

**Trout-West Fuels Reduction Project
Pike/San Isabel National Forest
Scenery Management Specialist Report
Jan Langerman**

Note: If there are any inconsistencies between this report and the Trout-West Final EIS, the Final EIS takes precedent.

Introduction

Scenery, as well as other natural resources, must be cared for and managed for future generations. Visual resources vary by location and include existing natural features such as vegetation, water features, landform, and geology and human-made elements. All activities that forest visitors experience are performed in a scenic environment defined by the arrangement of the natural character of the landscape along with components of the built environment.

The purpose of this project is to reduce hazardous fuels within the Trout-West project area on the Pikes Peak Ranger District, Pike-San Isabel National Forest. Implementation of the project is intended to reduce the probability of damaging wildfires through fuels reduction.

Legal and Administrative Framework

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) states that it is the “continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means to assure for all Americans, aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings.” NEPA also requires “a systematic and interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts into planning and decision-making which may have an impact on man's environment.”

Numerous federal laws require all Federal land management agencies to consider scenery and aesthetic resources in land management planning, resource planning, project design, implementation, and monitoring.

Several USDA handbooks have been developed to establish a framework for management of visual resources, including but not limited to the following: *National Forest Landscape Management, Volume 2, Chapter 5 Timber; Agriculture Handbook No. 559.*

Forest Plan Direction

The Forest Plan provides guidance for the management of forested area on the Pike and San Isabel National Forests through its stated goals and objectives and through the objectives for each Management Area (MA). The Forest Plan also sets standards and guidelines that apply to the entire Forest. A detailed list of these can be found in the Forest Plan (*Pike-San Isabel Land and Resource Management Plan*, 1985). The standards and guidelines for visuals that apply to the proposed actions are given below.

Forest-Wide Goals

- Manage the visual resource to a desired condition that allows for acceptable alteration of the landscape.
- Enhance or preserve scenic values along heavily traveled roads, use areas, and trails through management activities.

Forest-Wide Standards and Guidelines

- Apply the Visual Management System to all National Forest System lands.
- Achieve enhancement of landscapes through addition, subtraction or alteration of elements of the landscape such as vegetation, rockform, water features or structures.
- Plan, design, and locate vegetation manipulation in a scale that retains the color and texture of the characteristic landscape, borrowing directional emphasis of form and line from natural elements.
- Blend soil disturbance into natural topography to achieve a natural appearance, reduce erosion and rehabilitate ground cover.
- Revegetate disturbed soils.

Visual Management System

The Visual Management System (VMS) was developed by the Forest Service to characterize, classify, and manage visual resources in National Forests (*National Forest Landscape Management Volume 2*, 1974). This VMS information is taken into consideration when Forest Plans are developed. These plans then establish Visual Management Objectives for Forests that are reflected in the MA direction.

The VMS divides the National Forest System lands into several visual categories based on variety class, sensitivity level, and distance zone. Variety classes are obtained by classifying the landscape into different degrees of variety. This determines those landscapes that are most important and those that are of lesser value from a standpoint of scenic quality. Sensitivity levels are a measure of the people's concern for the scenic quality of the Forest. Level 1 is the highest sensitivity and Level 3 is the lowest. Distance zones describe distances from which the landscape is viewed.

After the landscape has been inventoried, Visual Quality Objectives (VQOs) are established for the landscape. The VQOs help to guide management activities within a Forest. There are five VQOs in the current Forest Plan. They are described below.

Visual Quality Objectives in the Current Forest Plan

- Preservation - allows management activities that are not noticeable.
- Retention - allows management activities that are not obvious to the casual observer.
- Partial Retention - allows management activities that are noticeable, but do not attract attention.
- Modification - allows management activities that are obvious, but blend in with the surrounding landscape.
- Maximum Modification - allows management activities to dominate the characteristic landscape.

Management Area Direction

The Forest Plan designates areas in the Forest that are appropriate for various types of land uses and activities. This is done through the use of MA direction. The emphasis placed on visuals varies between MAs.

The Pike-San Isabel National Forest does not have maps showing the VQOs for the entire project area. However, a combination of the MA visual direction, VQO maps of the southern portion of the project area (Maps 1 & 2), and the assumed sensitivity levels for viewing locations and routes will provide the needed direction for this analysis. Table 1 provides VQO guidelines for the MAs where vegetation treatments are proposed. The Trout-West project area occurs in MAs 2B, 4B, 7A, 7D, and 10B.

Table 1: Management Area - Visual Quality Objective Guidelines

Management Area	Management Emphasis	VQO Guidelines
2B	Rural and roaded-natural recreation	Partial retention and modification
4B	Management Indicator Species	Modification
7A & 7D	Wood fiber production and utilization	Retention and partial retention along Forest arterial and collector roads and primary trails. In other areas, modification.
10B	Experimental Forest	Apply forest-wide Standards and Guidelines

Affected Environment

Landscape Character

The project area is located in the Southern Rocky Mountain Geographic area and the Landscape Character Sub-Type 12. Elevations range from approximately 6,000 feet along Trout Creek to almost 9,500 feet at some of the higher peaks. The terrain is extremely varied and includes deep narrow canyons, flat river valley bottoms, broad meadows, rugged mountain foothills, steep slopes, rounded granite peaks, and scattered rugged granite outcroppings. The varied and rugged topography greatly influences vegetation patterns in the project area. The variety of terrain also provides a range of possible visual experiences, from total enclosure to broad vistas.

Vegetation/Land Use Patterns

The project area is located in the montane vegetation zone. This zone is typically composed of ponderosa pine mixed with Douglas-fir and smaller amounts of Colorado blue spruce.

The contemporary vegetation patterns found in the project area differ from historic patterns. Fire historically played an important role in the ecosystem and vegetation patterns, thus influencing visual character. Prior to European settlement in the middle of the 19th century, wildfire was the predominant influence on vegetation species and patterns across the landscape. The historic fire regime was mixed-severity, which resulted in a mosaic of vegetation patterns across the landscape (Foster Wheeler 1999). There were more openings than are currently found and stands tended to be less dense. In addition, ponderosa pine was more dominant with Douglas-fir primarily relegated to moister, north facing slopes. Historically, these Douglas-fir stands would have been limited by fire except on these types of sites.

Two factors are primarily responsible for the current visual character of the forested portions of the project area. The first was the timber harvest operations that occurred in the in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. These harvests removed most of the large stands of trees. The second factor was the fire exclusion policy started in the 1940s. The two factors combined to change the visual character of much of the project area. By removing the stands of large trees and suppressing fire, the forests were converted to densely canopied ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir stands. As a result, the forest today appears densely uniform, with few interspersed openings.

Although the forested parts of the project area are much more uniformly dense today than they were historically, the project landscape is far from uniform in appearance. Because of the wide variety of topography and soils, there are many natural openings in most of the forests throughout the project area. There are also variations of species composition in the forested portions of the project area that provide scenic variety.

Many of the people who use the project area are unaware that the forest they see is not the type of forest that historically existed. This may lead to the perception that the forest is sustainable as it currently exists, when actually it has deviated significantly from what is considered a sustainable condition. Fire risk is a dominant concern within the project area (Foster Wheeler 1999).

Viewing Locations and Routes

The primary locations or routes from which the proposed actions could be viewed include: State Highways; Forest Service roads, trails, and recreation areas; communities; and private residences. A brief description of each location and routes are included below.

Sensitivity Level I Locations and Routes

State Highway 67 (SH 67) dissects the Manitou Park Recreation Area (Manitou Park) from Deckers south to Woodland Park. The highway passes through both private and National Forest System lands that are largely undeveloped and natural in appearance. Most of the developed areas observable from the highway are on private lands. They include a variety of rural land uses and buildings and several rural residential areas. The National Forest System lands that can be observed from the highway are generally natural in appearance, although several recreational facilities can be seen.

Viewing areas along the corridor include the Manitou Lake Picnic Area, the Painted Rocks Campground, the Colorado Campground, the Pike Community Campground, South Park Meadows Campground, the Red Rocks Campground, Centennial Trail, dispersed pull-outs, and private lands along SH 67. Views along the corridor are varied and can be enclosed by surrounding vegetation and terrain or extremely expansive. Viewers along this corridor include recreationists using SH 67 to access recreation areas, travelers passing through the project area, scenic drivers, campers and/or picnickers, and residents. VQOs along SH 67 are retention in the foreground and partial retention in the middle ground.

Sensitivity Level I roads within the Phantom, Ryan Quinlan, Skelton, and Rampart treatment units are located along County Roads (CR) 5, 25, 51, 78, 79, and 511. Local residents, dispersed campers, scenic drivers, and recreationists accessing National Forest lands use county roads. As with SH 67, the VQOs are retention in the foreground and partial retention in the middle ground.

If mitigation measures (refer to Mitigation section of this report) are applied to treatment units identified in Table 2, the VQOs of retention and partial retention will be met. A Landscape Architect or Recreation specialist would help determine site-specific methods to meet retention guidelines.

Table 2: Stands Along Primary Travelways

Road	Project Name	Stand	Comments
State Highway 67	Long John	29	Just north of Colorado CG
“	“	28	Colorado CG & adj. to SH 67
“	“	27	Fingers adj. to SH 67
“	“	25	Pike Community CG & FDR 336
“	“	12	¼ mile adj. to SH67 and pvt. land
“	“	11	½ mile adj. to SH67 & South Meadows CG
“	“	8	Adj. pvt. land & seen from SH67
“	“	4	SH67 dissects unit & runs adj. 1 mile
“	“	3	¼ mile adj. to SH67
“	“	2	½ mile adj. to SH67 & Red Rocks CG. District has identified that additional trees need to be planted between sites.
“	“	1	1/8 mile adj. to SH67 & FDR 342
State Highway 67 & County Road 78	Ryan Quinlan Gulch (RQG)	40	1/8 mile adj. to SH67 & ¼ mile of CR78
County Road 78	RQG/partially burned	13	¼ mile adj. to CR78 & adj. pvt. land
“	RQG/partially burned	10	¼ mile adj. to CR78 & FDT 341.B
“	“	9	¼ mile adj. to CR78 & adj. pvt. land
“	“	1	½ mile adj. to CR78 & Painted Rocks CG
County Road 79	Ridgewood	34	Point touches CR78 & 4 miles adj. pvt land
“	“	33	1-mile adj. to pvt. land & FDR 347
“	“	9	½ mile adj. to CR78 & adj. pvt. land
“	“	14	¼ mile adj. to CR78
“	“	8	¼ mile of CR78 dissects unit
“	“	7	1/8 mile of CR78 dissects unit
“	“	6	¼ mile of CR78 adj. and in unit
County Road 3	Phantom (P) (P) Partially burned	36	Small piece within ¼ mile of CR3 & adj. to pvt. land
“	(P) Partially burned	35	Within ¼ mile of CR3 & adj. to pvt. land
“	(P) Partially burned	34	Within ¼ mile of CR3 & adj. to pvt. land
“	“	23	¼ mile adj. to CR3 & adj. to pvt. land
“	“	22	½ mile adj. to CR3 & adj. to pvt. land
County Road 3 & 51	“	18	1 mile adj. to CR3 & 51; adj. to pvt. land
County Road 51	Phantom	16	1/8 mile adj. to CR51
“	“	15	1/8 mile adj. to CR 51 & adj. to pvt land
“	“	14	¾ mile adj. to CR51
“	“	13	½ mile adj. to CR51
“	“	12	¼ mile adj. to CR51
County Road 25	Skelton	67	1/8 mile adj. to CR 25
“	“	64	CR 25 dissects ¼ mile of unit
“	“	34	¼ mile adj. CR25
“	“	24	1/8 mile adj. CR25
“	“	20	¼ mile CR25 dissects unit
“	“	17	½ mile adj. CR 25
“	“	16	½ mile adj. CR 25
“	“	15	1/8 mile adj. CR 25 & pvt. land

Sensitivity Level II Locations and Routes

CRs 3 and 782, along with Forest Development Roads (FDRs) 362, 363, 364, 357, and 300 are Sensitivity Level II roads, generally located on ridgetops and offer opportunities for scenic vistas. VQOs are partial retention in the foreground and modification in the middle and background views.

The primary multi-use trail is the North Divide Trail 717, which mainly draws ATV and motorcycle users. This trail system is designated as a multi-use trail and attracts a nominal amount of mountain biking, hiking, and horseback riding use. The North Divide Trail system is located within MA 2B, 7A, and 7D. The VQOs set for these areas are partial retention in the foreground and modification in the remaining views.

The Rampart Range Motorized Recreation Area (RRMRA) is another very popular multi-use trail system in the Front Range and its popularity increases annually (Strategy 2010). Dispersed camping and scenic driving along FDR 300 are also popular activities within the treatment unit. Only a 7-mile portion of the RRMRA is included in the Trout West Project, in the Rampart treatment unit. Most of these lands have been assigned a MA of 10B and 2B and VQO of partial retention in the foreground and modification in the rest of the area. A small section on the south end of the Rampart treatment unit is in MA 4B, which emphasizes habitat for management indicator species. Human activity is regulated to favor the needs of the designated species. The VQO is not to exceed modification.

A variety of scenic vista opportunities occur throughout all of the treatment units, depending upon terrain, nearby vegetation, and location. The primary viewers in these areas are recreationists using the trail system, dispersed campsites, or people driving through the area.

Communities and Private Lands

Land ownership throughout the project area is mixed. Travelers using the county roads and residents in communities such as West Creek, Woodland Park, Divide and Florissant also view the project area. On private lands, there are residences, recreational businesses, agricultural buildings, and other manmade structures.

Private land development adjacent to National Forest may contribute to a cumulative effect that does not meet the assigned objectives; however, the VQOs do not apply to private land. Landscapes adjacent to private lands need not be managed as restrictively as travel corridors, but there should be a blending from the managed forest to private land.

Unclassified Roads and Trails

The number of unclassified roads and trails within the Trout West project area is expanding yearly. These roads/trails are degrading the landscape character, creating an altered view. Often, these roads are created in riparian areas or on ridgetops, which are causing visual and resource damage. In time, if these roads are not effectively closed, additional unclassified roads may be created, further degrading the scenic integrity of the landscape to an unacceptable condition.

Environmental Consequences

No Action Alternative

No Action represents the existing condition. Fuels reduction projects and associated roadwork would not occur.

Direct and Indirect Effects

Under No Action, the existing vegetation patterns found across the project area would be maintained in the short term. The appearance of the forest landscape would remain the same until events such as a fire, insects, or disease would occur, changing the existing vegetative composition. The scale of the change would depend on the extent of the disturbance. The recent Hayman Fire provides an extreme example of the effects of damaging wildfire on visual quality. Several thousand contiguous acres were burned in the Hayman Fire in 2002.

Over the long-term, the watershed would likely be subject to wildfires. If large fires were to occur, the resulting changes in the appearance of the project area would likely be similar to that of the other areas where fires occurred. Such fires would result in a cumulative decrease in the visual quality of the affected areas.

Changes caused by insect and disease would be more gradual and less noticeable. A severe epidemic would likely lead to large-scale changes to the visual environment. An epidemic could cause hillsides with standing dead trees, which often appear reddish brown. Endemic insect populations may cause pockets of standing dead trees. Endemic populations could add visual variety to the landscape as the pockets of dead trees revegetate.

Cumulative Effects

The Trout Creek Timber Sale, the Manitou Experimental Forest 40-acre thin, and other small forest management projects have had positive effects on visuals in and around the project area. The thinned forests would result in improved visual conditions as a result of a diversified mixture of vegetative species.

Proposed Action (PA)

Effects of Vegetative Treatments on Visual Resources

The Proposed Action (PA) would have relatively minor effects on visual resources given the site-specific planning for treatment areas that would be visible from primary viewing locations and routes. The use of tractor/cable to access timber in certain areas could have minor short-term effects on visual quality in a few locations.

Some people may find the more open and less dense forest in the project area less aesthetically appealing than the current condition. These people may choose to stay away from the area and go to other areas. Other people may find the more open forest attractive and may visit the area more frequently. Others may be attracted to the project area to observe treatment operations and to see how the area changes over the years.

Short-term visual effects would include slash and tractor paths remaining from harvest and smoke from prescribed burns. The visual effect of the slash would last from one to two years, until the area would be burned. Tractor paths would be rehabilitated upon completion of unit harvesting. The burned area may be visually unappealing for a short time until the underbrush is reestablished. Smoke from the prescribed burns would be a short-term effect (refer to Air Quality section).

The PA would reduce the risk of adverse visual effects caused by a large wildfire. However, fires and insect and disease epidemics could still occur and alter the visual quality of the area.

The PA proposes thinning to reduce the canopy cover from approximately 40 percent to approximately 20 percent. However, based on observations of another similar harvest treatment near the project area, the more open forest can appear natural and blend with the landscape so that a visitor new to the area may not notice the change once harvest has been completed. The thinned areas would be blended with the adjacent forest by using different intensities of thinning, particularly along the edge of the treatment area. This would prevent an abrupt change in texture of the forest and would avoid creating artificial looking lines. In addition, several no-treatment areas are distributed throughout the landscape. These areas will provide scenic variety and screening.

Effects on Viewing Locations and Routes

Treatment areas along the corridors of SH 67 and CRs 5, 25, 51, 78, 79, and 511 would have a VQO of retention in the foreground and partial retention in the middle ground. Viewers driving along these roads would pass through and adjacent to several treated areas. They would notice a much more open forest than exists today due to the thinning operations. They may also notice visual changes from the untreated to the treated areas. This may actually provide visual interest. Opening the forest may also provide better viewing opportunities.

The background views from these travel routes would not be noticeable to most people because of the many rock outcroppings, natural openings, and the rate of speed while traveling along these roads.

Several of the developed facilities along the SH 67 corridor would be in or near the treatment areas including the Manitou Lake Picnic Area, the Painted Rocks Campground, the Colorado Campground, the Pike Community Campground, South Park Meadows Campground, the Red Rocks Campground, Centennial Trail, and dispersed pull-outs. The VQO of retention would need to be met for the immediate vicinity around these areas. In these areas, openings would be carefully designed to blend with the thinned area and be natural in appearance (see Mitigation Measures section).

FDRs 362, 363, 364, 357, and 300 offer opportunities for scenic vistas. Most of these roads are located on ridge tops where treatment areas would be visible. Depending upon the distance from the road, the treatment units would be required to meet the VQO of partial retention in the foreground and modification in the background. As long as the mitigation measures for openings are implemented, there would not be any long-term visual effects, thus meeting the partial retention VQO.

The North Divide Trail is located within MAs 2B, 7A, and 7D. The VQOs set for these areas are partial retention in the foreground and modification in the rest of the area. Short-term and long-term effects would be the same as those identified for FDRs.

Private lands scattered throughout the project area will experience the same effects as described in the Viewing Locations and Routes section. Mitigation and design features that apply to all action alternatives are described in Chapter Two of the FEIS.

Effects of Unclassified Road/Trail Reclamation

The reclamation of the unclassified roads and trails would enhance the visual environment by reducing the evidence of resource damage from numerous social trails, by reclaiming roads to a more natural appearing environment, and by reducing the existing and potential future erosion on hillsides and along stream banks.

The new temporary roads would have a short-term negative impact on visuals. When the roads are reclaimed and vegetation is re-established, the visual effects would be minor.

Cumulative Effects

The combination of this alternative with activities being completed on Forest Service lands to the north would further move the project area towards a more open, historical forest condition. These projects will result in a forest that is gradually being modified from a closed, homogenous condition to a more open diversified canopy interspersed with numerous openings. Wildfires such as the Hayman Fire would be more detrimental to the visual resource than the Proposed Action.

This alternative complies with VQOs in the Forest Plan.

Alternative A

Alternative A would essentially have similar effects on visual resources as the PA except as described below.

With Alternative A, all acres would be treated without burning. Areas that could be burned or mechanically treated would not be treated in this alternative. Viewers along CR 3 and FDR 362 and 363 would not notice prescribed burn impacts such as smoke and blackened vegetation as in the PA. There would be no short-term effects of smoke produced by this alternative.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects would be the same as discussed for the PA.

Compliance with the Forest Plan

Compliance with the Forest Plan would be the same as discussed for the PA.

Alternative B

Alternative B would essentially have similar effects on visual resources as described in the PA for the Manitou Park Recreation Area, the Manitou Experimental Forest, and the Ryan Quinlan treatment unit, southern portion of Phantom, and the Skelton treatment units. Alternative B may have a greater likelihood of catastrophic fire than the PA.

Viewing platforms and routes in the northern portion of the Phantom and Rampart treatment units would not be affected. Visual effects in these areas would be the same as the No Action alternative.

Alternative B would improve fewer miles of FDRs and unclassified roads/trails than the PA and Alternative A. Because less area is being treated, visual effect would be less than the previous alternatives. However, in areas not being treated, unclassified roads and trails would not be improved, decreasing visual quality.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects would be the same as discussed for the PA except the effects of Trail Creek Timber Sale (on private land) would be the same as described under the No Action alternative.

Compliance with the Forest Plan

Compliance with the Forest Plan would be the same as discussed for the PA.

Alternative C

Alternative C would essentially have the same effects on visual resources as the PA, except as described below.

With Alternative C, no new temporary roads would be built to access treatment units. Stands that required new temporary roads would be yarded by helicopter. Helicopter treatments cause less ground disturbance than tractor/cable operations. Tractor paths would not be visible in helicopter treated areas. This alternative would reduce the amount and intensity of ground disturbance in the Phantom, Skelton, and Ryan Quinlan treatment units. There would be less effect on the visual resources as compared to the

PA.

The short-term effects of Alternative C would be noise produced from the helicopters during harvesting. All other short-term effects would be the same as the PA.

Alternative C would have less effect on visual quality than the PA because no new roads would be built and approximately the same number of FDRs and unclassified roads/trails would be improved and reclaimed as in the PA.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects would be the same as discussed for the PA.

Compliance with the Forest Plan

Compliance with the Forest Plan would be the same as discussed for the PA.

Alternative D

Alternative D would essentially have similar effects on visual resources as No Action and Alternative B. As in all action alternatives, there would be a short-term effect on visuals during vegetative treatments.

The long-term effect of Alternative D would result in the greatest risk, among all action alternatives, of a damaging wildfire occurring in the watershed.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects would be the same as discussed for the PA and Alternative B.

Alternative E

Alternative E would have the greatest effect on visual resources than all other alternatives as described below.

Alternative E proposes to treat all possible acres, eliminating the variety and screening inherent in the no-treatment areas. Acres prescribed in the PA as “light” or “no treat” units would be given a heavy mechanical treatment prescription, creating openings over about 30% of the landscape. All thermal and riparian areas would also be treated. Treatments of this magnitude may result in a homogeneous forest with little visual variety.

Visual quality from private lands and along viewing platforms/routes (SH 67, developed campgrounds, and private lands) would be heavily impacted by this alternative. Tractors/cable vegetation treatments would be used extensively, creating tractor “paths” readily observable by recreationists and private landowners. The potential for increasing off-road use would be greatest in this alternative.

Alternative E would have the same effects of road reclamation on visual quality as the PA.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects would be the same as discussed for the PA.

Compliance with the Forest Plan

Compliance with the Forest Plan may not be met for visuals in Alternative E. A forest plan amendment may have to be completed to implement this alternative.

Mitigation

The following mitigation measures will apply to areas in the immediate foreground (300 feet or sight distance, whichever is less) of developed campgrounds, private lands, SH 67, and CRs 3, 5, 25, 51, 78, and 79. The objective of these measures is to reduce negative visual effects of logging slash and other harvest-related disturbances and to meet VQOs.

Mitigation Measures

- A Landscape Architect or Recreation Specialist should help determine site-specific methods to meet retention guidelines.
- Tree marking will be visually sensitive. Paint will be placed on the side away from roads and trails for a reasonable distance. Butt marks may be on the visible side. Mark cut trees instead of leave trees where reasonable. The objective is to reduce marking paint visibility to the casual observer.
- Remaining trees will be randomly spaced and clumped, with concentrations blending into adjacent stands. In thinned units, densities and diameters of trees will be varied to maintain visual diversity.
- Stumps will be no more than eight inches high. Stumps that are pulled up as a part of roadwork will be buried, scattered, or removed unless needed for other purposes.
- Lop and scatter slash to a maximum depth of 18". Disperse slash to mimic natural tree litter.
- Natural elements such as rock outcrops, shrubs, and forbs will be protected to maintain visual diversity and to reduce visual impacts from management activities.
- Use whole-tree harvesting to minimize slash where possible.
- Minimize and screen slash piles, skid trails, and landing areas and return to a near natural condition.
- Replacement trees should be left in clusters rather than scattered uniformly (and artificially-looking) throughout the stand.
- Irregular edges should be shaped so that in places, the more open areas intrude deeper, like fingers, into the forest canopy. The boundaries of the openings should not be geometric or linear in appearance.

Note: Primary References are listed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

