

Public Workshop Summary  
*Rangeland Health in the Future*

Ashley National Forest: Forest Plan Revision  
March 3, 2018 – 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.  
Uintah Conference Center, Vernal UT



## Table of Contents

Workshop Purpose and Overview .....	1
Opening Remarks.....	1
Presentations .....	1
Panel Question & Answer Session .....	2
Table Groups – Process and Key Discussion Points .....	2
Synthesis of General themes / Areas of Convergence.....	4
Next steps .....	4
Closing remarks.....	4
Post-Workshop Key Observations and Recommendations from the Third-Party Neutral Facilitator .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

### Attachments

Attachment 1. Workshop agenda

Attachment 2. Workshop Participants

Attachment 3. Synthesis of Panel Question and Answer Session

Attachment 4. Transcribed notes from table groups

## Workshop Purpose and Overview

The U.S.D.A. Forest Service (Forest Service) hosted a public workshop for the Ashley National Forest (ANF) Forest Plan Revision process in Vernal, Utah on March 3, 2018. Attachment 1 contains the workshop agenda.

## Workshop Objectives:

- Create an understanding of:
  - How forest plans address rangeland health, productivity, and use.
  - Historical and projected conditions on Ashley National Forest rangelands: Implications for health, productivity and use.
- Explore challenges and opportunities regarding future rangeland health, productivity and use.
- Identify desired forest/management conditions to support future opportunities.
- Build capacity for future collaboration in the forest plan revision process.

The Forest Service utilized the ANF Forest Plan Revision mailing list, targeted letters to permittees, as well as traditional and social media outreach, to announce the event. Participants included members of the public, local and state government agency representatives, Forest Service staff, and invited speakers. Attachment 2 contains the list of meeting participants who provided their names.

The meeting was facilitated and managed by Susan Hayman and Lauren Dennis, EnviroIssues, contracted by the Forest Service to provide third-party neutral services.

## Opening Remarks

Jeff Schramm, Ashley National Forest Supervisor, welcomed attendees and thanked them for participating. He spoke about the forest plan revision effort, and the commitment he and the Ashley National Forest have made to meaningfully engage the public in this effort.

Susan Hayman, facilitator, welcomed the group and provided an overview of the meeting. She encouraged active participation and said she would provide additional process details at the start of each section of the meeting. She also introduced Forest Service staff assisting with table facilitation at the workshop.

After reviewing the meeting conduct guidelines, Susan introduced the presenters.

## Presentations

The following speakers were introduced with their stated topics:

- *How forest plans address rangeland health, productivity, and uses*  
Dustin Bambrough, Ashley National Forest Ecosystems Staff Officer
- *Historical and projected conditions on Ashley National Forest rangelands: Implications for health, productivity and use*  
Stan Kitchen, Rocky Mountain Research Station, USFS

Dustin presented information on forest plan components, specifically desired conditions, and how they address rangeland health, productivity, and uses. He spoke to decisions made in forest plans that affect

rangeland use. He also provided a summary of the current conditions and trends for rangelands and forage production on the ANF from the 2017 Assessment Report. Following Dustin's presentation, Stan shared information on past and future conditions of rangelands across the Great Basin and on the Ashley National Forest. He described how historical information regarding fire frequency and drought can be discerned from tree ring records. And he described processes (such as fire and drought) that have shaped rangelands over time, identified desirable attributes, and suggested strategies that will promote the health, productivity, and long-term sustainability of Ashley National Forest rangelands.

Presentation slides are available online at [\[link\]](#)<sup>1</sup>.

### Panel Question & Answer Session

Following the presentations, Susan convened the presenters in a panel for a question and answer (Q&A) session. Attachment 3 contains a synthesis of the Q&A session.

### Table Groups – Process and Key Discussion Points

Susan led participants through a table group activity, each table with 4-6 participants. Three rounds of discussion occurred, including the opportunity for independent participant review of Round 2 products from other table groups. Participants moved to new groups after the first round, and then remained at that table for the next two rounds. During each round, groups responded to the following discussion questions. Key discussion points are noted below for Rounds 2 and 3. **The complete set of transcribed notes from Rounds 2 and 3 can be found in Attachment 4.**

#### Round 1 (discussion only):

- *What was a key takeaway for you regarding:*
  - *How forest plans address rangeland health, productivity, and uses?*
  - *Historical and projected conditions on Ashley National Forest rangelands?*
- *What was your reaction to what you saw/heard? Why?*

#### Round 2 (table notes): *What opportunities for improving health, productivity and use of Ashley rangelands would you like to see?*

- Measures to control invasive species such as cheatgrass and pinion juniper include herbicides, proactive seeding, mechanical treatment, and more coordination with permittees, the public, and other local, state, and federal agencies
- Build in flexibility to manage grazing in a manner that responds to conditions of fire and drought and is site-specific
- Improve water availability and distribution to improve rangeland health; Utah Watershed Initiative could be a partner

---

<sup>1</sup> The file size of this document prohibits attachment and email delivery with this workshop summary. If you are unable to download this online, please contact Cathleen Neelan at [cneelan@fs.fed.us](mailto:cneelan@fs.fed.us) to receive a copy of the file copied to a flash drive.

- Utilize adaptive management practices that utilize science and ecological conditions to inform decisions
- Create forage reserves to benefit livestock and wildlife grazing needs when faced with drought and impacts to rangelands from wildfire
- Leverage opportunities to engage permittees in rangelands monitoring
- Prescribed fire and post-fire clean up can be used as a management tool in the new forest plan to facilitate livestock and wildlife movement through more forested areas
- Encourage the application of all grazing management tools to improve livestock distribution and reduce rangeland overuse (e.g., salting, riding)
- Manage recreational use so it doesn't harm the rangeland

**Round 3** (table notes): *What should Ashley National Forest rangelands look like/be managed for (i.e. desired conditions) to support these opportunities?*

After completing Round 3 of the small group discussion, the six groups reported their convergent perspectives on potential desired conditions. Responses included:

Table Group 1:

- Provide opportunities for large scale seeding and herbicide treatments through aerial treatments in order to control invasive species.
- Provide emergency pastures as a safety net in extreme circumstances.
- Rotate "rest" emergency pasture to avoid overgrowth
- Flexible plan when permitted resources are unavailable

Table Group 2:

- Integrate more local input and control for local communities
- Support multiple use and sustained yield on the forest
- If the ANF uses suitability as a criterion for grazing decisions, keep it flexible

Table Group 3:

- Promote active restoration after fire on rangelands
- Expand or maintain native vegetation
- Allow flexible stocking rates based on range conditions on an annual basis and per allotment

Table Group 4:

- Continue monitoring and implement an adaptive management strategy for livestock grazing that responds to drought and climate change

Table Group 5:

- Be more flexible with projects and grazing management in general
- Encourage vegetation treatments
- Streamline NEPA
- Increase communication and coordination with each other (state, fed, ranchers, etc.)

#### Table Group 6:

- Permittees or livestock associations should be recognized and rewarded for good allotment management, and given flexibility for following their annual operating instructions, enhancing range improvements, and meeting vegetation desired conditions.
- Maintain a healthy forest with multiple uses, including: livestock grazing, recreation, timbering, mining, energy use, fish and wildlife, water storage and delivery, and other multiple uses.

#### Synthesis of General themes / Areas of Convergence

From comments expressed during the panelist Q&A and from table group discussions, the general themes with convergence include:

- Participants are eager for more flexibility in grazing management to account for current conditions of the rangeland, and believe adaptive management is a necessary keystone of the next forest plan.
- Participants see the importance of monitoring in an adaptive management approach and envision a role for ranchers in collaboration with the Forest Service that will help maintain monitoring efforts.
- Participants believe that more coordination and consistency with other local, state, and federal agencies with regards to vegetation management would serve the forest well.
- Participants are concerned about the impacts of invasive species and support a range of proactive vegetation management treatments and restoration of native species.
- Participants are in favor of rangeland management that takes a holistic view of the rangeland system, supports multiple uses, and seeks ecological, social, and economic sustainability.

#### Next steps

Cathleen Neelan, Forest Plan Revision Team Leader for the Ashley National Forest, thanked participants for their time and participation, and noted that input collected at the workshop will be consolidated and provided to the forest's Interdisciplinary team working on the forest plan revision process. She also shared information about the next steps in the revision process, indicating that the forest is approaching this revision differently than before by collecting public input early on so that it can inform the forest plan's goals. She invited participants to provide feedback on whether they find this approach is effective.

Following the workshop, meeting materials will be made available to document the workshop. These materials include a written summary and links to presentations. They will be available online through the ANF website.

#### Closing remarks

Jeff thanked participants for their time and engagement and stressed again the importance of their continued participation in forest plan revision on the Ashley National Forest.

---

## Post-Workshop Key Observations and Recommendations

---

*The following key observations and recommendations are offered by the neutral, third party workshop facilitator. They are intended to inform future hot topic workshops, as well as future participatory approaches on this specific topic of rangeland health, productivity, and use.*

- While it is critical that the public have a voice in determining the desired conditions for a national forest, it can be challenging to get specific public input on this – a key observation from this workshop (as was also the case for the first workshop) was that many people preferred to talk about near-term opportunities on the Ashley rather than what conditions would be required in the long run to support them. **Recommendation:** Consider collecting input on opportunities only, explaining that FS staff will use that input to draft desired conditions on which the public will have an opportunity to provide feedback later.
- Despite being highly technical, participants responded favorably to the presentations by the non-Ashley National Forest FS staff speaker. **Recommendation:** Continue the extra effort to bring in non-Forest Service/non-Ashley National Forest presenters to complement the local Forest Service presenter speaking to forest-specific conditions and provide a more neutral voice. If data is being presented, work with the presenter to be ensure that key takeaways will be suitable and clearly articulated for a broad, often less-technical, audience.
- While there was some diversity of perspective in the participant pool, at some tables, discussions were dominated by one or two individuals. **Recommendation:** Ensure that table facilitators are well-trained and prepared to use techniques that provide for a more inclusive, balanced conversation.
- Building well-trained table facilitators is challenging, as the Forest Service assigns who has this role from workshop to workshop depending on the topic (i.e. prefer using staff connected to the topic), and Forest Service staff vary in their availability for table facilitator training on the Friday afternoon in advance of the workshops. **Recommendation:** Set up two 90-minute virtual advanced training opportunities (rather than one) the week preceding the workshop. Ensure that each table facilitator will attend one or the other.
- The level of participants' engagement given the impending weather and audience was significant, and the bodes well for future collaboration with permittees. **Recommendation:** Consider capitalizing on the momentum created by this workshop by identifying opportunities to follow-up with the permittee group.



## Ashley National Forest Public Workshop: Rangeland Health in the Future

Saturday, March 3, 2018 | 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Uintah Conference Center | 313 East 200 South | Vernal, UT 84078

---

### Workshop Objectives

- **Learn about:**
  - How forest plans address rangeland health, productivity, and use.
  - Historical and projected conditions on Ashley National Forest rangelands: Implications for health, productivity and use.
- **Explore** challenges and opportunities regarding future rangeland health, productivity and use.
- **Identify** desired forest/management conditions to support future opportunities.

### Workshop Agenda

- 1:00 p.m. Welcome, introductions, and workshop overview
- 1:15 p.m. Presentations
- How forest plans address rangeland health, productivity, and uses  
*Dustin Bambrough, Ashley National Forest Ecosystems Staff Officer*
  - Historical and projected conditions on Ashley National Forest rangelands: Implications for health, productivity and use  
*Stan Kitchen, Rocky Mountain Research Station, USFS*
- 2:15 p.m. Break
- 2:30 p.m. Moderated panel Q&A
- 3:00 p.m. Table group discussion (instructions provided by facilitator and at tables)
- 4:30 p.m. Sharing desired conditions
- 4:50 p.m. Wrap-up
- 5:00 p.m. Adjourn

---

For more information on Ashley Forest Plan revision, please visit our website at  
<https://www.fs.usda.gov/main/ashley/landmanagement/planning>  
or email us at [AshleyForestPlan@fs.fed.us](mailto:AshleyForestPlan@fs.fed.us)

## Attachment 1. Workshop Agenda



Dustin Bambrough is the Ecosystems Staff Officer on the Ashley National Forest. The Ecosystems Staff includes the Range Management Program as well as the Wildlife and Fish, Soil-Water-Air, Ecosystem, and Timber Management Programs. Dustin has been in this position since 2010. Prior to this position he worked for three years as a Land Management Planning Specialist on the Ashley National Forest's forest plan revision team. He was also a Rangeland Management Specialist on the Flaming Gorge and Vernal Ranger Districts for seven years. Dustin has B.S. and M.S. (2002) degrees in Wildlife and Range Resources from Brigham Young University.



Dr. Stan Kitchen started his career with Forest Service Research in 1988 as a botanist in the Intermountain Research Station. His undergraduate work was at Utah State University and he received graduate degrees from Brigham Young University. He has been a research botanist since 2002 with his current assignment to the Grassland, Shrubland and Desert Ecosystems Program of the Rocky Mountain Research Station. Stan has over 100 scientific publications and has broad experience unraveling the impacts of invasive species, climate variability and disturbance on natural systems with particular interest in long-term patterns of fire and drought in forested and non-forested systems of the Interior West. He has managed the Desert Experimental Range for 26 years and has been Scientist-in-charge for 16. Currently, he serves on the Steering Committee for the Western Aspen Alliance and as a member of the Utah Forest Restoration Working Group and the Monroe Mountain Working Group, diverse collaboratives grappling with the complexities of restoring aspen communities on a landscape scale. For a diverse set of contributions to science and management, Dr. Kitchen received the Forest Service, National Rangeland Research and Development Award in 2012.

## Attachment 2. Workshop Participants

Participants who signed in on the event sign-in sheet are listed below. Note, sign-in was not required, and a small number of participants chose not to sign in.

Arthur	Atkinson	Vernal	UT	<b>Forest Service</b>
Brad	Horrocks	Vernal	UT	Allen Huber
Bill	Ingalls	Vernal	UT	Birk Roseman
Bryce	Olsen	Neola	UT	Cathleen Neelan
Carol	Gardiner	McKinnon	WY	Chris Plunkett
Cory	McNeill	Vernal	UT	Garry Brown
Dan	Brown	<i>unknown</i>		Jeff Schramm
Dave	Allison	Vernal	UT	Kevin Draper
Dave	Evans	Duchesne	UT	Lara Kitchen
Deej	Brown	Vernal	UT	Megan Eno
Eaton	Nilsson	Steamboat Springs	Co	Sarah Leahy
Floyd	Bartlett	Vernal	UT	<b>Presenters</b>
Gordon	Hirschi	Vernal	UT	Dustin Bambrough, <i>Ashley National</i>
Jean	Dickinson	Rock Springs	WY	<i>Forest Ecosystems Staff Officer</i>
Jon	Murphy	Vernal	UT	Stan Kitchen, <i>Rocky Mountain Research</i>
Ken	Ludwig	Fruitland	UT	<i>Station, USFS</i>
Kent	Bastian	Neola	UT	<b>Facilitation Team</b>
Kent	Olsen	Neola	UT	Lauren Dennis, <i>EnviroIssues</i>
Mike	Bleazard	Duchesne	UT	Susan Hayman, <i>EnviroIssues</i>
Morgan	Batty	Vernal	UT	
Nick	Justice	Altimont	UT	
Ritchie	Anderson	Vernal	UT	
Ron	Horrocks	Lapoint	UT	
Shayla	McNeill	Vernal	UT	
Sherel	Goodrich	Vernal	UT	
Susan	Horrocks	Vernal	UT	
Tom	Elder	Vernal	UT	
Vance	Broadbent	Evanston	WY	

### *By Phone:*

Barrett	Anderson	Salt Lake City	UT
Melissa	Ure	Salt Lake City	UT
Redge	Johnson	Salt Lake City	UT
Robert	Hougaard	Salt Lake City	UT
Scott	Ericson	Salt Lake City	UT
Troy	Forrest	Salt Lake City	UT

### **Presenters' Panel Questions & Answers (Q&A)**

---

Following the presentations, the two presenters formed a panel and responded to questions from the participants. The following is a summary of questions (Q), comments (C), and corresponding responses (R) from the full group Q&A session.

**Q: Why was it determined that suitability [for grazing] won't be part of the Ashley plan?**

R: To clarify, we have a choice to define suitability for grazing, but the decision hasn't been made yet and Ashley National Forest—staff are still talking about it. In the last round of forest planning, it was required. We are not sure yet what it would look like for forest plan revision.

**Q: You spoke about invasive and exotic species – what are they and where are they?**

R: "Exotic" means not native to North America, and includes cheatgrass, halogeton, knapweeds, thistles, and Russian olive. "Invasive" means that the plant disrupts communities and reduces ecological productivity of a habitat. If a species is exotic and invasive, that's a big deal.

**Q: Are they brought or blown in?**

R: Both. The nature of invasive is that they have mechanisms for getting into ecosystems very easily.

**Q: What do you expect has been the cause of the great cheatgrass spread in the last 15 years? 20 years ago, it wasn't as severe as it is today.**

R: A significant factor is that there is not just one type of cheatgrass, but rather several varieties with different attributes and that are well adapted to different habitats. There have been multiple introductions from the Old World and Asia. There is also more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere now, and cheatgrass has taken advantage of that.

**Q: How does cheatgrass contribute to fire?**

R: Cheatgrass cures in the late spring/early summer, and where there is a lot of it, it creates a flashy, easily ignited fuel. In contrast, a perennial bunchgrass has large open spaces between patches and stays green longer. Thus, the presence of cheatgrass changes the frequency of fire.

**Q: How will species of conservation concern be dealt with in the revised forest plan, and will NEPA be applied?**

R: The forest plan directs us to create plan components for species of conservation concern, e.g., desired conditions, as others. We are not yet certain if we will have suitability for these species. There are a lot of factors going into that decision, and we value your input. We will apply the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process during forest plan revision. Plan components currently under development feed into a proposed alternative, which will be analyzed through NEPA.

**Q: Are we trying to do away with sagebrush (i.e. to improve rangeland), or enhance it (i.e. to improve sage-grouse habitat)?**

R: We certainly value sagebrush as part of the ecosystem and it offers a lot to wildlife. We have the opportunity to manage sagebrush and, if density is high, we have an opportunity to reduce those densities. Forty-sixty years ago, we didn't value sagebrush as much as we do now, however there's been

a paradigm shift and it's no longer treated as an invasive plant—it is part of wildlife habitat. There are opportunities to manage it as a whole system, and we ought to have places where we have the full spectrum of habitat – soon after disturbance and many years after disturbance.

**Q: In this basin, what would you identify as one of the most economical improvement opportunities to add that extra service for someone who is operating in a timber economy now?**

R: The more value you can add locally, the better. Rather than sending raw logs out to other areas to be processed, do that work here. That helps create economic activity and adds jobs locally.

**Q: Does grazing enhance or hurt the growth of sagebrush?**

R: Cattle don't use sagebrush unless they're practically starved. If cattle are grazing other species of vegetation in the area, then they increase grazing on sagebrush. Cattle use in the sagebrush ecosystem contributes to change in that system. Sagebrush can be grazed by elk, deer, and sheep at certain times of the year.

**C: We need to have a goal of establishing healthy rangelands that are ecologically sustainable for many species. Creating species-specific ranges (i.e. ecosystems that primarily benefit a single species)—rather than ranges that benefit the breadth of species that are supposed to be there—is the scariest thing we are facing.**

**Q: It's hard to overstate the importance of monitoring infrastructure (e.g., the system that Sherel Goodrich put into place). How safe will it be from budget cuts?**

R: We agree that it is important. We have an ecologist on staff, and that's a primary component of maintaining monitoring infrastructure.

**Q: Returning to cheatgrass...what can be done to stay on top of it?**

R: For any invasive, the best option is to manage for the desired species, and there are many tools to do that. Altering time and timing of grazing so it's less favorable for cheatgrass is one idea. Other methods include chemicals, but that is a short-term gain. In the long-term, it would be better to expand the perennial communities and help them become resistant to cheatgrass invasion.

**Q: Will the forest plan make allocations as to who is going to graze, what they're going to graze, etc.?**

R: In the past, under older planning rules, we've made some determinations in forest plans regarding the number of livestock head/months that will be permitted, and the extent and location of suitable grazing areas. The new planning rule doesn't require us to do those things. We've been monitoring our current livestock numbers and grazing locations for some time, and it seems like we should continue to provide some flexibility in grazing times, for example.

**Q: What about types of grazing, e.g., ungulates, domestic sheep, bighorn sheep, etc.?**

R: We will be developing desired conditions for species of conservation concern, and we are aware of the need to mitigate effects of domestic grazing on bighorn sheep. But we don't anticipate identifying suitability for specific species. We value wildlife species—sage-grouse and bighorn sheep, for example—while also allowing for other uses of the forest, such as livestock grazing.

**Q: In other meetings I've attended, the Forest Service has said they require an application for grazing two weeks earlier to deal with cheatgrass; does that apply on the Ashley?**

R: The regional policy allows two-week flexibility. We honor and will continue to use that flexibility, since cheatgrass is best-grazed early in the spring when cattle want to eat it. The challenge is that when we allow livestock on early to graze the cheatgrass, where do the livestock go next? Do you move to another unit, where the range maybe isn't ready yet to be grazed?

**Q: Are there plans for when cheatgrass increases substantially on the Ashley?**

R: We're looking at control strategies on the forest such as the use of chemicals and reseeding areas with aggressive plants that would compete with cheatgrass. We have various projects planned to reduce cheatgrass in some places.

**Q: The state of Utah went to great extent to require counties to develop County Resource Management Plans. How are those plans going to be reflected in the forest plan revision process, and how do we submit them for consideration?**

R: We welcome input from counties for plan components and invite you to submit the county plans for us to consider. The counties are also cooperating agencies during this effort, and we have regular meetings with them. Those meeting provide an opportunity to bring county objectives into the forest planning process.

**Q: The BLM uses a chemical for cheatgrass management, and DOI doesn't look at it as a short-term solution. It's very applicable to the Flaming Gorge area. When will there be continuity between DOI and USDA cheatgrass management practices?**

R: The Forest Service can use the same chemical that BLM uses. We're just learning about management of cheatgrass since we're at a higher elevation with less cheatgrass. The BLM is ahead of us and we are learning from them. Cheatgrass can be scary, however it's not the same problem at higher elevations as it is in lower ones – it's not driving the system in higher elevations. It is problematic and difficult, but it is not a "super plant" and we have strategies to deal with it.

**C: Suggest that you look at the Mustang Burn. The grasses there have done a good job of keeping cheatgrass at bay.**

## OPPORTUNITIES

---

### Table 1 (Lara, Facilitator)

- Able to fly herbicides and other treatments (seeding, etc.).
- Develop grass banks for times of need (fire).
- Streamline maintenance on fencing and other range improvements up-front
- If there are so many trees between the west side and east side of Red Cloud Loop that cows don't venture in there, it's time to thin out the trees.
- The bald areas on Taylor Mountain are because of campers parked up there for month on end, not because of overgrazing.
- Beetle kill removal.
- Flexibility in placement of cattle because of fires or drought.
- Continued improvement of communications in the improvement of range management.
- After fire, we need clean-up of downed timber.
- Fire wood cutting - timber sales. A lot of wasted trees.
- Off road vehicle concerns.

### Table 2 (Megan, Facilitator)

- Utah Watershed Initiative: Use this opportunity to improve rangeland health as well, watershed = range.
- BASI:
  - Science drives decisions.
  - Ecological conditions drive adaptive management.
  - We've become quite rigid in our AUM's + [illegible], but the climate is not rigid.
- Conifer encroachment:
  - Management actions to limit.
  - Affects aspen regeneration.
  - Would like to see coordination between wildlife/ag/watershed, agency collaboration with permittees and the public.
- Flexibility/Adaptive Management:
  - Cattle more mobile than ever - easy to move.
  - Create forage reserves to address drought conditions; used for grazing and not just wildlife.
  - Consider use of reserves.
- Monitoring:
  - Opportunities to engage permit holders in monitoring their allotments.
  - Know more about our permit area than a visiting tech.
  - Monitoring is a significant burden sometimes. There should be better coordination between techs + permittees especially with mixed land ownership.
  - Collaboration process - bother gathering and using the data -> ground truth + train together.
- Fire:
  - Not like to see the same fire region.

## Attachment 4. Transcribed Table Group Notes

- Use mechanized tools where fire does not happen naturally.
- Want to see more technology in new plan.
- Want public involvement in proposals for management actions.

### Table 3 (Birk, Facilitator)

- Mustang seeded after fire to stop cheat grass. Fires are an opportunity. FS should manage post fires, restoration of rangeland after fires. "Post" landscape direction in event of disasters.
- Chaining strategy to be used to clean PJs. Chemicals etc. used in lieu of fires; lop and scatter. Site-specific. Expand to work with other agencies.
- Limited use of chemical treatment to control invasive species.
- Appropriate water use for livestock, wildlife, etc. (guzzlers), flexibility.

### Table 4 (Sarah, Facilitator)

- Use of prescribed fire, P-J mechanical treatment to open up rangelands, return to earlier vegetation structure (return to earlier historical conditions in areas).
- Look like paradise: can support lots of livestock (healthy, productive; have openings made by fire, chaining, lop-and-scatter and do seeding where needed)
- Manage for droughts/climate change; continue monitoring and adapt as needed; we don't know yet.
- Manage the common juniper.
- Need to manage better for common juniper/aspen; forest does not burn enough (because of aspen).
- Need to do landscape-scale management, fire, lop and scatter, chaining.
- Partnerships to get management of PJ done; shrub (common juniper) or let permittee do it.
- Treat PJ by select cut and masticate - not clear cut, but thin.
- More fire use - prescribed fire.
- Flexibility in grazing management, time + timing and AUM's in response to range conditions, and overuse (the PLI - inflexible).
- Praise - keep on monitoring.
- Fire/chain or other, PJ encroaching, lack understory (leave downed trees).

### Table 5 (Garry, Facilitator)

- Be more flexible with projects and grazing management in general; encourage vegetation treatments (maintain or enhance habitat); streamline NEPA; increase communication, coordination with each other (state, fed, ranchers, etc.).
- Timber sales - how can we approve these?; encroachment - thin/reduce!; improve sagebrush habitat (mosaic) to benefit sage grouse/cattle.
  - Keep options open for treatments.
  - Improve water systems to spread cattle use.
  - Encourage tools – salt.
- Note:
  - Treat more in timber sales – regrowth.
  - Treat/reduce timber encroachment.

## Attachment 4. Transcribed Table Group Notes

- Improve sagebrush habitat to benefit sage-grouse/cattle; keep options open for treatments.
- Improve water systems to spread cattle use; encourage all grazing management tools (salting, riding).
- Encourage prescribed burns in timber or sagebrush.
- Expand use of herbicide treatment.

### **Table 6 (Allen, Facilitator)**

- ATV use + dispersed recreation on the forest is managed so that it doesn't take away from the desired conditions of the range.
- Site specific adaptive flexibility in managing grazing.
- Seek funding opportunities to increase cattle guards to keep livestock in allotments and permit recreational traffic use, including funding from recreational users.
- Reward good performance in the form of extended grazing in allotments where there is forage available.
- More [conducive] neighbors with the Ute Tribe.

## DESIRED CONDITIONS

---

### Table 1 (Lara, Facilitator)

- Provide opportunities for large scale seeding and herbicide treatments through aerial treatments in order to control invasive species.
- Provide emergency pastures as a safety net in extreme circumstances.
- Rotate "rest" emergency pasture to avoid overgrowth.
- Flexible plan when permitted resources are unavailable.
- Provide relief for pastures undergoing vegetation treatments.

### Table 2 (Megan, Facilitator)

- This is a working landscape; plan needs to reflect this.
- Special designation limited management.
- Integrate more local input + control for local communities.
- Natural resources are how we make a living; this needs to carry more weight than a once a year recreational.
- Support multiple use + sustained yield on the forest.
- If you do a suitability analysis, keep it flexible.
- Rangeland that produce + support the agriculture economy in the community; it's not just the economy but the societal health + ecological condition (range + timber).
- DC = stay in business for generations to come.
- ANF to be ecologically, socially, and economically sustainable/viable.
- This is a LOCAL forest - contributes to economy +livelihoods.
- Support + sustain traditional uses - feeling pushed off to FS, to BLM, to private.
- Move away from single species management to landscape scale.
- Minimize special designations.
- Agriculture is natural-based business; we can't thrive without a healthy ecosystem.
- Manage for a base AUM with flexibility.
- Traditional uses back on the forest: recreation, timber, grazing, saw mills.
- Contributing to infrastructure to support local economy/community.
- Tradition of being an energy corridor - feel blocked with special designations.
- Our infrastructure is a healthy forest.

### Table 3 (Birk, Facilitator)

- Where applicable, allow natural process for vegetation management.
- Promote active restoration after fire on rangelands.
- Post burn plans.
- Expand or maintain native vegetation.
- Introduce native and selected introduced species past fire or other disturbances.
- Flexible stocking rates based on range conditions on an annual basis and per allotment.

**Table 4 (Sarah, Facilitator)**

- Continue monitoring and adapt as needed for drought and climate change.
- Use of prescribed fire and mechanical treatment to control and open up rangelands.
- Healthy and productive landscapes.
- Continue adaptive management strategy for livestock grazing.
- Mitigation measures to maintain desired conditions.
- More fire.
- Flexibility.
- Develop water.
- Young Living Oils (essential oils) partnership to utilize juniper (or other trees).
- Restore rangelands.

**Table 5 (Garry, Facilitator)**

- Concern about maintaining AUMs when an increase of other resources are becoming politically acceptable (recreation, horses, elk).
- Maintain multi-use or balance.
- Law enforcement is needed to keep balance.
- Coordination with mine on FS boundary.
- More flexibility.
- Be more aggressive with invasive species.
- Shorter NEPA.

**Table 6 (Allen, Facilitator)**

- Maintain a healthy forest with multiple uses, including: livestock grazing, recreation, timbering, mining, energy use, fish and wildlife, water storage and delivery, and other multiple uses.
- Permittees or livestock associations are recognized and rewarded, and given flexibility for following the AOI, enhancing range improvements, and meeting vegetation desired conditions.
- Flexibility to use vegetative species, etc. cattle guards, etc. to fix problems in rangeland and restoration.

**OTHER COMMENTS**

---

**Table 1 (Lara, Facilitator)**

- It's not going to be what it was before; don't expect to have the same rangeland we did 50 years ago.
- Fire concerns - use it more, clean up after.
- Recreators following the laws.
- Removal of biomass after fire (dead + downed trees).
- Thinning timber - non-commercial would be more successful.
- Four wheelers are not where they should be.
- FLEXIBILITY.

## Attachment 4. Transcribed Table Group Notes

### Table 2 (Megan, Facilitator)

- Salt Scrub - we rely on this area for a winter base, both cattle + sheep.
- Disagree with assessment of low resiliency.
- Drought = dormancy in most cases, reduction to 1/8 size, with precipitation return, plant thrives.
- Sheep grazing association in the area - great resource.
- Needs to be a community discussion; science + ground-truthing + experience.
- Concerned about how SCC will impact grazing allotments.
- New mastication technology - use for PS removal.
- Young Living Oil corporate partnership will come in and pull out juniper + reseed.
- Transportation Access.
- Need to understand how other decisions made in plan will affect faster travel management decisions.
- How will you marry the Ashley travel management plan with other Wyoming, Utah, and Colorado agencies?

### Table 3 (Birk, Facilitator)

- Current allotments are suitable for grazing.
- Straight-forward-"on ground" determinations.
- Flexibility.
- Consistency.

### Table 4 (Sarah, Facilitator)

- I enjoyed Stan's discussion on the historical pattern of fire.
- One question though, how was the vegetation (besides the conifers) affected in the process of the vegetation re-growing post-fire?
- No one discussed any other landscape altering strategy besides fire. Chaining is an effective way to manage the P-J growth and is an effective way to manage sage brush.
- Species, [ecological sustainability], and [the ability to] maintain diversity should be the focus.
- Don't manage for uses.
- Need to discuss grazing, more than vegetation.
- Not enough time to exchange about the 2 presentations.
- Effects of climate change or climate change models on the ANF mitigation report.

### Table 5 (Garry, Facilitator)

- Flexible plan - Emory Pastures (forage reserve).
- Large scale treatments, seeding/herbicide.
- Support agriculture = good management for rest.
- Careful with special designation - keep multiple use.
- Support lifestyles/history.
- Flexible stocking rates on an annual basis.
- Proactive restoration after disturbance.
- Monitoring and flexibility need to continue.

## Attachment 4. Transcribed Table Group Notes

- Prescribed burns/treatments needed.
- Need healthy landscapes.
- Incentives or reward for those doing good with range improvements.
- Drought - normal, flexibility.
- Develop forage reserve - deal with drought.
- Use of nonuse allotments.
- Manage pastures.
- Keep options to treat and mimic fire if we can't burn (clearcut, bio char).

### **Table 6 (Allen, Facilitator)**

- 1 - Planning needs to take place.
- 2 - Forest service wants our input.
- 3 - Cheatgrass is a minimal concern on Forest.
- 4 - Drought area near Mustang needs to be brought to satisfactory.
- 5 - Forest Service isn't interested in input.
- Cheatgrass
  - Have a concern about sagebrush and how the FS manages it.
  - Certain allotments are concerned with wildlife species and their impacts to the range.
  - fire is a concern with rangeland management.