

## SCENIC RESOURCES

**Abstract:** The scenic resource constitutes all scenery visible to people. Scenery is described as the general appearance of a place or landscape, or the features of a landscape. The visual condition varies by location and is dependent on natural features such as geology, vegetation, landforms, and human developments.

The suppression of wildfires, attempts to control insects, and past management practices in this century have had consequences for forest composition and structure. Historic meadows and aspen stands have been infiltrated by conifers. Spruce-fir stands have been invaded heavily by lodgepole pine. Stands have increased in density and monotypic culture over what was present before our settlement of the forests.

Alternatives A, C, and I would move forests on the ARNF toward a more diverse scenic condition with fewer forested acres and more open areas which could better approximate historical conditions. However, they would cause the greatest change from the existing scenic condition. Alternative H would least affect the existing scenic condition, and would provide few opportunities to improve the diversity of the existing condition over the long term. Alternatives B and E fall between the two previous alternative groups in improving and maintaining scenic quality.

The Visual Management System will be implemented on the Forests and Grassland in FY 99, and added as an amendment to the revised *Forest Plan*.

### INTRODUCTION

The visual resource constitutes all scenery visible to people. Scenery must be managed with predetermined decisions to maintain a desired visual quality. This is accomplished through criteria developed within the Visual Management System. This system seeks to identify the visual characteristics of the landscape, determine the scenic (visual) resource goals, and provide a framework to analyze the potential visual effects of possible management actions.

### LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE FRAMEWORK

Several federal laws require all federal land management agencies to consider scenic and aesthetic resources in land and resource management planning, project design, project implementation and monitoring. The more important authorities for management of the National Forest System's visual resource lie in the following statutes:

- *The Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960*
- *The Wilderness Act of 1964*

- *The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968*
- *The National Trail System Act of 1969*
- *The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969*
- *The Environmental Quality Act of 1970*
- *The Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974*
- *The National Forest Management Act of 1976*
- *The Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977*

Forest Service Policy and Regulations are defined in the *Forest Service Manual (FSM)* Chapter 2300—Recreation, Wilderness, and Related Resource Management; and Chapter 2380—Landscape Management. The Forest Service has responded to the above legislation by developing a Landscape Management program with the objective to “manage all National Forest System lands so as to attain the highest possible visual quality commensurate with other appropriate public uses and benefits” (*FSM* 2380.3).

Each Regional Forester is delegated the responsibility of establishing a management system for this resource and producing visual quality objectives (*FSM* 2380.4). These objectives are to be determined from consideration of the physical characteristics and scenic quality of the land as well as the principles of design and the desires and preferences of the public.

Also, the following USDA Forest Service publications in the National Forest Landscape Management Series are recommended for use to assist in managing the visual resources. They are found in Volumes 1 and 2.

1. USDA, Forest Service, 1973. National Forest Landscape Management: Volume 1. *Agriculture Handbook* 434.
2. USDA, Forest Service, 1974. National Forest Landscape Management: Volume 2, Chapter 1: The visual management system. *Agriculture Handbook* 462.
3. USDA, Forest Service, 1975. National Forest Landscape Management: Volume 2, Chapter 2: Utilities. *Agriculture Handbook* 478.
4. USDA, Forest Service, 1977. National Forest Landscape Management: Volume 2, Chapter 3: Range. *Agriculture Handbook* 484.
5. USDA, Forest Service, 1977. National Forest Landscape Management: Volume 2, Chapter 4: Roads. *Agriculture Handbook* 484.

6. USDA, Forest Service, 1980. National Forest Landscape Management: Volume 2, Chapter 5: Timber. *Agriculture Handbook 559*.
7. USDA, Forest Service, 1985. National Forest Landscape Management: Volume 2, Chapter 6: Fire. *Agriculture Handbook 608*.
8. USDA, Forest Service, 1984. National Forest Landscape Management: Volume 2, Chapter 7: Ski Areas. *Agriculture Handbook 617*.
9. USDA, Forest Service, 1987. National Forest Landscape Management: Volume 2, Chapter 8: Recreation. *Agriculture Handbook 666*.

The above principles, guidelines, rules, and regulations for management of the visual resource have been incorporated into the existing *Forest Plan*.

## AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The present landscape is a result of the interactions of existing vegetation and landforms on the line, form, color, and texture of the viewed scene. The visual condition varies by location and is dependent on natural aspects, including geology, water, vegetation, landforms and human developments. All management activities have the potential to alter the existing landscape.

Note that the *Existing Visual Condition* (EVC) of the Forests is based on the expansion of forested land that has occurred in the recent past, primarily due to the suppression of fire. The "natural" condition of the Forests as it is described today is different from the natural condition of the mid-nineteenth century. More open meadows and fewer, less dense stands of trees existed at that time.

All management activities have the potential to alter the existing characteristic landscape. Existing visual condition (EVC) levels are used to describe the visual components of the existing landscape. For the purposes of EVC definition, the natural condition is the existing visual condition of the Forests with expanded tree cover. The six visual condition levels are described in Table 3.135.

Where EVCs describe the current landscape, visual quality objectives (VQOs) are established to provide measurable goals for visual resource management. A predominant VQO has been established for each management area and may be used to describe the degree of acceptable alteration of the landscape. The five degrees of VQO are:

**Preservation**—Allows ecological change only. Management activities, except for very low scenic impact recreation facilities (trails), are prohibited.

**Retention**—Retains a natural appearing environment with no *evident* human alterations. Examples of allowable alterations are a passive relay electronics site that mimics the

**Table 3.135 Visual Condition Levels**

Level 1	Areas in which only ecological change has taken place except for trails needed for access. They appear to be untouched by human activities.
Level 2	Areas in which changes in the landscape are not visually evident to the average person unless pointed out. They appear not to have occurred.
Level 3	Areas in which changes in the landscape are noticed by the average forest visitor, but they do not attract attention. The natural appearance of the landscape remains dominant. Changes appear to be minor disturbances.
Level 4	Areas in which changes in the landscape are easily noticed by the average forest visitor and may attract some attention. They appear to be disturbances but resemble natural patterns.
Level 5	Areas in which changes in the landscape are strong and would be obvious to the average forest visitor. These changes stand out as a dominating impression of the landscape. Yet they are shaped so that they might resemble natural patterns when viewed from 3-5 miles or more distant. They appear to be major disturbances.
Level 6	Areas in which changes in the landscape are in glaring contrast to the natural appearance. Almost all forest visitors would be displeased with the effect. They appear to be drastic disturbances.

shape and color of the surrounding vegetation and topography, and a shelterwood/group selection timber harvest that is imperceptible by the untrained observer.

**Partial Retention**—Manages the environment with human alterations evident but subordinate to the character of the natural landscape. A power line that uses flat, low-reflectivity, natural colors that blend with the background could meet his level, as could irregularly shaped timber harvests with some trees left and feathered edges, or ski slopes in areas with natural openings that allow some blending.

**Modification**—Manages the environment with human alterations evident and somewhat dominating the natural landscape’s character. Roads that are evident, created openings from some timber harvests, and ski slopes on completely forested slopes are examples of this level.

**Maximum Modification**—Manages the environment with human alterations strongly evident and dominating the natural landscape’s character. Visually contrasting activities such as timber harvests that have linear edges and unnatural shapes, and mining operations that are strong focal points, are examples.

Although specific activities and projects will require a detailed analysis of the impacts to the scenic resource to determine which types, location, and size of management activities are permitted, an overall predominant VQO has been adopted for each management area. They are displayed in Tables 3.136 and 3.138, with the EVC and the expected Desired Future Visual Conditions<sup>1</sup> (DFVCs) as visual quality objectives to be implemented. They are discussed in the *Forest Plan*, Chapter 2, Geographic Area Direction. The VQOs are also displayed as a Decision Map in the accompanying map packet.

Generally, the predominant VQO will prevail for the whole management area. However, some on-the-ground situations may require a less restrictive VQO. Consequently, some management areas may contain secondary Visual Quality Objectives in addition to the predominant objective. The goal is to hold the deviations to a level subordinate to the whole management area and allow the activity or use to occur and meet other important goals and objectives desired in the management area.

Objectives may also change over time. For example, an oil and gas field could result in a VQO of modification in a partial retention management area on the Grassland. This may occur even though mitigation measures such as less visible locations and natural colors of facilities have been used. However when the field is depleted in 15 to 20 years, reclamation will return the area to partial retention.

Tables 3.137 and 3.139 are summaries of the Inventoried VQOs and the Adopted VQOs allocated in the six alternatives.

---

<sup>1</sup> The combination of desirable attributes to be attained in the future by management of a national forest. For scenery management, desired future condition is comprised of interrelated components, including desired travelways, desired use areas, desired landscape character and desired scenic condition.

**Table 3.136 EVCs and DFVCs for the Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests for All Alternatives**

MA	Management Area Name	EVC	Predominant VQO	Secondary VQO	DFVC
1.1	Wilderness	1	P	P	1
1.2	Wilderness	1,2,3	R	R	2
1.3	Backcountry Recreation	1,2,3	R	R	2
1.41	Core Habitat-existing	1,2,3	R	R	2
1.42	Core Habitat-restoration	1,2,3	R	R	2
1.5	Wild Rivers	1	P	P	1
2.2	Research Natural Areas	1,2,3	P	P	1
3.1	Special Interest Areas	1,2,3,5	R	PR,M	2
3.21	Limited Use Areas	1,2,3,4,5	R	R	2
3.3	Backcountry Motor Rec	1,2,3,4,5	R	R	2
3.5	Flora and Fauna	1,2,3,4,5	PR	M	3
3.55	Corridors	1,2,3,4	PR	M	3
4.2	Scenery	1,2,3,4,5	R	PR	2
4.3	Dispersed Recreation	1,2,3,4,5	PR	R	3
4.4	Recreation Rivers	1,3,4,5	R	PR	2
5.11	Forest, Intermingled	1,2,3,4,5,6	PR	R,M	3
5.31	Forest Products	1,2,3,4,5,6	M	PR	3,4
5.31	Experimental Forest	1,2,3,4,5	M	R,PR	3,4
5.5	Disp. Rec. - Forest	1,2,3,4,5,6	PR	M	3
7.1	Intermix	1,2,3,4,5,6	PR	R,M	3
8.21	Developed Rec.	3,4,5	M	PR	3,4
8.22	Ski-based Resorts	2,3,4,5	M	PR,MM	3,4
8.3	Utility Corridors-Elec.	4,5,6	R	M	3

### ARAPAHO AND ROOSEVELT NATIONAL FORESTS

The existing visual conditions of the Forests span all six levels. Wilderness and unroaded areas have natural characters, areas with some roads can be natural appearing, and views that have some evidence of human activities such as timber harvests and campgrounds are modified forest. Ski areas may also be modified forest, but could reach maximum modification with a large development such as Winter Park. The existing visual condition levels for the majority of the Forest is 3.

**Table 3.137 Inventoried and Adopted Predominant VQOs, ARNF**

Inventoried VQO	Acres in Each Alternative <sup>a</sup>					
	A	B	C	E	H	I
Preservation—P	310,837	340,980	310,837	322,705	743,232	301,691
Retention—R	213,009	346,094	153,468	452,855	124,969	299,701
Partial Retention—PR	328,807	476,335	335,625	452,824	386,172	425,225
Modification—M	436,397	125,641	489,120	60,665	34,676	262,432

<sup>a</sup> The figures are based on a Forest total of 1,289,050 acres.

**Table 3.138 EVCs and DFVCs for the Pawnee National Grassland for All Alternatives**

MA	Management Area Name	EVC	Predominant VQO	Secondary VQO	DFVC
2.2	Research Natural Areas	1,2,3	P	P	1
3.1 <sup>a</sup>	Special Interest Areas	1,2,3,4	R	PR,M	2
3.21	Limited Use Areas	1,2,3,4,5	R	R	2
3.61	Prairie Woodlands	1,2,3	R	R	2
4.2	Scenery	1,2,3,4,5	R	PR	2
4.3	Dispersed Recreation	1,2,3,4,5	PR	R,M	3
6.4 <sup>a</sup>	Mid-Comp H-struct NSP	1,2,3,4,5	PR	R,M	3
6.6 <sup>a</sup>	Mic-Comp L-struct GRP	1,2,3,4,5	PR	R,M	3
8.21	Developed Rec. Complexes	4	M	PR	3,4
8.3	Utility Corridors-Elec. Sites	3,4,5,6	R	M	3

<sup>a</sup> No more than 1 to 2 percent of an area viewed will exceed the predominant VQO.

Four nationally-designated scenic byways (Mt. Evans, Guanella Pass, Peak-to-Peak, and Cache la Poudre-North Park), and one state-designated byway (Colorado Headwaters) are on the Forests. The landscapes along the byways are classified as “remarkable and outstanding,” and will be managed to a Retention VQO. Existing facilities such as powerlines, roads, campgrounds, and picnic grounds may be obvious. Management activities such as vegetative manipulation are likely to be less evident, of short duration, and more natural in appearance than in many other portions of the Forests.

**Table 3.139 Inventoried and Adopted Predominant VQOs, PNG, 1995**

Inventoried VQO	Acres in Each Alternative <sup>a</sup>					
	A	B	C	E	H	I
Preservation—P	0	0	0	0	0	0
Retention—R	763	10,740	1,887	2,031	18,993	1,499
Partial Retention—PR	4,775	173,193	182,046	181,902	164,940	182,434
Modification—M	187,011	8,615	8,615	8,615	8,615	8,615

<sup>a</sup> The figures are based on a Grassland total of 192,542 acres.

### PAWNEE NATIONAL GRASSLAND

The existing visual conditions are primarily pastoral or Level 3, with extensive viewsheds containing windmills, fences, two-track roads and other improvements. The Pawnee Pioneer Trails Scenic Byway travels through the Grassland. A few natural or natural-appearing areas also exist. Some areas such as oil and gas fields are at modification VQO. Because of the scattered ownership of the Grassland, the intermixed developed and cultivated private land adjacent to the federal lands, and the extensive viewsheds consisting of private and federal ownership, VQO levels higher than partial retention are limited to small areas in the large blocks of federal ownership.

### RESOURCE PROTECTION MEASURES

Mitigation in all alternatives would occur in *Forest Plan* and project implementation. *Forest Plan* standards and guidelines will direct rehabilitation, enhancement of visual quality, integration of aesthetics in resource planning, and efforts to vary stand densities to create vegetation diversity. Examples of mitigation efforts commonly used include revegetation of disturbed sites, choice of materials and colors for structures that reduce their visibility, placement of utilities underground, design of timber harvest units to blend with the natural landscape, and possible use of some vegetation screening.

---

## ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

### DIRECT AND INDIRECT EFFECTS

#### Effects Common to All Alternatives

Each alternative has a different mix of VQOs, depending on the relative acreage in each management area, as displayed in Tables 3.137 and 3.139. However, note that not all acres labeled "Modification" would be visually altered at one time. The rate of implementation of VQOs is related to the types by timber harvest and other surface disturbances expected in each alternative.

All alternatives will maintain, alter, or enhance the scenic character of the landscapes on the Forests and Grassland in varying degrees. The most obvious and significant effects on the visual resource are from vegetation and landform alterations typically associated with resource management activities such as road building, vegetation management, powerline and pipeline clearings, recreation facility development, and mineral development.

Current levels of trail maintenance are generally sufficient to protect soil and stream banks, but potential scenic effects associated with existing erosion, multiple braided trails, and damage to stream crossings may occur. These areas need to be carefully designed and rehabilitated.

Grazing by livestock may result in an altered landscape appearance, depending upon the intensity of forage utilization. Allotment management plans require permittees to move their livestock so that they do not concentrate in sensitive areas like meadows and riparian areas. Although there could be an effect from seasonal trampling and heavy utilization of the forage, the potential for change to the existing scenic condition is low. Structural improvements such as fences, windmills, and stock ponds on the Grassland may be visually evident and detract from the natural landscape. Generally, improvements are small and localized, and have a minor effect on the scenic quality of the surrounding area. Some Grassland users and visitors expect such improvements in the pastoral setting of the Grassland.

Some habitat improvement projects, such as lodgepole pine and ponderosa pine harvests, aspen regeneration cuts, and prescribed burns, may change the short-term character of the landscape. Project design will consider scenic resources under any alternative so that habitat improvements will appear natural.

The existing scenic condition could be changed by placement of new utilities or replacement and improvement of existing facilities. Under all alternatives, management emphasizes placing utility development in designated corridors. Mitigation measures include specifying the colors and types of materials used for the facility.

A change in the scenic condition due to soil displacement, and disturbance or removal of existing vegetation may occur. In all alternatives, development will follow *best management practices* to protect the soil resource and reduce the potential change to the existing scenic condition.

Air quality deterioration may detrimentally affect scenic views. However, unless the air quality deteriorates to the point that vegetation is killed, little direct effect on the existing scenic condition of the ARNF-PNG is expected in any alternative.

Forestwide standards and guidelines for scenic resource management apply to all alternatives. Although some alternatives would result in a change in the EVC in some areas, the overall scenic character of the Forests and Grassland would not change significantly in the first decade. Special consideration would be given to areas visible from sensitive travel routes. Factors such as viewer sensitivity, scenic quality, and distance from viewers would continue to be used in project design and implementation.

### **Effects on Scenic Resources from Travel Management**

Alternatives A, C, and I emphasize commodity production, and will require the construction and reconstruction of the greatest amount of additional Forest Development Road miles, especially in less developed areas. They will have the greatest potential to change the existing landscape. Alternatives B and E provide for maintaining existing levels in the road system, while Alternative H provides for a decrease. Because the Forests currently have an extensive road system and new construction is predicted to be minimal, all alternatives will have little effect on the EVCs. Scenic resources will be considered in any new road project.

### **Effects on Scenic Resources from Vegetation Management**

Vegetation management may be used to improve scenic quality, particularly where there are opportunities to enhance scenic views, provide a landscape associated with the public's expectations, increase the variety of vegetation species, or reduce stand homogeneity. In general, the short-term change to the existing scenic condition resulting from vegetation management is more acceptable where there have been previous disturbances to the landscape. In areas where no changes in the natural scenery have previously occurred, disturbances may be less acceptable to the public. Thinnings, partial cuts, and selection cuts generally are more acceptable to the public than overstory removal or shelterwood or clear cuts in the short term. Landscape management principles will be used in design and layout of harvest areas, regardless of the alternative. Projects will be designed to meet adopted VQOs.

Alternatives E and H have the lowest levels of vegetation manipulation and would have the smallest change from the EVC. However, the emphasis toward mature, dense forest may result in dead and down material that may be visually evident. Alternative H represents the smallest change in the visual condition from the EVC (Table 3.137).

Alternatives C, A, and I have the highest timber harvest volumes and the greatest potential change. Alternative C will have the greatest change to the EVC, with relatively high levels of regeneration harvest and other surface disturbances.

Alternative B falls between Alternatives I and E. A moderate amount of vegetation manipulation may occur, but the emphasis will be a balanced effort to meet the demands for resources of the Forests and Grassland.

### **Effects on Scenic Resources from Wildlife Management**

Alternatives A and B emphasize wildlife habitat enhancement by vegetation management to improve stand structure and composition for all wildlife species, including forage for big game species. These alternatives would place emphasis on a more mosaic forest as found prior to settlement. They would include fire-simulation cuts that have the greatest potential to change the existing scenic condition.

Alternatives C and I have a lower level VQO and more adverse effects on the total scenic quality of the Forests and Grassland because more disturbance is allowed. These alternatives have the most potential for a change to the existing scenic condition.

Alternatives E and H emphasize a mature forest with the closed tree canopies, reducing the diversity of the ground vegetation. In the long term (greater than 25 years), these alternatives would reduce the variety of the existing scenic condition unless insect infestations or wildfire open the forest canopy.

### **Effects on Scenic Resources From Mineral Exploration and Development**

Mineral exploration and subsequent development could have an effect on scenic resources in all alternatives. Mitigation measures such as color and location of facilities may be used, but VQOs may not be met, especially for oil and gas production on the Grassland. Drilling is a very short impact of 7 to 10 days. Production may last for 15 to 20 years before the sites are reclaimed. In May 1997, 45 producing wells and 15 sites in reclamation existed on the Grassland and disturbed approximately 121 acres. Over the life of the *Plan*, the number of producing wells is expected to remain about constant on the Grassland in all alternatives except H, and decrease to 42 in that alternative. The actual disturbed acres may decrease slightly from 158 acres in May 1997, to 128 acres (Alternatives A,B,C,E,I) and 116 acres (Alternative H). On the Sulphur and Redfeather Districts, no wells currently exist, but seven producers are expected for all alternatives except H. In that alternative, no wells would be drilled.

For locatable minerals, approximately 20 acres were disturbed on the Forests as of April 1995. This amount is not expected to increase significantly for any alternative; an additional 20 acres may be expected. The effect on scenic resources is detrimental at the mine locations, but may be mitigated by natural colors of structures.

### **Effects on Scenic Resources from Fire, Insects, and Disease**

Wildfire has the potential to alter the natural landscape's character under all alternatives. The effects from wildfire are estimated to be similar to the present situation across all alternatives

except H. Alternative H emphasizes allowing natural processes to occur which will likely result in larger acreages burned by wildfire. Unmanaged stands, especially dense sapling/pole and mature timber stands, have the greatest risk of catastrophic fire.

Insect and disease outbreaks have generally occurred frequently over small areas and infrequently over large areas. Depending on the severity of an infestation, effects on scenic resources can vary widely. Predicting the severity of the effects is not possible at this time. Alternatives A, C, I, and B, in that order, would have the most positive effect in maintaining insects and diseases at endemic levels because they will treat the most acres. Management activities in Alternatives E and H have little, if any, effect in altering the natural course of insects and diseases.

### **Effects on Scenic Resources from Recreation Management**

Recreation provides opportunities for the public to enjoy the Forests and Grassland, including developed sites and dispersed settings, roaded and unroaded, and motorized and nonmotorized. The emphasis and direction vary by alternative. Developed recreation opportunities do not vary significantly in Alternatives A, B, C, H, and I. Alternative E has more additional development. However, the effects on scenic resources can be mitigated by location and management of vegetation.

Dispersed recreation opportunities vary by alternative. Alternatives A, C, and I emphasize roaded settings and intensive resource management. They have the greatest potential to change the existing landscape. Alternatives B and E have a more moderate emphasis toward retaining road miles and resource management. Alternative H would have the least potential to change the existing scenic condition because of a decrease in forest development roads resulting from closures.

### **Effects on Scenic Resources from Wilderness Management**

The predominant VQO for wilderness is Preservation, with a recreation setting for primitive type activities and experiences. Alternatives A, C, E, and I maintain the existing wilderness acreages. Alternative B recommends an additional 8,810 acres for designation, and Alternative H recommends 259,363 acres. Changes to scenic settings in wilderness may occur due to wildfire or insect epidemics.

### **Effects on Scenic Resources from the Landownership Adjustment Program**

Through land exchange or purchase, private lands may become National Forest System lands to protect scenic resources on scenic byways, scenic trails, and other important travel corridors. However, development on lands exchanged into private ownership may be detrimental to the scenic quality of the area. These potential beneficial and adverse effects exist equally in all alternatives.

## **Effects on Scenic Resources from Ski Areas**

All ski areas address the scenic resource in a sensitive manner to meet the established VQO for each area as development occurs.

Alternative A has the potential to have the greatest impact on the scenic resource with four new areas added to the three now existing. Scenic quality can be expected to diminish from the current visual condition. The visual impacts will be predominantly from the development of ski runs and base-area developments. The three existing areas (Eldora, Loveland, and Winter Park-Mary Jane) are allocated acres for their existing operations.

Alternative B allocates acres to support the expansion of these existing ski areas as approved in current or proposed master development plans. Low to moderate visual impacts can be expected as these areas build to their expansion potential.

Alternatives C, E, and I are similar in total acreages, and allow for the expansion of Eldora and the development of three new areas. A decline in the existing scenic quality can be expected due to the development of the ski runs and base area facilities.

Alternative H is the least impacting on the scenic resources; it allows for Winter Park and Eldora to operate as they do now and provides for limited expansion at the Loveland Area. The future visual intrusions will be very low or hardly noticeable beyond current situations.

## **CUMULATIVE EFFECTS**

As mining claims were patented and public lands were homesteaded, private lands within the Forests increased. Today, the Forests have 312,651 acres of private lands within the boundaries. The development of these private lands has affected the scenic quality of the landscape of the Forests. This development includes signs, powerlines, telephone lines, roads, and parking areas. Much private land occupies drainage bottoms and travel routes. Public desires to live in the mountains along the Front Range have altered the landscape's character and scenic quality, especially in the intermix areas. Urbanization along the Front Range will continue in the future. While Forest activities such as vegetation manipulation or livestock grazing may have a shortterm effect on the scenic condition, the greater long-lasting effects will come from permanent improvements occurring predominantly on the private lands, creating altered landscapes.

In addition to the development of private lands, other agencies manage lands adjacent to the National Forests and Grassland, including the Bureau of Land Management, Rocky Mountain National Park, and the Denver Mountain Parks. Maintaining the scenic conditions with little alteration to the landscape is a goal of these agencies.

