

Output 1: LaVA Pre-treatment Checklist

Project: East Kenneday Focus Area		District: Brush Creek-Hayden Ranger District
Partnership Project: Yes	Primary Partner(s): Wyoming State Forestry Division, Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Mule Deer Foundation	
Project Objective(s): #1 mitigate hazardous fuels; #2 provide for recovery of forest products; #3 enhance forest and rangeland resiliency to future insect and disease infestations; #4 protect infrastructure; #5 restore wildlife habitat; #6 enhance access for forest visitors and permittees; and #7 provide for human safety		
Accounting Unit: Bow Kettle	Accounting Unit: Cedar Brush	
Project Description and Location: Treatment areas are located generally east of Kenneday Peak on the north end of the Snowy Range; in portions of Townships 17 and 18 North, Ranges 79, 80, and 81 West, 6 th P.M., Carbon County, Wyoming (Figure 1); in Forest Plan Management Areas 2.1 (Special Interest Areas), 3.31 (Backcountry Recreation, Year-round Motorized), and 5.15 (Forest Products, Ecological Maintenance, and Restoration Considering the Historic Range of Variability); and partially in the Forest and Rangeland Resiliency and Forest Products Treatment Opportunity Area (TOA), the Recreation Emphasis (No Temporary Roads) TOA, the Special Emphasis (Limited Suite of Tools) TOA, and the Fuels Treatment and Safety Emphasis TOA.		
Data File Location(s): T:\FS\NFS\MBRTB\Project\LaVA_Implementation\GIS\East Kenneday\Data\1_PreTreatment		

Project Description (narrative):

Four preliminary treatments have been identified in the East Kenneday Focus Area. Many of the preliminary treatment units have not been reviewed in detail on the ground and are likely to change based on site-specific resource surveys, application of the design features and standard operating procedures identified in Appendix A, public and Cooperator feedback, and other factors.

Several areas of potential cross-boundary treatments have been identified. The Cooperators, other state and federal agencies, or private landowners will develop and implement these treatments, which are outside of the LaVA analysis but complementary to LaVA objectives (for example, aspen enhancement or fuels reduction). Depending on the implementation tool, some LaVA and cross-boundary treatments could be combined (for example, in a Good Neighbor Authority agreement) for efficiency.

Preliminary Treatments

Forest Products

Approximately 1,861 acres of treatments designed to produce commercial forest products and meet objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7. Harvest prescriptions may include clearcutting, overstory removal, or similar stand initiation treatment options. Within the preliminary treatment areas, about 240 acres of harvest units have already been field-validated. Temporary roads will likely be needed to access many of the harvest units.

Fuels

Approximately 2,809 acres of treatments designed to reduce or modify fuels and meet objectives 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7. Activities may include thinning, mastication, prescribed burning, or other treatments. Recovery of forest products is not anticipated; however, commercial thinning will be considered if appropriate. The use of temporary roads is possible.

Pre-commercial Thinning (PCT)

Approximately 26 acres of treatments designed to improve the health of younger conifer stands and meet objectives 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7. Additional areas of PCT will likely be identified during field validation. Activities could include hand or mechanical thinning. A secondary objective will be reduction of hazardous fuels. Recovery of forest products is not anticipated. Temporary roads will not be used.

Wildlife (Aspen Enhancement)

Approximately 799 acres of treatments designed to enhance the long-term health of aspen stands and meet objectives 1, 3, 5, 6 and 7. Activities could include removal of conifers encroaching on aspen stands, aspen cutting, or other treatments. Activities will be further refined during field validation. Recovery of commercial forest products is not anticipated but will be considered if appropriate. The use of temporary roads is possible.

Output 1: LaVA Pre-Treatment Checklist: East Kenneday Focus Area

For all “yes” answers below provide documentation on the next page.

YES	NO	Issue:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The treatment has the potential to affect long-term stream health. (If yes, go to Decision Trigger 1).
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed treatment includes treatments meant to maintain or improve wildlife habitat. (If yes, go to Decision Trigger 2).
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The proposed treatment has the potential to alter wildlife security areas. (If yes, go to Decision Trigger 3).
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed treatment occurs within a Lynx Analysis Unit or Linkage Corridor. (If yes, go to Decision Triggers 4 thru 9).
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This treatment will utilize temporary roads to access treatment areas. (If yes, go to Decision Trigger 10 and 11).
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The treatment has the potential to affect public access. (If yes, go to Decision Triggers 13 and 14).
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The treatment was brought forward or is primarily funded through a partnership source.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Do any “yes” answers above result in a Yellow-Light Trigger?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Do any “yes” answers above result in a Red-Light Trigger?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is it likely that the proposed treatment will result in a deviation from any Forest Plan Guideline? (If yes, elaborate on the next page)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does the proposed treatment impact the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail or a Wild and Scenic River? (If yes, describe length of trail/river affected, type of effects, and duration of effects on next page).
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on the proposed treatment, further Design Features are anticipated. (If yes, elaborate on next page).

Describe any Issues or Triggers from Page 2:

Following is an assessment of the preliminary treatments in relation to the Appendix A triggers. The analysis will be updated prior to completion of Implementation Checklists, once the treatment units are field validated.

Trigger 1

Pre-project Equivalent Clearcut Area (ECA) in HUC7 watersheds in the focus area range from 1% to 19%, under the 25% threshold for a yellow-light trigger. If all preliminary treatments were implemented, the ECA in three watersheds would increase to above the 25% threshold for a yellow-light trigger, including East Fk Pass Ck: HUC7 10180002110102 (40%), Finn Ck: HUC7 10180002110106 (27%), and Little Pass Ck: HUC7 10180002110203 (33%).

Final treatment acres are likely to be reduced by 25% to 50% during field validation. The current expectation is that the reduction in acres during field validation would limit ECA to below 25% in the Finn Ck watershed, possibly in the Little Pass Ck watershed, but possibly not in the East Fk Pass Ck watershed.

If analysis of the validated treatment units indicates ECA would increase above 25% in any watershed, treatments would need to be modified to limit cumulative ECA in that watershed to no more than 25%. Alternately, watershed information would need to be validated and a stream health assessment may need to be conducted. If a stream health assessment were to indicate a moderate or high potential for a long-term change to a lower stream health class (red-light trigger), treatments would be modified as needed to avoid this risk following the options described in Appendix A. Additional design features may be developed to improve watershed condition.

Trigger 2

One of the preliminary treatments (Wildlife – Aspen Enhancement) was designed specifically to maintain or improve wildlife habitats, although some benefits to wildlife habitat are expected from the other treatments as well. This treatment represents about 15% of the total treatments in the focus area and will contribute to achievement of the desired condition for this trigger.

Trigger 3

This trigger will not be affected because no preliminary treatments are planned in wildlife security areas.

Triggers 4-9

There are two Lynx Analysis Units (LAUs) in the focus area: Brush Creeks and Kettle Ponds. Both LAUs have relatively low percent unsuitable habitats (10.9 and 15.0%, respectively). At present, there are 4,622 acres of suitable lynx habitat available for conversion under the yellow-light threshold (Trigger #4) in the Brush Creeks LAU, but only 455 acres of preliminary treatments in suitable habitats. Similarly, there are 4,490 acres of suitable lynx habitat available for conversion in the Kettle Ponds LAU, compared with 2,989 acres of preliminary treatments. The precise amount of lynx habitat that would be converted to unsuitable is currently unknown and will not be known until treatment units and prescriptions are finalized. If all preliminary treatments in suitable lynx habitat were implemented, the proportion of unsuitable habitat in the Brush Creeks and Kettle Ponds LAUs would increase to 12.0% and 23.0%, respectively, and would remain below the threshold for the yellow-light trigger.

WUI exemptions to Standards VEG S1 or VEG S2 (Trigger #5) will not be used for the preliminary treatments.

A relatively small proportion of suitable habitat has been converted to unsuitable in the Brush Creeks (0.9%) and Kettle Ponds (0.4%) LAUs in the past 10 years (Trigger #6). At present, there are 4,530 acres of suitable lynx habitat available for conversion under the yellow-light trigger threshold in the Brush Creeks LAU in the next decade, compared with 455 acres of total proposed treatments in suitable habitat. Similarly, there are 4,610 acres of suitable lynx habitat available for conversion in the Kettle Ponds LAU in the next decade, compared with 3,720 acres of total proposed treatments in suitable habitat. The amount of habitat that would be converted is currently unknown and would not be known until treatment units and prescriptions are finalized; however, even if all proposed treatments in suitable lynx habitat were implemented, the amount of conversion would remain below the threshold for the yellow-light trigger.

PCT is not proposed in suitable lynx habitat in the East Kenneday focus area. The 1% exemption to Standard VEG S5 (Trigger #7) will not be used for the proposed treatments.

WUI exemptions to Standards VEG S1, VEG S2, VEG S5, and VEG S6 (Trigger #8) will not be used for the proposed treatments.

The use of other exceptions to the SRLA standards (Trigger #9) is unknown but is expected to be a small fraction of the 2,314 acres available under the yellow-light trigger.

Triggers 10 and 11

The use of temporary roads is expected, but currently unknown for forest products units, but not for other treatment types. The use and rehabilitation of temporary roads is expected to be well within the limits for yellow-light triggers.

Trigger 13 and 14

Public access will not be affected in the long-term. Minor, short-term restrictions on some routes may be needed to protect public safety during active treatment operations.

Other Supplemental Information

At this point in the Appendix A process, the need for additional design features is unknown. Additional design features may be needed to address ECA concerns, lynx habitat, or other issues that arise when the preliminary treatments are field validated. Additional design features, if any, will be added during preparation of the Implementation Checklist(s).

District Ranger Approval/Review

District Ranger signature confirms all appropriate documentation for necessary pre-implementation items is attached and the treatment planning can proceed.

Approved By (District Ranger): [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Signature and Date: