Output 1: LaVA Pre-treatment Checklist

Project: Mullen Fire Roadside Hazard Tree Focus Area			District: Brush Creek-Hayden and Laramie Ranger Districts			
Partnership Project: Yes	Primar	Primary Partner(s): Wyoming State Forestry Division				
Project Objective(s): #1 mitigate hazardous fuels; #3 enhance forest and rangeland resiliency to future insect and disease infestations; #4 protect infrastructure; #6 enhance access for forest visitors and permittees; and #7 provide for human safety						
Accounting Unit: Fox Wood		Accounting Unit: French Douglas				
Accounting Unit: North Corner		Accounting Unit: Owen Sheep				
Accounting Unit: Pelton Platte		Accounting Unit: West French				
Project Description and Location: Implementation will take place within the Mullen Fire perimeter; in portions of Township 12 North, Ranges 78-80 West; Township 13 North, Ranges 77-81 West, Township 14 North, Ranges 77-81 West, and Township 15 North, Ranges 79-81 West; 6 th P.M., Carbon County, Wyoming (Figure 1).						
Data File Location(s):						

T:\FS\NFS\MBRTB\Project\LaVA_Implementation\GIS\Mullen\Data\1_PreTreatment

Project Description (narrative):

The Mullen Fire Roadside Hazard Tree Project (project) is designed to systematically remove potential roadside hazard trees within the footprint of the 2020 Mullen Fire, within the framework of the LaVA Record of Decision, and using the process, design features, and standard operating procedures in Appendix A.

A focus area for the project was defined that covers about 94,833 acres and includes part or all of 12 previously defined LaVA focus areas. Additional treatments are likely to be planned in the future; however, the immediate need to protect infrastructure, access, and public health and safety precludes identification of an integrated set of projects in those focus areas at this time.

Preliminary treatment areas (road segments) for the project were identified through GIS analysis of existing data. The following parameters were used to define priority roads for treatment:

- Inside the Mullen Fire perimeter
- On National Forest System lands
- Not in roadless or wilderness
- In forested areas of moderate to high burn severity
- Not in areas that have been previously treated to address roadside hazard trees
- Not in LaVA No Treatment areas
- Roads with operational maintenance levels (ML) 2-5 (not decommissioned or ML 1)
- Not in old growth

Based on this analysis, an estimated 207 miles of priority roads may need treatment to address roadside hazard trees. Another 29 miles have limited need based on earlier treatments along most of their length. Nine miles of decommissioned roads and 24 miles of roads in LaVA No Treatment areas were removed from consideration. Table 1 provides additional detail on the preliminary treatment areas based on the GIS analysis.

LaVA Project MFEIS – Appendix A: Adaptive Implementation and Monitoring Framework Output 1: LaVA Pre-Treatment Checklist: Mullen Fire Roadside Hazard Tree Focus Area

Table 1 GIS Analysis Results					
	Operational Maintenance Level				
Treatment Type	ML 2	ML 3	ML 4	ML 5	Total
Priority	178	14	15	-	207
Limited Need	-	24	2	2	29
Decommissioned	9	-	-	-	9
No Treatment Area	18	2	3	-	24
Total	205	40	21	2	268

The next step for the project will be field validation of the preliminary treatment areas. None of the preliminary treatment areas have not been reviewed in detail on the ground. Changes to the priority road segments are likely 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. Depending on funding and capacity, some or all of the field validation will be accomplished during the 2022 field season. Additional field validation may occur in future years. Implementation is not expected to begin any sooner than the fall of 2022 and may continue for several years.

Anticipated funding is likely not sufficient to treat all of the priority roads. During field validation, crews will identify road segments with the highest need for treatment. Factors to be considered include traffic levels, access to recreation sites and private inholdings, other access needs, and the extent of potential hazard trees identified in the field.

Field validation will also be used to identify the most efficient treatment methods, which could include mechanical or hand felling, chipping, mastication, or other methods. Depending on post-treatment fuel loads, slash and logs could be left in place, piled and burned, chipped, decked, or removed.

It is likely that little or no commercial forest products will be produced because of the moderate to high burn severity in the treatment areas; however, removal of commercial products will be considered if they exist. Temporary roads will not be used since all treatments will be adjacent to existing roads. LaVA Project MFEIS – Appendix A: Adaptive Implementation and Monitoring Framework Output 1: LaVA Pre-Treatment Checklist: Mullen Fire Roadside Hazard Tree Focus Area

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

YES	NO	Issue:
\boxtimes		The treatment has the potential to affect long-term stream health. (If yes, go to Decision Trigger 1).
	\boxtimes	The proposed treatment includes treatments meant to maintain or improve wildlife habitat. (If yes, go to Decision Trigger 2).
	\boxtimes	The proposed treatment has the potential to alter wildlife security areas. (If yes, go to Decision Trigger 3).
\boxtimes		The proposed treatment occurs within a Lynx Analysis Unit or Linkage Corridor. (If yes, go to Decision Triggers 4 thru 9).
	\boxtimes	This treatment will utilize temporary roads to access treatment areas. (If yes, go to Decision Trigger 10 and 11).
\boxtimes		The treatment has the potential to affect public access. (If yes, go to Decision Triggers 13 and 14).
	\boxtimes	The treatment was brought forward or is primarily funded through a partnership source.
\boxtimes		Do any "yes" answers above result in a Yellow-Light Trigger?
	\boxtimes	Do any "yes" answers above result in a Red-Light Trigger?
	\boxtimes	Is it likely that the proposed treatment will result in a deviation from any Forest Plan Guideline? (If yes, elaborate on the next page)
	\boxtimes	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).
\boxtimes		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 the Implementation Checklist(s), once the treatment units are field validated.

Trigger 1

Every watershed in the focus area was affected to some extent by the Mullen Fire. Pre-project (baseline) equivalent clearcut area (ECA) in each HUC7 watershed in the focus area is listed in Table 2. This baseline includes areas of high burn severity from the Mullen Fire. Only seven of the 32 watersheds have not reached or exceeded the yellow-light trigger and several of those are only slightly below the threshold.

Table 2 Pre-project ECA						
HUC7 Code	HUC7 Name	Total area (acres)	NFS Area (acres)	Baseline ECA (acres)	Baseline ECA (% of NFS)	Yellow light trigger reached?
10180002010101	North Platte C	7,381	7,109	4,858	68.3%	Yes
10180002010102	Walbright Ck	2,673	2,673	1,908	71.4%	Yes
10180002010103	Sixmile/Porter Cks	6,950	6,837	4,954	72.5%	Yes
10180002010104	Elkhorn Ck	6,047	6,047	4,187	69.2%	Yes
10180002010105	Teepee/Salt Cks	9,660	7,564	4,357	57.6%	Yes
10180002010401	Upper Douglas Ck*	13,424	12,322	2,860	23.2%	Yes
10180002010402	Middle Douglas Ck	11,502	11,115	5,727	51.5%	Yes
10180002010501	Upper Muddy Ck	7,098	7,093	4,433	62.5%	Yes
10180002010502	Lake Ck	11,473	11,334	8,338	73.6%	Yes
10180002010503	Middle Douglas Ck	7,006	6,682	4,648	69.6%	Yes
10180002010601	Illinoise Ck	7,302	6,877	3,292	47.9%	Yes
10180002010602	Pelton Ck	16,457	15,889	7,286	45.9%	Yes
10180002010603	Pelton C	239	239	118	49.1%	Yes
10180002010701	Devils Gate Ck	7,227	7,227	2,852	39.5%	Yes
10180002010702	Douglas Ck	14,201	14,201	8,706	61.3%	Yes
10180002020101	Savage Run Ck	6,368	6,211	4,273	68.8%	Yes
10180002020102	Cottonwood Ck	6,794	6,756	4,347	64.3%	Yes
10180002020103	Prospect Mountain	5,770	3,055	1,000	32.7%	Yes
10180002020201	North Mullen Ck	10,683	10,243	5,586	54.5%	Yes
10180002020202	South Mullen Ck	5,795	5,641	3,358	59.5%	Yes
10180002020301	South French Ck	20,640	20,640	2,018	9.8%	
10180002020302	French Ck	5,032	2,549	630	24.7%	
10180002030401	Spring Ck C	8,730	480	77	16.1%	
10180002030403	Spring Ck	13,266	2,234	621	27.8%	Yes
10180010020104	Bear Ck	3,713	3,565	884	24.8%	
10180010020107	Porter Ck	2,448	2,252	122	5.4%	
10180010020108	Woods Ck	4,047	3,651	752	20.6%	
10180010020401	Fench Ck	9,303	7,789	2,610	33.5%	Yes
10180010020402	Squirrel/Fox Cks	14,718	14,004	6,953	49.7%	Yes
10180010060101	Fourlog Park	3,751	3,751	147	3.9%	

Table 2 Pre-project ECA						
HUC7 Code	HUC7 Name	Total area (acres)	NFS Area (acres)	Baseline ECA (acres)	Baseline ECA (% of NFS)	Yellow light trigger reached?
10180010060201	South Fk Little Laramie Rvr	8,959	6,057	2,032	33.6%	Yes
10180010060202	Dry Park Road	5,887	2,089	679	32.5%	Yes

*Known stream health concern. Bear and Rambler Creeks, which are tributaries in the Upper Douglas Ck watershed, are 303(d) listed for metals.

Some of the proposed treatments, such as chipping, mastication, and low intensity prescribed burning, do not increase ECA, while other treatments, such as cutting and removal, can increase ECA. Appropriate treatment methods will be identified during field validation. To the extent they are feasible and meet project objectives, methods will be selected that do not increase ECA in watersheds that are at or above the yellow-light trigger.

If the treatments selected during field validation would increase ECA beyond the yellow-light trigger, they would need to be modified to limit cumulative ECA in each 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

None of the preliminary treatments are designed to maintain or improve wildlife habitat. The project will not contribute to achievement of the desired condition for this trigger; however, other projects are expected to improve sufficient areas of wildlife habitat across the LaVA analysis area to meet the requirements of this trigger.

Trigger 3

This trigger will not be affected because no preliminary treatment areas (road segments) cross wildlife security areas.

Triggers 4-9

There are two Lynx Analysis Units (LAUs) in the focus area: Douglas Creek and French Creek. Suitable lynx habitat was affected by the Mullen Fire in both LAUs, which have relatively high proportions of currently unsuitable habitat: 38.1% in the Douglas Creek LAU and 28.2% in the French Creek LAU. The yellow- and red-light thresholds for Trigger #4 have been exceeded for both LAUs. No additional suitable habitat can be converted to unsuitable by the LaVA project. During field validation, all proposed treatments will be reviewed; any suitable lynx habitat that remains will not be converted to an unsuitable condition by the project.

WUI exemptions to Standards VEG S1 or VEG S2 (Trigger #5) are not available for the Douglas Creek and French Creek LAUs and will not be used for the project.

A relatively small proportion of suitable habitat has been converted to unsuitable by vegetation management in both LAUs in the past 10 years (Trigger #6). Several thousand acres remain available for

LaVA Project MFEIS – Appendix A: Adaptive Implementation and Monitoring Framework Output 1: LaVA Pre-Treatment Checklist: Mullen Fire Roadside Hazard Tree Focus Area

conversion under this trigger; however, the project will not convert any suitable habitat to a currently unsuitable condition because of the requirements of Trigger #4.

Pre-commercial thinning is not part of the project and the 1% exemption to Standard VEG S5 (Trigger #7) will not be used.

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

Other exceptions to the SRLA standards (Trigger #9) will not be used for the project.

Note: roughly the southern half of the focus area falls within the Snowy Range linkage area, which is important for connectivity between LAUs in the Snowy Range and other lynx habitat to the south in Colorado. The project will maintain connectivity in the linkage area because all treatments will be immediately adjacent to roads. A mosaic of different habitat types will be maintained across the focus area. The proposed treatments and their effects will be consistent with the findings of the Biological Assessment for the LaVA project.

Triggers 10 and 11

This trigger will not be affected because no temporary roads are planned.

Trigger 13 and 14

Minor, short-term restrictions on some routes may be needed to protect public safety during active treatment operations. In the long-term, access and public health and safety will be improved because the potential for hazard trees to fall across roads will be reduced.

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 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): Frank Romero

Signature and Date: