



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Intermountain
Region

March 2000




Utah

Northern Goshawk Project

Decision Notice

Finding of No Significant Impact

Finding of Non-Significant Amendment



**DECISION NOTICE
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
AND
NON-SIGNIFICANT AMENDMENT
OF THE
FOREST PLANS IN UTAH
FOR THE
UTAH NORTHERN GOSHAWK PROJECT
USDA FOREST SERVICE
Intermountain Region**

Ashley, Dixie, Fishlake, Manti-LaSal, Uinta and Wasatch-Cache National Forests

Utah Counties: Beaver, Box Elder, Cache, Carbon, Daggett, Davis, Duchesne, Emery, Garfield, Grand, Iron, Juab, Kane, Millard, Morgan, Piute, Rich, Salt Lake, San Juan, Sanpete, Sevier, Summit, Tooele, Uintah, Utah, Wasatch, Washington, Wayne, and Weber
Wyoming Counties: Sweetwater and Uinta
Colorado Counties: Mesa and Montrose

1. Background

An environmental assessment has been prepared that summarizes the analysis completed for a proposed change in programmatic management direction for the six National Forests in Utah, relative to management direction in northern goshawk (hereinafter referred to as goshawk) habitat. The Utah Northern Goshawk Project Environmental Assessment (EA) was distributed for public comment and review in October 1999. The proposal and action alternatives would amend the Land and Resource Management Plans (forest plans) for each National Forest in Utah by adding management direction in the form of goals and objectives, standards and guidelines to be applied to management activities that could affect goshawk habitat. These amendments would remain in effect until each forest plan is revised, estimated to be within the next four years. The affected lands are located primarily in Utah, with small portions in Wyoming and Colorado (EA, Chapter 1, section 1.4.1). This amended direction will maintain options for goshawk habitat management by reducing the risk of potential negative impacts to habitat.

The programmatic direction will be mandatory and enforceable. The intent is to address the new information found in the "Habitat Assessment and Management Recommendations for the Northern Goshawk in the State of Utah" (Graham et al. 1999) and "Conservation Strategy and Agreement for Management of Northern Goshawk Habitat in Utah" (Utah NFs et al. 1998), and provide consistency in management direction that will narrow the management interpretations currently possible (EA, Chapter 1, section 1.3). Proposed direction would provide programmatic mitigation measures for potential environmental effects that may result from future projects and activities. None of the alternatives considered would make an irretrievable or irreversible commitment of resources (EA, Chapter 1, section 1.6). Additional mitigation measures may be added to particular projects as a result of site-specific conditions during project-level analysis, or refinements made to measures in this proposal.

Because this action would mitigate future environmental effects, the indirect effects are expected to be beneficial. Chapter 4 of the EA (sections 4.4 and 4.5) identifies the possibility of localized, indirect social and economic effects. These social and economic effects are not significant and do not require the preparation of an environmental impact statement, as discussed in section 5 of this decision notice.

2. Decision

I have selected Alternative F as the management direction to guide activities in goshawk habitat until the forest plans are revised. Alternative F concentrates activities on maintenance and restoration of habitat areas at risk to maintain the connectivity of habitat and capability to support viable populations of goshawks across the National Forest System lands in Utah. This alternative provides the greatest opportunity to minimize any further degradation of goshawk habitat and loss of future management options until the forest plans in Utah are revised.

Alternative F provides guidance for local managers to assess their habitat conditions at a landscape level and determine where the greatest needs for restoration and maintenance treatments exist. The objective is that each Forest in Utah prioritize treatment on at least 1000 acres per year to work toward this short-term goal focused on maintenance or restoration of habitat at risk, until the forest plans are revised. Alternative F also emphasizes management of plant communities important for goshawk prey species. The standards and guidelines that will be implemented are designed to protect goshawk habitat during all management activities, particularly in the nest and post-fledgling areas. The monitoring items that are included in Alternative F will continue to update our information and work toward adaptive management strategies for goshawks and their prey.

The focus in Alternative F regarding grazing is to change grazing practices only in those areas where landscape assessments determine grazing is a factor in putting a landscape "at-risk" relative to habitat needs of goshawk. Monitoring elements include assessing whether appropriate adjustments are being made in identified "at risk" locations (EA, Appendix B). Alternative F also specifies mitigation measures to be implemented for all management activities, whether vegetation treatments or issuing special use permits, to protect goshawk nest areas and foraging habitat. Clarification of desired habitat conditions for prey species has been added in Appendix AA (attached) to help field personnel envision what conditions we are trying to achieve.

In selecting Alternative F, I considered the following factors:

a. Laws, regulations & policies. The National Forest Management Act (NFMA) and implementing regulations (36 CFR 219) require that wildlife habitat be managed to maintain viable populations of existing native vertebrate species. To assure that viable populations will be maintained, habitat must be provided to support a minimum number of reproductive individuals and that habitat must be well distributed so that those individuals can interact with others in the planning area. When the forest plans in Utah were developed during the 1980s, the management direction was designed to meet this requirement.

The goshawk was listed by the Forest Service as a sensitive species in the Intermountain Region in 1991 and is also listed as a sensitive species by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (EA, section 1.2). New information, triggered by Graham et al. (1999) recommended that updated

management direction be adopted to maintain and restore habitat for viable populations of goshawks in Utah. This was a key part of the purpose and need for this project to amend the national forest plans.

To varying degrees, each National Forest within the State of Utah has inventoried for goshawks and monitored known territories since at least 1992. Data obtained from these studies was used in the development of "The Northern Goshawk in Utah: Habitat Assessment and Management Recommendations" (Graham et al 1999). Results of these monitoring studies on National Forest System lands were unable to detect a decline in territory occupancy.

The "Conservation Strategy and Agreement for Management of Northern Goshawk Habitat in Utah", a cooperative effort with the Utah National Forests, Bureau of Land Management, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources and United States Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service (Utah NFs et al. 1998) explains that managers rarely have all information needed to conduct a fully quantitative population viability analysis (PVA). In the face of missing information, one practical alternative is to use inventories of the quality and quantity of suitable habitat as a surrogate for PVA. For the goshawk, this surrogate analysis for PVA is documented in the "Habitat Assessment and Management Recommendations for the Northern Goshawk in the State of Utah" (Graham et al. 1999). Within the National Forests in Utah, there is systematic statewide monitoring that is described on page 10 of the Conservation Strategy. These documents are discussed in Chapter 1 of the EA.

By focusing management on those areas at the greatest risk of dropping from high and optimum habitat to low or moderate habitat, Alternative F prevents habitat loss and prioritizes management action to conserve goshawks in Utah. This contributes to on-going interagency efforts to prevent the goshawk from being listed as threatened or endangered.

b. Issues. The public issues raised during the EA comment period are addressed in Appendix AA, (attached). I observe that all sides of the issues have been expressed from a variety of people interested in management of the National Forests in Utah. While some people wrote that what we were proposing was unnecessary because goshawks are doing fine in Utah, others wrote that we were not doing enough to protect goshawk habitat. Similarly, some people think that current grazing and timber harvesting practices are not causing any harm to goshawk and its prey habitat, while others think eliminating grazing and timber harvest is necessary to achieve the desired habitat conditions.

The issues are organized in three main categories: science used; process concerns; and other topics of interest. In reviewing these, it strikes me that the disagreement in the scientific community about the "best" management for goshawks was not resolved by developing alternatives that incorporated different components from the different scientific studies. I do note from the comments received that the disagreement is with the differing science, not with the disclosure of the effects in Chapter 4 of the EA. In selecting Alternative F, I have determined that the recommendations from the Reynolds (et al 1992) and Graham (et al. 1999) studies are most appropriate for our situation in Utah because:

- i) The Reynolds study on the Kaibab Plateau is the longest running goshawk study, (Reynolds et al. 1992)
- ii) The Reynolds study is based on many similar habitat conditions as those found in the State of Utah, and the Graham (Graham et al 1999) is specific to Utah.
- iii) Dr. Reynolds is a well known raptor scientist who is renowned for his work in goshawk ecology.

One main point of the disagreement among scientists concerns how much canopy closure is adequate and whether clumps of trees are as useful as more uniform canopy closure for goshawks. This makes me realize the importance of the monitoring items described in Appendix B of the EA, and our commitment to continue the studies, monitor and adapt our management practices as we continue to learn about the habitat requirements for the goshawk. Other research was discussed and differing opinions recognized within the EA (Chapter 3, section 3.3.4). Further explanations of the different sciences considered follow in Appendix AA, Responses to Comments on the EA.

Many comments reflected the concern that “people are as important as goshawks”. As discussed in Chapter 4 (sections 4.4 and 4.5) of the EA, implementing this new direction will have minimal effects on local communities considering the small number of acres that would be possible to treat over the next four years until the forest plans in Utah are revised. I firmly believe that healthy communities of people cannot occur without healthy, diverse and productive watersheds and ecosystems that the management direction in Alternative F is designed to maintain and restore.

Some people questioned our ability to implement this direction, that guidelines instead of standards provide too much flexibility to local managers and that perhaps the intent is just to continue “business as usual”. As discussed more fully in Appendix AA, while guidelines do provide managers more flexibility to determine how best to implement the direction, the decision not to follow a guideline cannot be made lightly and must be documented during the site-specific decision making process. As projects are implemented, they must be in compliance with the amended direction in the forest plan. The public will have the opportunity at the project-level of decision making to assure the goshawk management direction is applied to meet the needs of each site-specific situation.

As the Plans are revised, I expect much of the direction in this decision will be incorporated, but during the revision process, interdisciplinary teams will integrate a longer-term strategy for goshawk management with other resource direction being revised. This means that some of the longer-term direction found in the other alternatives may appropriately be considered during the revision process. The effects of the longer-term strategy will be fully disclosed during the revision process, and people will again have the opportunity to be involved and provide comment during the revision process.

c. Environmental Documents Considered. In addition to the Utah Northern Goshawk Project EA, I also considered the information in The Northern Goshawk in Utah: Habitat Assessment and Management Recommendations, The Conservation Strategy and Agreement for Management of Northern Goshawk Habitat in Utah, numerous scientific studies, research documents, and the Biological Evaluations and Assessments prepared for the project. Other related environmental documents were taken into account including: the Intermountain Regional Guide and Land and Resource Management Plans (forest plans) and associated National Environmental Policy Act

(NEPA) documents for the six affected national forests. Refer to the literature cited in the enclosed Appendix DD.

3. Alternatives Considered

Six alternatives were developed in detail and are compared in Chapter 2 of the Utah Northern Goshawk Project Environmental Assessment (EA). In addition, three alternatives were eliminated from detailed study, as described on section 2.3.1 of the EA. Some of the comments received on the EA suggested that these alternatives should be considered in detail, but I stand by the reasons they were eliminated from detailed analysis. A brief description of the alternatives considered in detail and my reasons for not selecting these alternatives follow:

Alternative A is the no action alternative, and management would continue as is currently described in each forest plan in Utah. This would not provide the desired consistency in management of goshawk habitat across the state. It does not emphasize some actions needed to maintain or restore habitat for goshawk and its prey and could allow some activities to occur that would degrade habitat.

Alternative B is the proposed action that initially responded to the need to maintain or restore goshawk habitat and provided consistent management direction across the state. It allowed extreme events to occur and looked at more long-term goals for habitat management. In responding to the issues raised during scoping, other alternatives were developed including the preferred alternative (F). Allowing extreme events, while consistent with the historic range of variation, may place landscapes at risk to disturbances that would create an imbalance of structural diversity when considering the desired habitat conditions for goshawk and its prey. Trying to prevent extreme events, as will occur in Alternative F, is a more conservative approach to ensure the sustainability of desired habitat conditions across landscapes. The long-term needs for goshawk management are more appropriately integrated with other resource concerns when each forest plan is revised.

Alternative C is similar to Alternative B, except that extreme events are not desired and management would be designed to prevent large-scale destructive events like wildfire. The concept of clumps of trees to provide canopy cover is introduced in this alternative, and the goals are again long-term. Alternative C did not address directly the concerns about grazing affecting prey habitat for goshawks, as does Alternative F, and again the long-term goals are more appropriately addressed during forest plan revisions.

Alternative D builds on Alternatives B and C, but prescribes a range of canopy closures and opening limits within goshawk home ranges. It also prescribes grazing utilization guidelines and specifies that transportation systems be managed to minimize goshawk territory disturbance. Alternative D would be very prescriptive and leave little discretion to local managers to assess their landscape situations and make site-specific decisions tailored to their unique needs. Because of the many varied situations managers encounter across the state of Utah, I believe it is important to retain some flexibility at the local level. Additionally, Alternative D has the greatest potential to adversely affect local economies in rural Utah because the ability to address local situations would be constrained by its prescriptive nature. Alternative F allows more flexibility to address local situations.

Alternative E applies a different scientific approach to goshawk management by specifying higher canopy closures and small opening limits within the entire goshawk territory. It also would prohibit any treatment of older structural stages and require that locally adapted native seed sources be used in management activities. The concern with *Alternative E* is that it likely is not sustainable. The risk of insect and disease infestations increases when large areas of older structural stages are not managed for patches and a variety of age classes. This could ultimately result in conditions not desirable for goshawks or their prey. It is also not reasonable at this time to require locally adapted native seed sources because of the lack of seed quantity and variety to meet specific needs. Also, the costs of procuring locally adapted seed would be excessive. While it is desirable to use the locally adapted seed in *Alternative F*, it is not mandated because we cannot guarantee the availability. Similar to *Alternative D*, the prescriptive nature of *Alternative E* does not allow the flexibility to address local situations that is part of *Alternative F*.

4. Public Involvement

As described in the EA (Chapter 2, section 2.2), public involvement efforts consisted of a series of open houses and informative post cards to the public and access to the goshawk project information on a web site. Notices were also placed in the Federal Register. Comments received during the scoping process were used to generate the alternatives. The EA was completed in October 1999 and distributed for public review and comment. A list of the individuals and organizations submitting comments on the EA is found in the enclosed Appendix AA.

I have reviewed the public comments on the EA with the Interdisciplinary Team, to determine if there is new information that requires other alternatives or additional analysis prior to my making a decision. Most public comment did not raise new information and many of the concerns were similar to those raised during scoping. While some people were dissatisfied with how we addressed the issues in the analysis, I did not find any new issues that would change our approach to address the needs of the goshawk in Utah.

5. Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

The selected programmatic direction, *Alternative F*, has a relatively broad context by applying management direction to an estimated 8.1 million acres of National Forest System lands within the six Utah National Forests (approximately 7.98 million acres in Utah; 90,000 acres in Wyoming; and, 30,000 acres in Colorado). The alternatives (Chapter 2), affected environment (Chapter 3), and consequences (Chapter 4) are disclosed in the EA. In consideration of the analysis documented in the EA and in light of the reasons set forth below, I find that selection of *Alternative F* as the management direction for northern goshawk habitat in Utah will not significantly impact the human environment.

a. The proposed management direction would be limited in geographic application (40 CFR 1508.27(a)). The proposed management direction applies to projects affecting acres that are forested within the estimated 8.1 million acres of National Forest System lands of the six affected national forests. The amount of land affected by the proposed direction for the remainder of this current planning period (projected to be 4 years) is a small subset of the land since not all lands would have projects generated in that time period. The only activities that were found to affect a

measurable amount of acres at the state scale were timber harvest, wildland fire, and livestock grazing. Based on records from 1990-1997 for acres affected by commercial timber harvest activities and 1994-1998 for wildland fire, the number of acres affected annually is estimated at less than 1% of the total forested acres across the six National Forests. (Chapter 4, section 4.3.1).

Changes to current grazing permits would occur in those landscapes where grazing can be attributed as a causing a deterioration in goshawk habitat. The number of allotments affected would only be those where an assessment determines that wildlife and livestock grazing is a factor in placing a landscape at-risk relative to the habitat needs of the goshawk (Chapter 4, section 4.5.2). The conclusion in the analysis is that the degree of change in terms of acres or permits affected in the projected 4-year period until plans are revised would a small percent of the 539 allotments potentially affected. Depending on the solution, there may be no overall change in actual numbers of animals, but the grazing system may be modified or other management tools applied.

b. The proposed management direction would be limited to certain projects and activities. The management direction in Alternative F applies to proposed and new projects only. Activities promoting goshawk habitat are prioritized in landscapes where habitat conditions for the goshawk are at risk of dropping from optimum and high value habitat for the goshawk, to low or moderate value (as defined by Graham et al. 1999). Projects will be designed to address problems identified as causing the at-risk condition.

Activities in exemption areas (such as wilderness, see Chapter 2, section 2.3.2) are not affected by direction in this proposal. Current forest plan direction still applies in these areas. In addition to exemption areas, any valid, prior existing rights on NFS lands would not be affected by this amendment. Also, locatable, mineral material or leasable mineral activities and facilities that have been authorized for such use under existing plans, licenses or permits, or have been leased or authorized for leasing prior to the decision date of this amendment, will not be affected by this amendment.

Effects to resources would not be significant, given the short time period until the forest plans are revised and the ability to relocate or adjust activities to meet habitat needs for the goshawk without adversely affecting these areas of interest. The proposed management direction would reduce the potential environmental impacts of project decisions from those allowed by current plans. Disclosure of the site-specific effects and public participation will occur prior to the project decision.

c. The proposed management direction will not significantly affect public health or safety (40 CFR 1508.27(b)2)). The proposed management direction does not, on its own, authorize any ground-disturbing activities or direct changes to the environmental status quo. Instead, it provides programmatic direction and mitigation measures to be applied to site-specific projects and activities. Additional mitigation measures may be added to particular projects as a result of site-specific conditions during project-level analysis. New project decisions would be preceded by site-specific NEPA analysis. Alternative F does not have significant effects on human health and safety beyond those already documented in existing forest plan Environmental Impact Statements and the site-specific analyses of on-going projects and activities, or might be identified in such future analyses of proposed projects and activities.

d. *The proposed management direction will not significantly affect any unique characteristics of the geographic area (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)), does not adversely affect anything listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, nor does it cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)).* The proposed management direction does not alter the environmental protection afforded such unique lands as is already provided for in the forest plans and may provide improved protection for such resources if they reside within goshawk habitat areas where proposed management direction will be applied.

e. *The management direction does not cause effects on the quality of the human environment that are likely to be highly controversial (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(4)).* There are differing opinions in the biological community on the importance or role of habitat attributes associated with the goshawk and its prey. The controversy is with the differing sciences rather than the effects on the quality of the human environment. These differences, described in the EA (Chapter 3, section 3.3.4) focus primarily on canopy closures, densities of understories, and the amounts of mature and old forests in some home ranges. The alternatives developed in detail incorporated different combinations of these attributes to estimate the differences in environmental effects with application of the differing scientific opinions. No disagreements have been identified with the disclosure of effects in Chapter 4 of the EA. While some comments differed with our conclusion that goshawk populations would remain viable in Utah by implementation of Alternative F, the reasons for this difference are based on the scientific opinions, not with the disclosure of the effects.

Controversy in this context refers to cases where there is substantial dispute as to the size, nature or effect of the Federal action, rather than to opposition to its adoption. This decision does not alter current planning direction on *why* we need to manage (e.g. provide habitat to support viable populations of sensitive species) or *what* management actions can be taken (e.g. vegetative treatments to manage habitat). This decision focuses on new information related to the *how* (e.g. how vegetative treatments will be implemented to achieve habitat conditions), *where* (e.g. at-risk habitat) and *when* (e.g. priority on habitat at-risk) we need to manage habitat.

f. *The proposed management direction does not establish any highly uncertain, unique, or unknown risks (40 CFR 1508.28(b)(5)).* The best available scientific information specific to forested habitats in Utah provided the foundation for designing the proposed management direction (EA, Chapter 1, section 1.2). Measures proposed for adoption are consistent with the management direction adopted for management of goshawk habitat on other National Forest System lands such as in the Southwestern Region of the USDA Forest Service (Region 3), and the Targhee National Forest. It is similar in intent with the direction proposed in the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project and currently being developed in the Sierra Nevada Framework Project.

g. *The proposed management direction does not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects and does not represent a decision in principle about a future consideration (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(6), nor is it related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulative significant impacts (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(7)).* The Environmental Assessment discloses the projected cumulative effects (EA, Chapter 4, section 4.1.2) of adopting the management direction on habitat conditions and trends on land within the forested landscapes administered by the Forest Service within Utah. The discussion includes currently evolving policies including roads, roadless and lynx. These cumulative effects are not considered to be significant at the state-wide scale and timeframe covered by this analysis and decision. Project analysis at the local scale will again

consider the cumulative impacts and make a determination of significance. Additionally, when forest plans are revised, the cumulative effects will again be analyzed at the forest-scale.

The proposed management direction is a short-term effort to retain the environmental status quo until forest plan revision on the six affected national forests is completed. The temporary nature of the proposed management direction would limit its effects. Any long-term strategy would be founded on the appropriate NEPA documentation and analysis and not on the short-term direction for goshawk management until the forest plans are revised.

h. The proposed management direction would not adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)). A biological assessment evaluating impacts to threatened and endangered species found in Utah has been prepared for this project. A draft is located in Appendix H of the EA and a final has been completed which is available in the project record. The US Fish and Wildlife Service has concurred with our determination of "may affect but not likely to adversely affect" determination for Canada lynx and Mexican spotted owl and "no effect" determination for other threatened and endangered species and critical habitat.

i. The proposed management direction does not threaten a violation of Federal, State or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)). Adoption of the selected alternative would not significantly affect the following elements of the human environment, which are specified in statute, regulation, or executive order: Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Farm Lands (prime or unique), Floodplains, Native American Religious Concerns, Hazardous or Solid Wastes, Water Quality, Wild and Scenic Rivers, and Wilderness. The Navajo Nation did comment on the EA regarding the sacred nature of hawks and their part today in sacred ceremonies and the oral traditions of the Navajo elders. They have no concerns or objections regarding the project at this time, but they reserve the right to offer and submit undiscovered information in the future, if need be.

Finding

On the basis of the information and analysis contained in the EA and all other information available as summarized above, it is my determination that adoption of the proposed management direction (as reflected in Alternative F) until the six affected national forests complete forest plan revision (projected to be 4 years), does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an Environment Impact Statement is not needed.

6. Findings required by other laws and regulations

Finding Of Non-Significant Amendment

Under the National Forest Management Act (NFMA, 16 USC 1604(f)(4), forest plans may "be amended in any manner whatsoever after final adoption and after public notice, and, if such amendment would result in a significant change in such plan, in accordance with subsections (e) and (f) of this section and public involvement comparable to that required by subsection (d) of this section." The NFMA regulations at 36 CFR §219.10(f) state: "Based on an analysis of the objectives, guidelines, and other contents of the forest plan, the Forest Supervisor shall determine whether a proposed amendment would result in a significant change in the plan."

The Forest Service Land and Resource Management Planning Handbook (Forest Service Handbook 1909.12) provides a framework for consideration, section 5.32, lists four factors to be used when determining whether a proposed change to a forest plan is significant or not significant: (a) timing; (b) location and size; (c) goals, objectives and outputs; and (d) management prescriptions. I have evaluated the proposed management direction and concluded that it does not constitute a significant amendment of the 6 forest plans in Utah (Ashley, Dixie, Fishlake, Manti-LaSal; Uinta, and Wasatch-Cache) for the reasons described below:

a. Timing. The timing factor examines at what point, over the course of the forest plan period, the Plan is amended. Both the age of the underlying documents and the duration of the amendment are relevant considerations. The handbook indicates that the later in the time period, the less significant the change is likely to be. All of the forest plans affected are nearing the end of the first planning period. As noted in the EA (Chapter 1, section 1.4.2 and 1.6; Chapter 4, section 4.1), the action is limited in time and changes to the Plans are not intended to be permanent. The proposed management direction will be in place until efforts to revise forest plans are complete (projected to be 4 years), supports the determination that they do not constitute significant amendments of the forest plans.

b. Location and Size. The key to the location and size is context, or "the relationship of the affected area to the overall planning area, "the smaller the area affected, the less likely the change is to be a significant change in the forest plan." As discussed in the EA (Chapter 2, section 2.3.2), the proposed management direction applies only to proposed and new projects that fall on that portion of the total 8.1 million acres of National Forest System lands on the six affected national forests that are forested and are not within an exemption category. Exempted areas, such as wilderness (EA, Chapter 2, section 2.3.2, Table 1) cover 1.2 million acres, or about 15% of the total acres. Forested acres affected by future timber harvest or wildland fire projects proposed prior to forest plan revision (projected to be 4 years) that would use the proposed management direction in design and implementation would be a small subset of this total; less than 1% of the acres annually across six national forests. (Chapter 4, section 4.3.1).

There would be limited effects to some grazing permits during the life of this amendment. Changes to permits would only occur in those landscapes where grazing can be attributed as a causal factor to an at-risk condition. The number of allotments likely to be affected in 4 years is a small percentage of the total 539 active allotments on the six Utah National Forests (Chapter 4, section 4.5.2). Thus, the size of the area projected to be affected during this time period is very small when compared to the total in the planning area.

In addition to vegetation treatments and grazing activities, all other projects anticipated in the next four years, like campground developments, special use permits and minerals, would still be a very small portion of the total National Forest System acres in Utah that are affected by the management direction (EA, Chapter 2, section 2.4; and Chapter 4, Effects by Resource).

c. Goals, Objectives, and Outputs The goals, objectives, and outputs factor involves the determination of "whether the change alters the long-term relationship between the level of goods and services in the overall planning area" (Forest Service Handbook 1909.12, section 5.32(c)). This criterion concerns analysis of the overall forest plan and the various multiple-use resources that may be affected. As discussed in the EA (Chapter 1, section 1.5.3 and Chapter 2, section 2.3.2), the

proposed management direction would apply only to proposed or new projects following adoption of this amendment.

The new goal and objective in Alternative F (EA, Appendix A) help move toward the existing forest plan goals and objectives related to threatened and endangered and sensitive species and their habitat for each National Forest in Utah. Thus, the proposed management direction does not significantly alter the long-term relationships between the levels of goods and services projected by the forest plans.

The guidance in Forest Service Handbook 1909.12, section 5.32(c) explains: "In most cases, changes in outputs are not likely to be a significant change in the forest plan unless the change would forego the opportunity to achieve an output in later years." Any short-term temporary reductions in outputs do not foreclose opportunities to achieve such outputs in later years. Again, the proposed management direction does not foreclose the achievement of existing goals and objectives.

d. Management Prescriptions The management prescriptions factor involves the determination of (1), "whether the change in a management prescription is only for a specific situation or whether it would apply to future decisions throughout the planning area" and (2), "whether or not the change alters the desired future condition of the land and resources or the anticipated goods and services to be produced" (Forest Service Handbook 1909.12, section 5.32(d)).

Implementation of direction in Alternative F will provide for consistency in management of habitat on the National Forest System lands in Utah. The desired future conditions and long-term levels of goods and services projected in current plans are not substantially changed by the proposed management direction. The proposed management direction will work to accomplish an element of the multiple-use desired future condition currently described in forest plans by providing habitat needed to support viable populations of goshawks, a sensitive species.

As noted above, the proposed management direction is short-term and applies only to a small portion of the overall planning area. Thus, the "anticipated goods and services" will not be greatly affected by proposed management direction. In adopting the proposed management direction (essentially mitigation measures) until forest plans for the six Utah National Forests are revised, the Plan amendments retain or improve the environmental status quo on a portion of the affected national forests.

For a detailed assessment of each National Forest in Utah, refer to the supplemental information reports (SIRS) completed by each national forest in the fall of 1998 and winter 1999 (available in the project records, Exhibit K and on the web site <http://www.fs.fed.us/r4/goshawk>). These SIRS contain preliminary NFMA significance findings at the individual forest scale that supports findings in this document.

Finding

On the basis of the information and analysis contained in the EA and all other information available as summarized above, it is my determination that adoption of the management direction reflected in Alternative F until the six affected national forests complete forest plan revision (projected to be 4 years), does not result in a significant amendment to these current forest plans.

No negative direct, indirect or cumulative effects to heritage resources, soil and water will occur because my decision is programmatic and does not supercede any of the direction currently in the forest plans that protects cultural sites, soils, and water resources. (EA, Chapter 4).

Environmental Justice was discussed in the EA (Chapter 3, section 3.4.1). It was determined that the local effects are not measurable at the state-wide scale and would not be disproportionate to low income or minority groups (Chapter 4, section 4.4.1).

7. Implementation date

The decision is effective 7 days after publication of the legal notice (36 CFR §217.10(a)). The anticipated date of publication is the end of March 2000.

8. Administrative Review or Appeal Opportunities

This decision is subject to appeal pursuant to 36 CFR 217.3. A written appeal must be postmarked or received in duplicate by the Appeal Reviewing Officer within 45 days of the date of publication of the legal notice of availability for this decision in the *Salt Lake Tribune* newspaper. The publication date is expected to be at the end of March 2000. Appeals must meet the content requirements of 36 CFR 217.9 and be mailed to:

Chief, USDA Forest Service
ATTN: Appeals Office, EMC, 3-Central
PO Box 96090
Washington, DC 20090-6090

9. Contact Person

For further information about this project, contact Peter W. Karp, Forest Supervisor, Uinta National Forest, PO Box 1428, Provo, Utah 84601, phone: 801-342-5100.



JACK A. BLACKWELL
Regional Forester
Intermountain Region

MAR 14 2000

Date

APPENDIX AA

Responses to Comments
on the
Environmental Assessment (EA)

APPENDIX AA

The UTAH NORTHERN GOSHAWK PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT was made available for 60 days notice and comment on October 29, 1999. By the close of the comment period, 1156 letters had been received, including many organized response letters and postcards. Over 500 additional comments from these organized responses were received after the close of the comment period. While all the comments were considered, the names of those received after January 10, 2000 are not included in TABLE 2 RESPONDENTS, but they are available in the project files.

Two groups prepared a form letter for organized responses. One (a Utah forest products company) supported the Preferred Alternative (F); the second, an Arizona-based environmental group, favored Alternative E. One letter was received from the Navajo Tribe and nine letters were received from various Utah county officials. No Federal or State agencies provided comments.

The comments and responses have been organized into the categories outlined below. Each comment summary is followed by examples of statements made by respondents. The examples are shown with italics and quotation marks. Some of the quotes have been edited slightly to clarify a comment that's been taken out of context or to capture several thoughts in one comment. Responses to the comment follow in the plain text. When tracking a specific comment and response in this write-up, be aware that some points in a comment may be addressed in another response paragraph. Table 2, which follows the comment analysis, provides a list of individuals and organizations submitting comments.

RESPONSES TO THE COMMENTS ON THE GOSHAWK EA OUTLINE

1. SCIENCE-BASED

- 1.A. Canopy Cover and Closure page AA-3
 - 1A.1. Canopy closure guidelines
 - 1.A.2. Canopy densities
 - 1.A.3. Risk of insect, disease and wildfire
 - 1.A.4. Explanation of 40% and 50% canopy cover
- 1.B. Structure page AA-6
 - 1.B.1. Mature and old growth structures
 - 1.B.2. Snag and down log densities
 - 1.B.3. Structure and seral stages
- 1.C. Viability page AA-7
 - 1.C.1. Viability analysis
 - 1.C.2. Fragmentation and connectivity
 - 1.C.3. Habitat ratings
- 1.D. Science Used page AA-9
 - 1D.1. Best science available
 - 1D.2. Credibility of Graham and Reynolds
 - 1D.3. Desired habitat conditions (DHC)
 - 1.D.4. Silvicultural treatments
 - 1.D.5. Nesting and territories
 - 1.D.6. R3 Guidelines

- 1.E. Aspen, Grazing and Prey Habitat page AA-15
 - 1.E.1. Aspen management and grazing
 - 1.E.2. Grazing and prey habitat.
- 1.F. Social-Economic Effects page AA-16
 - 1.F.1. Local economies and uses.
 - 1.F.2. Health of rural communities

2. PROCESS

- 2.A. Purpose, Data & Alternatives page AA-18
 - 2.A.1. Purpose and Need
 - 2.A.2. Inadequate data
 - 2.A.3. Range of alternatives
 - 2.A.4. Generating alternatives
 - 2.A.5. New alternatives
- 2.B. Other Process page AA-25
 - 2.B.1. EIS and NFMA significant amendment
 - 2.B.2. Geographic scope
 - 2.B.3. Priority for treatment
 - 2.B.4. Proposed Action and Preferred Alternative
 - 2.B.5. Roads, Roadless, Revision & Other Broad Scales
 - 2.B.6. Cumulative Effects

3. AGENCY CREDIBILITY

- 3.A. Doing what we say page AA-28
 - 3.A.1. Guidelines
 - 3.A.2. Length of applicability
 - 3.A.3. Monitoring
- 3.B. Underlying Intent page AA-30
 - 3.B.1. Continued logging and grazing
- 3.C. Other Comments
- 3.D. Favor a specific alternative

4. OTHER TOPICS OF INTEREST

- 4.A. Navajo Nation page AA-32
- 4.B. Native Plants
- 4.C. Clarifications page AA-32
 - 4.C.1. Turkeys
 - 4.C.1.a. Beetle-killed trees' value
 - 4.C.1.b. Prey habitat desired conditions
 - 4.C.1.c. UDWR coordination
 - 4.C.1.d. Biological basis
 - 4.C.1.e. Different tree species'
 - 4.C.1.f. Forest cover categories
 - 4.C.1.g. Exemption Areas
 - 4.C.1.h. Mitigation vs. restoration
 - 4.C.1.i. Canopy and foraging
 - 4.C.1.j. Managing grazing in Alternative E
 - 4.C.2. Post signs to protect goshawk areas page AA-38
 - 4.C.3. Mycorrhizal fungi impacts
 - 4.C.4. Recreation and access impacts
 - 4.C.5. Payment in lieu of taxes

RESPONSES TO THE COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

1. SCIENCE-BASED

1.A. Canopy Cover and Closure

1.A.1. Some people were concerned that according to some studies, canopy closure guidelines in all alternatives except Alternative E are below the mean level needed by goshawk for foraging and nesting. There was particular concern relative to ponderosa pine types.

"It's clear that alternatives B, C, and F, by allowing canopy cover in goshawk foraging habitat to be reduced to 40% are not consistent with the best available scientific information."

"There is nothing in the EA which cites or discusses the dozens of scientific studies which quantify the canopy cover required by goshawks for nesting or foraging."

"The EA does not cite a single field study, which indicates that goshawks avoid or hunt less successfully in dense forests."

"The EA seems to have concluded that lower canopy covers are a benefit to goshawks without any substantiation and contrary to all of the data that does exist."

Response: Little information is available on goshawk foraging habitat specifically in Utah. As described in Graham et al 1999 (page 5, Foraging Habitat) "Goshawks prefer to forage in closed canopy forests with moderate tree densities as compared to young open forests. Goshawks take prey from openings although they usually hunt these areas from perches near the edge." Within the EA, page 4-31 paragraph 1, it was disclosed that lower canopy closure might not be adequate in the long term for goshawks. The Biological Evaluation for the EA contained in Appendix H has a discussion of goshawk foraging habitat and preferences that cites several scientific studies (EA, page H-12).

The range of canopy closures (Alternatives B, D & E) and percent of stand covered by clumps of trees (Alternatives C & F) described within the EA (page 2-26 and Appendix A, page A-5 to A-6) follow the intent of the science published by Reynolds et al 1992. Science provided by Reynolds is the only long-term research study within forest cover types approximating those found in Utah. A definition of stands has been added to the glossary. Stands of trees naturally vary considerably across the landscape. Aspen stands tend to have more uniform, high canopy closures while conifer stands tend to be more clumpy in nature, resulting in patches of high canopy closure broken by areas of lower or even zero canopy closure.

It is not the absolute value of canopy cover for a given landscape that is important, but the pattern that goshawks consistently use areas with the highest canopy cover available. These areas with high canopy cover are "clumped", often adjacent to more open areas. The biological evaluation (BE) on page 11 (Appendix H), cites several studies that describe features of goshawk nesting habitat. Canopy cover is tied to interlocking crowns, not necessarily tight crown closure that would cause light interception or exclusion of light to the forest floor. The point of these citations is to highlight the fact that goshawks consistently use areas with relatively high canopy closure for nesting. All alternatives would maintain a minimum of 50% canopy cover or stand covered by clumps of trees in nesting areas, a figure that is within the range of nesting area cover values reported in the literature and cited in the supporting documentation.

While we are aware of a substantial amount of research indicating that high canopy closure is an important habitat feature in goshawk nest areas, the pattern does not necessarily extend to foraging habitat. The few studies that have attempted to describe attributes of foraging habitat have yielded conflicting results. Also the methodologies used to measure canopy cover vary among studies that lead to values that are difficult to compare directly. For example, Hargis et al. (1994) reported that goshawk home ranges had an average canopy cover of 34%, a figure that is not especially high. However, goshawks did select areas for foraging with higher basal area and canopy closure than was available at-random. Bright-Smith and Mannan (1994) also reported conflicting results. The majority of male goshawks in their study showed no preference for habitat in different canopy cover classes. They foraged in habitat classes ranging from <15% canopy cover to >55% canopy cover in proportion to their availability. However, when they examined the relative preference for habitat based on canopy cover class available within 90 m of the location, preference of the canopy closure categories increased with increasing canopy closure. They concluded, that the recommendation of maintaining 40% canopy cover in foraging areas in Reynolds et al. (1992) was consistent with their data. Alternatives B, C, and F all maintain minimum canopy closures or stand covered by clumps of trees in foraging habitat of at least 40%. This figure is in line with those reported in the peer-reviewed literature and cited in the supporting documentation.

The basis for the assertion that habitat quality would decline in ponderosa pine stands under all alternatives except E is that stands with canopy closures of 40%-50% are not suitable habitat and will not be used by goshawks. Goshawks tend to use stands with high canopy closure *relative to the average* for a given landscape. The published literature on goshawk habitat use does not support the concept of an absolute threshold value in canopy closure (see above paragraphs). The EA incorporated canopy closure requirements for ponderosa pine published in Reynolds et al. (1992), based on research done on a persistent goshawk population in ponderosa pine forests of northern Arizona. The Reynolds document was used because its study area has conditions similar to those found in ponderosa pine habitats of southern Utah, and was therefore likely to be applicable to the area covered by the EA (i.e., its conclusions were likely to be derived from landscapes capable of similar average canopy closure values). By specifying that canopy closure be managed to remain within historic range of variation (HRV), the action alternatives provide for forest conditions that are achievable and sustainable as well as within the range of conditions known to be used by goshawks.

1.A.2. Another concern expressed was that low canopy densities give advantage to competitors like great horned owls and red-tailed hawks. Prey habitat might also not be as good with lower canopy closure, especially in times of severe winter weather.

"...the creation of open forest conditions will increase competition with other raptors which may have a competitive advantage over the goshawk under these conditions."

"In winter, many of the goshawk prey species migrate or hibernate leaving available only a limited number of prey species which are dependent upon dense forests."

Response: As described within the EA (page 3-13), the alternatives were developed on the basis of prey ecology or the "food-web" approach. This approach received support from others as cited in Chapter 3. The action alternatives prescribe a mosaic of dense patches across the landscape for several reasons. Great horned owls and red-tailed hawks can out compete goshawks and even kill its young in sparse open conditions. These dense patches provide security cover for young goshawks and give foraging goshawks an advantage over other avian predators who are not as

successful hunting in dense patches. It's the importance of the interlocking crowns that provides the overstory cover for fledgling and squirrel habitat that also create a variety of habitat conditions for goshawk prey species.

1.A.3. The risk of insect, disease and fire destroying goshawk habitat increases with higher canopy closures.

"High canopy cover and high tree densities have increased risk for insect and disease and associated risk for stand replacement fire which would justify lower canopy closure."

"Extreme events, like naturally occurring fires, should be allowed to occur."

Response: Extreme events, like bark beetle outbreaks and stand replacement fire, can create broad swings in vegetation structure, composition and pattern (distribution) across the landscape. Appendix D discusses canopy cover and stand density index as they relate to risk of extreme events. This section also discusses historic range of variation (HRV) and properly functioning condition (PFC) and how they relate to native processes and extreme events. These landscape level disturbances could result in irreversible change and reduce species and structure diversity. Standards and guidelines allow for vegetation treatments (harvest and prescribed fire) that reduce risk to live stands, which will contribute to the long-term sustainability of landscape patterns and maintenance of important ecosystem attributes. These treatments create landscape conditions that are within the habitat requirements for goshawk.

Old, mature, and dense forests are more prone to large scale insect infestations and fires (EA page 4-27 to 4-28). The result of these events would be large tracts of young forests. Large tracts of young forests would largely be avoided by goshawks for nesting; however limited foraging may take place along the edges. The habitat assessment for Utah states that "Goshawks prefer to forage in closed canopy forests with moderate tree densities as compared to young open forests (page 5). Reynolds (page 18) includes a similar discussion. This is further discussed in Chapter 3 of the EA beginning on page 3-4.

1.A.4. Concern was expressed that the guideline to maintain the canopy cover at 40% in goshawk habitat would never reach the 50% canopy cover required in nest & PFA areas.

"On pages 4-30 and 31, the EA states that maintaining 40% canopy cover outside of goshawk nest areas and PFA's is important. This argument is internally contradictory since Alt. B defines the minimum nesting/PFA canopy closure as 50%."

Response: The key is that Alternative B will provide *at least* 40% canopy cover in all goshawk habitat. Where more restrictive measures are necessary, as in PFAs and nest areas, they will be applied. Guideline g-13 (EA, page A-5) specifies that at least 50% canopy closure be achieved in PFAs and nest areas.

1.B. Structure

1.B.1. Some comments said that the most important habitat component for goshawk is mature and old growth structures rather than just prey abundance (food web).

"The open forest conditions that are discussed in the EA are likely to create forest structural characteristics which will not enable goshawks to use their morphological adaptations most efficiently."

Response: Alternatives B, C, D & F were developed on the basis of prey ecology, with the desired habitat conditions that 40% of conifer and 30% of aspen stands be managed for mature and old structural stages. Old growth and mature forests provide a broad range of structure and species that support prey base habitat. The debate concerning goshawk ecology is discussed on pages 3-13 and 3-14 of the EA. The support for this approach is described and includes support from the technical reviewers (Braun et al. 1996). Alternative E was developed more on the basis of mature and old growth structures so the differences in approaches could be compared in the effects discussion (Chapter 4, pages 4-30 to 4-32). All action alternatives to varying degrees outline management that would result in early, mid and late seral stages grouped across large landscapes.

1.B.2. Other comments said that snag and down log densities are inadequate to provide for the prey base.

"Bull (1997) found natural or recommended snag numbers (> 10 inches DBH) per acre in ponderosa pine forests to be 4.8 and in mixed conifer to be as many as 48. Snags and down logs decay rapidly with time and leaving only 2-3 snags per acre and 3-5 down logs per acre does not account for decay."

Response: The rationale used in determining needs for snags and down woody materials is found on pages 2-6 and 2-7 of the EA. Snag and down log densities are included in all action alternatives. These recommendations drew from the intent in Reynolds, et.al. 1992. The Bull publication (1997), as discussed on page 2-7 of the EA, was describing natural conditions related to size and number of snags and down logs, and not requirements for goshawk habitat specifically. Alternatives D and E also prescribed minimum numbers of groups of mature and old trees to maintain habitat over the long-term (g-10, page A-3 and s-3 & s-4, page A-4). In addition, all action alternatives address the distribution of structural stages to assure the snag and down log components remain over time. Monitoring plus on-going and future research will help validate current standards and guidelines to ensure sustainability of snags, down logs and requisite prey base conditions across the landscape (m-4 & m-5, pages B-3, B-6 & B-7).

1.B.3. Some comments were concerned that the preferred alternative would remove late seral stages, thus promoting younger forests that would not meet goshawk habitat needs. Other comments were concerned that harvesting large trees should not be completely restricted.

"The preferred alternative encourages the removal of late seral species to encourage younger growth"

"Old dying trees should be allowed to be taken to protect surrounding trees"

Response: The Preferred Alternative F would emphasize early seral species, but not specifically young trees. Alternative F also contains standards and guidelines that allow for management of landscapes within properly functioning condition (PFC, guideline g-2), provide for a full range of seral stages (g-5), provide snag and down wood habitat (g-9 and g-11) and provide for the full range

of structural stages to maintain the sustainability of habitat (g-15). The desired habitat conditions are to have 40% of conifer and 30% of aspen stands in mature and old growth stages. There are no guidelines that totally restrict the harvest of any tree size class. The standards and guidelines also allow for the restoration of disturbed habitats (from fire, insect disease, etc) as described in guidelines g-2 and g-3. Patch dynamics are extremely important to allow for a full range of structural and seral stages. Clumps of trees (2 – 9) with interlocking crowns, with a number of clumps comprising groups distributed across landscapes provide a mosaic of structural and seral stages desirable for goshawk habitat.

1.C.Viability

1.C.1. People are concerned that no population demography or viability analysis has been completed, so it is still unsure what the status is of the goshawk in Utah.

“Our expectations were that this effort would initiate a formal protocol to determine viability.”

“We disagree that the current goshawk population is viable in the state of Utah.”

Response: To varying degrees, each National Forest within the State of Utah has inventoried for goshawks and monitored known territories since at least 1992 (one year after it was listed as a Forest Service Sensitive species). Data obtained from these studies was used in the development of “The Northern Goshawk in Utah: Habitat Assessment and Management Recommendations” (Graham et al 1999). Results of these monitoring studies on National Forest System lands were unable to detect a decline in territory occupancy. Within the National Forests in Utah there is a systematic statewide monitoring system that is described on page 10 of the Utah Conservation Strategy. These documents are discussed in Chapter 1 of the EA

The “Conservation Strategy and Agreement for Management of Northern Goshawk Habitat in Utah”, a cooperative effort with the Utah National Forests, Bureau of Land Management, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources and United States Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service (Utah NFs et al. 1998) explains that managers rarely have all information needed to conduct a fully quantitative population viability analysis (PVA). In the face of missing information, one practical alternative is to use inventories of the quality and quantity of suitable habitat as a surrogate for PVA. For the goshawk, this surrogate analysis for PVA is documented in the “Habitat Assessment and Management Recommendations for the Northern Goshawk in the State of Utah” (Graham et al. 1999).

Graham et al. (1999) assessed the ability of Utah’s forested lands to support goshawks. They found that most lands that had the potential to be goshawk habitat were, in fact, currently estimated to be of medium or high value as habitat. Furthermore, all patches of suitable habitat in the state were well-connected, meaning that goshawks dispersing from one habitat patch are likely to be successful in finding another. Population viability at the state level was inferred from these habitat conditions, but with caveat that habitat deficiencies may be present at smaller geographic scales and that their assessment was an indirect measure of viability (Graham, page 42). The statements regarding viability within the state of Utah all cite Graham et al. (1999), and thereby include the rationale and qualifiers in that document. In addition, the EA considered findings published by the USFWS in response to a petition to list the goshawk as threatened or endangered in the western United States (EA, page 3-13), in which no evidence of declining populations or habitat were found. In the proceedings from the World Conference on Birds of Prey and Owls (Badajoz, Spain 1995),

Dr. Clayton White summarized his conclusion as follows: “despite the tremendous focus of attention on this species in the West during the past five years, there are no convincing data that it fits the “endangered” category.”

Rationale for the conclusion that goshawks would remain viable in the state of Utah for the lifespan of this amendment is provided on page 4-26 of the EA. The demographic data needed for a direct assessment of the population viability are not available. Therefore, a direct assessment of population viability is not possible. This was clearly disclosed in the habitat assessment (Graham et al. 1999, page i of the Executive Summary and page 42).

The debate over goshawk management strategies within the scientific community is discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 of the EA. Pages 3-14 to 3-15 of the EA and the Biological Evaluation (Appendix H) both contain discussions of the rationale used for the population viability determination. As stated on EA page 1-6 the project was initiated not because the agency was concerned that we could lose a viable population of goshawks prior to revision of forest plans in Utah, but in response to identified concerns that current management strategies permitted actions that may degrade habitat. Rather than a determination of population viability, the intent of the process is to provide reasonable assurances that habitat to support viable goshawk populations are sustained (page 1-6). Effectiveness monitoring of nesting territories as called for in the monitoring section (Appendix B, m-1 & m-2, pages B-2, B-4 & B-5) and in the Utah Conservation Strategy (page 10) will aid in determining the validity of this.

1.C.2. Some commented that fragmentation and connectivity are not adequately addressed.

“The EA appears to completely ignore the fact that dispersing goshawks may not move equally well across all habitat types. If dispersing goshawks typically avoid intervening habitat because of, for example, predation pressure, then the connection distance is irrelevant.”

“Further fragmentation of mature forests should not be allowed. Northern Utah’s forests are ecologically linked with those of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem.”

Response: Graham et al. (1999) assessed the ability of Utah’s forested lands to support goshawks. They found that most lands that had the potential to be goshawk habitat were, in fact, currently estimated to be of medium or high value as habitat. Furthermore, all patches of suitable habitat in the state were well-connected, meaning that goshawks dispersing from one habitat patch are likely to be successful in finding another habitat patch. In Chapter 2 of the EA, pages 2-10 to 2-13, it explains how retaining current habitat connections in Utah is the foundation for preserving management options, as a component of all the action alternatives. Monitoring item m-3 is designed to track maintenance of habitat connectivity and applies to all action alternatives (EA page B-3). Alternative E was formulated in part to deal with the issue of fragmentation by not allowing harvest of mature and old growth trees. We agree that the forests of Utah, especially northern Utah, are ecologically linked to the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem.

The Utah assessment received peer review by a number of State, Federal and University scientists as indicated in the Assessment on page 48. Comments from these reviewers were incorporated into the final document. Additionally, the Utah Assessment was developed by Utah biologists who have studied goshawks and their habitat for as long as eight years. Their cumulative efforts greatly exceed the efforts of any others in the State of Utah. The results of these efforts combined with research from dozens of other locations were used in the development of the Assessment. The

quality of all suitable habitats within Utah was rated for goshawk and their prey (Graham et al 1999, page 19-28). Many of the instances of long distance dispersals or migrations cited on page 24 of the Assessment crossed long distances over forested and non-forested habitat.

1.C.3. Others are concerned that the habitat ratings are inadequate.

"The basis for judging what constitutes high quality nesting and foraging habitat for goshawks in Utah is weak."

Response: The process used to rank habitat patches in terms of quality for goshawks is described on page 15 of the habitat assessment (Graham et al. 1999). It was a subjective ranking process, using expert opinion of biologists working for land management agencies in Utah. These experts used their knowledge of the published literature on goshawk habitat use plus their experience surveying for and monitoring known goshawk territories in the field. Ranking factors were assigned at very coarse scales, considerably larger than an individual stand, and therefore were indicative of generalized habitat conditions. Presence or absence of goshawks was one factor considered in the ranking process, but was not required in order for a habitat patch to be ranked as high value habitat. This approach was used specifically because standardized survey information was not available for all forested areas in Utah, and to rely on survey information alone or as the primary ranking factor would have ignored a great deal of potentially suitable habitat that had not been formally surveyed.

This subjective ranking process was considered appropriate for depicting habitat and making generalized management decisions at the state scale. This is the scale and context in which the EA used Graham et al.'s (1999) information. However, Graham et al. (1999) noted that finer resolution data should be used in project level analyses to more accurately assess habitat conditions, especially stand-level characteristics such as canopy closure. The EA also notes the importance of landscape-level assessments (EA, page 4-22) and project-level analyses (EA, page 4-2), in which more detailed site-specific information should be used to make decisions. These smaller scale analyses are the most appropriate and practical scales at which to address the respondent's concerns regarding quantification of habitat conditions.

1.D. Science Used

1D.1. The best science available as basis for analysis was not used.

"...the near complete absence of all quantitative information concerning goshawk habitat preferences; ...refusal to explain why the Forest Service plans to manage goshawk habitat so far outside the range of known goshawk habitat needs..."

"The EAs failure to analyze the adequacy of the HCS is based on the presumption that the HCS is the best available scientific information."

1.D.2. Credibility of Graham and Reynolds documents is questioned.

"Both the Reynolds and Graham documents are based on flawed assumptions and questionable methodologies."

Response: There are differing opinions from the biological community dealing with many ecological aspects of goshawk management (EA, pages 3-13 to 3-14). The different approaches in the scientific management recommendations became significant issues that were used to generate alternatives, as described on pages 2-3 to 2-6). The alternatives were in part developed on the basis

of prey ecology or the "food-web" approach. This approach received support from others as cited above (EA, page 3-13 to 3-14). Also, if monitoring, as described in Appendix B of the EA and the Utah Conservation Strategy, indicates viability concerns, the further analysis and adjustments would be made (Utah Conservation Strategy, page 10).

Where differences exist between various published descriptions of habitat use, the HCS and EA give more weight to studies that have larger sample sizes, more years of data or were conducted in habitat similar to those in Utah. Reynolds et al. (1992) was used extensively for those reasons. More recent research was incorporated through use of Graham et al. (1999) and other papers cited in the EA (pages R-1 to R-6) and BE (Appendix H).

Drafts of both the Assessment (Graham et al. 1999) and the EA were peer reviewed by biologists, researchers, and others who are associated with many federal and state agencies, and universities. Lists of reviewers are found on page 47 of the Assessment and page 85 of the Management Recommendations for the Northern Goshawk in the Southwestern United States. Additionally, the Utah Assessment was developed by Utah biologists who have studied goshawks and their habitat for as long as eight years. Their cumulative efforts greatly exceed the efforts of any others in the State of Utah. The results of these efforts combined with research from dozens of other locations were used in the development of the Assessment. The quality of all suitable habitats within Utah was rated for goshawk and their prey (Graham et al 1999, page 19-28).

The science used in Alternatives B, C, D and F was chosen because:

- i) The Reynolds study on the Kaibab Plateau is the longest running goshawk study (Reynolds et al. 1992);
- ii) The Reynolds study is based on many similar habitat conditions as those found in the State of Utah;
- iii) Dr. Reynolds is a well known raptor scientist who is renowned for his work in goshawk ecology, and the Graham Assessment (Graham et al. 1999) is specific to Utah; and
- iv) Other research was discussed and differing opinions recognized within the EA, pages 3-13 to 3-14.

1.D.3. Some people said that there is no basis for desired habitat conditions (DHC), that the historic range of variation (HRV) is too unclear to use as a management tool, and that the properly functioning conditions (PFCs) are artificially constrained to produce a regulated forest not a natural forest.

"The majority of the suggested standards and guidelines restrict vegetative management activities and will not attain HRV [historic range of variation] condition levels. This will degrade habitat capability for the goshawk and will in turn impact many forest users who are the backbone of our rural area's economy."

"We fear that the concept of 'historical range of variation' is far too nebulous and indiscernible to be used as a management tool."

"The DHCs prescribed by the PFC are biologically arbitrary."

Response: The desired habitat conditions come directly from the science we used (Reynolds et al 1992 and Graham et al 1999). The EA refers to the biological evaluation, which (on page 11) cites several studies that quantify goshawk nesting habitat. Numerous studies have described the range of habitats used by goshawks, several have determined nesting habitat preferences, but to our

knowledge, none have identified critical or *required* nesting habitat or habitat attributes. The latter requires an understanding of the demographic performance of goshawks in various habitats. The vast body of goshawk habitat literature indicates that abundant large trees and high canopy closure are two consistent habitat features in nesting areas. Regardless of the studies cited, the pattern of habitat use is similar. However, the majority of habitat studies have been conducted in habitat types or ecological regions different from those found in the Utah. While patterns of habitat use may be similar across regions, absolute habitat values cannot be taken from one region and applied to another, particularly in widely different habitat types.

Where differences exist between various published descriptions of habitat use, the Habitat Conservation Strategy and EA give more weight to studies that have larger sample sizes, more years of data and/or were conducted in habitat similar to those in Utah. Reynolds et al. (1992) was used extensively for those reasons. More recent research was incorporated through use of Graham et al. (1999) and other papers cited in the EA and BE.

Properly functioning condition (PFC) is an ecological approach to management that uses a rapid assessment, coarse filter process to determine which components of the ecosystem are at risk (Properly Functioning Condition Process Draft, USDA Forest Service, 1998). In Appendix D the EA discusses how PFC fits within the historic range of variation (HRV) and factors in social and economic limits. To manage landscapes outside PFC may place them at risk to disturbances that would create an imbalance of structural diversity. The use of PFC is a more conservative approach to ensure the sustainability of desired habitat conditions across landscapes.

While insect, disease and fire disturbances even at extreme levels may be a part of HRV, large scale disturbances may not be appropriate for PFC. Standards and guidelines allow for treatments that reduce risk in live stands and allow for salvage efforts and restoration of disturbed areas. We agree that management activities including harvest and fire can contribute to the long-term sustainability of goshawk habitat.

The purpose of the EA is to disclose the effects of implementing the Habitat Conservation Strategy (HCS) per the signed Habitat Conservation Agreement. The EA relies on the HCS and its supporting documentation (Reynolds et al. 1992, Graham et al. 1999) for its definition of goshawk habitat. Both supporting documents contain extensive literature reviews, including both quantitative and descriptive studies of habitat use patterns in goshawks. The desired habitat conditions defined in the HCS and carried forward into the action alternatives in the EA are within the range of conditions described in one or more studies cited in the supporting documentation

1.D.4 While some comments supported the use of silvicultural treatments as a valid tool to maintain forest health, others questioned the benefits of silvicultural treatments as “uncertain at best”.

“By excluding logging in nesting areas, the Forest Service is setting up for a wildfire that would be more damaging to goshawk than harvesting or other human uses.”

“We disagree that silvicultural treatments are beneficial to goshawks.”

Response: The rationale for utilizing silvicultural treatments to benefit goshawk habitat is found within the Management Recommendations for the Northern Goshawk in the Southwestern United States, The Northern Goshawk in Utah: Habitat Assessment and Management Recommendations,

and the Conservation Strategy and Agreement for the Management of Northern Goshawk Habitat in Utah. This rationale is summarized in Chapter 1 of the EA.

While the EA does not specify which management tool to use, the standards and guidelines are developed for the manager to follow after the site-specific tool is selected. The Preferred Alternative allows for harvest activities and prescribed fire treatments with some treatment and timing restrictions. Treatments could occur even within nest areas (see guideline g-22) where those management activities are designed to maintain or improve desired habitat. See Appendix A of the EA for which standards and guidelines apply to Alternative F.

Mechanical treatments and prescribed fire are viable methods to move structural habitat components toward the desired condition and meet habitat sustainability because they can mimic small disturbances (such as fire and windthrow) and lessen the chances of large-scale disturbances. Richard Reynolds points out that goshawk populations are higher on the national forest lands on the Kaibab Plateau than the North Rim of Grand Canyon National Park. It is his assertion that this difference is primarily a result of management and fire on the national forest versus the densification of the forest in the Park where no treatments have been applied (Reynolds and Graham, 1999).

It is important to forest health to re-establish native processes. It is also important that the past 100 years of exclusion of fire have created ecosystems that are outside the historic range of variation. We cannot presume that we can restore fire to these systems and native processes will return within the historic range of variation. Many ecosystems could be destroyed by large-scale stand replacing fires. According to Jenkins et al. (1998) the most proactive effort to reduce hazardous fuels is by mechanical means and application of prescribed fire. Schmidt (1996) further stated that social demand, economic consideration and the changing nature of the ecological system may not allow us to fully restore fire as a native process.

The effects of fire exclusion are described by Arno et al. (1995). The severe fires of 1994 occurred as a result of dense stands with fuel ladders that allowed for increased fire intensity. According to Arno, the general goal of restorative management is to develop more open-stand structures as consistent with historic disturbance regimes. It is usually necessary to design restoration treatments in today's dense stands with a "low thinning" that removes excess understory, followed by a low intensity prescribed fire. This is also supported by Covington and Moore (1994).

1.D.5. Several concerns about the management direction for nesting and territories were expressed as follows:

"All nest and PFA habitat within a given territory should be protected from logging in order to retain mature/old growth and canopy closure attributes, rather than just currently active nest sites as the EA seems to indicate. This is required in order to be consistent with Reynolds et al. (1992)."

"All nest and PFA areas active at least once since 1989 should be permanently protected."

"No direction is given for establishment of nest areas. All nest areas should be within the PFA and should encompass the best available habitat."

"Single territory approach does not meet ecological needs of goshawks."

"Most goshawk territories on the Dixie, Ashley and Wasatch-Cache do not contain alternate nests...logging has likely reduced nesting habitat in Utah."

"Why the difference between approximately 30 acres for nest size (EA & Graham) and over 30 acres for nest size (Graham)?"

"The limits on activities during active nesting season will prevent on-going, routine activities such as road maintenance adjacent to a goshawk nest area."

Response: All action alternatives require identification of alternate and replacement nest areas approximately 30 acres in size (EA, Appendix A, page A-7), 180 acres total. In a study by Woodbridge and Detrich, stands used for nesting ranged from approximately 10 acres to 375 acres. Larger nest areas are not necessarily better, depending on other factors like proximity to water and overall size of the forested area, but can mean a higher occupancy rate (Woodbridge & Detrich 1994).

Standards and guidelines relating to vegetative manipulation in nest areas are the same for active, alternate and replacement nests areas; i.e. activities are restricted to those that are specifically designed to maintain or improve conditions for nesting goshawks (guidelines g-22 and g-23). The only difference between management of active vs. alternate or replacement nest areas is that active nest sites are protected from activities that might cause *behavioral* disturbance of nesting goshawks, resulting in nest abandonment (guideline g-21 and standard s-10). This management direction would not apply to alternate or replacement nests since by definition there would be no nesting activity in those areas.

All action alternatives would include a guideline stating that a historic nest that is not associated with an active nest area will be managed for home range characteristics (EA, Appendix A, page A-7). Standard s-8 (Appendix A., page A-7) requires that 2 alternate nest areas and 3 replacement nest areas be identified for each active nest area. The thinking is that most historic nest sites would be protected by this requirement.

Appendix A, pages A-7 to A-8 provide management direction for nest areas. Guideline g-20 states that "(a)lternate nest areas should be identified in suitable habitat with similar vegetative structures as the active nest areas. Replacement nest areas should be identified in habitat which will develop similar vegetative structures as the active nest area at the time the active and alternate nest areas are projected to no longer provide adequate nesting habitat". Guideline g-24 states that a PFA should be identified "which encompasses the active, alternate and replacement nest areas and additional habitat needed to raise fledglings."

The EA contains direction to protect and enhance known goshawk territories but it also calls for an ecosystem or landscape approach for sustaining habitat for the northern goshawk and its prey (EA, pages 2-11 to 2-13).

As identified by White and Johansson (1993, page 4) they used "data that either was already gathered or was easily and cheaply available". As a result, they did not invest a lot of time, or effort into searching for alternate nests. Because this data set was very small and no intense nest searches conducted, it is not surprising that only 6 territories (not 4 as stated in the respondents letter) had more than 1 nest. The White and Johansson (1993) report does not discuss the Ashley or Wasatch-Cache National Forests. On the Ashley National Forest, as many as 6 nests have been located in a single territory. On the Dixie National Forest, as many as 4 nests have been located in a single territory. Territories with one nest are the exception rather than the rule. Even if few alternate nests were known, it would be difficult to draw any conclusions regarding the causal agent, especially

since discovery of alternate nests is highly dependent on search effort. It would take many hours in the field by experienced personnel to conclude that alternate nests were absent, rather than simply undiscovered.

Guideline g-21 (page A-7) provides direction for the protection of all nest areas whether they are active, alternate or replacement when considering vegetative manipulations. Standard s-9 prohibits forest vegetation manipulations within active nest areas during the active nesting period. Once they are identified, nesting areas would be managed in such a manner that the territory would remain viable. Language has been added to standard s-9 and guideline g-21, to be clear that routine, on-going activities, such as road maintenance, that have always been adjacent to active nest areas, usually will not be restricted. See the enclosed Appendix BB for the language added.

The effects of excluding all logging activities within these key areas has been described within the EA on pages 4-28 through 36. Vegetation management may be needed within these key goshawk areas in order to sustain important attributes for goshawks. Nesting areas would be managed in such a manner that habitat would continue to provide important attributes for goshawk occupancy. Appendix A, page A-7 lists the protections afforded to active, alternate and replacement nest areas.

1.D.6. Some comments said that the R3 (Southwest Region [AZ & NM] of the Forest Service) guides are not appropriate in Utah and other comments questioned why they weren't completely adopted. Of particular concern were the criticisms of the R3 direction calling for creation of younger successional stages in post-fledging family areas and goshawk foraging areas and differing climates.

"Also state why the conclusions in this EA relative to the biological needs of the northern goshawk differ so much from the conclusions in the southwest region of the Forest Service relative to goshawk management."

"In particular, because the forested areas of Utah are typically much colder and windier than much of the forested habitat in R3, it is reasonable to conclude that goshawks in Utah need more extensive thermal protection than goshawks in R3. This implies nesting, PFA and foraging habitat in R4 should contain more mature, closed-canopy component than in R3."

Response: The conclusions of Reynolds et al. (1992) for the Southwestern United States were used as a starting point for the Utah Habitat Assessment and subsequent EA. Changes were made to reflect differing forest and habitat conditions in Utah that do not exist in the southwest. The most obvious examples of these are the existence of quaking aspen and lodge pole pine forests. Alternative C does closely follow the recommendations contained in Reynolds et. al. (1992). Other alternatives vary somewhat because they were developed in response to comments received during the scoping process (see Chapter 2 of the EA).

While the intent and the process used are similar to those in R3, the management direction from R3 is not universally adopted. The Management Recommendations for the Northern Goshawk in the Southwestern United States used studies from throughout the west in the development of its recommendations (see the references beginning on page 35 of the Management Recommendations). We also used many other studies from throughout the west in our conclusions in the EA (see Appendix H, page H-17 and Reference page R-1). This literature contains information on the habitat needs for goshawks throughout many parts of the species' range.

The Reynolds' document was the building block from which Graham et al. structured the recommendations for Utah. It is important that the two Forest Service Regions network to see what works in achieving desired outcomes and what does not. We have learned that it is very important to focus on healthy structural attributes of VSS 4,5 and 6 and retain these whenever possible. This effort will take a good amount of on the ground training and a very active monitoring program. We must also remember that it is an adaptive management program and we need to adjust to changing conditions and new information to be successful.

There are differing opinions over Goshawk management strategies within the scientific community. On pages 3-13 through 3-14 of the EA there is a discussion of these differing opinions. The rationale for creating younger successional stages to benefit goshawk habitat is found within the "Management Recommendations for the Northern Goshawk in the Southwestern United States", "The Northern Goshawk in Utah: Habitat Assessment and Management Recommendations", and the "Conservation Strategy and Agreement for the Management of Northern Goshawk Habitat in Utah". This rationale is summarized in Chapter 1 of the EA.

1.E. Aspen, Grazing and Prey Habitat

1.E.1. Concerns were expressed that the need for aspen management is not emphasized. Grazing has accelerated late seral succession especially in the aspen type, which has resulted in impacts to prey habitat.

"...it is a waste of resources to identify aspen regeneration as a priority for goshawks habitat, and then propose an alternative which makes no strides toward improving the cover type."

"...scientific literature displays a very strong consensus that overgrazing is a major negative impact on aspen regeneration."

"Inflated populations of elk are destroying the understory and disrupting aspen rejuvenation; this is not addressed in the EA."

Response: The aspen type has shown the most change as a result of grazing and the exclusion of fire. Aspen is discussed at some length in the Affected Environment (pages 3-5 to 3-6). Grazing practices of the early 1900's removed much of the herbaceous understory and allowed for the establishment of conifers that have overtopped the aspen (EA, page 3-9). Current grazing of domestic livestock, and large ungulate wildlife may keep herbaceous vegetation at a level where fire will not carry across the landscape. There are isolated places where elk grazing is causing detrimental impacts to aspen regeneration (EA, page 3-12). These will be identified during the landscape assessment process and addressed in site-specific analyses.

Fire exclusion and dense shading have contributed to changes in understory vegetation, which can impact many goshawk prey species (EA pages 3-8 and 3-12). Winward (1997) indicated that understory species are reduced once canopy closure reaches 40%. Grazing both by domestic livestock and wildlife can impact aspen reproduction as discussed in the environmental effects, Chapter 4 (page 4-13). Busby (1978) and Winward (1997) indicate that most western range has stabilized.

In addition to grazing, timber harvest, insect and disease epidemics and fire exclusion all have contributed to the cumulative impacts occurring since the late 1900's (EA, page 1-3). The change created in the absence of native processes, like fire, usually includes successional pathways that

move toward late seral species dominance, a densification of the tree canopy which results in reduced understory vegetation. It would be improper to assume that livestock grazing was the single cause for these changes.

Alternative F which is the preferred alternative recognizes natural disturbance regimes and the need to manage for seral species which provides for the aspen type. It also indicates that the prescribed fire program has the greatest potential to benefit this type (page 4-13 paragraph 4). Guideline g-29 provides for the modifying of grazing practices to maintain desired forage structure and m-7 develops the monitoring strategy to determine if these modifications are effective.

1.E.2. Grazing has adversely impacted prey habitat. Some comments suggested grazing be eliminated and others said grazing isn't the problem.

"Numerous issues surrounding grazing and the effects upon fire, forest density and prey base were ignored even though the primary research relied on in the EA suggests grazing restrictions are part and parcel of protecting goshawk habitat."

"The EA doesn't properly address livestock impacts that deplete forage for goshawk prey base."

Response: Alternatives D and F were formulated, in part, to deal with the issue of ungulate wildlife and livestock grazing. Page 4-36 in the EA explains how Alternative F focuses on the need to change grazing practices only in those areas determined to be at risk relative to habitat needs of goshawk and their prey. The impacts of grazing upon fire is one of the items considered when determining which areas are at risk. The preferred Alternative F also addresses this concern in Appendix A (page A-9) guidelines g-28 and g-29 and in monitoring requirements m-6, (Appendix B, pages B-3).

On page 2-9 of the EA it states that the elimination of all cattle grazing is outside the scope of this project, and it is not consistent with the Forest Service mission: "To sustain the health, productivity and diversity of the land to meet the needs of present and future generations (GPRA, 1999)." The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources has the responsibility to manage the population of game animals. The Forest Service collaborates with the Division in the efforts to develop game herd management plans and annual harvest on a site-specific basis.

The description of desired prey habitat conditions has been clarified and is included in the attached Appendix BB, Clarifications and Errata. The intent with this is to give a more clear description of the desired conditions management for field people to better understand what we want to achieve.

1.F. Social-Economic Effects

1.F.1. Some comments said that logging and grazing is a minor part of local economies and can be replaced by other economic resources. Other people said that changes in grazing, timber management, road and access management, etc. affect community livelihood.

"The degradation of any access, grazing or timber will significantly restrict the customs and culture and economic base of Uintah County and its residents."

"Logging is apparently the reason that the northern goshawk is in the dire situation that it is; thus addressing the species' viability through logging is not the answer."

"Many cattlemen may be affected by this issue."

"We respectfully request that you make a decision that leaves the grazing AUMs as they now are."

Response: Implementation of the standards and guidelines will still allow use and development in the national forests. The main restrictions would be seasonal, limiting ground disturbing activities around nest areas during the nesting season. Language has been added to standard s-9 and guideline g-21, to be clear that routine, on-going activities, such as road maintenance, that have always been adjacent to active nest areas, usually will not be restricted. See the enclosed Appendix BB, Clarifications and Errata.

The small number of acres that could be treated by projects using this direction over the next four years will not affect grazing, logging, access, or other uses at a statewide level. As discussed in Chapter 4 page 4-49, no measurable effects are estimated. As site-specific projects are implemented, the effects will be looked at again at the local scale. Changes in operations, such as seasonal changes or altered grazing systems that may be proposed, would be disclosed with the effects estimated, and the public will have the opportunity to be involved at this site-specific decision level.

"The 'localized effects' on low income and minority populations are measurable. Revise the environmental justice section to portray an accurate description of the issue."

Response: As discussed in Chapter 4, page 4-49 to 4-50, overall effects to local communities from forest operations such as mining, grazing, logging, and road construction, are estimated to be minimal considering the small number of acres that could be treated by projects using this direction in design and implementation over the next four years. Some localized effects to grazing permits may occur in alternatives D and F (see page 4-54). Localized (allotment) effects are expected to be highly variable due to varying site conditions, and interested people will be included in the site-specific decision making process. In addition, with the exception of Alternative E (see page 4-52) cumulative effects to wood products and timber are not likely to be measurable during this timeframe.

Chapter 3 (pages 3-15 to 3-30) and Chapter 4 (pages 4-48 to 4-62) of the document discuss the social and economic impacts of the alternatives from a statewide perspective. In addition, a section called Environmental Justice, describes the low income and minority populations in Utah for consideration in the Assessment (pages 3-15 to 3-18). The impacts to rural communities, minorities, and low income populations in the state are of prime importance and are analyzed when considering the elements of the proposed alternatives.

Also in Chapter 3 (page 3-16), statistical data from the State of Utah show that the majority of low income and minority residents live in the metropolitan areas of Salt Lake, Davis, Weber and Utah Counties. However, it is recognized that there are many low income and minority groups throughout Utah. The four-year time frame for the document does not demonstrate measurable effects on these populations. Local minority and low income residents will be considered as part of the analysis for each of the forest plans now under revision and are always considered during the planning of site-specific projects.

1.F.2. The health of rural communities is as important as the goshawk and is also an integral part of the ecosystem that should be considered.

"To protect the goshawk at the expense of the timber, recreation and grazing users would be another attack to pacify the so-called environmentalists."

"The habitat of the goshawk and its prey would be and could be protected by allowing some use and development and still be in compliance with the continuity standards."

Response: As was stated above, overall effects to local communities from forest operations such as mining, grazing, logging, and road construction, are estimated to be minimal considering the small number of acres that could be treated by projects using this direction in design and implementation over the next four years until the forest plans in Utah are revised.

Two National Forest Plans are currently under revision (Wasatch-Cache and Uinta). The remaining four revisions are planned to be completed within the next four years. During plan revisions, management direction for goshawk habitat will be integrated along with other resources. Impacts of forest management decisions, including activities surrounding goshawk habitat, will be assessed with the local communities. As stated in Chapter 4, page 4-49, individuals or groups dependent on income related to NFS lands are considered during site-specific, project level decisions.

The purpose of the environmental assessment is to compare alternatives and disclose the environmental effects for the public and decision maker to understand the trade-offs. The Regional Forester considered these effects and the comments from the public in reaching his decision. The reasons for his decision are described in the decision notice.

2. PROCESS

2.A. Purpose, Data & Alternatives

2.A.1. Many comments said that the purpose and need for the project is unclear as follows:

"All evidence points to the fact that the population and habitat of northern goshawk in Utah are viable and stable. The entire exercise may be without merit."

"NFMA is multiple use-sustained yield, thus should not be managing for single species. Evidence is that populations and habitats are viable and stable, thus no merit to purpose."

Response: Chapter 1 of the EA (pages 1-2 to 1-10) explain the background for this project, how the goshawk became a "sensitive" species in Utah, and the assessment and conservation strategy that have occurred since the forest plans were developed. The EA explains (page 1-6), with scientific references, that changes in forest structure, especially harvesting large trees, and changes in fire severity and risk of large scale habitat losses from catastrophic fire and insect events may negatively affect goshawk populations. The purpose of taking action now is also explained on page 1-6 (section 1.3.1), that there are more management options available when trying to prevent a species from being listed as threatened or endangered.

The purpose and need sections in the EA (page 1-6) explain why action is necessary now to prevent potential degradation to goshawk habitat in this interim period before the forest plans in Utah are revised. The monitoring described in Appendix B will lead to effectiveness determinations that Continually update information to be integrated into the forest plan revision efforts.

While the Endangered Species Act tends to focus more on single species, in doing the analyses for the assessment, conservation strategy and management recommendations, the focus expanded to include a wide variety of prey species. As explained in the Habitat Assessment, the recommendations describe actions aimed at sustaining the habitat of the goshawk and selected prey species for the forests and woodlands of Utah (HCA, page 38). The Conservations Strategy and Agreement further provides for adequate nesting and foraging habitat for goshawks and also to provide habitat for a large variety of avian and mammalian species associated with goshawks. This is perhaps more in line with what NFMA intended.

2.A.2. Other comments were concerned that there is inadequate data to establish standards and guidelines for goshawk management.

"It is impossible to make informed decisions on policy without a much better idea of distributions and health of goshawk."

"The EA presents no data that the lower standards will benefit goshawk – it simply asserts that lower canopy closures and open foraging conditions are adequate."

"There is little basis for establishing standards and guidelines to direction management of home range habitat outside of nest stands; suitable foraging habitat may be the key to goshawk productivity."

Response: To varying degrees, each National Forest within the State of Utah has inventoried for goshawks and monitored known territories since at least 1992 (one year after it was listed as a Forest Service Sensitive species). Data obtained from these studies was used in the development of "The Northern Goshawk in Utah: Habitat Assessment and Management Recommendations" (Graham et al 1999). Effectiveness monitoring of nesting territories is called for in the monitoring section (Appendix B). Within the national forests in Utah there is a systematic statewide monitoring system that is described on page 10 of the Utah Conservation Strategy. These documents are discussed in Chapter 1 of the EA.

As explained previously in 1.A.1., none of the alternatives recommend canopy closures in foraging habitat that are inconsistent with several studies.

Suitable foraging habitat may be the key to goshawk productivity. This fact is discussed in the Biological Evaluation (Appendix H, page H-12) where it states: "populations may be limited by shortage of nest sites; and where nest sites are readily available, densities may be limited by food abundance and availability". As explained in the response to 1.C.3., the process used to rank foraging habitat was considered appropriate for depicting habitat and making generalized management decisions at the state scale.

2.A.3. Concerns over the range of alternatives came from two aspects:

-Key issues like canopy cover and which guidelines apply are not adequately distributed across alternatives.

-Standards and guidelines that apply to all - or all but one - action alternatives have artificially constrained decision opportunities.

"The only reasonable and scientifically supported provision listed in the EA that would provide some protection of existing foraging habitat is s-2, yet s-2 only applies to Alternative E and would not work to recover foraging habitat that has been lost due to timber harvest in past decades."

“The alternatives are built around the same set of standards, guidelines, goals and objectives, thus alternatives only differ in relatively minor ways. The EA lacks evaluation of alternatives based on stronger sets of standards and guidelines.”

Response: Chapter 2 of the EA explains how the alternatives were developed and how the various standards and guidelines were applied. Section 2.2.2 (pages 2-3 to 2-6) describe the issues used to generate alternatives. The significant issues centered around the disagreements about the science used and how the science should be applied in management direction for goshawk habitat. This drove how the alternatives were formulated.

The alternative descriptions (pages 2-16 to 2-20) explain how and why various standards and guidelines were used (or not) to address the issues that drove development of that alternative. Table 2 (page 2-21) summarizes and compares how the standards and guidelines were selected for each alternative. The comparison of alternatives (section 2.4, page 2-22) shows the alternatives on a relative scale given the risk of loss of habitat and social and economic costs.

The standards and guidelines are based from the differing sciences on what's the best management strategy for goshawk habitat. Where there are disagreements on “best” is where there are differences in which standards and guidelines apply to that alternative. That sometimes the same standards and guidelines apply to several alternatives has to do with meeting the intent for which that alternative was developed, and where there is agreement among the scientists, rather than limiting the decision opportunities. The purpose for developing alternatives was to have a reasonable range to address the significant issues identified, not have a reasonable range of application of standards and guidelines. In this sense, the standards and guidelines are like tools that can be used to meet the intent of the alternatives. That often the same tool can be used means it is a useful tool, not that there is too limited a choice of tools.

Evaluation of tighter standards is represented in the range of alternatives considered, (EA, pages 2-11 to 2-26), with a comparison table of the differing management direction found in Table 2 on page 2-21, and the differences in outcomes compared in Table 3 on page 2-26. Alternative E represents the “tightest” standards, from this perspective, with no treatments in mature and old stands, and a minimum 60% canopy closure in foraging areas, with 75% in nests and PFA areas. Further descriptions are found in Chapter 4, pages 4-27 to 4-37, where the effects of each alternative on goshawk habitat and abundance are discussed and compared.

Regarding application of standard s-2 to only Alternative E, guideline g-7 applies to the other action alternatives. While g-7 allows for more discretion in its application than s-2, it does provide for the protection of the mature and/or old structural groups. For planned treatments to vary from this guideline it would be necessary for the biological assessment to conclude that the proposed action was consistent with the intent of the Conservation Strategy and Agreement for Management of the Northern Goshawk in Utah (EA pg.A-2).

“Why is it outside PFC to allocate even more old growth and mature forest?”

Response: The concept of regulating VSS classes across the landscape ensures that during any disturbance, there would be a likelihood that a certain mosaic of structural diversity would remain. If 100% of the landscape was in mature and old growth that may be at risk to beetle outbreaks and an epidemic occurred, this could move the entire landscape back to early structure (seedlings/saplings). These broad swings in ecological amplitude may not be acceptable, and are not sustainable.

4.C.1.j. *“Explain the logic for not including managing and monitoring the effects of grazing activities in Alternative E”*

Response: Alternative E would manage and monitor the effects of grazing as is currently prescribed in the existing forest plans (EA, page 2-19). The additional management requirements for grazing in Alternatives D and F were not part of Alternatives E, A, B or C. Also, the science that was used as the basis for Alternative E specifically recommended against broad grazing guidelines, opting instead for project-level coordination during allotment planning.

4.C.2. *“Post signs to protect goshawk areas.”*

Response: The interdisciplinary team discussed the concept of signing sensitive species habitat, during this project; however, it was not carried into any alternative due to the risk of highlighting sensitive areas to the public. It was agreed that sensitive habitat areas such as nests would have greater protection by not identifying their existence. Implementing the management direction for the various alternatives would provide for current and future PFA habitat in varying degrees depending on the alternative.

4.C.3. *“Mycorrhizal fungi communities, which are the most important food source for the goshawk’s small mammal prey, will be adversely impacted by open forest conditions.”*

Response: As identified in Chapter 4 (page 4-18) Vegetation Consequences, understory vegetation is reduced under high canopy conditions. Fungi are strongly influenced by down wood and moisture conditions.

As described within the EA (page 3-13) the alternatives were developed on the basis of prey ecology, or the “food-web” approach. This approach received support from others as cited in the above referenced text. On page 2-26, as described within the EA, all action alternatives provide for a range of canopy closures, which would support fungi communities. The goshawk management recommendations ensure abundant mycorrhizal communities by providing for a continuing supply of woody debris, downed logs, and requisite soil conditions throughout the landscape (Reynolds, pages 31-32).

Comparison of Alternatives D and C & F -- Alternatives C and F call for retaining between 50-70% and 40-70% percent of the area covered by clumps of trees with interlocking crowns in nest areas, and PFA's/FA's, respectively. Alternative D provides minimum canopy closure values for nest areas, in several habitat types (e.g. mixed conifer, spruce/fir, and aspen), that are higher than alternatives C & F. Higher canopy cover values in foraging and PFA habitat can also be found for certain cover types in alternative D. Alternatives C, D, and F are comparable in terms of reducing risk of habitat loss by allowing treatments in older age classes. Consequently, alternative D would provide better quality habitat in those cover types where higher canopy cover values are prescribed.

Comparison of Alternatives D and E – The logic that an alternative is superior simply because it provides uniformly high canopy closures is flawed because it fails to examine the ecological context of the alternative or consider long-term habitat sustainability. Alternative E provides the highest canopy closures of any alternative, but prohibits any removal of trees in the older age classes over the next four years. While this may provide good quality nest and PFA habitat in the short term, it does not address sustainability of these habitats. The EA notes that the high canopy cover prescribed by Alternative E, may be positive in the short-term, but in the long-term would place goshawk habitat at a higher risk of and susceptibility to wildland fire, insects, and disease. Given that we are interested in maintaining goshawk populations and habitat in perpetuity, the alternative that could achieve long-term improvements in habitat when the programmatic direction is implemented would be better than one that only had short-term benefits. In this context, Alternative D provides for sustainable goshawk habitat better than Alternative E.

“Alternative D prescribes a variety of canopy closures in nest areas and PFA's. The EA on page 4-31, states that it will provide slightly higher amounts of higher quality goshawk habitat due to higher canopy closures in some habitat areas than Alt. B, C, or F. Why doesn't EA compare D and E in this regard?”

Response: While there is no direct comparison of Alternatives D and E, narratives under both headings (pages 43-31 and 4-32) and information supplied in Appendix A, provide sufficient information to draw conclusions. Alternative D provides 50-70% canopy cover in all nest areas and PFAs and all cover types, while alternative E prescribes even higher canopy cover values in these areas. To understand why, high canopy closure by itself does not determine the benefit to goshawks, of an alternative; consider the ecological context of Alternative E. Alternative E provides the highest canopy closures but prohibits any removal of trees in the older age classes over the next four years. While this may provide good quality nest and PFA habitat in the short term, it does not address sustainability of these habitats. The EA notes that the high canopy cover prescribed by alternative E, may be positive in the short-term, but in the long-term would place goshawk habitat at a higher risk of and susceptibility to wildland fire, insects, and disease. Given that we are interested in maintaining goshawk populations and habitat in perpetuity, the alternative that allowed for long-term improvements in habitat would be better than one that only had short-term benefits. In this context, alternative D provides for sustainable goshawk habitat better than alternative E.

"The assertion that Alt. C & F will provide better foraging habitat than Alt. E is completely arbitrary since the EA provides no explanation of why it believes this."

Response: There is no direct comparison of Alternatives C and F with Alternative E. However, the narratives (on page 4-31 under Alternatives C and F and 4-32 under Alternative E) provide sufficient information to make such a comparison. Alternatives C and F call for retaining between 50-70% percent of the area covered by clumps of trees with interlocking crowns. Alternative E would provide high canopy closures in both nesting and foraging habitat (somewhat similar to C and F), and it would prohibit any removal of trees in the older age classes over the next four years. While high canopy cover may seem to be a beneficial habitat feature, canopy cover alone will not provide good quality goshawk habitat into the future. In other words, the relative rank of an alternative depends not only on the structural attributes prescribed, but also on the ecological framework or context of the entire alternative. As noted in the EA, the high canopy cover prescribed by Alternative E, may be positive in the short-term, but in the long-term would place goshawk habitat at a higher risk of and susceptibility to wildland fire, insects, and disease. Given that we are interested in maintaining goshawk populations and habitat in perpetuity, the alternative that results in long-term improvements in habitat would be better than one that only had short-term benefits. In this context, Alternatives C and F provide canopy closure guidelines and allow management direction that is within the properly functioning condition of the ecosystems that provides a balanced range of structural stages needed to promote sustainable conditions. This is estimated to provide the important elements of goshawk foraging habitat better and over a longer time frame than Alternative E.

"The analysis is internally inconsistent. It states on page 4-31 that Alt. D will provide slightly higher amount of higher quality goshawk habitat due to higher canopy closures in some habitat areas than Alt. B, C & F. But if Alt. D is superior to C and F in this regard, Alt. E is even more superior because it provides more uniformly high canopy closures. How then can Alts. B and C provide less high quality habitat than D but more than E."

Response: First a point of clarification; alternatives B, D, and E use traditional measures of canopy cover across individual stands, while alternatives C and F use the vertical canopy projection method. This method is described in detail in Appendix D, page D-2. Although the two measures both describe cover provided by the overstory, the values are probably not strictly equivalent.

Refer to Table 3 on page 2-26 of the EA for a summary of the key differences between alternatives under the Forest Structure heading. Alternative D calls for maintaining canopy closures of 40-70%. Values are specific to cover types and goshawk habitat areas (see page A-6 in Appendix A for details).

Comparison of Alternatives D and B -- Alternative B calls for 40% canopy closure in foraging areas, and 50% in nesting areas/PFA's regardless of cover type. Alternative D provides 50-70% canopy cover in all nest areas and all cover types. The minimum canopy closure is comparable to that provided by alternative B. Where the alternatives differ, is in canopy closure values applied to PFA and FA's. Where alternative B calls for at least 50% canopy closure across cover types, higher canopy closures are required for some cover types under alternative D (e.g. 70% in VSS5/6 SF in a PFA). Alternative D would yield higher quality goshawk habitat, in comparison to B, because it is more detailed and accounts for differences in capabilities between cover types.

4.C.1.f. *“Forest cover categories that are provided are not a surrogate measure for understory habitat or prey density... The Forest Service fails to provide crucial information on goshawk densities, prey densities, known impacts of logging, livestock and human activities”*

Response: The Northern Goshawk in Utah: Habitat Assessment and Management Recommendations rated the cover types within the State for goshawk nesting and foraging. See EA Appendix E especially tables 7 and 8. This information was used in the development of the Environmental Assessment as discussed in Chapter 1 and cited throughout the text. The effects of logging, livestock and human activities to goshawks are disclosed in Chapter 4 of the EA and in the biological assessment and evaluation (Appendix H). Both of these documents reference numerous scientific papers relating to goshawk ecology.

4.C.1.g. **There was a misunderstanding about statement on page 2-14 concerning primary emphasis in exemption areas only and Table 1 percents where Direction will apply from 6.9% to 85%.**

Response: Clarification of the statement on page 2-14 has been made in the attached Appendix BB to be clear that this section is describing the exempted areas only. On Table 1 (EA, page 2-15) the 6.9 refers to millions of acres where the goshawk management direction will apply, which is 85% of the total 8.1 million National Forest System Acres in Utah.

4.C.1.h. *“Why do most of the alternatives restrictively mitigate the timber and grazing resources ad nauseam and only allude in general terms to the restoration activities needed across the spectrum of ecological processes?”*

The observation here is somewhat accurate, in that by far most of the standards and guidelines give direction for how to manage current activities, rather than looking forward to what restoration is needed. This is because what’s needed to protect goshawk habitat during known activities can be more readily identified than restoration needs that are not yet known until an assessment at a more local scale has been completed. During landscape assessments, these restoration needs will be more clearly identified and become more specific to local situations.

4.C.1.i. *“Since the EA does not even attempt to explain why it believes the resultant canopy closures in Alt. C & F will provide constant nesting habitat, the assertion, on page 4-31, is an arbitrary and capricious conclusion.”*

Response: On page 4-31, the EA states, “The structural attributes promoted by direction under these alternatives will provide a more constant, sustainable supply of suitable goshawk nesting and foraging habitat.” The EA does not state that the supply of nesting habitat would be constant per se. Rather, the management direction outlined in these alternatives would provide suitable nesting habitat over time, in a sustainable fashion. Direction provided by these alternatives will reduce the risk of losing habitat to extreme events, and help create nesting habitat in a sustainable fashion. In addition, because alternatives C and F will attempt to minimize extreme disturbance events, nesting habitat would be available on a more continuous and sustainable basis, rather than on a boom/bust cycle.

4.C.1.c. – Clarify UDWR coordination - *“In the decision notice, please also present a discussion of what if any influence the possible listing of the northern goshawk pursuant to the Endangered Species Act has had on the EA. Present a discussion and documents of all communications the Forest Service and the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources of any other person or entity with biological expertise in preparing the EA relative to techniques, processes, and means for avoiding listing.”*

Response: The interagency signatures on the Conservation Strategy and Agreement and review of Utah Assessment show the coordination that has occurred. The Fish and Wildlife Service reviewed the draft and final biological evaluations as well, prior to the final decision on the Environmental Assessment. Personnel from both the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources and the US Fish and Wildlife Service have been involved in discussions concerning this project.

4.C.1.d. *“In the decision notice, please discuss the biological basis for your conclusion that the northern goshawk is a habitat generalist. Cite all scientific reports that support this conclusion. State what specific part of those reports supports the forest Service’s conclusion the goshawk is a habitat generalist. If you rely on the “professional opinion” of Forest Service’s biologists, or any other biologists, to support this conclusion, cite all reports and analyses they relied to support their conclusion. Name any biologists the Forest Service relies on in this regard and present any documents where they have gone on the record stating the goshawk is a habitat generalist.”*

Response: This determination was based on Reynolds et al. (1992), where on page 10, it states: “the goshawk is a forest habitat generalist, occurring in all major forest types”. Reynolds cites additional studies as well. Refer to responses 1.A. to 1.D. that discuss further why we selected Alternative F, that used the Reynolds and Graham science as its basis, as the preferred alternative.

4.C.1.e. *“Making the proposed management direction even less useful and less credible is the failure to recognize the different values of different tree species to goshawks ...The Management Direction should be refined to focus habitat maintenance requirements on forest types which are primarily used by goshawks.”*

Response: The EA contains the following statement on page 3-10: “Although all forested landscapes are used to some extent, certain forest cover types appear to be occupied by goshawks more than others (Graham et. al. 1999)”. Graham (1999) rated the cover types within the State for goshawk nesting and foraging (EA, Appendix E). Planned treatments would be evaluated by the site-specific NEPA process and associated biological evaluation. These steps would help ensure that goshawk habitat is managed to provide for viable populations distributed across the species range.

Goshawks do not use all tree species for foraging and nesting equally. Some forest types, such as spruce/fir are rarely used by goshawks for foraging, nesting or fledging, although exceptions are common in the high elevation spruce/fir on the Dixie National Forest. Guideline g-5 provides for a full range of seral stages by forested cover type to achieve a mosaic of habitat conditions and diversity. Guideline g-7 further specifies that landscapes below the desired percentage of land area in mature and old growth structural stages (40% mature and old-growth in conifer and 30% in aspen) be priority for treatment to maintain or enhance the characteristics of these older structural stages. This gives managers adequate direction to maintain goshawk habitat in forest types primarily used by the goshawk.

Response: Goshawks are able to live and reproduce in insect killed forests as stated on pages 2 and 9 of the Habitat Assessment (Graham et al 1999). However, this does not mean insect killed forests are the best habitat, or that they will be sustainable through time due to the risk from wind-throw and fire. Dead forests may continue to be used for a period of time, however, as the dead trees begin to fall, habitat is degraded. Habitat quality is degraded due to increased risks from predation and competition that are discussed on page 9 of the Assessment (Graham et al, 1999).

4.C.1.b. Several comments suggested that desired conditions for prey habitat were not emphasized enough, so the following clarification has been added to the attached Appendix BB:

Clarification of Desired Habitat Conditions for Prey Species
Especially related to ungulate grazing

Guideline g-28 (EA, page A-9) gives direction to use the landscape assessment process to identify plant communities important to prey species that contain **seed, mast and foliage components** needed. Overall, the greatest variety of species that can produce seed and mast are associated with mid-seral stages. Guideline g-29, then, directs that these components be maintained or restored. *The intent is to have utilization levels of grasses and forbs that maintain native foods and cover for prey species.*

Further components of desired habitat conditions for prey species from Reynolds' work, and the guidelines that address these components, include:

1. **Snags** for woodpecker feeding and nesting, mammal nests, & bird perches (g-9);
2. **Downed logs** for cover, feeding and nesting for a variety of prey (g-11);
3. **Woody debris** to provide cover and feeding for a variety of vertebrates (g-11);
4. **Openings** for food and cover (g-25 for PFAs);
5. **Large trees** for nesting, denning, feeding, roosting, cone production and hunting perches (g-15);
6. **Interspersion** (intermixing) of vegetative structures (g-7 & g-15); and
7. Promotion of **aspen regeneration** (g-5) and growth of **native grasses** (g-4).

Herbaceous shrubs and intact forest soils, with emphasis on organic surface layers with natural turnover rates, are other identified components of desired habitat conditions for prey species that are not specifically included in the guidelines.

The direction in g-28 and g-29 is that, as part of the landscape assessment process and as grazing allotments are updated, all of these components be evaluated toward achievement of desired habitat conditions for prey species. Appropriate courses of action, such as a change in pasture rotation, shorter seasons of use, or reductions in numbers of livestock, would then be determined at the site-specific level. Additionally, if wild ungulate grazing is determined to be part of the problem, immediate contact with UDWR would be made for resolution.

4. OTHER TOPICS OF INTEREST

4.A. The Navajo Nation commented on the EA regarding the sacred nature of hawks and their part today in sacred ceremonies and the oral traditions of the Navajo elders. They have no concerns or objections regarding the project at this time, and want continued protection for the goshawk. They reserve the right to offer and submit undiscovered information in the future, if need be.

Chapter 3 (pages 3-16 to 3-18) discusses the traditional and non-traditional ties to the land, religious sites and Native American practices. As discussed throughout the document, implementation of Alternative F will help in the conservation of many species, including the goshawks. During the public involvement activities related to this project, all Indian Tribes in Utah were notified via letters, postcards and personal conversations.

4.B. Some comments specifically agreed with use of native plants.

"We agree that use of native plant species should take priority over use of exotics wherever feasible."

Response: The use of native seed, and the potential need for non-native seed, is discussed in guideline g-4 (EA, Appendix A, page A-2). The preferred measure is to utilize native seed, but in some areas undesirable species like cheat grass may inhibit the establishment of the native species but some non-persistent non-native specie could be used to stabilize the site, reduce the establishment of the undesirable species and allow for the establishment of natives.

Alternative F provides for the maintenance of a broad range of ecosystem functions. The EA focuses on the importance of native processes, composition and structure (guideline g-2, page A-1). Guideline g-5 promotes a full range of seral stages, which includes old growth. This is further supported by Graham and Reynolds et al. where they discuss the retention of VSS 6 which is the old forest structure, including old trees, dead wood and snag habitat.

4.C. Clarifications – several comments indicated a misunderstanding of the intent of the management direction or how the analysis was done. The following clarifications are added:

4.C.1. *"Turkeys are competing with the Goshawk for much of the same food supply, and to allow these Turkey numbers to continue to grow would jeopardize the Goshawk even further."*

Response: Turkeys forage on some of the same vegetation as do goshawk prey species, so there is a potential conflict. However, while there is a slight potential for competition between goshawks and turkeys for food, there are numerous locations throughout the State and west where these species co-exist with no apparent problem. Goshawks have been known to prey upon turkeys, especially poults (Schorger, 1966). The presence of a large population of turkeys may be advantageous for goshawks. The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources manages the harvest and populations of game species.

4.C.1.a. *"The most obvious contradiction is the assertion that goshawks continue to successfully utilize beetle-killed forests and there is the statement insinuating the Englemann spruce killed by bark beetles create conditions that are of low value for both goshawk nesting and foraging."*

and g-15. These attributes are also discussed in Graham et.al. and Reynolds et.al. The Preferred Alternative F also allows for fire interactions to meet these goals.

3.C. Many other comments were received, some supportive and others critical of the effort.

"Doing nothing with our national forests land is wrong...All the land should be managed to promote good land use."

"I have received the Utah Northern Goshawk Project EA and feel the answers to your assessment questions are adequate to cancel any goshawk concerns in our region."

"It [the EA] is not acceptable and I do not trust it because it demonstrates that it is not serious about preserving biodiversity...it allows all uses everywhere including destructive uses."

Response: All sides of the issues have been expressed from a variety of people interested in management of the National Forests in Utah. While some people wrote that what we were proposing was unnecessary because goshawks are doing fine in Utah, others wrote that we were not doing enough to protect goshawk habitat. Similarly, some people think that current grazing and timber harvesting practices are not causing any harm to goshawk and its prey habitat, while others think eliminating grazing and timber harvest is necessary to achieve the desired habitat conditions.

The Forest Service is committed to fostering a public involvement climate that allows for the open expression of ideas and encourages people to engage with the intent to arrive at balanced, multiple-use management of the national forests.

3.D. Many comments favored a specific alternative or were critical of a specific alternative or component.

"We do not feel that current livestock grazing is being over-applied or mis-applied."

"I support multiple use of all national forests and consider the proposal or Alternative F to be reasonable and one I could support."

"Our organization supports Alternative E."

"I strongly urge you to select Alternative E as it is the only one to ensure that there will be no further loss of old-growth forests to logging."

"The only alternative of the six considered that has a chance of maintaining the current satisfactory habitat for goshawk is Alternative A – No Action."

Response: We received over 1000 postcards that favored certain alternatives. Many supported Alternative A, E or F, sometimes with suggested modifications. The variations of these alternatives are addressed in the previous response 2.A.5. We do consider these comments as a part of the analysis and appreciate the interest shown in this project, but they are not used as a voting process. The reasons for the selected alternative are described fully in the Decision Notice.

(Appendix B). Within the National Forests in Utah there is systematic statewide monitoring that is described on page 10 of the Utah Conservation Strategy. These documents are discussed in Chapter 1 of the EA.

Focused studies of goshawk ecology are important. We have and will continue to work with Universities and other research organizations to address specific points of goshawk ecology. Guideline g-29 is referring only to livestock grazing and the process of using annual operating plans to manage grazing. Other monitoring requirements with varying timeframes are listed in Appendix B of the EA.

3.B. Underlying Intent

3.B.1. Some people said that the project's underlying intent is to justify timber harvest and allow grazing to continue.

"Emphasis on early seral forest conditions is transparent invitation for logging"

"The preferred alternative ... assumes human manipulation is better than natural processes."

"The other alternatives have been designed to address previous comments by organizations whose goals appear to have been to use the goshawk as a surrogate issue to further their preservationists agendas."

Response: The EA provides standards and guidelines to be applied when local managers determine that site specific conditions warrant vegetative management. This determination is usually made taking into account forest health conditions. The standards and guidelines in the EA do not prescribe the management tools that will be utilized. In addition, PFC prescribes a balanced range of conditions from early to late seral stages, including maintenance of old growth conditions and regeneration to promote sustainability across the landscape. See Appendix D, pages D1 and D2.

The EA sets guidelines that should be followed when the site-specific tool is selected by the manager. Emphasis is on early seral species as described in Graham page v-vi and not "forest conditions". Guideline g-5 also emphasizes a broad range of seral stages with a strong representation of early seral tree species. In section 4-11 the third paragraph under all action alternatives discusses the analysis under way that would amend Forest plans in Utah to increase the use of prescribed and wildland fire. Management recommendations for northern goshawk habitat are detailed (with references) in Graham et.al. pages 38-40 and Reynolds et.al. pages 21-30.

It is useful to discuss vegetation manipulation guidelines in silvicultural terms, whether management is implemented via commercial or non-commercial, mechanical or fire as the primary tool. The existing or current conditions are compared to the desired condition as described in the EA. If this indicates a need for treatment then management activities would be initiated within the standards and guidelines to deal with other issues (roadless, visuals, etc). With the current standards and guidelines, it is unlikely that harvest would accelerate.

Standards and guidelines are designed to be within properly functioning conditions (PFC) and historic range of variation (HRV) for management actions. Maintaining ecosystems within HRV and PFC provides our best estimate of sustainable conditions (page 4-10). The management direction in the EA provides the standards and guides for activities once the manager selects the tools to be applied. Old growth habitat, as well as all other structural stages, are described in g-5

distributed across the species range. As discussed above, guideline g-7 provides specifically for recruitment into the VSS 5 and 6 (mature and old growth) classes. The requirement for a BE only strengthens this guideline to manage for this older structure.

3.A.2. Some comments said that the interim period of time the direction would apply and analysis completed are is arbitrary and capricious.

"Short-term time-frame is a poor excuse for inattention to long-term monitoring strategy and other details."

Response: Interim direction is intended to provide consistency, yet allow managers flexibility to address their local situations. Emphasis at this programmatic level is on consistency with the desired habitat conditions, leaving more discretion on exactly how this is to be applied for each project to the site-specific decisions at the local levels that will follow.

Effectiveness monitoring of nesting territories is called for in monitoring requirements m-1 and m-2 (Appendix B). Within the National Forests in Utah there is systematic statewide monitoring that is described on page 10 of the Utah Conservation Strategy and Agreement (Utah NFs, 1999). On each national forest monitoring will be conducted annually using a random sample of at least 20 territories or 50% of all known territories, whichever is greater. If monitoring reveals three consecutive years of a 20% or greater decline in territory occupancy, further evaluation must occur to determine the cause and appropriate corrective action. An interagency team would conduct this evaluation.

3.A.3. Other comments expressed concerns about monitoring, that what is proposed is not a suitable long-term strategy.

"Monitoring is an essential component of adaptive management."

"During the time that this management direction applies (~4 years), effort should concentrate on establishing monitoring methods that permit accumulation of the desired knowledge."

Response: The standards and guidelines selected are based on the science described in Chapter 1 and will be monitored based on the requirements described in Appendix B of the EA. These monitoring requirements describe the range of acceptable results for each item, and the evaluation of the results will lead to adaptive measures, perhaps even further plan amendments (pages B-4 to B-10)

Monitoring activities as described in Appendix B (m-1,m-4,m-5) are critical to making adaptive management work. Future adjustments to standards and guidelines may be needed. As additional research is completed, amendments to forest plans should take this information into account. The standards and guidelines in Appendix A (category 1, 2, 3, and 6) are designed to take this into account. Goal 10 clearly states the importance of maintaining landscapes in properly functioning condition.

To varying degrees, each national forest within the State of Utah has inventoried for goshawks and monitored known territories since at least 1992 (one year after it was listed as a Forest Service Sensitive species). Data obtained from these studies was used in the development of "The Northern Goshawk in Utah: Habitat Assessment and Management Recommendations" (Graham et al 1999). Effectiveness monitoring of nesting territories is called for in the monitoring section

2.B.6. Some concern was expressed about the cumulative effects analysis.

"The environmental consequences of the cumulative effects of past practices has not been fully measured."

Graham et al. (1999) provide information on the current condition of ponderosa pine forests in Utah and the effects of past logging practices. The EA used this information in its assessment of existing conditions (EA, pages 3-12, 3-13, 3-21 and 3-22). Past practices related to cumulative effects discussions are summarized in the EA, Chapter 4, section 4.1.2 (pages 4-3 to 4-6). Pages 4-9 and 4-10 give the assumptions that were used in the effects analysis related to the biological components, with discussions of average timber harvest and number of acres burned in wildland and prescribed fires.

3. AGENCY CREDIBILITY

3.A. Doing What We Say

3.A.1 People said they were concerned that the Forest Service would not really change its priorities or activities and would not implement the guidelines because they are not mandatory and that too much flexibility at the local level was still possible.

"...it is difficult to trust that FS foresters are capable of this much-needed change [to ecosystem management]."

"The EA provides an unacceptable level of discretion to the agency providing such latitude for decisions that the continuation of poor scientific knowledge and traditional failure to curtail negative impacts is possible."

"Standards and guidelines are a step in the right direction, but are unenforceable and will require strengthening."

"Guideline g-7 allows for vegetation treatments in areas that are at or below minimum habitat requirements."

Response: Once the programmatic direction from this goshawk EA is amended into the Utah forest plans, it will be mandatory and enforceable. The intent (EA, page 1-6) is to address the new information found in the habitat assessment and conservation strategy, and provide consistency in management direction that will narrow the management interpretations currently possible. As projects are implemented, they must be in compliance with the amended direction in the forest plan. The public will have the opportunity at the project-level of decision making to assure the goshawk management direction is applied, and perhaps updated to each site-specific situation.

While the use of guidelines do allow for a degree of discretionary management, the decision to not follow a guideline is not to be taken lightly. The rationale for each such decision would need to be documented in the specific project NEPA analysis (EA Glossary, page G-2) and discussed in the associated biological evaluation. Monitoring is prescribed in part to determine whether or not the standard and guidelines are effective in accomplishing the goals and objectives (page B-1). Specifically the following question would be answered: "Are mitigation measures effective in maintaining habitat for the goshawk and its prey and are goshawk territories remaining occupied?"

Planned treatments would be evaluated by the NEPA process and associated biological evaluation. These steps would help ensure that goshawk habitat is managed to provide for viable populations

purpose and need and respond to the substantive issues raised with the proposed action (Alternative B) were the alternatives (A, C, D, E, F) analyzed in detail in the environmental assessment so that the environmental effects and trade-offs of different management actions could be meaningfully evaluated. After the completion of the environmental analysis, Alternative F was identified as the preferred alternative in the abstract (page i) of the EA and in the draft finding of no significant impact (page-1) that was included with the EA. Appendix H of the EA, the biological assessments and evaluations, also are based on Alternative F as the preferred alternative.

2.B.5. Many comments questioned if the roadless initiative, current forest plan revisions on the Wasatch-Cache and Uinta National Forests, the Utah Fire Amendments, and other broad-scale analyses had all been considered adequately.

“Even though the EA has a life span of 4 – 6 years depending upon the ease and speed of forest plan revision it is consequential in that direction in this document will likely be simply lifted into the revision process.”

“We are also concerned how this process fits into the Wasatch and Uinta forest plan revision processes.”

“In view of concern for lynx, wolverine and a variety of interior forest carnivores and birds associated with mature stands of trees, these analyses need to integrate management for all species of concern in accord with modern conservation biology.”

Response: The purpose of this proposal is to amend the forest plans in Utah to provide consistent, interim direction in management of goshawk habitat, until the forest plans are revised. During the revision process, a long-term strategy for management will be integrated with the other changes under consideration, including those for lynx, wolverine and other species associated with mature forest stands, as well as the Utah Fire Amendment (in progress) and individual forest plan amendments that have been made over the last 10 to 15 years. These are discussed in the EA in Chapter 4, Cumulative Effects (page 4-3). The subsequent NEPA analysis, documentation and disclosure for the long-term strategy will stand on their own procedural merits whether or not they evolve from this interim management direction.

Because this analysis is at a programmatic level, it makes no decisions that any action is mandatory anywhere on the national forests in Utah, including roadless areas. This would be true for all alternatives in the EA, including A (no action) and B (proposed action) as well as F, (preferred alternative). Any projects initiated must be in compliance with current policies, including the roadless initiative. This would be determined at the site-specific level of analysis and decision making follow the decision made from this Utah Goshawk EA, with full opportunities for public review and comment as projects are proposed.

The Forest Service is not required to consider the impacts of an anticipated long-term strategy for which the planning process has not yet begun, or is in progress. The long-term strategy to be completed as each forest plan in Utah is revised, if challenged, will be founded on the appropriate NEPA documentation and analysis and need to survive on its own procedural merits.

is in this sense that forest plans are “permissive”, allowing actions to occur within the standards and guidelines, but not mandating that any action occur. It is at the project decision level where the irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources are made, with full disclosure and opportunities for the public to engage and have their comments considered.

2.B.2. Some comments questioned the geographic scope of the analysis, that using administrative lines makes no sense from an ecological perspective.

“Why has the issue of management of a migratory bird like the goshawk been done piecemeal by breaking up management areas in separate studies and action plans?”

The EA on page 2-10 explains why this proposal only applies to the National Forests in Utah, including: the habitat assessment was completed for Utah only; the majority of data about goshawks are from this assessment; and other assessment efforts in neighboring states are integrating goshawk habitat management for their geographic areas.

Focused studies of goshawk ecology are important. We have and will continue to work with Universities and other research organizations to address specific points of goshawk ecology. Guideline g-29 is referring only to livestock grazing and the process of using annual operating plans to manage grazing. Other monitoring requirements with varying timeframes are listed in Appendix B of the EA.

2.B.3. Several comments said that the priority of treating high and moderate quality goshawk habitat in this interim period makes no sense.

“The basis for prioritization as outlined in alternative F is flawed. It appears illogical to focus all attention on preventing changes that move habitat areas from high to lower quality for goshawks. It may be equally important to take advantage of opportunities, which may arise from unexpected natural events to facilitate promotion of habitat areas from low to higher quality for goshawks. The prioritization focus of alternative F as currently articulated is unnecessarily restrictive and may compromise the Forest Service’s ability to take advantage of opportunities to improve, as opposed to simply maintain, habitat quality for goshawks.”

Response: Alternative F concentrates on maintenance of habitat areas that are “at risk” of further degradation of habitat and loss of management options. It does not preclude the ability to “take advantage of opportunities, which may arise from unexpected natural events”. Guideline g-34, which applies only to Alternative F explains that variance in this prioritization may occur when management objectives for goshawk habitat in concert with other resource needs, necessitate. This gives sufficient latitude that it would be possible to take advantage of any opportunity that may arise. For a discussion of the process used to rank foraging habitat quality for goshawks, refer back to response 1.C.3.

2.B.4. Several of those who commented thought that the proposed action (Alternative B) was also the preferred alternative (Alternative F).

“...the EA notes Alternative B is the proposed action but the October 1999 draft FONSI is based on Alternative F.”

Response: The proposed action (Alternative B) was the starting point the Forest Service used to meet a specific purpose and need, identified on page 1-6 of the EA. Different ways to meet this

requirement in NEPA is to have a reasonable range. Because the effects are very small of applying this programmatic direction across the state of Utah for this interim period of time until forest plans are revised, making other combinations of standards and guidelines is not needed to address the issues and compare trade-offs for the public and decision maker to understand the consequences.

2.B. Other Process

2.B.1. Although there was some support for preparing an EA and draft FONSI (finding of no significant impact), several comments strongly suggested that an EIS be prepared and that under NFMA (National Forest Management Act), a significant amendment is needed.

"We support the finding of no significant impact thereby eliminating the need for an EIS on this project and we support the NFMA finding of nonsignificance."

"This issue requires a full EIS to include all aspects of ecosystem protection for the goshawk..."

"Instead an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be prepared that includes analysis of all science and places priority on northern goshawk habitat."

"If any of alternatives A, B, C, D or F is selected, a full EIS will be required because of the major negative impact on the environment and the clearly demonstrated scientific controversy."

Response: The need to prepare an EIS was discussed early in the process, with a summary found on page 2-8 of the EA. The reasons not to do so were also described in the draft finding of no significant impact (FONSI) that was distributed for public review and comment with the EA. The draft FONSI has been updated to incorporate the comments received and the final FONSI is included in the Decision Notice. In summary, preparation of an EIS is unnecessary when the programmatic direction of the decision provides additional guidelines and restrictions on the use of resources, rather than irretrievably committing resources at a project-level decision. The decision now is designed and anticipated to conserve goshawk habitat, with the environmental effects of these additional standards and guidelines disclosed in Chapter 4 of the EA. In reviewing the context and intensity of the effects of the decision to be made, (40 CFR 1508.27), no irreversible or irretrievable resource commitments are made at this level. Regarding the difference of scientific opinion on the appropriate guidelines for habitat management, there is little disagreement in the disclosure of the effects of applying the various guidelines considered in each alternative.

As explained on page 2-8 of the EA, a finding of no significant impact (FONSI) is used to briefly present why an action will not have a significant effect on the human environment and for which an environmental impact statement therefore will not be prepared (40 CFR 1508.13).

The draft determination that this would be a non-significant plan amendment was also distributed for public review and comment with the EA. The reasons included: limited duration of the amended direction (until the forest plans in Utah are revised) that changed late in the planning period; a small subset of the total National Forest System lands in Utah would be affected only as new projects are implemented (estimated less than 1% of the acres across six forests annually); no change in the long-term relationships and foregone opportunities related to levels of goods and services projected; and little change in the desired future conditions currently expressed in the forest plans. The final determination of a non-significant amendment is also part of the Decision Notice.

It is important to understand that at the programmatic level of this decision to update the management direction for goshawk habitat in Utah, no actions or projects are mandated to occur. It

Standard s-9 only pertains to active nest sites (a 30-acre area) and only pertains to vegetation manipulation treatments.

Standard s-11 was added to Alternative F to emphasize the need in the short-term to pay attention to all management activities with the potential to affect goshawk habitat, not just vegetation manipulation. Using the biological evaluation process to document findings and recommend mitigation measures and evaluate consistency is Forest Service policy and would occur in any alternative.

Monitoring requirement m-7 deals with "at-risk" locations where the monitoring activities would measure ungulate grazing practices as they apply to G-10, g-28 and g-29. The intent is to track whether appropriate adjustments are being made to grazing practices if the need is identified.

"Alternative E would be biologically and legally sufficient with the following changes: No logging should be permitted in any nest area or PFA, active or inactive."

Response: Timber harvest can be used to maintain or improve conditions in a stand that provides nesting or PFA habitat for goshawks (e.g., by reducing risk of fire, insects or disease while retaining structural components important to goshawks). Guidelines g-22, g-23, g-25 and g-26 allow for harvest activities that are specifically designed to benefit goshawks, but restrict harvest activities for other purposes.

"Recruitment nest areas and PFAs should be established at 1.5 mile intervals across the entire landscape."

Planning for replacement nest areas and PFAs at an arbitrary fixed interval across all landscapes found in Utah is not practical. Such an approach would make it difficult to consider variations in habitat capability and topography that affect both the degree to which desired habitat conditions could be achieved and the likelihood that a goshawk would actually use the designated nest areas and PFAs. The EA analyzed alternatives containing direction to maintain mature and old forest on 40% of a management landscape (EA, Appendix A, page A-2) and to provide well-distributed habitat for successful goshawk nesting and brood rearing (post-fledgling areas) within and across landscapes (Appendix A, page A-7). This management direction retains management flexibility needed to respond to site-specific conditions, in order to be most effective in providing and maintaining nest and PFA habitat.

"Cattle grazing should be curtailed in all goshawk habitat."

Response: Alternative D does address this concern by applying utilization standards that would likely reduce the amount of grazing in goshawk habitat (EA, page 4-54). Given the limited information specifically regarding effects of grazing on goshawks and their prey (EA, page 4-35), it would be difficult to justify excluding grazing altogether. Alternative F contains management direction designed to identify where grazing is causing a loss of habitat for goshawk and its prey, then take appropriate action to mitigate the specific problem. The effects of different approaches to management of grazing on goshawk habitat are compared on pages 4-35 and 4-36.

The above responses have explained the reasons why various standards and guidelines were applied to specific alternatives. Making other combinations could be done many times over, but the

action (Alternative B). In response to the comments received during scoping, guideline g-33 was developed to address all components of the ecosystem, rather than just forest structure that was the original focus of g-6. Guideline g-33 also gives more description of the status, risk and opportunities that need to be part of the landscape assessments.

“Eliminate: g-4 which at times penalizes ecosystem function, G-7 – the goal must be to obtain ecosystem function, rather than the artifacts of old growth preservation agendas; g-15, HRV must be the determinant and not a guide that penalizes the broad scale goals of goshawk and its prey habitat management requirements; g-17, two year survey requirements excessive; g-25, may exceed HRV considerations; g-29 duplicates existing grazing administrative direction and is not needed; and s-9, inhibits needed treatments, especially prescribed fire; & s-11, why does this apply to Alternative F only?”

“Also eliminate m-7 in alternative F which reflects recommendation under s-11”.

“A minimum of two years of goshawk surveys should be completed [prior to implementing management actions].”

Response: This recommendation was considered, since the EA included two alternatives that required two years of surveys prior to project implementation in standard s-7 (EA, Appendix A, page A-7).

Guideline g-4 requires the manager to first try to use native species, but it does not preclude the use of non-natives. Only Alternative E made this a firm requirement (S-1) and the effects are compared in Chapter 4 (EA, page 4-12). While using locally adapted native seed sources is preferred, the quantity and variety of seeds are not yet regularly available to make this a requirement.

Goal G-7 would manage for mid-aged, mature, and old structural stages for Alternatives B & E. The purpose was to compare the estimated outcomes by approaching management from an old-growth aspect with other approaches like Alternatives C and D which emphasize management of clumps of trees and interlocking crowns (G-8, page A-5).

Guideline g-15 uses properly functioning condition (PFC) as a subset of historic range of variation (HRV) because using HRV as the determinant could result in conditions not desirable for goshawk management, as explained in response 1.A.3. Also, g-15 was applied to Alternatives C and F, while g-13 and g-14 would apply to Alternatives B and E to compare outcomes. Guideline g-15 allows for greater variability for the variety of habitats and conditions that exist around the State.

Guideline g-17 (2 consecutive years of surveys are preferred) was applied to Alternatives B, C and F, based on the recommendations of Kennedy and Stahlecker (1993) and Joy et al. (1994). Standard s-7 would make this a more rigid requirement in Alternatives D and E. Again, the purpose of applying these different management approaches was to compare outcomes, which is why there is a range of alternatives.

Guideline g-25 is not intended to exceed the historic range of variation. Applying this guideline at the site-specific level will surface any inconsistencies that can then be evaluated.

Guideline g-29 highlights the need to maintain habitat for goshawk and its prey that is not currently emphasized in grazing administration direction.

character on national forests. The reasons this alternative was not included in detail are described on page 2-9 of the EA, and include: elimination of resource uses and active management is outside the scope of this project and not consistent with the Forest Service mission to sustain the health, productivity and diversity of the land to meet the needs of present and future generations.

Many of those who commented wanted to see an alternative that would prohibit all management activities in goshawk areas:

“Develop a conservation biology alternative that protects large “reserves” of goshawk nesting and foraging habitat as well as corridors connecting those reserves.”

“Fully preserve all goshawk habitat as sanctuary areas.”

“We support an Alternative allowing roadless areas and known goshawk areas to remain undisturbed by roads, timber, harvest, livestock grazing, fire suppression and vegetation treatments.”

“Standard s-9 allows for vegetation manipulation in nest stands after the nesting seasons. Such activities could destroy nesting habitat.”

Response: Depending upon the alternative, varying levels of vegetation management are allowed and prescribed in order to sustain and maintain goshawk habitat throughout the National Forests in Utah (see Chapters 2 and 4 of the EA). Where appropriate, scientific studies are referenced in the text. Vegetation management is used to mimic natural disturbances that have been altered due to the exclusion of fire, insect and disease epidemics, timber harvest, and livestock grazing, or a combination of these factors (EA page 1-3). Alternative E was developed to contain many of the components of a “biological reserve” in response to comments received during the scoping process, see EA pages 2-4 to 2-5, and 2-19.

Alternative E, the basis for development is described on page 2-19 of the EA, would achieve similar results by prohibiting any treatment in existing mature and old forest stands. As explained on page 2-9 of the EA, elimination of all management activities is outside the scope of this project and not consistent with the Forest Service mission to sustain the health and productivity and diversity of the land to meet the needs of present and future generations.

Goal 10 articulates the overall intent during this interim period to restore or maintain forested landscapes in a properly functioning condition to provide habitat for northern goshawk and its prey. Any activities proposed in nest areas outside the nesting season must consider the retention of nesting habitat (s-8, g-18, g-19 and g-20) and would be subject to site-specific analysis, with full public disclosure and opportunities to participate.

“Modify Alternative F by adding the following guidelines: g-1 which recognizes and provides for HRV including extreme events; g-6 which recognizes and provides for ecological scale vegetative structure; and g-13 which offers less restrictive canopy closure parameters that default to HRV.”

Response: As explained in Response 1.A.3., extreme events, like bark beetle outbreaks and stand replacement fire, could result in irreversible change and reduce species and structure diversity. Alternative B and E would allow extreme events (guideline g-1), while the other action alternatives would not. The effects are compared in Chapter 4 (pages 4-10 to 4-11). A summary and comparison of the effects is found in Chapter 2 (pages 2-22 to 2-26). In Alternative F, guideline g-15 replaced g-13 and allows for greater variability for the variety of habitats and conditions that exist around the PFA and foraging areas. Guideline g-6 was used as a starting point in the proposed

2.A.4. The use of scientific disagreements to generate alternatives is not appropriate and was not applied properly to adequately assess the effects of differing scientific approaches.

"The EA states it will incorporate the contradictory science in Alternative E, but does not discuss this science in relation to any of the other alternatives...each alternative in its own turn must be judged against the scientific evidence in the administrative record, information which has been presented to the Forest Service by the public during the scoping process."

"Alternative F is inconsistent because it only has one goal and one objective."

In Chapter 2 of the EA, pages 2-3 to 2-6 describe the issues used to generate alternatives, including the scientific disagreement with the Habitat Conservation Strategy. Alternative E was developed to disclose and compare the effects of applying a different scientific approach for goshawk management direction. Alternative C was developed to incorporate inconsistencies some scientists saw with how the HCS was applied in Alternative B (the original proposed action). Alternative D was developed to respond to the issue that not enough of the management direction was reflected from the original habitat assessment. These alternatives clearly represent other courses of action to be considered to resolve conflicts concerning uses of available resources and sharply define the issues to provide a clear basis of choice, as required by NEPA. The description of alternative development in Chapter 2 indicates on which scientific information each alternative is based, and the disclosure of effects in Chapter 4, especially related to goshawk habitat and abundance (pages 4-27 to 4-37) compare and contrast the different outcomes and effects of each alternative, making it clear how applying different scientific approaches varies among the alternatives considered.

Chapter 2 of the EA, page 2-20, explains why the long-term goals common to the other action alternatives were deleted from Alternative F and replaced with a single goal that focuses on short-term maintenance and restoration of optimum habitats. Table 2, on page 2-21 shows that only goal 10 and objective 1, described in full in Appendix A (page A-10) apply to Alternative F.

2.A.5. Many comments requested that new alternatives be considered. Often these new alternatives would add or delete certain standards and guidelines. An analysis of each of these proposed alternatives follows:

"Consider a new alternative (which would be a modified version of Alternative E) that includes the following points:

- s9) Goshawk Territories - All past, present, and future goshawk territories should be permanently protected regardless of whether they are occupied in any given year.*
- Older Forest Habitat - No logging should be permitted in the nest/PFA area regardless of whether it is an active or alternate nest – not enough is being done to protect older forest habitat.*
- Recruitment Nest/PFA - Recruitment nest/PFA areas should be established at 1.5 mile intervals across the entire landscape.*
- Cattle grazing is a well-documented threat to goshawk habitat and prey – it should be curtailed in all goshawk habitat.*
- Surveys - At a minimum, 2 years or more of goshawk surveys should be completed".*

Response: This proposal for a new alternative would be something like a combination of Alternatives D and E as currently described in the EA (pages 2-18 to 2-19), and would place the most restrictions on activities throughout all goshawk habitat areas, rather than just the active nest sites and post-fledgling areas (PFAs). In many respects this is similar to an early alternative considered but eliminated from detailed study that would reserve all roadless and undeveloped

4.C.4. *"The EA continues to be vague in regards to roads and their effect upon the northern goshawk and its prey species as well as off road vehicle use. Goshawks are disturbed by the presence of humans and their vehicles, roads provide that access, thus it is clear building roads for timber harvest and leaving existing roads open will not contribute to the goshawk's long-term viability."*

"FS road closure techniques have been shown to be less than effective in many separate independent tests."

Response: Uses of roads and trails by people may disturb nesting goshawks. As pointed out in Appendix A pages A-7 & 9 disturbance to goshawks while nesting will be kept at a minimum. Impacts will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and documented through the biological evaluation process. The EA addresses at a programmatic level the impacts of recreation use on goshawk habitat (pages 4-60 to 4-61). Situations as described in these comments need to be addressed on an individual (site-specific) basis. Work with local ranger district personnel to address enforcement problems and assess impacts of use of these sites on specific goshawk habitat will be most effective.

4.C.5. *"There is Federal 'Payment-in-lieu-of-taxes' available to communities who apply – it is worth making this availability known"*

"Layer the protection of HR 2868 on top of Alternative E and the preservation of habitat for northern goshawk is yet even more comprehensive."

Currently there is a bill before Congress (HR 2868) that would guarantee states and counties consistent compensation for federal lands instead of tying payments to a percent of revenues from timber sales, which is currently the case. This information, while of definite interest to local communities, was not used to evaluate alternatives because the bill has not passed yet. Using the language in HR 2868 would be considered speculative and outside the scope of this project. The effects on timber production are estimated to be less than a 1% change annually statewide for Alternative F.

Table 2 Respondents

Name	Organization
A. Robertson	
A.H. Loewenstein	
A.M. Richards	
Abigail Hagler	
Adam Burdick	
Adrienne Simonson	
Alan and Krista Binnie	
Alan Frank	
Alan L. White	
Alan Ladd	
Alan Locklear	
Albert Norcross	
Alex Mueller	
Alexander Turret	
Alia and Peter Scott	
Alice Goddard	
Allan V. Teasley	
Allen Swanson and Elizabeth Bunting	
Allen T. Decker	
Allison Jones	Wild Utah Project
Alvaro Rowe	
Alvin Finkelstein	
Amy Adshead	
Amy Hale	
Amy Silverthorn	
Amy Stevenson	
Andrea Smith, Ph D.	
Andy Robinson	
Angela Rasmusson	
Ann Carr	
Ann Siner	
Anne C. Britt	
Anne C. Scofield	
Anthony Horstman	
Anthony Stachorski	
Ariel Barfield	
Arifa Goodman	
Arlene E. Stevenson-Booth	

Name**Organization**

Armen Chakerian
Audrey Ingelsen
Ayelet Hines
B. Angelie
B. Beoleur
B.J. Hunt
Barbara Beaumont
Barbara C. Adler and John Nemerovski
Barbara Henner
Barbara Iverson
Barbara Sparks
Barbara Walrafen
Barrett and Sandy Edgar
Barrie K. Gilbert, Ph D.
Bartholomew Hobson
Ben Gardner
Ben Vigoda
Benjamin Hitz, Jr.
Betsy Semmens
Bette Reincke
Bettina Bickel
Betty Nordahl
Betty Slye
Beverley Lane
Beverly Cherner
Beverly Denney
Beverly Full
Beverly Nielsen Halkias
Bill and Diane Yanneck
Bill and Janice Brown
Bill and Marilyn Hopping
Bill Brown
Bill Copeland
Bill Demski
Billy B. and Betty J. Neubert
BK Burns
Blair McLaughlin
Bob and Melody Burns
Bob and Sue Kotz
Bob Kinghorn
Bob Tafanelli

Name**Organization**

Bobbie D. Becker	
Bonnie Hooser	
Boon Hughey	
Bradley M. Cale	
Brent Plater	
Bret Ashton	UP-Wasatch Technologies
Brian Cottam	Southern Utah Forest Products Association
Brian E. Hughes and C. Lavender Hughes	
Brian Wooldridge	
Brita J. Miller	
Bruce A. Hamilton	
Bruce and Canda Emmeluth	
Bruce Grubbs	
Bruce Kendall	
Bruce Moehlman	
Bruce Pendery	
Bruce Thompson	
Bruce Threlkheld	
Bryan Bird	Forest Conservation Council, Southwest Regional Office
Bryan Dixon	Bridgerland Audubon Society
Buzz Johnson	
Byron Anderson	
Byron Hayes	
C Mesling	
C. Barrett	
C. Duch	
C. Scott Bennett	
C. Thomas Read	
C. Walling	
C.D. Stout	
C.E. Violet	
C.H. Luther	
Cal Lash Jr.	
Canning	
Carin Rackham Ruiz (?)	
Carl Albrecht	Garkane Power Association Inc.
Carol Dillard	
Carol M. Browner	
Carol Owens	
Carol Schatt	
Caroline F. Anderson	

Name**Organization**

Carolyn and Bob Burns
Carolyn Cauner
Carolyn D. Chase and Chris Klein
Carolyn Goss
Carolyn Kobe
Caryl Williams Brown
Casey O'Brien
Catherine Goodrich
Cathy O'Leary and John Carey
Censor
Charisse and Walter Sydoriah
Charles Adams
Charles Bemis and Judith Bemis
Charles Conner
Charles Pezeshki
Charles R. Hummel
Charlie Kane
Chas Muller
Cheryl Houser
Chester A. Rowland
Chico Sumpf
Chip Miller
Choi-Wessells
Chris and Erica Wangsgard
Chris Fields
Chris Watson
Christa Chappell
Christine Curtis
Christine Karas
Christine L. McGuire
Christopher B. Mann
Christopher Calvert
Christopher Christie
Christopher L. Christie
Cindy Roper
Cindy Strutebaker
Claire Bradley Feder
Clara E. Peterson
Clark Smith
Claudia M. Whitnah
Clemens Titzck

Name**Organization**

Clint McKnight	
Clyde Alan Locklear	
Clyde Pax	
Cody L. Hill	
Cohen-Joppa	
Connie Seare	
Constantina Economou	
Cooper	
Cory Zimbleman	
Craig D. Jolly	
Craig Hagood	
Craig Kackskos	
Craig Lombard and Blythe Rusling	
Cress Bohnn, M.D.	
Cristen Conley	
Curt Bradley	
Curtis Coates / Eddy Jean Coates	
Cyndi Nelson and Scott Thorburn	
Cynthia Frank	
Cynthia Hyde/Thomssen	
D and J Sunquist	
D. Brandt	
D. Ortiz	
D. Wolpoff	
Dale Cisek	
Dale Craig	
Dale F. Pogorelski	
Dale Kasman	
Dale Massey	Uintah Basin Chapter, People for the USA
Dallas Hardison	
Dan Freeman	
Dan Gross	
Dan Hefferman	
Dan Miller	Logan Canyon Coalition
Dan Redwine	
Dan Steinberg	
Dane T. and Dani E. Hemmings	
Daniel Patterson	
Daniel Snyder	
Danny Ruppert	
Darren and Jessica Irwin	

Name	Organization
Darryl J. Robbins	
Darryl Robbins	
Daryl and Lisa Pritchard	
Dave Anderson, Monte C. Wilson, Jay Burton Levell,	Oak Creek Grazing Association
Dave Hall	
Dave Rich	
Dave Richmond	
Dave Robinson	
David A. Langebartel	
David and Beth Newton	Rabbit Trail Ranch
David and Sherry Osinga	
David and Sondra Hammack	
David Bertelsen	
David Biser	
David Bolger	
David F. Buchanan	
David F. Wright	
David Graham	
David J. Pengelley	
David Leavitt	
David M. Salman	
David McCaleb	
David McCargo	
David Negri	
David R. Genth	
David R. Swinebart	
David S. Haines	West USA Realty
David Ther	
David Van Buskirk	
Dayton Hooser	
Dayton R. Hooser	
Deanna Dyke	
Deborah Filipelli	
Deborah Riley	
Debra Kloss	
Debra Landau	
Debra McElroy	
Debra Patla	
Decot Hy-WYD	Sport Glasses, Inc.
Dena Thomas	
Denise Berringer-Wood	

Name**Organization**

Denise Boggs	
Dennis Holz	
Diana Cunningham	
Diane Brown	
Dick Carter	High Uintas Preservation Council
Dieter Erdmann	
Dirk Frauenfelder	
Domenico DiToro	
Don and Elizabeth Goertz	
Don and Sarah Marbach	
Don Fordney	
Don Muller	
Don Szekely	
Donald and Paige Francis	
Donald C. Bentley and Linda Holman Bentley	
Donald H. Gunther	
Donald J. Duerr & Jeff Kessler	Biodiversity Associates/Friends of the Bow
Donald L. Terry	
Donald Queen	
Donna Anderson	
Donna Palladino	
Dorian Dunlavy	
Dorothy Garten	
Dorothy O'Connell	
Doug Abbott	
Douglas Dietrich	
Douglas Holmgren	
Dr. and Mrs. David Poterc	
Dr. and Mrs. Dennis L. Coon	
Dr. and Mrs. James Gosman	
Dr. and Mrs. John L. Graham	
Dr. and Mrs. William Dantzler	
Dr. Arthur and Marisa Wall	
Dr. Diane W. Davidson	U of U - Biology Dept.
Dr. Edward R. Garrison	
Dr. Ernest Manuel	
Dr. Eugene I. Majerowicz	
Dr. Federico Mora	
Dr. Gary M. Heymann	
Dr. Gregory K. Penniston	
Dr. James Vernon Lewis	

Name	Organization
Dr. Justin Schmidt	
Dr. Margaret Powell	Powell Clinic, PC
Dr. Michael Ghiglieri	
Dr. Paul S. Leo	
Dr. W. Richard Hardy	
Dusty Mouie	
Dwight Ruthrauff	
Dylan Norton	
E. De Hoyos	
E.V.S. Claxton	
Ed Kirsten	
Ed Pushich	
Edith H. Jonas	
Edna H. Evans	
Edward Barengo	
Edward Franzblau	
Edward J. Hirsch	
Edward Reagan	
Edwin K. Swanson	
Edwin Silver	
Edythe Mattone	
Elaine Cohen	
Elaine Gorham	
Eleanor Inskip	
Elena Meyer	
Elisabeth Edlund	
Elise Asch and Aviva Kamin	
Elizabeth A. Drees	
Elizabeth Bouwens	
Elizabeth Culley	
Elizabeth Emery and Evan Wachs	
Elizabeth Fuller	
Ellen C. Bokde	
Ellen Dunscomb	
Ellen Gavitt	
Ellen Nelson	
Elsie A. W. Vezey	
Elton A. Ellisen	
Eric and Robyn Weber	
Eric Lundquist	American Motorcyclist Association
Eric Meyer and Sarah Snell, M.D.	

Name**Organization**

Eric Peterson	
Eric Smith	
Eric Wittenbech	
Erik George	
Erik Jonsson	
Ernest A. Dernburg, M.D.	
Ernest G. Endes	
Eugene Alu	
Eugene J. Krajewski	
Eugene Johansen	Emery Water Conservancy District
Eugene Monroe	
Evan Laughlin	
Eve Gate	
Evelyn R. Moran	Unit 2
Faver-Suttle	
Felicia B. May	
Fiona Hale	
Florence Bisanz	
Frances K. Greenleaf and Patrick Griego	
Francis E. Clark	
Frank Duffy	
Frank Kirschner	
Frank Worthington	
Fred Cagle	
Frederick and Pauline Balkwill	
Frederick Sawyer	
G. Billings	
G.E. Hollenbeck	
Gail Gapo	
Gail Goodman	
Gail Potts	
Gale Monson	
Gary Goodrich	Anglogold
Gary Hinman	
Gary L. Allen	
Gary L. Smith	
Gary Stogsdill	
Gary V. Christensen	
Gavin Noyes	
Gayle Castaneda	
Gene and Vivian Snow	

Name**Organization**

Gene Dilworth

George and Marilyn Berry

George L. Pauk, M.D.

George Larrabee

George Richardson

George Roether

Society of American Foresters, Wasatch Front Chapter

George Wyeth

Gerald Cichlar

Geri Murphy

Gillian Alshley

Giuliana O. Taylor

Glenn R. Stewart

Glenn Vargas

Gloria Schneider

Gordon H. Scribner

Grace H. Yoshizaki

Grant Heffelfinger

Greg Vines

Gregory Forbes

Greta Balderrama

Guy DeColte

Harry and Marta Stang

Harry L. Stevenson

Heather McPherson

Heinz and Leslie Strunk

Helen A. Polonitza

Helen Fairley

Helen Koenig

Helmut Groemer

Henry K. Pitts

Henry M. Lagergren

Herb Laeger

Herb McHarg

Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance

Herbert Weinberg

Hillary Oppmann

Holden Chase

Holly Finstrom

Howard E. Harrison

Howard S. Bremond

Howard Shuken

Hugh H. Phillips

Name**Organization**

Name	Organization
Hugh Rodgers and Regina Reed Rodgers	
Hugo H. Soll	
Ilene Celniker	
Ira W. Hatch	Emery County, Board of Commissioners
Irene A. Zappia, PhD	
Irene M. Slater	
Irene Terry and Bob Roemer	
Irista Azary and Roger Lee	
J. Michael Suarez	
J. Petterson	
J. Rhodes	
J. Rusciollelli	
J.C. Fraser	
J.E. Schweitzer	
J.H. Brooker	
J.J. Barrios	
J.M. Caruso	
J.W. Beardsley	
Jack and Alesue Bacasteu	
Jack and Cher Altersitz	
Jack Bartley	
Jack Gurewitz	
Jack Kloepfer	
Jack L. Carter	
Jackie Beck	
Jaden Rivers	
Jake Schepps	
James Biser	
James Clark	
James Crane	
James E. Ambrose, Jr.	
James E. Notestine	
James F. Hays	
James G. Jackson	
James J. Sampanes	
James M. Shea	
James Nelson	
James Peck	
James S. Ulverstad	
Jan Elster	
Jan McCreary	

Name**Organization**

Name	Organization
Jane Burnett	
Jane M. Pray	
Jane Martin	
Janet Cremin	
Janet Kackskos	
Janice Allen	
Janice E. Catt	
Janice Miano	
Jason Groenewold	
Jason Hammond	
Jason J. Anderson	
Jason Tamblyn	
Jay Gold	
Jean C. Ossorio	
Jean Hancock	
Jeanette A. Oreszak	
Jeanne Basta	
Jeanne Williams	
Jeannie Johnson	
Jeff Hogue	
Jeff Kargel	
Jeff Norman	
Jeff Smith and Denise Boggs	HawkWatch International, Utah Environmental Congress
Jeff Stone	
Jeffrey and Lisa Maxcy	
Jeffrey Cain	
Jeffrey L. Brake	
Jeffrey Michael Grubic	
Jeffrey P. Ronstadt	
Jehana Balzer	
Jene Jones	
Jennifer Brewer	
Jennifer LaMoureaux	
Jennifer Sampson	
Jerilyn Hirshberg	
Jerry and Ann Larsen	
Jerry Sue Thompson	
Jesse Wood	
Jim and Jan Bradley	
Jim and Linda Michael	
Jim and Mary Dale Deacon	

Name**Organization**

Jim Benenson	
Jim Light	
Jim Morehead	
Jim Morris	
Jim Otterstrom	
Jim Stoltz	
Jim Tress	West Land Resources
Joan Berde	Carson Forest Watch
Joan Mutchler	
Joan ORhoades	
Joan T. Butz	
Joan W. Montague	
Joanne K. Webber	
Joanne Odenthal	
Joanne S. Hershenhorn	
Joe Alcock	
Joe and Terry Chacko	
Joe Freedman	
John and Hermi Hiatt	
John and Liliana Ratmeyer	
John and Robin Baade	
John and Sue Alcock	
John C. Mueller	
John C. White	
John Carey	
John Carter	Willow Creek Ecology
John D. Isaaca	
John de Forest	
John Delventhal	
John Dukes	
John Ford	
John Golter	
John J. Oliver	
John Keeler	Utah Farm Bureau Federation
John L. Ritter	
John Long	
John M. Peterson	
John M. Wigren	
John Mackin	
John Mangimeli	White Sands National Monument
John Miranda	

Name**Organization**

John Nett	
John Northrop	
John P. and Lorilee McDowell	
John Patterson	
John R. Purbaugh	Manufacturers' Representatives
John R. Swanson	
John R. Welch	
John S. Jachna	
John T. Winter	
John Talberth	National Forest Protection Alliance
John Wahl	
John Watson	
John Wilson	
Joleen Bell	
Jon and Tracey Rowley	
Jonathan Proctor	
Jonathan S. Burnworth	
Jose Placer	
Josefina Alvarez	
Joseph Bail	
Joseph Ciaramitaro	
Joseph K. Skinner	
Joseph Petrofsky	
Joseph T. Masarone	
Joyce M. Coover	
Judith C. Nielsen Adams	
Judith G. Sugg	
Judith Watson	
Judy Asbury	
Judy Kean	
Julia A. Antaine	
Julia K. Hughes	
Julie Conels	
Julie Greenberg	
Julie Kutz	
June A. Smith	
June P. Payne	
K and M Houghtalling	
K. Davidson	
K. Frank Hogan	
K. P. Follett	

Name**Organization**

K. Roberts

K. Shelton

K. Vassar

Kahty A. Holen

Kahty Meier-Hockaday

Kaji andn Molly Sherpa

Karen Cohen

Karen Lowery

Karen M. Freeman

Karen Stucke

Karin E. Begg

Karl and Pat Oesch

Katherine Gilbert

Citizens for the Protection of Logan Canyon

Katherine Postelli

The Ecology Center, Inc.

Katherine W. Bueler and Gary Schiffmiller

Kathryn Lance

Kathryn Sky

Kathryn Wild, Ph.D.

Wild By Nature, Inc.

Kathy (Jo) Andersen

Andersen Coinman

Katie L. Lee

Kay Millar

Keesha M. Ashanti

Keith Hermann

Keith M. Jones

Satterwhite Log Homes

Keith R. Kaback

Keith Sonnier

Kelly Sheehan

Ken Fitch

Ken Gregg

Ken Maloney

Ken Richards

Ken Smith

Kendric C. Smith

Kenneth C. Jackimczyk, M.D.

Kenneth D. Johnsen

Kenneth Sizemore

Five County Association of Governments

Kenneth Weaver

Kenny and Sondra Langone

Kenny Roberts

Kent R. Petersen

Emery County, Board of Commissioners

Keran O'brien

Name**Organization**

Kerri and Matt McWenig	
Kerri Campbell	
Kevin Bunoy	EPIC
Kevin Dahl	
Kevin Mueller	
Kevin Shumway	
Kevin W. Rand, MD	
Kevin Weinert	
Kibbe Hearn	
Kieran Suckling	Center for Biological Diversity
Kim and Vic Flake	
Kimberly Burkland	
Kirsten Bovel	
Kris Schmidt	
Krissie Siegle	
Kristen R. Holmquist	
Kristin and Jack Wilson	
Kristin Gevekel	
Kristy M. Karschner	
Kurt Aronow	
L. Fadem	
L. Seese	Spes Dolphin
L. Vista Michael	
L. Wesley Ryon	
L.J. Cherow D.V.M	
Larissa Greco	
Larry and Nancy Zuiker	
Larry E. Hendrickson	
Larry Glover and Dorothy Beatty	
Larry Hughes	
Larry Langstaff	
Larry Meyer	
Larry Moss	
Larry Stevens	
Larry Walker	
Lauretta J. Gotte	
Laurie Nessel	
Laurie Wirt	
Lawrence Cormier	
Lawrence E. Stewart	
Lawrence R. Carlson	

Name**Organization**

Lea Shepperson	
Lee and Marilyn Athenour	
LeighAnn Davis	
Lenore Dowling	
Leon R. Deking	
Leona J. Lansing	
Leonard Juck	
Leonard L. Thomas	
Les Barclay	
Les W. Barclay	
Leslie Lund and Tony Lee Montoya	
Leslie Schipp	
Liisa Phillips	
Linda Crawford	
Linda Dills	
Linda K. Goodwin	
Linda Youlios	
Linda Z. Leblang	
Lisa Force	
Lisa Hastings	
Lisa K. Pritchard	
Lissa Adams	
Liz Cartmill	
Liz Wui	
Lloyd J. Perper	
Lois Bullock and Norman Carroll	Iron County Board of Commissioners and Kane County Board of Commission
Lois Hermann	
Lon Franson	Franson-Noble & Assoc., Inc.
Lorraine Zagula	
Lori Reger	
Louis King	Louis King Engr. Co.
Louise Fucile	
Louise Liston	Garfield County Commission
Lowell Baumunk	
Luke Mulligan	
Lumina Greenway	
Lyn Chenier	
Lynn E. Miller	
Lynn Jacobs	
M Jones	
M. B. Parisi	

Name**Organization**

M. Carlisle Ellis	
M. Dearden	
M. McGinnis	
M. S. Jones	
M. Thede	
M. Warden	
M. Whitson	
M.R. Rubenstein	
Madonna and Pablo Ortega	
Malcolm Sawyer	
Mandell Jensen	Satterwhite Log Homes
Marc W. LeGette	
Marc Zuch	
Marci L. Tebockhorst	
Marcia A. Phillips	
Marcie Colpas	
Mardelle Ulman	
Margaret H. Pettit	
Margaret Hadderman	
Margaret O'Neil	
Margaret Pope	
Margaret Ross	
Margaret Ryan Rackham	
Margaret Taylor	
Margrit A. Petrofsky	
Mariam G. Graham	
Marian Reisman	
Marianna S. Wells	
Marilyn Barrett, Ph.D.	
Marilyn C. Joaeva	
Marilyn Colyer	
Marilyn Dinger	
Marilyn L. Monroe	
Marion C. Shive	
Marisa M. Howe	
Marjorie J. Williams	
Mark A. Brown	
Mark and Donna Wilensky	
Mark and Gaye Belles and Family	
Mark Andrew Bartlett	
Mark Balitzer	

Name**Organization**

Mark Belles

Mark Floor

Mark Holdsworth

Mark Noethen

Mark P. Rich

Mark Prett and Karen Blumenthal

Mark Sherman

Mark Trainor

Mark Walsh

Utah Association of Counties

Mark Ziem

Marklyn A. Chee

The Navajo Nation, Historic Preservation Department

Marlin L. Golar

Marnie Gaede

Martha P. Davis

Martha Turnquist

Martin Levisch

Mary Ann Lewis

Mary C. Poore and Mark S. James

Mary E. Bradley

Mary Green

Mary Isabel Steele

Mary Jo Cox

Mary L. Valikai

Mary M. Koehn

Mary Martinez

Mary R. Duffield

Mary Ramstetter

Mary Sanchez

Mary Tillinghast

Mary V. Franklin

Mary Wolfe

Matthew and Johanna Wolford

Matthew Dodson

Matts Myhrman and Judy Knox

Megan A. Forsmark

Megan Murray

Melinda Bimberg

Melinda F. Irvin

Melissa C. Grimes

Mercedes Aggioner

Meredith A. Hartwell

Name**Organization**

Michael Andrews	
Michael Byrd	Riparian Ecologist- Usufruct, Inc.
Michael C. Harper	
Michael Carroll	
Michael Clarken	
Michael Cohen	
Michael Curto	
Michael Durgain	
Michael Earl M.D.	
Michael Haseltine	
Michael J. Dear	
Michael J. Meyer	
Michael J. Stock	
Michael J. Vandeman	
Michael K. Lucid	
Michael Kelly	
Michael Mills	
Michael Minky, C.P.A.	
Michael Nurre	
Michael Powers	
Michael R. Colbert	
Michael Reily	
Michael Weng	
Michelle Montaque Bruno	
Mike Rogala	
Mitch Elmore	
Mogi Hogle	
Molly and Gary Beverly	
Mr and Mrs Stan Schuster	
Mr. and Mrs. Braham Latch	
Mr. and Mrs. Chris Frey	
Mr. and Mrs. Don Zepp	
Mr. and Mrs. Gene Gustafson	
Mr. and Mrs. Harry Wilkinson	
Mr. and Mrs. J. L. deRoulhac	
Mr. and Mrs. Karl Vogel	
Mr. and Mrs. R.C. Burkholder	
Mr. and Mrs. Randall Welty	
Mr. and Mrs. Sol Resnick	
Mr. and Mrs. Vernon Reeves	
Mr. and Mrs. Yetman	

Name**Organization**

Mrs. Edward H. Calvert
Mrs. G. Vlassis
Nancy L. Arthur
Nancy Laplaca
Nancy Neyenhouse
Nancy Peterson
Nancy Phillips
Nancy R. Bogin
Naomi C. Franklin
Natalie and Douglas Danforsth
Natalie M. Tedford
Nathan James Baker
Nathan Wyeth
Nauze Whitley
Neale E. Smith
Ned Egen
Nick Rodin
Nicole Capretz
Nina Janik
Nina L. Bradley
Norma Scott
Norman H. Anderson
Norman Lewis
Norme White
Olive G. Mayer
Olive McKinney
Paler
Pam Uihlen
Pamela Ensign
Pamela K. Sutherland
Panina Ballen
Parker
Pasquale V. Scaturro
Pat Widder
Patricia Danser
Patrick Ciegan
Paul Crimmins
Paul Friesema
Paul Geisinger
Paul Griffin
Paul K. Kinter III

Environmental Policy Program, IPR

Name**Organization**

Paul Krehbiel
Paul Lindberg
Paul M. Skan
Paul McConnell
Paul Richards
Paula and Robert Brewer
Paula Bachman-Williams
Paula M. Kulina
Paula V. Stone
Peggy Jacobson
Perry R. Wilkes Jr.
Pete Skartvedt
Peter Axelrod
Peter Fuhrman
Peter J. Ware
Peter Kadrich
Peter Marcuse
Peter Richards
Peter Sinclair
Peter Swolak
Peter Tallman
Peter Zados
Phil Hebets
Phil Morgan
Phil Schaefer
Philip R. Merkle
Phillip Cook
Phillis Herbster
Phyllis Larrabee
Pierre Landau and Katya Peterson
Priscilla M. Mendoza
Priscilla Pattison
R and S Liebold
R. Ginger
R.F. Tindall-Gibson
R.K. Beckwith
Racheli Gai
Ralph and Dolores Baleil
Ralph Kraetsch
Ralph S. Martin
Ralph T. Irwin

Name**Organization**

Ramon Vaizmg

Ray Chandos

Rural Canyons Conservation Fund

Ray Limb

Gunnison City Corporation

Ray Sayre

Raymond D. Weeter

Raymond E. Grabber

Raymond Laufer

Raymond M. Loveless

Mountainland Association of Governments

Raymond R. Ziarno

Reed Hart

Remo DiCenso, M.D.

Rex Funk

Emery County Road Department

Rhoda Riley

Rich Besser and Shirley Russman

Richard and Janice Ulrich

Richard Baker

Richard Barrios

Richard C. McCord

Richard Diffenderfer

Richard Ditch

Richard H. Edel

Richard McCoy

Richard Nielson

Utah Cattleman's Assn.

Richard Noble and Jay Franson

Richard Parachini

Richard S. Simons

Richard Schmitt

Rick Sampson

Rik Peters

RJ Miller

Rob Cockran

Rob Feran

Robbey Evans

Robert A. Huebsch

Robert A. Johnstone

Robert A. Witzeman, M.D.

Robert and Alice Sickels

Robert Brister

Robert C. Johnston

Robert Clancy

Robert D. Ohmart

Name**Organization**

Name	Organization
Robert Dean	
Robert Frederiksen	
Robert House & Tom Twitchell	Stoltze Aspen Mills
Robert J. Calun	
Robert L. Ray	
Robert Lyday	
Robert M. Miller	
Robert Modica-Iv	
Robert Mossman	
Robert O. Cocke	
Robert O. Lorentzen	
Robert Spertus	
Robert W. Garrett	
Robin Laughlin	
Robin Smith	
Rod Chambers	
Roderic and Sybille Smith	
Rodger Silvers	
Roger Anyon	
Roger Bishop	
Roger Harmon	
Roger Robison	
Roland Stone	
Romeo and Thelma Corrales	
Ron and Sandie Sell	
Ron Anderson	
Ron Dinchak	Mesa Community College
Ron Tipton	
Ronald A. Pelech	
Ronald Anderson	
Ronald Kwilosz	
Rosana Guimaraes	
Rosemary Bolza	
Ross Coleman	
Roy Parker	
Russell	
Russell Gaines	
Russell Lowes	
Russelle Wallace	
Ruth and Bill Stamm	
Ruth B. Davis	

Name**Organization**

Ruth Bolen	
Ruth L. Eckert	
Ryan Stewart	
S. Bush	
S. Morris and R. Plattner	
S. Thomas	
S. Tsosie	
S.E. Carson	
S.L. Few	
S.V. Hitts, M.D.	
Sally Spencer	
Sandal English	
Sandra Hegman	
Sandy Berry	
Sandy Draus	
Sara and Jim Gibson, M.D.	
Sara Folger	Predator Conservation Alliance
Sara L. Morlan	
Sara Timsy	
Sarah B. Jayne	
Sarah J. Wallace	
Sarah Wyckoff	
Scott Brill	
Scott Clifford	
Scott Colburn	
Scott Dalebout	
Scott Goodrich	
Scott Highleyman	
Scott P. Anderson	
Shan Collins	
Shane Jimerfield	
Shannon Hoff	
Sharon Cardella	
Sharon Hotham	
Shayer	
Sheila Gershen	
Sherry and Dan Kline	
Sherry Harry	
Shirley A. DiCenso	
Shirley Berry	
Shirley Pearsons	

Name**Organization**

Shirley Turner	
Sig Stangeland	
Sophie Plassard and Scott Walton	
Stacy Thompson	
Stefan Fuegi	
Stefani and Dean Hines	
Stephanie Fauber	
Stephanie Nichols Young	
Stephen M. Miller, M.D.	West Winds Farm
Stephen O. Redacre	Jerome Humane Society
Stephen Steed	Utah Forest Products
Sterling Jordan	
Steve and Marla Karmesin	
Steve Barancik	
Steve Burndle	
Steve Erickson	
Steve Golston	
Steve Hartman	
Steve Martinek	
Steve Wheaton	
Steven B. Kjar	Sanpete County Assessor
Steven H. Snoey	
Steven N. Spearman	
Steven Russ	
Steven Shochat	
Steven Slaff	
Storm Sermay	
Stu Dalheim	
Stuart and Jeanne Klein	
Stuart Schulman	
Sue Galvin Macdonald	
Sue Katz	
Susan Barber	
Susan K. Valdivia	
Susan Lee Benson	
Susan North	
Susan Rivera	
Susan Waites	
Susan Wenberg	
Susannah Fiering	
Susannah Gallaway	

Name**Organization**

Name	Organization
Suzanne Artemieff	
Suzanne Higgins	
Sylvia Crisler	
T. F. Sae	
T.R. Weiner	
Tanya Sharon	
Ted Gartner	
Ted H. Myrick	
Ted Paulauskas	
Teri Morris, Glen Morris, Spencer Morris, Jana Ols	
Terra and Perry Crumpton	
The Reverend Paul E. Danielson, Jr.	
Thelma J. Slayton	
Theodore C. Mertig	
Theodre Guleserian	
Theresa M. Gregg	
Therese B. Meyer	
Thomas A. and Lani F. Drolet	
Thomas Abrams	
Thomas C. Evans	
Thomas H. Hay	
Thomas Slaback	
Tim Coleman	
Tim Compbell	
Tim Hogan	
Tim L. England	
Tim Lengerich	
Tim Loser	
Tim Mckimmie	
Tim W. Duffin	
Timothy J. Murphy	
Timothy J. Wernette	
Timothy McKenna	
Todd L. Kelly	Essential Oil Distribution
Todd L. Martin	
Tom Angelos	
Tom Bachtell	Summit County
Tom Evans	
Tom Fisher	
Tom Fitch	
Tom Hausam, M.D.	

Name**Organization**

Tom J. Hines	
Tom Miller	
Tom Peace	
Tom Ribe	
Tom Riesing	
Tom Shepherd	
Toni Francis	
Tracy N. Wilkinson	
Valeria Quintana	
Valerie Sparks	
Veronica Egar	
Vic DeFrancesco	
Vicki Miles	
Vicky Stone	
Vince Scheidt	
Virginia Burris	
Viviane Marquez	
Vivienne Caron Jake	Kaibab Paiute Tribe-Environmental Program
W. Odem	
W.F. Johnson	
Walter and Dorothy Pelech	
Walter Victor	
Ward, Killian, Ward, Ward, Jones, Ward, Ward, Jens	
Wayne and Marilyn Meinke	
Wayne Hafner	
Wayne Persons	
Webster D. Starling	
Wendy Brewer	
Wendy H. Walker	
Wesley C. Leonard	
Wesley H. Odell	
Willard H. Beattie	
William B. Heed	
William Bloch	
William Breed	
William C. Little	
William Chambers	
William D. and Elda C. Tumbow	
William E. Guse	
William Ellett	
William Fitzgibbon	

Name**Organization**

William Hurst

William L. Deneen

William Miller

William Nisbet

William Sheppard

William Whiteside

William Yaroch

Wilma A. Riley

Wm E. Lewis

Wolfe

Yarri Soteros

APPENDIX BB

The following corrections or clarifications are made to the EA:

Page 2-14:

The 2nd paragraph on page 2-14 is not clear where the direction adopted in this amendment would apply. The intent is that the direction applies in all goshawk habitat, except the exemption areas. “Exempted” is added to the first sentence in the 2nd paragraph so it reads,

“While the direction adopted in this amendment will only be applied when it does not conflict with the primary use of an *exempted* area”.

Page 3-27:

Paragraph 1: Ashley and Uinta NFs, sentence 3: reference should be USDA Forest Service 1997*b*.

Paragraph 2: Manti-LaSal NF, sentence 2: reference should be USDA Forest Service 1993*a*.

Page 4-57:

Bullet 2 in the middle of the page, procedures for permit modification should cite the Forest Service Handbook *FSH 2209.13, R4 Supplement* instead of FSM 2230.

Page A-7:

Examples of vegetative manipulation and a sentence has been added to standard s-9 to clarify that guideline g-21 applies to non-vegetative manipulation activities as follows:

(STANDARD) Prohibit forest vegetative manipulation (*timber harvest, prescribed burning, fuelwood, thinnings, weedings, etc.*) within active nest areas (approximately 30 acres; e.g-19) during the active nesting period. The active nesting period will normally occur between March 1st and September 30th. *For non-vegetative manipulation activities (such as road maintenance, oil and gas exploration, recreation sites, etc.), adjacent to a new nest site, or a new activity adjacent to an established nest, guideline g-21 applies.*

Some question was raised about what the term “restrict” means in guideline g-21 (also page A-7). For this definition, we go straight to Webster’s:

“restrict: to keep within limits, hold down, limit, confine.”

This is not the same as the language in the standard s-9 which prohibits. Guideline g-21 allows managers and biologists to assess individual situations and determine what restriction is necessary to avoid nest abandonment.

Page G-6 (Glossary):

There is some confusion as to how the term stand is applied in the document, therefore the following definition from the Principles of Silviculture by Daniel, Helms and Baker (1979) is added to the glossary. The definition of stand that was used in this analysis and assessment is as follows:

“Stands are usually the management units that make up a forest. A stand is a reasonably homogeneous unit that can be clearly differentiated from surrounding stands by its age, composition, structure, site quality, or geography. There is no precise area implied by stand, and size may change as management intensifies. In addition, a stand’s particular condition may be repeated many times within a forest.

Appendix B:

Three of the task sheets (m-3, m-4, m-5) in the EA were mislabeled. They were corrected as follows:

- Task Sheet for Monitoring Requirement m-3 is now m-4.
- Task Sheet for Monitoring Requirements m-4 is now m-5.
- Task Sheet for Monitoring Requirement m-5 is now m-3.

MANTI-LASAL FOREST PLAN AMENDMENT
Utah Northern Goshawk Project

The following conventions are used in this document:

Italicized print is text copied from the current Manti-LaSal Forest Plan.

Normal print is used for the amendment language.

(Guideline) and **(STANDARD)** labels are bold and italicized in the amendment language.

Pg. III-3

Protect, maintain, and/or improve habitat for threatened or endangered and sensitive plants and animals.

Restore or maintain forested landscapes in a properly functioning condition (PFC). Functioning forested landscapes provide habitat for the northern goshawk and its prey to support a viable population of goshawks in Utah.

Objective: For the remainder of the current planning period, prioritize treatment on at least 1000 acres where goshawk habitat areas are rated as high or optimum quality (per the process in Graham et al. 1999), and that are functioning-at-risk.

Implement treatments that will provide reasonable assurance that areas will not drop to low to moderate value.

Additional forest-wide direction follows that has been added to the Standards and Guidelines for the Wildlife, with cross-references to this amended direction other resource areas.

Pg. III-19

Mgt. Act. **GENERAL DIRECTION**
(A16) 02 *Act on special-use applications*
 according to the following
 priorities:

STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

c. Refer to the new **guideline q.** for issuing permits in goshawk habitat.

Pg. III-22

Mgt. Act.

GENERAL DIRECTION

STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

(C01) 04 *Maintain and/or improve habitat and habitat diversity for minimum viable populations of existing vertebrate wildlife species.*

a. *Manage at least 5 percent of forested areas in mature timber stands*

Refer to the new **Guideline e.** for management of mature and oldgrowth stands in goshawk habitat.

(C01) 06 *Provide for habitat needs of cavity nesting birds, raptors and small animals by:*

Refer to the new **Guideline f.** for snag direction in goswhawk habitat

(C01) 07 *Manage down timber to provide habitat for wildlife.*

Refer to the new **Guideline g.** for direction for down logs in goshawk habitat.

Pg. III-24

Mgt. Act.

GENERAL DIRECTION

STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

(D02) 03 *Manage livestock and wild herbivores forage use by implementing proper use criteria as established in the Allotment Management Plan.*

a. Refer to the new **Guideline v.** for grazing management analysis in goshawk habitat.

Pg. III-25

Mgt. Act.

GENERAL DIRECTION

STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

(E00) 02 *Provide for timber stand improvement, reforestation in sale area improvement plans, and wildlife habitat improvement.*

a. (4) *Generally include ponderosa pine, mixed conifer, aspen, and spruce fir types, and ararely oak or pinon-juniper.*

b. Refer to the new **STANDARD p.** for seasonal restrictions during goshawk active nesting periods.

Pg. III-26

Mgt. Act.

GENERAL DIRECTION

STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

(E03, 06, 01 AND 07) *01 Combine appropriate management activities for the timber type to provide the acceptable range of management intensity for timber production.*

a. Refer to the new **GUIDELINE h.** for vegetative treatments in goshawk post-fledgling and foraging areas.

pg. III-27

Mgt. Act.

GENERAL DIRECTION

STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

(E03, 06 and 07) 02 Silvicultural treatments will normally begin after the stand density index (SDI) reaches the lower management level and will be completed prior to reaching the upper management level.

c. *SC 84 plus 195 180 180 180 ----*

Refer to the new **Guideline e.** for management of mature and oldgrowth stands in goshawk habitat.

G. Limit the maximum size opening created by timber sales to 40 acres unless: (1) Approved by the Regional Forester after a 60 day public review period, or (2) Salvaging openings created by natural events such as fire, insect or disease attack, and wind throw.

a. Refer to the new **GUIDELINE t.** for maximum size of openings in goshawk habitat.

Pg. III-43

Mgt. Act.

GENERAL DIRECTION

STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

(P11 to 14) 01. Maintain fuel conditions which permit fire suppression forces to meet protection objectives for the Management Unit.

a. Reduce or otherwise treat fuels, or break up continuous fuel concentrations, or provide added protection for areas.

Refer to the new **Guideline g.** for down logs and coarse woody debris requirements in goshawk habitat.

MANAGEMENT
ACTIVITY

GENERAL
DIRECTION

STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

- (C01) 04 *Manage habitat of sensitive species to keep them from becoming threatened or endangered.*
- a. **(Guideline)** Management actions should be designed to encourage conditions that are within the historic range of variation (HRV) as defined by Regional or local properly functioning condition (PFC) assessments. PFC operates within the range of HRV where extreme events are not desired. Actions should remain within the variability of size, intensity, and frequency of native disturbance regimes characteristic of the subject landscape and ecological processes.
 - b. **(Guideline)** Within disturbed ecosystems, management actions should be designed to be consistent with restoration objectives.
 - c. **(Guideline)** Utilize native plant species from locally adapted seed sources in management activities when and where practical. Non-native plant species have the potential to cause systems to move outside of historic range of variation (HRV), therefore the use of non-native species should be justified to indicate how their use is important to maintain or restore a cover type to functioning conditions.
 - d. **(Guideline)** When initiating vegetative management treatments in forested cover types, provide for a full range of seral stages, by forested cover type, that achieve a mosaic of habitat conditions and diversity. Each seral stage should contain a strong representation of early seral tree species. Recruitment and sustainability of early seral tree species in the landscape is needed to maintain ecosystem resilience to perturbations.
 - e. **(Guideline)** Planned vegetative management treatments (excluding unplanned and unwanted wildland fire) in the mature and/or old structural groups in a landscape that is at or below the desired percentage of land area in mature and old structural stages (40% conifer, 30% aspen), should be designed to maintain or enhance the characteristics of these structural stages. Within these landscapes the percentage of land area in mature and old structural stages treated should not move out of the mature and old structural stage. Planned treatments may vary from this guideline if the action was assessed through the biological evaluation (BE) process, and the BE concluded that the action is consistent with the intent of the Conservation Strategy and Agreement for Management of the Northern Goshawk in Utah.

f. **(Guideline)** When initiating vegetative management treatments in forested cover types, leave the following minimum number and size of snags. If the minimum number of snags is unavailable, green trees should be substituted. If the minimum size is unavailable, then use largest trees available on site. It is desirable to have snags represented in all size classes above the minimum available on the site. The number of snags should be present at the stand level on average and, where they are available, distributed over each treated 100 acres. This distribution is needed to meet the needs of prey species that utilize this habitat.

COVER TYPE	MINIMUM SNAGS (PER 100 ACRES)	MINIMUM PREFERRED SIZE
Ponderosa Pine	200	18 Inch DBH <--> 30 Feet Tall
Mixed Conifer And Spruce/Fir	300	18 Inch DBH <--> 30 Feet Tall
Aspen	200	8 Inch DBH <--> 15 Feet Tall
Lodgepole And Aspen/Lodgepole	300	8 Inch DBH <--> 15 Feet Tall

g. **(Guideline)** When initiating vegetative management treatments, prescriptions should be designed to retain the following minimum amount and size of down logs and woody debris. These habitat components should be present at the stand level on average and, where they are available, distributed over each treated 10 acres. This distribution is needed to meet the needs of prey species that utilize this habitat.

COVER TYPE	Minimum Down Logs	Minimum Log Size	Minimum Coarse Woody Debris >= 3 inch diameter
	(per 10 acres) Down logs take precedence over tons of coarse woody debris	(Diameter <---> Length) (Mid-point diameter; or if minimum size not available, largest available on the site)	(Tons per 10 acres, inclusive of down logs)
Ponderosa Pine	30	12 inch <--> 8 feet	50
Mixed Conifer and Spruce/fir	50	12 inch <--> 8 feet	100
Aspen	50	6 inch <--> 8 feet	30
Lodgepole and Aspen/Lodgepole	50	8 inch <--> 8 feet	50

- h. **(Guideline)** - Vegetative treatments designed to maintain or promote a VSS 4, 5 and/or 6 group, the percent of the group acreage covered by clumps of trees with interlocking crowns should typically range from 40-70% in post-flegling and foraging areas, and 50-70% in nest areas. To manage outside this range, it should either be shown that the range is not within PFC for the site and the biological evaluation process determines that managing outside the range will be consistent with landscape needs of the goshawk and its prey. Use the best information available and deemed most reliable to make determinations. Groups are made up of multiple clumps of trees. Groups should be of a size and distribution in a landscape that is consistent with disturbance patterns defined in Regional or local proper functioning condition assessments (PFC). Clumps typically have 2 to 9 trees in the VSS 4, 5 or 6 size class with interlocking crowns.
- i. **(STANDARD)** Use the latest Regionally accepted Biological Prefield Research form (USFS Region 4) to determine the level of goshawk field survey(s) needed to complete the Biological Evaluation. Completion of this form is required to document where surveys are not required.
- j. **(STANDARD)** Where goshawk field surveys are required, complete surveys for territory occupancy within suitable habitat. Surveys will be completed during the nesting and/or post-fledgling period, and must be conducted at least one year prior to implementation of management actions.
- k. **(Guideline)** Where goshawk field surveys are required and when project planning permits, two consecutive years of surveys for territory occupancy prior to implementation of management actions is preferred.
- l. **(Guideline)** If a historic nest is not associated with an active nest area, management direction for home range habitat should be applied.
- m. **(STANDARD)** When an active nest area has been identified, identify 2 alternate nest areas and 3 replacement nest areas. The next two guidelines provide recommended direction for implementation of this standard.
- n. **(Guideline)** Each nest area (active, alternate and replacement) should be approximately 30 acres (total of approximately 180 acres) in size when sufficient suitable habitat exists. If sufficient amounts of suitable habitat are not present, use existing suitable habitat that is available.
- o. **(Guideline)** Alternate nest areas should be identified in suitable habitat with similar vegetative structures as the active nest areas. Replacement nest areas should be identified in habitat which will develop similar vegetative structures as the active nest area at the time the active and alternate nest areas are projected to no longer provide adequate nesting habitat.

- p. (**STANDARD**) Prohibit forest vegetative manipulation (timber harvest, prescribed burning, fuelwood, thinnings, weedings, etc.) within active nest areas (approximately 30 acres; i.e. **Guideline n.**) during the active nesting period. The active nesting period will normally occur between March 1st and September 30th. For non-vegetative manipulation activities (such as road maintenance, oil and gas exploratin, recretaion sites, etc.), adjacent to a new nest site, or a new activity adjacent to an established nest, **Guideline q.** applies.
- q. (**Guideline**) In active nest areas (approximately 30 acres; i.e. **Guideline n.**), restrict Forest Service management activities and human uses for which Forests issue permits during the active nesting period (does not include livestock permits) unless it is determined that the disturbance is not likely to result in nest abandonment. If the disturbance is likely to result in abandonment, a biological evaluation (BE) must be completed. To implement the action the BE must conclude that the action is consistent with the intent of the Conservation Strategy and Agreement for Management of the Northern Goshawk in Utah.
- r. (**Guideline**) Forest vegetative manipulation within active, alternate and replacement nest areas should be designed to maintain or improve desired nest area habitat. Use the active nest area habitat characteristics as an indicator of the desired nest area habitat, and as the best available information for nest area habitat for that cover type.
- s. (**Guideline**) Identify a Post-Fledgling Area (PFA) which encompasses the active, alternate and replacement nest areas and additional habitat needed to raise fledglings. A PFA should be approximately 420 acres in size (exclusive of nest area acres) when sufficient suitable habitat exists. If sufficient amounts of suitable habitat are not present, use existing suitable habitat that is available.
- t. (**Guideline**) Forest vegetative manipulation within the PFAs should be designed to maintain or improve the same habitat features as discussed for the goshawk home range (i.e., stand structure, snags, down logs, nest trees important in the life histories of the goshawk and its prey species common to the geographic location), except:
- a) Openings, as **defined in glossary and Reynolds et al.**, created as a result of mechanical vegetative treatments (**does not include wildland fire**) should not exceed the following by cover type:

Cover Type	Maximum Created Opening Size
Ponderosa Pine and Mixed Conifer	2 acres
Spruce/fir	1 acre
Aspen and Lodgepole pine	Follow current management direction
 - b) Management activities should be restricted during the active nesting period. The active nesting period will normally occur between March 1st and September 30th.
 - c) Where timber harvest is prescribed to achieve desired forest conditions, **plan the transportation system to minimize disturbance to the PFAs.** For example, small, permanent skid trails should be used in lieu of roads to minimize disturbance in goshawk PFAs. Variance may occur if it is determined that a combination of new permanent or temporary roads and permanent skid trails would result in less overall disturbance to PFA habitat.

- u. **(Guideline)** Through the landscape assessment process identify plant communities important to goshawk prey species that contain seed, mast, and foliage components that are important to these prey species.
- v. **(Guideline)** Where it is determined through the landscape assessment process that ungulate grazing is contributing to an identified functioning-at-risk condition relative to habitat needed to support goshawk and its prey, modify grazing practices to maintain or restore the desired seed, mast, and foliage production defined in the landscape assessment process. Review success of modifications annually. If modifications are not providing for the desired progression toward production objectives defined in the landscape assessment, modify practices through the next annual operating plan. This guideline does not apply to non-forest patches.
- w. **(Guideline)** To help determine opportunities for habitat maintenance or enhancement for goshawk and its prey, conduct landscape analyses at the 5th to 6th order HUC or equivalent ecological scale (10's to 100's of thousands of acres). These assessments provide information concerning resource conditions, risks, and opportunities in a systematic way, thereby enhancing the agency's ability to estimate direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of management actions that may affect habitat for the goshawk and its prey. With this information in hand, managers have a better opportunity to balance the needs of resources and humans and are less likely to negatively impact far-ranging species such as the northern goshawk or other species of concern. Essentially, actions are proposed within the context provided by the landscape assessment. As a minimum, landscape assessments should describe current status of resources, risks and opportunities (as discussed below) using the best information available locally at the time of the assessment.
 - *Status* is the condition of the resources relative to the historical condition. The historical condition should be depicted through the identification of the historic range of variation (HRV) for the resource attribute of interest (i.e., forest structure, composition, canopy closure), as defined in Regional or local properly functioning condition (PFC) assessments.
 - *Risk* should include both short- and long-term risks of adversely affecting the current condition of these resources (i.e., insect, disease, wildfire, human related development).
 - *Opportunities* are situations where either improvements in resource condition or a reduction in risk can be achieved in a landscape through some form of subsequent management decisions. These decisions will be made either through site-specific project decisions or future adjustments in land use plans, both of which include additional analysis and public involvement.

Landscape assessments are not necessary where the Forest or project interdisciplinary team determine that the intent of the assessment has been met through other analytical processes. Meeting the intent means that sufficient information exists concerning resource conditions and risks to understand the effects (direct, indirect, and cumulative) of a proposed site-specific project on goshawk habitat relative to the broader landscape context.

- x. (**STANDARD**) When non-vegetative management activities (for example: mineral & energy development, land exchanges, recreation facility development, ski resort construction, utility corridors, etc.) are proposed that would result in loss of suitable goshawk habitat, sufficient mitigation measures will be employed to insure an offset of the loss. The biological evaluation (BE) process will be used to document findings, recommend mitigation measures, and evaluate consistency with the intent of the Conservation Strategy and Agreement for Management of the Northern Goshawk in Utah
- y. (**Guideline**) To provide the greatest reduction in risk to loss of habitat needed to support goshawk populations across Utah, treat those acres rated as high or optimum value to goshawks and its prey that are at risk to dropping into the low or moderate value. Variance in this prioritization may occur when management objectives for goshawk habitat in concert with other resource needs, necessitate. In these cases, changes to the quality of goshawk habitat across a landscape should not impact meeting landscape habitat objectives for goshawk habitat quality, quantity and connectivity identified in the landscape assessment

Clarification of Desired Habitat Conditions for Prey Species

Especially related to ungulate grazing

Guideline g-28 gives direction to use the landscape assessment process to identify plant communities important to prey species that contain **seed, mast and foliage components** needed. Overall, the greatest variety of species that can produce seed and mast are associated with mid-seral stages. Guideline g-29, then, directs that these components be maintained or restored. *The intent is to have utilization levels of grasses and forbs that maintain native foods and cover for prey species.*

Further components of desired habitat conditions for prey species from Reynolds' work, and the guidelines that address these components, include:

1. **Snags** for woodpecker feeding and nesting, mammal nests, & bird perches (g-9)
2. **Downed logs** for cover, feeding and nesting for a variety of prey (g-11)
3. **Woody debris** to provide cover and feeding for a variety of vertebrates (g-11)
4. **Openings** for food and cover (g-25 for PFAs)
5. **Large trees** for nesting, denning, feeding, roosting, cone production and hunting perches (g-15)
6. **Interspersion** (intermixing) of vegetative structures (g-7 & g-15)
7. Promotion of **aspen regeneration** (g-5) and growth of **native grasses** (g-4).

Herbaceous shrubs and intact forest soils, with emphasis on organic surface layers with natural turnover rates, are other identified components of desired habitat conditions for prey species that are not specifically included in the guidelines.

The direction in g-28 and g-29 is that, as part of the landscape assessment process and as grazing allotments are updated, all of these components be evaluated toward achievement of desired habitat conditions for prey species. Appropriate courses of action, such as a change in pasture rotation, shorter seasons of use, or reductions in numbers of livestock, would then be determined at the site-specific level. Additionally, if wild ungulate grazing is determined to be part of the problem, immediate contact with UDWR would be made for resolution

MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

ID	Goals & Obj.	Standards & Guidelines	Question	Item to Measure	Acceptable Range	Measurement Frequency	Report Frequency
m- 1	G-10	all under the alternative goal	Are known goshawk territories on national forests remaining occupied?	Goshawk territory occupancy at the forest level.	Less than 20% decline in territory occupancy over a 3 year period.	Annually	Every 3 years
m- 2	G-10	s-9 G-21	Are mitigation measures (standards and guidelines) employed during vegetative management project implementation sufficient to prevent territory abandonment?	Goshawk territory occupancy following vegetative management treatments.	No territory abandonment on projects where mitigation measures are used.	The first full breeding period following activity in all projects where pre-project surveys determined territory occupancy.	annually
m- 3	G-10	g-7	Is habitat connectivity, as represented by structural and species diversity and dispersion thereof, within and among 5th to 6th order watersheds (or equivalent ecological scale) being maintained?	Spatial dispersion and patch size of mature and old forest groups within a 5th to 6th order watershed. Tree species composition mix within mature and old groups within a landscape.	Approximately 40% of the coniferous and/or 30% of the aspen forested acres within a landscape are in VSS 5 and 6 classes. Seral species characteristic of the cover type are well represented in VSS 5 and 6 classes.	Completion of each landscape assessment	Every 5 years
m- 4	G-10	g-9	Is snag habitat (i.e., number and size of snags) being maintained in desired spatial arrangement?	Snag densities and sizes within a 100 acre block treated by mechanical or wildland fire use.	75% or more of the blocks measured meet guideline requirements.	10% or more of the acres treated within a project area, within 2 years following completion of the vegetative treatment.	Every 5 years
m- 5	G-10	g-11	Are down woody material and logs being maintained in sufficient amounts, sizes and spatial locations?	Down log and woody debris amounts and sizes within a 10 acre block treated by mechanical or wildland fire use.	75% or more of the blocks measured meet guideline requirements.	5% or more of the acres treated within a project area, within 2 years following completion of the vegetative treatment.	Every 5 years
m- 7	G-10	g-28 g-29	Are appropriate adjustments made to grazing practices in identified "at-risk" locations where grazing is contributing to the "at-risk" condition?	Ungulate grazing practices (i.e.- utilization, season of use, grazing system) in identified "at-risk" locations.	Grass, forb, and shrub production objectives are within the range identified in landscape assessments.	Grazing practices reviewed annually on at least 2 allotments where "at-risk" conditions have been identified.	Every 5 years

Monitoring Exhibits

The following task sheets are Exhibits to help during implementation for each monitoring requirement. Changes to these task sheets will not require a Forest Plan Amendment.

Task Sheet m-6 is intentionally missing because it doesn't apply to the selected alternative.

Task Sheet for Monitoring Requirement "m-1"

Goal/DFC: 10 _____ Restore or maintain forested landscapes in a properly functioning condition (PFC).
Objective: _____
Standard: _____
Monitoring purpose: Track trends in goshawk territory occupancy across the state.
Question(s): Are known goshawk territories on the NFS lands remaining occupied?
Monitoring item: Territory Occupancy- a territory is occupied if evidence of use is present; nesting does not need to be documented.
Range of acceptable results: Less than 20% decline in territory occupancy over a 3 year period on a National Forest.
Reliability: moderate Precision: high

Collection of Information

Who collects: Forest or District Biologist; or Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (partners) (district, research, co-op, etc.)
Method of collection: Most current Regional Protocol for field and data collection. (specific)
Time and frequency of collection: Annual. 50% of known territories or all if less than 20
Source of data (field, research, data base, etc.): field
Cost of collections: \$300/nest

Analysis/Evaluation of Findings

Who conducts: Forest Biologist and UDWR
Method of analysis: Statistical analysis by UDWR of trends in occupancy across Utah. Forest tabulation of findings annually.
Results:
Within range of acceptable results: Y N
Monitoring purpose achieved: Y N
Further monitoring required: Y N
Recommended actions: Y N
Recommended actions implemented: (Date)
Cost of A/E: \$300
Total cost of monitoring: \$300/nest plus \$300 for analysis

Report of Findings

Information to be reported: Trend in occupancy by forest and all forests in Utah
Frequency of report: every 3 years
Method of reporting: Written summary of results for Forest Monitoring Report, forest and state database.
Target audience for report: Agency biologists and leadership teams

Task Sheet for Monitoring Requirement "m-2"

Goal/DFC: 10 _____ Restore or maintain forested landscapes in a properly functioning condition (PFC).
Objective: _____
Standard: _____
Guideline g-21 _____ Restrict management activities within PFA during active nesting period.
Monitoring purpose: To determine if guidelines are being implemented and are effective.
Question(s): Are mitigation measures employed during vegetative management projects sufficient to prevent territory abandonment?
Monitoring item: Territory Occupancy surveys of active territories, after activity.
Range of acceptable results: No territory abandonment.
Reliability: moderate Precision: High

Collection of Information

Who collects: District or Forest Biologist or Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (partners) (district, research, co-op, etc.)
Method of collection: Most current regional protocol for territory surveys for field survey and data collection. All active territories where treatments occur.
(specific)
Time and frequency of collection: First full season after treatment
Source of data (field, research, data base, etc.): Field
Cost of collections: \$300/nest

Analysis/Evaluation of Findings

Who conducts: Forest Biologist
Method of analysis: Presence or absence

Results:

Within range of acceptable results: Y N
Monitoring purpose achieved: Y N
Further monitoring required: Y N
Recommended actions: Y N
Recommended actions implemented: (Date) _____
Cost of A/E: N/A
Total cost of monitoring: \$300/nest

Report of Findings

Information to be reported: Were measures sufficient to maintain occupancy of territory.
Frequency of report: Annual
Method of reporting: Written summary and nest database
Target audience for report: Forest and District leadership teams

Task Sheet for Monitoring Requirement "m-3"

Goal/DFC: 10 _____ Restore or maintain forested landscapes in a properly functioning condition (PFC).
 Standard: _____
 Guideline: g-5 _____ ...provide for a full range of seral species...
g-7 _____ ...treatments in mature/old VSS in landscapes that are at or below desired amount should be designed to maintain or enhance these VSS...

Monitoring purpose:

Question(s): Is habitat connectivity, as represented by structural and species diversity and dispersion thereof, within 5th and 6th order watersheds (or equivalent ecological scale) being maintained?

Monitoring item: Percent of coniferous forest and aspen forest in mature and old stages, distribution of mature and old, and representation of early seral species.

Range of acceptable results: At least 40% of the coniferous and/or 30% of the aspen forested acres within a landscape are mature and old classes. Mature and old structures are distributed across the landscape in patterns that are representative of HRV (as defined by PFC alt. C,D and F). In Alternative E, no reduction in mature and old forests. Seral species characteristic of the landscape are well represented.

Reliability: Moderate Precision: Moderate

Collection of Information

Who collects: Interdisciplinary Team (district, research, co-op etc.)

Method of collection: GIS, aerial photography, forest inventory data, surveys

Time and frequency of collection: Whenever landscape assessments are implemented

Source of data (field, research, data base, etc.): Data base, local knowledge

Cost of collections: Highly variable depending on current data base and size of landscape, costs would be part of the landscape assessment process.

Analysis/Evaluation of Findings

Who conducts: Interdisciplinary Team

Method of analysis: Comparison of data to desired conditions.

Results:

Within range of acceptable results: Y N

Monitoring purpose achieved: Y N

Further monitoring required: Y N

Recommended actions: Y N

Recommended actions implemented: (Date) _____

Cost of A/E: Highly variable depending on current data base and size of landscape, costs would be part of the Landscape assessment process.

Total cost of monitoring: Highly variable depending on current data base and size of landscape, costs would be part of the Landscape assessment process.

Report of Findings

Information to be reported: Degree of successful attainment of objective.

Frequency of report: Every 5 years

Method of reporting: Landscape Assessment Document

Target audience for report: Forest & Regional Office

Task Sheet for Monitoring Requirement "m-4"

Goal/DFC: 10 _____ Restore or maintain forested landscapes in a properly functioning condition (PFC).
Objective: _____
Standard: _____
Guideline: g-9 _____ When initiating vegetative treatments in forested cover types, leave the following minimum number and size of snags.
Monitoring purpose:
Question(s): Is snag habitat (number and size of snags) being maintained in desired spatial arrangement?
Monitoring item: Number and size of snags per 100 acres within vegetation treatment areas.
Range of acceptable results: At least 75% of the measured blocks meet objectives.
Reliability: High Precision: High

Collection of Information

Who collects: Stand Examination Crew or Biological Technician
(district, research, co-op, etc.)
Method of collection: Field plots, preferably collected during otherwise scheduled post-treatment examinations.
(specific)
Time and frequency of collection: Once, within 2 years of completion of veg. treatment. 10% of project acres.
Source of data (field, research, data base, etc.): Field Data
Cost of collections: \$100-500 per 100 acres

Analysis/Evaluation of Findings

Who conducts: Silviculturist and Biologist (Forest or District level)
Method of analysis: Comparison of measured data to desired conditions.

Results:

Within range of acceptable results: Y N
Monitoring purpose achieved: Y N
Further monitoring required: Y N
Recommended actions: Y N
Recommended actions implemented: (Date) _____
Cost of A/E: \$250
Total cost of monitoring: \$250 + \$100-500 per 100 acres.

Report of Findings

Information to be reported: Degree of successful attainment of objective.
Frequency of report: Every 5 years
Method of reporting: 5-year Monitoring Report for Forest
Target audience for report: General & Regional Office

Task Sheet for Monitoring Requirement "m-5"

Goal/DFC: 6 Management of forest vegetation to promote adequate
 Alt F 10 Restore or maintain forested landscapes in a properly
 functioning condition (PFC).
 Objective: _____
 Standard: _____
 Guidelines 11 When initiating vegetative management treatments,
 prescriptions should be designed to leave the following
 minimum number of down logs and woody debris.

Monitoring purpose:

Question(s): Are down woody debris and logs being maintained in sufficient amounts, sizes and spatial location?

Monitoring item: Numbers and size of down logs, tons of down woody debris.

Range of acceptable results: At least 75% of the measured blocks meet objectives.

Reliability: High Precision: High

Collection of Information

Who collects: Stand Examination Crew or Biological Technician
 (district, research, co-op, etc.)

Method of collection: Field plots, preferably collected during otherwise scheduled post-treatment examinations.
 (specific)

Time and frequency of collection: Once, within 2 years of completion of veg. treatment. 5% of project acres.

Source of data (field, research, data base, etc.): Field Data

Cost of collections: \$5-10 per 10 acres

Analysis/Evaluation of Findings

Who conducts: Silviculturist and Biologist (District or Forest level)

Method of analysis: Comparison of measured data to desired conditions.

Results:

Within range of acceptable results: Y N

Monitoring purpose achieved: Y N

Further monitoring required: Y N

Recommended actions: Y N

Recommended actions implemented: (Date)

Cost of A/E: \$250

Total cost of monitoring: \$250 + \$5-10 per 10 acres.

Report of Findings

Information to be reported: Degree of successful attainment of objective.

Frequency of report: Every 5 years

Method of reporting: 5-year Monitoring Report for Forest

Target audience for report: General & Regional Office

Task Sheet for Monitoring Requirement "m-7"

Goal/DFC: 10 _____ Restore or maintain forested landscapes in a properly functioning condition (PFC).
Objective: _____
Standard: _____
Guideline g-28 & g-29 _____ Management of grass, forb and shrub vegetation within forested cover types to promote adequate production of forage, mast and seed for goshawk prey species.

Monitoring purpose:
Question(s): Are appropriate adjustments made to grazing practices in identified "at-risk" locations where grazing is contributing to the "at-risk" condition?
Monitoring item: Ungulate grazing practices in identified at-risk locations.

Range of acceptable results: Results are within acceptable bounds as identified in the landscape assessment.
Reliability: Moderate Precision: Moderate

Collection of Information

Who collects: Rangeland Specialist
(district, research, co-op, etc.)
Method of collection: Field inspection; ocular to actual measurement depending on factor addressed.
Time and frequency of collection: Annually in allotments where "at-risk" conditions have been identified; however, no more than 2 per forest required per year.
Source of data (field, research, data base, etc.): Field data
Cost of collections: \$250 to \$3500 per allotment depending on element being measured.

Analysis/Evaluation of Findings

Who conducts: Rangeland Specialist
Method of analysis: Comparison of data to desired conditions.

Results:

Within range of acceptable results: Y N
Monitoring purpose achieved: Y N
Further monitoring required: Y N
Recommended actions: Y N
Recommended actions implemented: (Date) _____
Cost of A/E: \$50 per allotment measured.
Total cost of monitoring: \$150 to \$3550 per allotment depending on element being measured; \$300 to \$7100 per national forest.

Report of Findings

Information to be reported: Degree of successful attainment of objective.
Frequency of report: Every 5 years
Method of reporting: Allotment inspection forms / records.
Target audience for report: Forest & Regional Office