

Documentation of Minimum Management Requirements

Prescott National Forest
Revised Forest Plan

Prepared by Greenbelt Insights
Sally Hess-Samuelson, Consultant

Introduction

Provisions of the 1982 Planning Rule establish minimum requirements to be met in accomplishing goals and objectives for the National Forest System. They are set out in the section labeled 219.27 Management Requirements. The management practices and corresponding plan components needed to meet the management requirements are called Minimum Management Requirements (MMRs). MMRs are the guidance that must be met for every resource.

A plan component is an MMR if it establishes a minimum outcome or condition that may not be inhibited by any other component and would be expected to be included in each action alternative (alternatives other than existing condition) in the Environmental Impact Statement.

This report defines and describes the MMRs that were used in the planning process to revise the 1987 Forest Plan. The report first identifies the plan components that make up MMRs based on those items labeled "Resource Protection" in the provisions of the 1982 Planning Rule. Table 1 Documentation of Management Requirements related to Resource Protection, displays each requirement from the subpart in the provisions of the 1982 Planning Rule, the Plan components from the Prescott NF revised Plan that apply, explanation and rationale for identifying the components as MMRs, and whether alternatives identified in the Environmental Impact Statement meet or exceed those MMRs.

Parts b through d found in provisions of the 1982 Planning Rule labeled 219.27 refer to tree cutting practices and related reforestation activity. Parts e through g provide additional guidance for management practices that take place within riparian areas, that may impact soil and water conditions, and that could affect wildlife and fish species diversity. Items b through g are addressed in Table 2 Documentation of Management Requirements related to Timber Production and Management Practices. Table 2 identifies requirements from the provisions of the 1982 Planning Rule. It indicates which Plan components provide guidance, if any; clarifies the level of planning where the requirement is best addressed; and indicates whether action alternatives use more than one means to address the requirement.

Table 1. Documentation of Management Requirements related to Resource Protection

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale/Explanation related identification as MMR in the revised Forest Plan	Do Action Alternatives (B, C, and D) meet or exceed the Minimum Management Requirement?
Resource Protection—Part (a) of Provisions of 1982 Planning Rule; identified as Section 219.27			
<p>(1) Conserve soil and water resources; ensure no permanent impairment of productivity.</p>	<p>Desired Conditions describe goals for resource conditions. Those related to soil and watershed are: DC-Watershed-1,3, 4, and 6;</p> <p>Objectives provide emphasis on activities that will help move toward desired conditions. Objectives related to soil and watersheds are: O-8, O-16, O-18, O-20, and O-21.</p> <p>Standards and Guidelines assist in protection of soil and water resources: Standards and Guidelines that apply are: Std-WS-1 to 3; Guides- WS-2 and 3; Guide-Soils-1 and 2; Guide-Rec-6; and Guide-Trans-6.</p> <p>Management Area direction that applies is: Desired Conditions CK MA-1; WVS MA-3; PB MA-2; and Guidelines CK MA-1; and VV MA-2. Questions included as part of Monitoring Theme 4 will assist in adaptively modifying actions to maintain and improve Watershed and Soil conditions.</p>	<p>The plan components identified are considered necessary to ensure no permanent impairment of productivity. Soil and Water resources are particularly important in the arid and often less productive Southwest to maintain ecosystems that impact wildlife and plant species.</p> <p>Descriptions of the desired character of soils and watersheds assist in identifying projects that will maintain or improve conditions. Objectives set priority for important activities.</p> <p>Standards and Guidelines set sideboards for future activities to protect resources.</p>	<p>Plan components listed meet the requirement and are consistent across action alternatives.</p>

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale/Explanation related identification as MMR in the revised Forest Plan	Do Action Alternatives (B, C, and D) meet or exceed the Minimum Management Requirement?
<p>(2) Minimize hazards from flood, wind, wildfire, erosion or other physical forces.</p>	<p>Hazards addressed relate primarily to enhancing ecosystem resiliency in response to potential changes due to climate change, maintaining water flows to enhance ecological functions, and addressing fuel build-up within wildland urban interface to avoid catastrophic wildfire effects.</p> <p>Desired Conditions that apply are: DC-Ecosystem Resilience-1; DC-Watershed 1 and 6; DC-Airshed-1; DC-Veg-1, 4, 8, 12, 15, 19; and DC-Wild and Scenic 1.</p> <p>Standards and Guidelines that apply are Std Wildland Fire-1 and Std-Range-2; and Guide-Wildland Fire 1 to 3 and 9.</p> <p>Theme three monitoring questions (Retaining Ecosystem Resilience) will lead to improved outcomes of management actions by adjusting site specific methods to better produce desired effects.</p>	<p>Wildfire, changes in climate conditions, and lowered water flows are the hazards that most likely will impact the Prescott NF.</p> <p>The Plan components listed are needed to minimize hazards such as preventing impact to human health and safety.</p> <p>There is one river on the Forest with continuous flow from headwaters to mouth—the Verde River. The portions of this river that lie within the Prescott NF are either designated or eligible for Wild and Scenic River designation. Maintaining desired vegetative habitat is the method used to minimize flood hazards.</p>	<p>Plan components listed meet the requirement and are consistent across action alternatives.</p>
<p>(3) Reduce long lasting hazards and damage due to pest organisms.</p>	<p>Desired Conditions reference maintaining resilient, healthy ecosystems (DC-Veg-1). Objectives O-2 to 5 provide direction for managing species and vegetation structure to improve forest health. In particular, treatment of highly departed ponderosa pine systems is identified to increase resiliency to pest</p>	<p>Most insect infestations are cyclic and increases in populations coincide with other stressors such as drought. Generally, reducing vulnerability to insects and pathogen activity includes improving tree vigor and maintaining forest health by maintaining natural species, and structural</p>	<p>Plan Components, except for objectives, are consistent across action alternatives. Estimated annual treatment in ponderosa pine ranges in action</p>

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale/Explanation related identification as MMR in the revised Forest Plan	Do Action Alternatives (B, C, and D) meet or exceed the Minimum Management Requirement?
	<p>organisms such as Ips bark beetles.</p> <p>Objectives that call for a minimum of 27,500 acres of treatment over 10 years in ponderosa pine are considered the Minimum management requirement.</p> <p>Guide-Plants-6 includes guidance for treatment timing and slash accumulations for ponderosa pine to avoid Ips beetle population breakouts.</p>	<p>characteristics.</p> <p>In recent years, the most extensive damage has been in ponderosa pine due to Ips bark beetle infestations (Lynch et al). Plan components listed help decrease the risk of long lasting hazards due to pests.</p>	<p>alternatives are shown below:</p> <p>B. 2750 to 5800 ac</p> <p>C. 3250 to 7300 ac.</p> <p>D. 2750 to 5800 ac.</p>
<p>(4) Protect streams, streambanks, riparian area, shorelines, lakes, wetlands and other bodies of water.</p>	<p>Desired conditions focus on protecting and restoring riparian areas, improving aquatic habitats, and protecting the portions of the Verde River that are eligible or designated as part of the Wild and Scenic Rivers system. Desired Conditions that apply are; DC-Watershed 2, 6; DC-Veg-5, DC-aquatic-1; DC-Wild and Scenic -1.</p> <p>Objectives O-19 to 23 focus attention on making improvements in watershed and riparian integrity.</p> <p>The following Standards and Guidelines apply: Stds-WS-1 to 3 and Range-2; Guides-WS-4 to 10; Guide-Wildland Fire-8; Guides- Rec-1, 6, and 8.</p> <p>Management Area Guidance includes: Desired Condition CK MA-3 and Guideline AF-MA-1.</p>	<p>Plan components listed are needed to meet minimum requirements to protect riparian areas and shorelines and to trend toward habitat needs of species of viability concern associated with riparian shrub habitat :</p> <p>Desired Conditions listed identify outcomes that represent healthy riparian or ground water dependent systems.</p> <p>Objectives respond to current impacts to riparian areas, including treatment of improperly functioning areas, relocating roads or trails that impact watersheds integrity (including riparian), rehabilitating unauthorized recreational routes, improving stream crossings and enhancing seeps and springs. Activities that fall within these classifications will respond to the high risk of reduced watershed integrity</p>	<p>Plan components listed meet the requirement and are consistent across action alternatives.</p>

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale/Explanation related identification as MMR in the revised Forest Plan	Do Action Alternatives (B, C, and D) meet or exceed the Minimum Management Requirement?
		situations in areas listed in Table 6 of the 2009 Ecological Sustainability Report.	
(5) Provide for diversity of plant and animal communities.	<p>Diversity of plant and animal communities was included by identifying ecosystem characteristics and comparing them to information collected on natural conditions. By working toward these desired conditions, habitats for desired plant and animal communities will be maintained or improved. Desired Conditions that apply are: DC-wildlife 1; DC-Aquatic-1; DC-Veg-3 to 5 and 13 to 21. Objectives that focus attention on ecosystems with highest risk of impacts are O-1 to 6 and O-24 to 28. The low end of ranges listed as Objectives in Alternative B in the Environmental Impact Statement are considered the MMR.</p> <p>Standards and Guidelines that apply are: Std-Plant-1; Std-Range-1; Guide-WS-11; Guides-Plants-1 to 5 and 7; Guides-Wildland Fires 2 and 5; Guides-WL-1 to 7; Guide-Fish/Aquatics 1 to 3; Guide-Rec-4; Guide-Trans.3 to 5; and Guide-Range 2 to 4.</p> <p>Management Area direction includes Desired Condition CK MA-3 and WVN MA-2.</p> <p>By answering Theme 2 monitoring questions</p>	<p>Plan components listed are needed to provide for species diversity now and to provide species resilience to potential future changes in climate.</p> <p>A comprehensive list of species expected to be present on the Prescott NF was analyzed to determine those that were associated with Potential Natural Vegetation Types. Those ecosystems that are at high risk of departure from natural conditions, pose a risk to species diversity. If vegetative conditions trend toward desired conditions, habitat conditions for species associated with the plant communities are expected to be improving as well.</p> <p>When species are associated with habitat features not associated with a particular vegetation type, Standards and Guidelines provide added guidance to ensure protection or development of those features.</p>	<p>Plan Components, except for objectives, are consistent across action alternatives. Annual Vegetation treatment ranges in action alternatives are shown below:</p> <p>B. 11,350 to 31,800 ac C. 16,250 to 26,800 ac. D. 11,350 to 22,800 ac.</p> <p>Objectives also vary across action alternatives for Aquatic and Terrestrial habitat improvement. Alternatives B and D are identical and meet the MMR, but Alternative C includes fish restoration in more stream reaches, more miles of fence improvement, more acres of pronghorn</p>

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale/Explanation related identification as MMR in the revised Forest Plan	Do Action Alternatives (B, C, and D) meet or exceed the Minimum Management Requirement?
	(Conserving Biological Diversity) trends toward achieving desired outcomes can be determined and adjustments to treatments identified.		habitat improvement and more improvements in more water developments.
(6) Provide for fish and habitat to maintain viable populations.	<p>Viable populations of fish and wildlife are maintained by promoting needed habitats that are well-distributed. Desired Conditions provide descriptions of desired habitats (vegetation conditions). Desired conditions that apply are: DC-wildlife-1 and 2; DC-Aquatic-1, 2; DC Watershed-2 and 6; and DC-Veg-6 to 7 and 13 to 22.</p> <p>Objectives provide focus on habitats that may be missing or could be enhanced. Objectives that apply are O-1 to 6; O-24 to 28. Activity at the low end of ranges included in Objectives listed in Alternative B are considered the MMR.</p> <p>Standards and Guidelines provide direction to retain specific habitat features that are needed to maintain viability. Those that apply are: Std-Wildland Fire-2; Guide-WS-11; Guide-Plants 1 to 5; Guide-WL-1 to 7; Guide-Wildland Fire 5; Guide-Fish /Aquatic-1 to 3; Guide-Trans.-2 to 5; and Guide-Range 2 to 4. Management Area direction Desired Condition CK –MA-3 also</p>	<p>Plan components listed are needed to provide for species viability now and to provide resilience against changes in the future.</p> <p>A viability analysis was done to determine species that could be at risk and the potential factors that could impact them. Habitats and habitat features associated with those species were identified and included in Desired Conditions and as standards or guidelines. Habitats and elements associated with species having high viability risk included grasslands, and ponderosa pine forests (Table 14, Species Viability Analysis 2011).</p> <p>Desired factors within these communities are addressed via plan components.</p>	<p>Plan Components, except for objectives, are consistent across action alternatives. Plan components related to riparian and desert communities are consistent across action alternatives. Annual vegetation treatment ranges in action alternatives for grasslands and ponderosa pine are listed below:</p> <p>B. 5,350 to 12,800 ac C. 10,250 to 16,800 ac. D. 5,350 to 12,800 ac.</p> <p>Objectives also vary across action alternatives for Aquatic and Terrestrial habitat</p>

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale/Explanation related identification as MMR in the revised Forest Plan	Do Action Alternatives (B, C, and D) meet or exceed the Minimum Management Requirement?
	<p>applies.</p> <p>Monitoring Questions included as part of Theme 2 monitoring Questions (Conserving Biological Diversity) will assist in understanding whether trends toward desired outcomes are having the desired effect.</p>		<p>improvement. Alternatives B and D are identical for this resource, but Alternative C includes fish restoration in more stream reaches, more miles of fence improvement, more acres of pronghorn habitat improvement and more improvements in more water developments.</p>
<p>(8) Prevent adverse modification of critical habitat for Federally listed Threatened or Endangered species.</p>	<p>Plan components that either describe critical habitat or call for maintaining critical habitats are: Desired Conditions DC-Veg-3; DC-Lands-2; and DC-Wild and Scenic-1. Std Plants-2; Std-WL-1; Std-Fish/Aquatics-1; and Std-Wild and Scenic-2.</p> <p>Theme 2 monitoring questions include two questions to measure outcomes of following plant components. They are: Have conservation actions or strategies for federally listed species been implemented? And What are the habitat trends for Federally Listed species on the</p>	<p>The Endangered Species Act calls for maintenance of critical habitat for threatened and endangered species.</p> <p>In general, desired conditions and standards reference maintaining critical habitat and using mitigation that was included in current recovery plans and conservation strategies for federally listed Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, and Candidate plant, wildlife, and fish species. If those legally required actions change in the future, the revised Forest Plan allows</p>	<p>Plan components listed meet the requirement and are consistent across action alternatives.</p>

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale/Explanation related identification as MMR in the revised Forest Plan	Do Action Alternatives (B, C, and D) meet or exceed the Minimum Management Requirement?
	Prescott NF. Based on the answers to these questions, future management may be modified.	this flexibility and plan requirements would change as well.	
(9) Provide for needed transportation, utility corridors and other significant rights of way.	Plan Components that apply and that are MMRs: DC-Transportation and Facilities-1; DC-Lands-1; Std-Rec-1; and Guides-Lands 1, 4 and 5.	<p>Transportation corridors provide access to dwellings on private land, special use permit areas, and to utility corridors. Utility corridors are expected to make use of existing corridors including the West-Wide corridor if possible.</p> <p>Future decisions for roads and trails will make use of the Motorized Vehicle Use Map to help determine need to modify System.</p>	Plan components listed meet the requirement and are consistent across action alternatives.
(10) Ensure road designs consider safety, cost, and impacts to resources.	Plan components that apply and that are MMRs: DC-Transportation and-Facilities-1; DC-Lands-1; Guide-Rec-5; and Guides-Trans 1 and 2.	While revised Plan guidance provides general direction, specific considerations about safety, costs, and impacts must be determined at the site specific project level, in order to better understand trade-offs.	Plan components listed meet the requirement and are consistent across action alternatives.

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale/Explanation related identification as MMR in the revised Forest Plan	Do Action Alternatives (B, C, and D) meet or exceed the Minimum Management Requirement?
(11) Ensure vegetative cover is re-established following construction and use.	Plan components that apply and that are MMRs: DC-Transportation and Facilities-1; Guide-Rec-5; and Guides-Trans 1 and 2.	Focus of the revised Plan is primarily on ensuring that non-designated motorized routes are restored to their natural vegetated state to avoid confusion about trail routes and to maintain and improve watershed integrity. Few temporary roads are expected to be needed in the Prescott NF for timber harvest given the relatively small amount of tree cutting that is carried out.	Plan components listed meet the requirement and are consistent across action alternatives.
(12) Maintain air quality.	Plan components that apply and that are MMRs: DC-Airshed-1 and Theme 4 monitoring questions including “Are management activities contributing or responding to air quality effects on human health or human enjoyment?” and “Are air quality related values of Sycamore Canyon and Pine Mountain Wilderness Areas being maintained?” Answering these questions will lead to adaptation of future management.	Wildland fire is the primary means that the Prescott NF will have of impacting Airsheds. Desired conditions call for adaptively identifying mitigations that help reduce smoke that could cause health concerns in communities due to planned burning and to consider airsheds as decisions are made for managing wildfires. The Clean Air Act and Manual direction provide direction to involve the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality to coordinate prescribed fire activity on the Forest. Therefore guidelines to that effect are not needed.	Plan components listed meet the requirement and are consistent across action alternatives.

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale/Explanation related identification as MMR in the revised Forest Plan	Do Action Alternatives (B, C, and D) meet or exceed the Minimum Management Requirement?
Sub parts that will be addressed as site specific implementation is accomplished:			
(7) Assess impacts and consistency with uses planned for the general area.	The Forest Plan includes forestwide and management area-specific desired conditions.	Consistency with management area desired conditions and potential resource impacts can only be assessed as projects are identified at a site specific level.	Consistent across all alternatives

Table 2. Documentation of Management Requirements related to Timber Production and Management Practices

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale for inclusion or non-inclusion in the revised Forest Plan and clarification of level of planning where requirement is best addressed.	Is there more than one means of meeting management requirements in Action Alternatives (B, C and D)?
Manipulation of Tree Cover—Part (b) of Provisions of 1982 Planning Rule; identified as Section 219.27			
Sub parts that will be addressed as site specific implementation is accomplished			
(1) Ensure that projects are best suited to multiple use desired conditions (goals) considering resource and economic impacts.	Forestwide and Management Area desired conditions found in the revised Forest Plan will be the starting point for identifying need for site specific projects. In addition Objectives (O-3 and O-5) identify acreage ranges expected to be treated using tree cutting.	Site specific proposals are expected to include consideration of methods that are best suited to achieving desired conditions. Desired Conditions and objectives provide guidance that responds to ecological, economic and social factors.	Consistent across action alternatives
(2) Assure that tree cover can be adequately restocked	Ponderosa pine is the vegetation type that could likely call for restocking following management activity. However, ponderosa pine desired conditions generally call for uneven age management at a landscape scale. Desired Conditions DC-Veg-14 and DC-Veg-17 contain descriptions.	While it is unlikely that vegetative manipulation will require restocking activity, project design is expected to consider size of open areas desired and need for tree regeneration for the future. The forest arrangement would consist of small clumps and groups of trees interspersed with variably-sized openings. The size, shape, number of tree groups and number of trees per	Consistent across action alternatives

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale for inclusion or non-inclusion in the revised Forest Plan and clarification of level of planning where requirement is best addressed.	Is there more than one means of meeting management requirements in Action Alternatives (B, C and D)?
		tree group would vary across the landscape. As natural or managed disturbances occur, a small amount of natural tree regeneration or tree planting would be expected	
(3) Projects are chosen for total benefit—not just greatest dollar return.	Projects will be designed to produce conditions that trend toward the desired condition descriptions included in the revised Forest Plan. These include not only ecological goals but provide for production of sustainable amounts of wood products and livestock grazing (DC-Veg-2).	Site specific conditions must be considered as site specific projects are identified to achieve desired conditions that respond to ecological, economic, or social factors. Therefore, this subpart will be addressed at the site-specific level.	Consistent across action alternatives
(4) Projects are chosen after consideration of effects on residual trees.	Desired conditions provide the desired outcome and site specific projects will be identified to cause a trend toward achieving those outcomes, including desired number and condition of residual trees.	Desired conditions describe vegetation at three scales; however, specific locations must be identified in order to determine possible effect on residual trees.	Consistent across action alternatives

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale for inclusion or non-inclusion in the revised Forest Plan and clarification of level of planning where requirement is best addressed.	Is there more than one means of meeting management requirements in Action Alternatives (B, C and D)?
(5) Projects are chosen to avoid impacts to soil and water resources and to not permanently impair productivity.	See Table 1, subpart 1 (row 1) above.		
(6) Projects provide desired effect on multiple resources such as water quality, wildlife and fish habitat, forage production, recreational uses, and aesthetic values.	Determinations of project emphasis on various resource areas will be made at the site specific level; trend toward desired conditions for each resource will determine the need for projects. Desired conditions for each resource were developed in an interdisciplinary manner and many projects are expected to benefit more than one resource area.	Desired effects on resources are to trend toward ecological, social, and economic desired conditions found in the revised Forest Plan. Relative emphasis on each must be determined once a site specific location for a project is identified.	Consistent across action alternatives
(7) Projects are practical in terms of transportation and costs of administration and contract preparation.	Practicality will include consideration of forest budgets and transportation needs at the time a project was proposed.	Practicality must be determined at the site specific project level in order to consider landform, resource values, esthetic values and others.	Consistent across action alternatives

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale for inclusion or non-inclusion in the revised Forest Plan and clarification of level of planning where requirement is best addressed.	Is there more than one means of meeting management requirements in Action Alternatives (B, C and D)?
<p>Silvicultural Practices for Timber Production—Part (c) Provisions of 1982 Planning Rule; identified as Section 219.27</p>			
<p>(1) Ensure no timber harvest takes place on lands classified as not suited for timber production.</p>	<p>A summary of acreage suited for timber management is found in Chapter 7 of the revised Forest Plan. More detail on area classified as unsuited for timber production is found in the Plan Revision Project Record.</p>	<p>Provisions of the 1982 Planning Rule include process to use to identify unsuited lands. Tree cutting may take place on unsuitable lands if done to salvage damaged trees, or if done to meet other multiple use values or objectives.</p>	<p>The acreage of land unsuitable for timber production varies between alternatives, depending on the intent and management emphasis for each alternative. Unsuitable lands vary from 1.211 to 1.217 million acres across alternatives. The Prescott NF includes 1.255 million acres under National Forest management.</p>
<p>(2) Ensure that the volume harvested for timber production during the planning period does not exceed the allowable sale quantity (ASQ).</p>	<p>The 10-year timber base sale schedule and the ASQ are found in Appendix B, Proposed and Probable Management Practices, of the revised Forest Plan.</p>	<p>Identifying a maximum timber production volume for the planning period is intended to provide notice of planned amount of tree cutting for timber production and identify an upper limit for activities with that purpose. Tree cutting to produce timber volume and more commercially valuable trees is a small program on the Prescott NF and</p>	<p>Given that the number of unsuited acres changes by alternative, the ASQ also changes by alternative. ASQ ranges from 23,385 hundred cubic feet to 40,447 hundred cubic feet per 10 years.</p>

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale for inclusion or non-inclusion in the revised Forest Plan and clarification of level of planning where requirement is best addressed.	Is there more than one means of meeting management requirements in Action Alternatives (B, C and D)?
		most tree cutting is related to treatment of fuels or meeting ecological goals described in the desired conditions.	
(3) If tree cutting is done with the goal of timber production, ensure the area is adequately restocked within 5 years of final harvest.	Reforestation requirements are included within the National Forest Management Act and are not repeated in the revised Forest Plan.	Most tree cutting is related to treatment of fuels or to meeting ecological goals described in desired conditions. These are described as uneven-aged on a landscape scale and would likely require little reforestation.	Consistent across action alternatives
(4) Thinning, or other partial cutting, may be used to achieve improvement in timber values or to meet other multiple use objectives.	There is potential included in several objectives to make use of mechanical treatments to reduce vegetation density. Objectives O-2 to 5 are included.	Density reductions provide benefits to wildlife, improve watershed and rangeland conditions, improve structural characteristics, and reduce fuels within the wildland urban interface.	Alternatives vary in the amount of acreage to be treated within each alternative.
(5) If identified as a need, ensure that intensive timber management activity is continued until late in the planning period.	No intensive management activities for timber production were identified.	Most tree cutting is related to treatment of fuels or to meeting ecological goals described in desired conditions.	Consistent across action alternatives
(6) Ensure protection of soil, watershed, fish and wildlife, recreation, aesthetic resources, and tree regeneration if even-aged management is used.	See Table 1 and part b in Table 2.	It is unlikely that even-aged management will be used except on a very small scale. Consideration of competing resources will be accomplished at a site specific project level.	Consistent across action alternative

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale for inclusion or non-inclusion in the revised Forest Plan and clarification of level of planning where requirement is best addressed.	Is there more than one means of meeting management requirements in Action Alternatives (B, C and D)?
<p>(7) Use tree cutting methods to prevent or modify unnatural insect pest population increases.</p>	<p>Guide-Plants-6 includes guidance for treatment timing and slash accumulations for ponderosa pine to avoid Ips beetle population breakouts. Vegetation desired conditions, Objectives O-2 to 5 provide direction for managing to adjust species and structure to improve forest health.</p>	<p>Most insect infestations are cyclic and increases in populations coincide with other stressors such as drought. Generally, reducing vulnerability to insects and pathogen activity includes improving tree vigor and maintaining forest health by maintaining natural species, and structural characteristics. In recent years, the most extensive damage has been in ponderosa pine due to Ips bark beetle infestations.</p>	<p>Consistent across action alternatives</p>
<p>Even-aged management of Timber—Part (d) Provisions of 1982 Planning Rule; identified as Section 219.27</p>			
<p>(1)Ensure that openings due to even-aged management are located to achieve the desired combination of multiple use objectives.</p> <p>(2)Ensure that maximum size limits for clearcuts are 40 acres, with some exceptions, such as at the site-specific level with Regional Forester approval and 60-day public notice or in response to natural catastrophic conditions.</p>	<p>The following guidelines for visual, wildlife, watershed, and other values have been included in the revised forest plan to guide all types of vegetation management: Guides-SM-1 to 6; Stds-WS-1and 2; Guides WS-1, 3, 5 to 7, and 9 to 11;Guides-Scenic-1 to 3; Guides-Soils-1 and 2; Std Plants-1 and 2, Guides-Plants-1 and 6;Std-WL-1; Guides-WL-1,3 to 6; Std-Fish/Aquatics-1; Guides-Fish/Aquatics-1 and 3.</p>	<p>Little or no classic even-aged management is likely needed to achieve the desired conditions for vegetation. Desired conditions in ponderosa pine describe landscape scale structure as being un even-aged. Guidelines for all vegetation management will be adequate to guide any even-aged management identified at a site-specific level.</p>	<p>Consistent across alternatives</p>

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale for inclusion or non-inclusion in the revised Forest Plan and clarification of level of planning where requirement is best addressed.	Is there more than one means of meeting management requirements in Action Alternatives (B, C and D)?
	However, Guidelines specific to clearcutting or shelterwood systems have not been included in the revised Forest Plan.		
Riparian Areas—Part (e) Provisions of 1982 Planning Rule; identified as Section 219.27			
Ensure that special attention is paid to the area dominated by riparian vegetation along edges of streams, lakes, and other bodies of water.	Watershed guidelines Guides-WS-4 to 11 apply directly to riparian areas. Other plan components also reference bodies of water either directly or indirectly. They are: DC-watershed-2 and 6; DC Aquatic-1; O-18 and O-19; Guide-Fish/Aquatics-1; Guides-Trans-1, 2, 4, and 6.	With few perennial streams, riparian areas are extremely important in providing habitat for terrestrial and aquatic-related species such as fish, amphibians, and reptiles.	Consistent across action alternatives
Soil and Water—Part (f) Provisions of 1982 Planning Rule; identified as Section 219.27			
Use technical handbooks to guide analysis, protection, enhancement, treatment and evaluation of soil and water resources.	The most recent version of the Region 3 technical guide for soils management will be used. In addition, Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory (also called Terrestrial Ecological Survey) classified soils within the Prescott NF and provided soil data, evaluation of soil potential, and	Maintaining site productivity is primarily influenced by soil condition. If soil characteristics are restored or maintained, site productivity will be maintained or improved.	Consistent across action alternatives

Subpart	Prescott NF Plan components that apply	Rationale for inclusion or non-inclusion in the revised Forest Plan and clarification of level of planning where requirement is best addressed.	Is there more than one means of meeting management requirements in Action Alternatives (B, C and D)?
	<p>interpretations and guidance for management activity. Information from the survey was used to determine grazing capability.</p> <p>Finally, Plan components for soils are often included with those for Watershed Integrity (DC-Watershed-3; Guides-Soils 1 and 2.</p>		
Diversity—Part (g) Provisions of 1982 Planning Rule; identified as Section 219.27			
<p>Ensure management activities maintain and enhance the diversity of plant and animal communities so that the diversity found is as great as that expected in a natural forest and the diversity of tree species is similar to that existing in the planning area.</p>	<p>See list of plan components found in Table 1 subpart 5 (row 5).</p> <p>Vegetation desired conditions in the revised Forest Plan provide detailed descriptions of desired vegetative composition for the 11 Potential Natural vegetation Types found on the Prescott NF.</p>	<p>Early inventory and analysis of vegetation and habitats showed that several vegetation systems were departed from desired structural and compositional characteristics. Desired conditions provide the outcomes which management activities should achieve. Objectives identify habitats that need to be treated to improve plant and wildlife diversity.</p>	<p>With varying acreages included in objectives found within each alternative, there are varying emphases on improving habitats leading to improved diversity.</p>