale designated MSO target and threshold habitat ..... 495

Figure 58. Alternative C amendment 1 proposed activities in  
MSO PACs in relation to no treatment areas (Coconino NF).....511

Figure 59. Alternative C amendment 1 prescribed fire within and outside of MSO core areas . 512

## Contents

Figure 60. Alternative C amendment 1 landscape target and threshold analysis.....	513
Figure 61. Alternative C amendment 1 general locations of MSO target and threshold habitat managed from 110 to 150 basal area (Coconino NF) .....	514
Figure 62. Alternative C amendment 1 locations of MSO target and threshold treatments .....	515
Figure 63. Alternative C general location of goshawk habitat subject to canopy cover requirements in VSS 4 to VSS 6 (Coconino NF and Kaibab NF).....	526
Figure 64. Alternative C amendment 2 general locations of savanna and grassland restoration treatments (Coconino NF and Kaibab NF).....	527
Figure 65. Alternative C general location of goshawk habitat subject to canopy cover requirements in VSS 4 to VSS 6 (Coconino NF and Kaibab NF).....	542
Figure 66. Alternative C general locations of savanna and grassland restoration treatments (Coconino NF and Kaibab NF) .....	543
Figure 67. Alternative C treatments in the Garland Prairie proposed RNA (Kaibab NF) .....	547
Figure 68. Alternative C amendment 3 landscape target and threshold analysis (Coconino NF and Kaibab NF).....	558
Figure 69. General locations of MSO threshold habitat on the Kaibab NF.....	559
Figure 70. General location of MSO target and threshold habitat treatments within the project area (Coconino NF and Kaibab NF).....	560
Figure 71. Alternative C amendment 1 general locations of MSO target and threshold habitat managed from 110 to 150 basal area (Kaibab NF) .....	561
Figure 72. Old tree characteristics (Thompson 1940).....	645
Figure 73. Old age tree characteristics continued (Thompson 1940) .....	645
Figure 74. Section E density management and stocking guidelines .....	657
Figure 75. Pre-1996 vegetation and prescribed fire projects within the project area.....	676
Figure 76. General locations of past projects (post-1996) within the project area .....	682
Figure 77. General locations of current and ongoing projects within or adjacent to the project area.....	690
Figure 78. General locations of foreseeable projects within or adjacent to the project area .....	697
Figure 79. Relative, post-treatment forest density across the 4FRI project area, alternative C..	703
Figure 80. RU boundaries within the 4FRI project area.....	706

## List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of alternatives analyzed in detail.....	vi
Table 2. Summary of forest plan amendments by alternative and theme.....	viii
Table 3. Canopy openness (classification percent of interspace) by restoration unit.....	10
Table 4. Existing VSS distribution within goshawk LOPFA .....	12
Table 5. VSS distribution within goshawk PFA habitat .....	13
Table 6. Existing and desired conditions for goshawk habitat components.....	13
Table 7. Existing and desired habitat components within MSO habitats .....	14
Table 8. Ponderosa pine old growth allocation acres and percent by forest and restoration unit .....	15
Table 9. Pinyon-juniper old growth allocation acres and percent by forest .....	16
Table 10. Existing ponderosa pine beetle hazard rating (percent of area in each RU).....	18
Table 11. Existing dwarf mistletoe infection level by restoration unit (RU) .....	18
Table 12. Existing and desired fire potential in ponderosa pine in the project area.....	24
Table 13. Existing and desired fire regime condition class ponderosa pine.....	25
Table 14. Forest plan management areas (MA), geographic areas (GA), and land use zones (LUZ) within the project area .....	31

Table 15. Large tree retention strategy and large tree implementation plan crosswalk..... 60

Table 16. Alternative B–D springs, channels, and roads adaptive management actions..... 65

Table 17. Alternative B mechanical and prescribed fire treatment descriptions and acres ..... 71

Table 18. Alternative B through D road activity miles by restoration unit (RU) ..... 74

Table 19. Alternative B through D springs, riparian, ephemeral streams, and aspen activities by restoration unit (RU)..... 74

Table 20. Alternative B treatments in goshawk habitat..... 77

Table 21. Alternative B summary of treatments in Mexican spotted owl (MSO) habitat ..... 77

Table 22. Alternative B–D ponderosa pine old growth allocation acres and percent by forest and restoration unit..... 79

Table 23. Alternative B–D pinyon-juniper old growth allocation acres and percent by forest and restoration unit..... 79

Table 24. Alternative C mechanical and prescribed fire treatment descriptions and acres ..... 83

Table 25. Alternative C treatments in goshawk habitat..... 86

Table 26. Alternative C Treatments in Mexican spotted owl (MSO) Habitat ..... 86

Table 27. Alternative D mechanical and prescribed fire treatment descriptions and acres ..... 90

Table 28. Alternative D treatments in goshawk habitat ..... 93

Table 29. Alternative D treatments in MSO habitat ..... 93

Table 30. Summary of alternatives analyzed in detail..... 95

Table 31. Comparison of alternatives..... 96

Table 32. Alternatives A–D soil disturbance and erosion by treatment area and aggregate of 6<sup>th</sup> code watershed by alternative ..... 112

Table 33. Soil condition and productivity environmental consequences by alternative..... 113

Table 34. Comparison of effects to watershed function by alternative ..... 113

Table 35. Total cumulative effects analysis area 6<sup>th</sup> code (acres) by alternative ..... 121

Table 36. Acres of vegetation cover types by restoration unit (RU) in the project area ..... 122

Table 37. MSO habitat stratification within the analysis area (acres by RU) ..... 123

Table 38. Northern goshawk habitat stratification within the analysis area (acres by RU)..... 124

Table 39. Alternatives A–D comparison of canopy density and openness..... 125

Table 40. Comparison of alternatives relative to attaining interspaces and tree groups (acres) 126

Table 41. Goshawk forest structure and habitat components in 2020 and 2050 in all RUs ..... 127

Table 42. Forest structure desired conditions in goshawk habitat across alternatives ..... 128

Table 43. Stocking guides to meet tree group canopy cover requirements within goshawk habitat areas outside of PFAs (LOPFA) ..... 129

Table 44. Stocking guides to meet tree group canopy cover requirements within goshawk PFAs ..... 130

Table 45. Alternative A–D in 2020 and 2050 VSS distribution for goshawk LOPFA even-aged and uneven-aged stands (percent of area) ..... 132

Table 46. Alternatives A–D 2020 and 2050 VSS distribution for goshawk PFA even-aged and uneven-aged stands (percent of area) ..... 133

Table 47. Alternative A–D MSO habitat forest structure and habitat components projected to the years 2020 and 2050\*\* ..... 137

Table 48. Alternative A–D 2020 and 2050 bark beetle hazard rating ..... 139

Table 49. Alternative A–D 2020 and 2050 dwarf mistletoe infection level by alternative ..... 140

Table 50. Alternatives B, C, and D residual tree damage..... 141

Table 51. Cubic feet of biomass (forest products) by alternative and forest..... 142

Table 52. Acres of ground disturbance from road actions in alternatives B, C, and D ..... 142

Table 53. Approximate acres of vegetation management activities and wildfire within the project area from 2001 to 2010 ..... 146

Contents

Table 54.	Approximate acres of present and foreseeable vegetation management activities within the project area.....	148
Table 55.	Modeled fire type for alternative A (2020) by restoration unit* in acres and percent of treatment area.....	156
Table 56.	Alternative A canopy characteristics 2010 to 2050 .....	157
Table 57.	Alternative A FRCC 2010 to 2050 in acres and percent.....	157
Table 58.	Alternatives B, C, and D landscape scale (treatment area) fire behavior .....	158
Table 59.	Alternatives B–D canopy characteristics for ponderosa pine from 2010 to 2050.....	160
Table 60.	Alternative B–D surface fuel loadings in ponderosa pine from 2010 to 2050 .....	161
Table 61.	Alternatives B, C, and D FRCC in 2020 and 2050.....	161
Table 62.	Smoke sensitive areas and sensitive receptors .....	167
Table 63.	Areas expected to be impacted by proposed prescribed fire treatments.....	168
Table 64.	Baseline and 2064 goal in 2003 Arizona State Implementation Plan (SIP) for natural conditions.....	169
Table 65.	Threatened, endangered, candidate, and sensitive species evaluated in this analysis.....	175
Table 66.	Threatened, endangered, candidate, and sensitive species not addressed in this analysis .....	176
Table 67.	Predicted fire behavior in existing MSO habitat .....	180
Table 68.	Alternatives B, C, and D miles of road decommissioning in all MSO habitat.....	185
Table 69.	Alternatives B, C, and D road maintenance, temporary roads, and reconstruction in MSO habitat in miles .....	186
Table 70.	Forest Service sensitive species or habitat occurrence in the project area .....	194
Table 71.	Alternatives B, C, and D sensitive species environmental consequences determination.....	201
Table 72.	MIS not analyzed in the analysis.....	225
Table 73.	MIS analyzed and forestwide current habitat and population trends .....	228
Table 74.	MIS habitat and population trends by habitat and alternative .....	230
Table 75.	Area of analysis for cumulative effects by species.....	237
Table 76.	Aquatic threatened, endangered, candidate, and sensitive species evaluated in this analysis.....	246
Table 77.	Aquatic threatened, endangered, candidate, sensitive, and MIS species evaluated in this analysis and their affected environment .....	247
Table 78.	Aquatic threatened, endangered, candidate, and sensitive species environmental consequences.....	251
Table 79.	Treatment area noxious and invasive weeds evaluation.....	256
Table 80.	Summary of 4FRI project tribal consultation .....	266
Table 81.	Example of forest products and their traditional use.....	267
Table 82.	Population change 1990 to 2010 .....	273
Table 83.	Per capita income, labor, and nonlabor income, and unemployment .....	274
Table 84.	Economic contribution of forestry related sectors in the study area .....	275
Table 85.	Wildland-urban interface, planning area, and westwide (2000).....	276
Table 86.	Change in employment and labor income from alternative A.....	280
Table 87.	Net present value of stewardship contracts .....	280
Table 88.	Past, present, and future Forest Service actions with vegetation and/or fuels treatments within the project area.....	301
Table 89.	Combined acres treated under current project and past, present, and foreseeable projects.....	301
Table 90.	4FRI DEIS Coconino and Kaibab NF preparers and contributors .....	333

Table 91. Summary of forest plan amendments by alternative and theme.....	439
Table 92. Alternative B Amendment 1 Current and Proposed MSO Forest Plan Language (Coconino NF) .....	445
Table 93. Alternative B amendment 1 management area acres (Coconino NF) .....	458
Table 94. Alternative B Amendment 2 Management of Canopy Cover and Ponderosa Pine with an Open Reference Condition in Goshawk Habitat (Coconino NF) .....	460
Table 95. Alternative B amendment 2 management area acres (Coconino NF) .....	467
Table 96. Alternative B amendment 3 effect determination for cultural resources (Coconino NF).....	469
Table 97. Alternative B amendment 1 – management of canopy cover and ponderosa pine with an open reference condition in goshawk habitat (Kaibab NF) .....	476
Table 98. Alternative B amendment 2 geographic area acres .....	483
Table 99. Alternative B amendment 2 MSO proposed forest plan standard and guideline language (Kaibab NF) .....	485
Table 100. Alternative B Kaibab NF amendment 2 GA acres .....	498
Table 101. Alternative C amendment 1 MSO current and proposed forest plan language (Coconino NF).....	503
Table 102. Alternative C MSO amendment 1 management area acres.....	519
Table 103. Alternative C amendment 2 management of canopy cover and ponderosa pine with an open reference condition in goshawk habitat (Coconino NF) .....	522
Table 104. Alternative C Amendment 2 MA Acres.....	529
Table 105. Alternative C amendment 3 effect determination for cultural resources.....	531
Table 106. Alternative C amendment 1 – management of canopy cover and ponderosa pine with an open reference condition in goshawk habitat (Kaibab NF) .....	538
Table 107. Alternative C amendment 1 geographic area acres (Kaibab NF).....	545
Table 108. Alternative C amendment 2 Kaibab NF proposed Garland Prairie Research Natural Area (RNA) .....	547
Table 109. Alternative C amendment 3 current and proposed forest plan language.....	550
Table 110. Alternative B Kaibab NF Amendment 2 Geographic Area (GA) Acres.....	563
Table 111. Alternatives B, C, and D design features, best management practices, and mitigation.....	565
Table 112. Annual implementation checklist.....	603
Table 113. Planned acres by treatment type and restoration unit (RU).....	604
Table 114. NEPA, NFMA, ESA, CFLR Act compliance evaluation .....	607
Table 115. Supporting documentation checklist .....	608
Table 116. MSO restricted habitat target/threshold conditions for pine-oak forests.....	612
Table 117. Restricted other habitat treatment criteria .....	615
Table 118. Percent of trees, tree groups, and interspaces by treatment intensity (LOPFA) .....	618
Table 119. LOPFA WUI and UEA treatments stocking guidelines for tree groups .....	619
Table 120. Interspace percent and width in LOPFA WUI and UEA treatments.....	620
Table 121. Percent of area occupied by trees, tree groups, and interspace in LOPFA IT .....	621
Table 122. Stocking guidelines for VSS 4 to 6 tree groups in LOPFA IT treatments .....	622
Table 123. Percent and width of interspace in LOPFA IT treatments .....	622
Table 124. Percent of area occupied by individual trees, tree groups, and interspace in LOPFA SI treatments.....	623
Table 125. Stocking guidelines for tree groups in LOPFA SI treatments.....	624
Table 126. Interspace percent and width LOPFA SI treatments.....	625
Table 127. Stocking guidelines for VSS 4 to VSS 6 tree groups in LOPFA pine-sage treatments .....	626

Contents

Table 128. Percent of area occupied by individual trees, tree groups, and interspace in dPFA/PFA UEA treatments..... 629

Table 129. Stocking guidelines for tree groups in dPFA/PFA WUI and UEA treatments..... 630

Table 130. Interspace percent and width in dPFA/PFA WUI and UEA treatments..... 630

Table 131. Percent of area occupied by trees and interspace for dPFA/PFA IT ..... 632

Table 132. dPFA/PFA IT treatments stocking guidelines for VSS 4 – 6 tree groups ..... 632

Table 133. Interspace percent and width in dPFA/PFA IT ..... 633

Table 134. Percent of area occupied by individual trees, tree groups, and interspaces in dPFA/PFA SI treatments..... 634

Table 135. Stocking guidelines for tree groups in dPFA/PFA SI treatments..... 635

Table 136. Interspace percent and width in dPFA/PFA SI treatments..... 635

Table 137. Stocking guidelines for VSS 4–6 tree groups in dPFA/PFA pine-sage treatments.... 637

Table 138. Minimum structural attributes in suitable goshawk nest stands\* ..... 638

Table 139. Section B decision matrix for establishing tree groups, interspace, and regeneration openings ..... 642

Table 140. Section E the relationship between treatment intensity, tree group density, and overall average density ..... 654

Table 141. Monitoring plan tiers ..... 660

Table 142. Monitoring scales ..... 661

Table 143. Implementation monitoring questions, indicators, frequency of measurement, data source, and cost ..... 663

Table 144. Landscape-scale effectiveness desired conditions, indicators, frequency of measurement, data source, and cost..... 666

Table 145. Effectiveness monitoring plan ..... 671

Table 146. Summary of past vegetation and prescribed fire project acres (2000 to 2010) ..... 678

Table 147. Summary of past vegetation and prescribed fire project acres (2000 to 2010) adjacent to the project area ..... 681

Table 148. Coconino and Kaibab NF wildfire acres 1940 to 2010 ..... 683

Table 149. Acres affected by insect and disease outbreaks by forest (within project area) ..... 685

Table 150. Past treatments on private, State, and other federally managed lands..... 686

Table 151. Current and ongoing vegetation (mechanical) and prescribed fire projects ..... 687

Table 152. Current and ongoing other projects ..... 689

Table 153. Reasonably foreseeable vegetation management/ ground-disturbing projects within and adjacent to the project area..... 691

Table 154. Reasonably foreseeable recreation projects within the project area..... 693

Table 155. Other agency and private lands foreseeable vegetation and prescribed fire projects..... 694

Table 156. Other foreseeable vegetation and prescribed fire projects outside the project area.. 694

Table 157. Acres of treatment and nontreatment areas within the 4FRI project area ..... 699

Table 158. Acres of proposed treatment in terms of post-treatment openness..... 701

Table 159. Post-treatment contributions to bridge habitat provided by each treatment designation ..... 701

Table 160. Proposed post-treatment openness condition (Percent) by RU ..... 706

Table 161. Design features, BMPs, and mitigation measures contributing to bridge habitat..... 710

Table 162. Excerpt from section D of the 4FRI implementation guidelines ..... 712



## List of Acronyms

4FRI	Four-Forest Restoration Initiative
ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
ADEQ	Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
ADGF	Arizona Department of Game and Fish
APE	Area of potential effect
APIF	Arizona Partners in Flight
ATV	All-terrain vehicle
AUM	Animal unit month
ADGF	Arizona Game and Fish Department
BA	Basal area
BAER	Burned Area Emergency Response
BCC	Birds of Conservation Concern
BCR	Bird Conservation Region
BE	Biological evaluation
BMP	Best management practice
BSTR	Breeding season timing restriction
CBD	Canopy bulk density
CBH	Canopy base height
CCF	Hundred cubic feet
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFLR	Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration
CFLRP	Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CHU	Critical habitat unit
CNF	Coconino National Forest
CO	Carbon monoxide
CWD	Coarse woody debris
CWPP	Community wildfire protection plan
d.b.h.	Diameter at breast height
DEIS	Draft environmental impact statement
dPFA	Dispersal post-fledgling area
d.r.c.	diameter at root collar
EIS	Environmental impact statement
EMA	Ecosystem management area
EO	Executive Order
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ERT	Emission reduction techniques
FAAWN	Forest attributes and wildlife needs FEIS
	Final environmental impact statement
FLEA	Flagstaff/Lake Mary Ecosystem Analysis
FRCC	Fire regime condition class

## Contents

FSH	Forest Service Handbook
FSM	Forest Service Manual
FVS	Forest Vegetation Simulator
GA	Geographic area
GFFP	Greater Flagstaff Forest Partnership
GIS	Geographic information system
GPS	Global positioning system
HCI	Habitat capability indices
HUC	Hydrologic unit code
IBA	Important Bird Areas IDT
	Interdisciplinary team
IMPLAN	Impact Analysis for Planning
IT	Intermediate thin
KNF	Kaibab National Forest
LANL	Los Alamos National Laboratory
LMR	Lake Mary Region
LOPFA	Landscapes outside post-fledgling area
LTIP	Large tree implementation plan
LTRS	Large tree retention strategy
LUZ	Land use zones
MA	Management area
MAUM	Thousand animal unit month
MMBF	Million board feet
MBF	Thousand board feet
MIS	Management indicator species
ML	Maintenance level
mph	Miles per hour
MRNG	Management Recommendations for the Northern Goshawk in the Southwestern United States
MSO	Mexican spotted owl
MSO PAC	Mexican spotted owl protected activity area
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NACOG	Northern Arizona Council of Governments
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NF	National forest
NFMA	National Forest Management Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NMED	New Mexico Environment Department
NO2	Nitrogen dioxide
NOGO	Northern goshawk
NOI	Notice of intent
NVUM	National Visitor Use Monitoring

O <sub>2</sub>	Ozone
OGP & LTRS	Old growth protection and large tree retention strategy
OTIP	Old tree implementation plan
PA	Participating agreement
PAC	Protected activity center
PFA	Northern goshawk post-fledgling family area
PIF	Partners in Flight
PJ	Pinyon-juniper
PM	Particulate matter
PNVT	Potential natural vegetation type
PPC	Potential plant community
QMD	Quadratic mean diameter
RAP	Roads analysis process
RNA	Research natural area
ROD	Record of decision
ROS	Recreation opportunity spectrum
ROW	Right-of-way
RU	Restoration unit
RVD	Recreation visitor day
SDI	Stand density index
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SI	Stand improvement
SIO	Scenery integrity objectives
SMS	Scenery Management System
SO <sub>2</sub>	Sulfur dioxide
SOPA	Schedule of proposed actions
SPCC	Soil prevention control and countermeasures
SSM	Single sample maximum
SU	Subunit
SUDS	Special Uses Database System
TAP	Travel analysis process
TCP	Traditional cultural properties
TES — soils term	Terrestrial ecosystem survey
TES species —biological term	Threatened, endangered and sensitive species
TM	Travel management
TMR	Travel Management Rule
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
TPA	Trees per acre
UEA	Uneven-aged
UGM	Upper Gila Mountain
UGM RU	Upper Gila Mountain Recovery Unit
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture

## Contents

USDI	United States Department of the Interior
UTV	Utility task vehicle
VMS	Visual Management System
VQO	Visual quality objectives
VSS	Vegetation structural stages
WCF	Watershed condition framework
WEPP	Water Erosion Prediction Project
WFLC	Western Forest Leadership Coalition
WFUD	Wildlife fish user day
WUI29	Wildland-urban interface