



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

# MONTICELLO & BLANDING MUNICIPAL WATERSHED IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS



Forest Service  
Intermountain  
Region

Manti La Sal  
National Forest

Moab/Monticello  
Ranger District

March 2003

## DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT



### How to Read This EIS (Environmental Impact Statement)

Following Federal regulations, this EIS has been designed and written (1) **to provide** the Manti-La Sal National Forest, Forest Supervisor, with sufficient information to make an informed, reasoned decision concerning the proposed Monticello and Blanding Municipal Watershed Improvement Projects and (2) **to inform** members of the affected and interested public of this project so they may express their opinions to the Forest Supervisor.

This EIS follows the organization and content established by the CEQ Regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508). Note that the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences sections (usually displayed as Chapters 3 and 4) have been combined into one chapter (Chapter 3) in order to provide ease of comparison for the reader of the current management situation and consequences of actions. The EIS consists of the following chapters:

- 1.0 Purpose and Need
- 2.0 Alternatives
- 3.0 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences
- 4.0 List of Preparers
- 5.0 List of Agencies and Persons Consulted
- 6.0 Bibliography
- 7.0 Glossary
- Appendices

**Chapters 1 and 2** are written so that non-technical readers can understand the potential environmental, technical, economic, and social consequences of **taking** and **not taking** action.

- Chapter 1 introduces the Monticello and Blanding Municipal Watershed Improvement Projects. It provides a brief description of the project.
- Chapter 2 provides detailed descriptions of Alternative A – No-Action, Alternative B – Proposed Action, and Alternative C - Modified Timber Harvest. Most important, it includes a **summary comparison** of the predicted effects of these three alternatives on the human environment, providing a clear basis for choice between the alternatives for the Forest Supervisor and the public.

**Chapter 3** contains detailed, scientific information, presented to alert technical specialists to potential problems, opportunities, and solutions. This chapter serves as the scientific and analytic basis for the summary comparison of the predicted effects that are presented in Chapter 2. This chapter briefly describes the past and current conditions of the relevant resources (issues) in the project area that would be meaningfully affected, establishing a part of the baseline used for the comparison of the predicted effects of the alternatives. Detailed, analytic predictions of the consequences of implementing Alternatives A, B, and C are then presented. These predictions include the direct, indirect, short-term, long-term, irreversible, irretrievable, and cumulative effects of implementing the alternatives.

# **Monticello and Blanding Municipal Watershed Improvement Projects Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

---

<b>Lead Agency:</b>	United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service
<b>Cooperating Agencies:</b>	City of Monticello City of Blanding San Juan County USDI Bureau of Reclamation USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service
<b>Responsible Official:</b>	Elaine Zieroth Forest Supervisor Manti-La Sal National Forest 599 West Price River Drive Price, Utah 84501 (435) 637-2817
<b>For Further Information Contact:</b>	glenn P. Casamassa, District Ranger Greg T. Montgomery, Team Leader Moab/Monticello Ranger District P.O. Box 820 496 East Central Monticello, Utah 84535 Telephone: (435) 587-2041 Fax: (435) 587-2637
<b>Abstract:</b>	This Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) documents the analysis of three alternatives, including a No-Action alternative, for the Monticello and Blanding Municipal Watershed Improvement Project on the Moab/Monticello Ranger District of the Manti-La Sal National Forest. Alternative A is the No-Action Alternative. Alternative B, the proposed action, emphasizes reduction of the risk of development of epidemic spruce beetle populations within the project area and provides intensive management for the regeneration of aspen. Alternative C responds to wildlife concerns by modifying vegetation treatments.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>S-1</b>
<b>1 PURPOSE AND NEED .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.2 PROJECT AREA.....	2
1.3 PROPOSED ACTION .....	2
1.4 PURPOSE (OBJECTIVE) OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSAL.....	8
1.5 SCOPE OF THIS ANALYSIS DOCUMENT.....	10
1.5.1 History of the Planning and Scoping Process.....	10
1.5.2 Relevant Planning Documents .....	10
1.5.3 Forest Plan Management Area Goals, Standards, and Guidelines.....	11
1.6 ISSUE IDENTIFICATION .....	14
1.6.1 Significant Issues .....	14
1.6.2 Key Issues .....	15
1.6.3 Other Issues.....	16
1.7 DECISIONS TO BE MADE .....	17
1.8 APPLICABLE LEGAL AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS AND COORDINATION .....	17
1.9 DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION .....	19
<b>2 ALTERNATIVES.....</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1 INTRODUCTION .....	21
2.2 ACTIONS OR ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT STUDIED IN DETAIL .....	21
2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL.....	24
2.3.1 Alternative A – No-Action.....	25
2.3.2 Elements Common to All Action Alternatives (Alternatives B and C)....	25
2.3.3 Alternative B - Proposed Action.....	28
2.3.4 Alternative C - Modified Timber Harvest .....	38
2.4 FOREST PLAN AMENDMENT .....	39
2.5 MONITORING AND EVALUATION .....	44
2.6 ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY .....	44
2.7 COMPARISON OF PROJECT OBJECTIVE ACHIEVEMENT .....	45
2.8 COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES ON SIGNIFICANT AND KEY ISSUES .....	47
2.9 IDENTIFICATION OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE .....	49
<b>3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES ....</b>	<b>51</b>
3.1 INTRODUCTION .....	51
3.2 FOREST VEGETATION .....	53
3.2.1 Vegetation Composition and Structure .....	53
3.2.2 Insects and Disease .....	69
3.2.3 Fire/Fuels .....	79
3.2.4 Relationship Between Short-Term Use and Long-Term Productivity ....	88
3.2.5 Irreversible/Irrecoverable Commitment of Resources .....	88
3.2.6 Forest Plan Consistency .....	89
3.3 WILDLIFE RESOURCES.....	91

3.3.1	Northern Goshawk .....	91
3.3.2	Three-Toed Woodpecker .....	96
3.3.3	Deer and Elk .....	101
3.3.4	Relationship Between Short-Term Use and Long-Term Productivity ...	107
3.3.5	Irreversible/Irretrievable Commitment of Resources .....	107
3.3.6	Forest Plan Consistency .....	107
3.4	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM .....	111
3.4.1	Public Access and Safety .....	111
3.4.2	Relationship Between Short-Term Use and Long-Term Productivity ...	118
3.4.3	Irreversible/Irretrievable Commitment of Resources .....	118
3.4.4	Forest Plan Consistency .....	118
3.5	VISUAL LANDSCAPE .....	119
3.5.1	Visual Character.....	119
3.5.2	Relationship Between Short-Term Use and Long-Term Productivity ...	128
3.5.3	Irreversible/Irretrievable Commitment of Resources .....	129
3.5.4	Forest Plan Consistency .....	129
3.6	RECREATION .....	131
3.6.1	Recreation Settings, Opportunities, and Uses.....	131
3.6.2	Relationship Between Short-Term Use and Long-Term Productivity ...	136
3.6.3	Irreversible/Irretrievable Commitment of Resources .....	137
3.6.4	Forest Plan Consistency .....	137
3.7	MUNICIPAL WATERSHED.....	139
3.7.1	Soil Erosion Hazard .....	139
3.7.2	Support of Beneficial Uses of Water .....	146
3.7.3	Compliance with Utah's Antidegradation Policy .....	148
3.7.4	Watershed Resilience.....	151
3.7.5	Relationship Between Short-Term Use and Long-Term Productivity ...	158
3.7.6	Irreversible/Irretrievable Commitment of Resources .....	158
3.7.7	Forest Plan Consistency .....	158
3.8	SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED DISCLOSURES.....	159
3.8.1	Threatened and Endangered Species .....	159
3.8.2	Cultural and Historic Resources .....	164
3.8.3	Wetlands and Floodplains.....	165
3.8.4	Environmental Justice.....	166
3.8.5	Effects of Alternatives on Social Groups.....	166
3.8.6	Prime Farm Land, Rangeland and Forest Land .....	166
3.8.7	Energy Requirements and Conservation Potential .....	166
3.8.8	Effects on the Human Environment.....	166
3.8.9	Conflicts with Other Agency Goals and Objectives .....	167
<b>4</b>	<b>LIST OF PREPARERS.....</b>	<b>169</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>LIST OF AGENCIES AND PERSONS CONSULTED .....</b>	<b>171</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>LITERATURE CITED .....</b>	<b>175</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>GLOSSARY .....</b>	<b>179</b>

## FIGURES

Figure 1 - Horsehead Peak.....	2
Figure 2 - Forest Plan Management Units (USDA Forest Service, 1986).....	12
Figure 3 - Other Issues Considered but not Analyzed in Detail .....	16
Figure 4 - Alternative Summary Table .....	44
Figure 5 - Summary Comparison of Alternative Achievement of Project Objectives .....	46
Figure 6 - Comparison of Alternatives by Issue .....	47
Figure 7 – Structural Stages Crosswalk for Engelmann Spruce Vegetation Types.....	54
Figure 8 – Current Vegetation Types and Structure (Acres).....	55
Figure 9 – Direct Effects of the Alternatives on Stand Composition and Structure (Acres) if all Stands are Treated.....	59
Figure 10 – Direct Effects of the Alternatives on Stand Composition and Structure (Acres) if Optional Areas are not Treated.....	59
Figure 11 – Typical Aspen/Spruce-fir Stand (Short-term).....	60
Figure 12 – Typical Aspen/Spruce-fir Stand Following a Spruce Beetle Epidemic (Long- term).....	61
Figure 13 – Example of an Average Aspen/Spruce-fir Stand Following Harvest, Alternative B.....	62
Figure 14 - Example of an Average Aspen/Spruce-fir Stand Following Harvest, Alternative C.....	63
Figure 15 – Treatment Acres by Alternative .....	64
Figure 16 – Cumulative Effects of the Alternatives on Stand Composition and Structure (Acres) if all Stands are Treated .....	66
Figure 17 – Cumulative Effects of the Alternatives on Stand Composition and Structure (Acres) if Optional Areas are not Treated.....	66
Figure 18 – Typical Spruce/Subalpine fir Stand (Short-term).....	71
Figure 19 – Typical Spruce/Subalpine fir Stand Following a Spruce Beetle Epidemic (Long-term).....	73
Figure 20 – Spruce/Subalpine fir Stand Following a Treatment under Alternative B (Short-term).....	74
Figure 21 – Spruce/Subalpine fir Stand Following a Treatment under Alternative C (Short-term).....	75
Figure 22 – Spruce Beetle Risk for the Project Area if all Proposed Acres are Treated..	75
Figure 23 – Spruce Beetle Risk for the Project Area if all Proposed Acres are not Treated ..	76
Figure 24 – Summary of Treated and Untreated Acres by Alternative .....	77
Figure 25 – Fire Occurrences on the Monticello Ranger District from 1970 to 2002.....	79
Figure 26 – Number of Fires by Decade on the Monticello Ranger District.....	80
Figure 27 – Comparisons of Fuel Loadings by Fuel and Vegetation Groups (Short and Long-Term).....	82
Figure 28 – Summary of Potential for Initial Attack Escape (Short and Long-Term). ....	83
Figure 29- Short-term Fine Fuel Loading and Long-term (2092) Large Fuel Loading by Fuel Groups for each Alternative before Fuel Treatment.....	84
Figure 30 – Short-term Fire Behavior by Alternative Before Slash Treatment.....	84
Figure 31 – Large and Fine Fuels Reductions for each Alternative. ....	85

Figure 32 - Fire Behavior for all Alternatives in 2092 (Long-term).....	86
Figure 33 - Northern Goshawk- Direct/Indirect Effects .....	94
Figure 34 - Northern Goshawk-Cumulative Effects.....	96
Figure 35 - Three-toed Woodpecker-Direct and Indirect Effects .....	100
Figure 36 - Three-toed Woodpecker-Cumulative Effects .....	101
Figure 37 - Post-hunting Season Status of the San Juan Herd (2002)* .....	102
Figure 38 - Post-hunting Season Status of the San Juan Herd (2001)* .....	102
Figure 39 - Deer and Elk-Direct/Indirect Effects .....	105
Figure 40 - Deer and Elk Cumulative Effects.....	107
Figure 41 - Acres Meeting Goshawk Standards and Guidelines .....	108
Figure 42 - Acres Disturbed (Mature→Younger) .....	109
Figure 43 - Existing and Projected Transportation System- Project Area.....	112
Figure 44 - Roads Analysis Recommendations .....	117
Figure 45 - Horsehead Peak .....	120
Figure 46 - Horsehead Peak Simulation (Alternative A).....	124
Figure 47 - Aspen Treatment with Adjacent Spruce-fir Treatment Simulation .....	126
Figure 48 - Horsehead Peak Simulation (Alternatives B and C) .....	127
Figure 49 - Average Daily Traffic (ADT) .....	133
Figure 50 - Recreation Opportunity Spectrum.....	133
Figure 51 - Soil Erosion Hazard as Levels of Concern (LOC).....	140
Figure 52 - Existing Roads, Trails, Pipeline, and Soil Levels of Concern .....	140
Figure 53 - Indian Creek Soil Levels of Concern and Activity Acres.....	142
Figure 54 - Spring Creek Soil Levels of Concern and Activity Acres .....	143
Figure 55 - North Creek Soil Levels of Concern and Activity Acres.....	143
Figure 56 - Johnson Creek Soil Levels of Concern and Activity Acres .....	144
Figure 57 Disturbed Acres Ten Years Following Implementation.....	145
Figure 58 - Summary of Road and Trail Acreages Adjacent to the Stream Network ...	152
Figure 59 - Sensitivity to Disturbance at Representative Stream Locations .....	152
Figure 60 - Additional Disturbed Acres and Distance from the Stream Network.....	154
Figure 61 – Water Resiliency Ratings (Short and Long-Term).....	155
Figure 62 – Wildland fire escape rating (percentage of watershed area) .....	156
Figure 63 - Stream Flow Changes Downstream in the Project Area .....	157
Figure 64 - Watershed Resilience Rating Summary.....	157
Figure 65 - Public Involvement (Commentor).....	172
Figure 66 - Public Involvement (Other Interested Individuals/Organizations) .....	173

## MAPS

Map 1 - Vicinity Map .....	4
Map 2 - Project Area.....	5
Map 3 - Blue Mountain Inventory Roadless Area .....	6
Map 4 - Monticello City Water System .....	7
Map 5 - Forest Plan Management Units .....	13
Map 6 - Water System Reconstruction (Alternatives B & C) .....	30
Map 7 –Proposed Road Construction/Reconstruction, and Classification Changes .....	31
Map 8 - Proposed Rock/Soil Sources (Alternatives B & C).....	33

Map 9 - Forest Type Treated (Alternative B) .....	34
Map 10 - Optional Treatment Area (Alternative B) .....	35
Map 11 - Logging Method (Alternative B).....	36
Map 12 - Silvicultural System (Alternative B).....	37
Map 13 - Forest Type Treated (Alternative C) .....	40
Map 14 - Optional Treatment Area (Alternative C) .....	41
Map 15 - Logging Method (Alternative C).....	42
Map 16 - Silvicultural System (Alternative C) .....	43
Map 17 - Existing Vegetation Types. ....	57
Map 18 - Existing Stand Structures .....	58
Map 19 - Spruce-fir and Aspen/Spruce Vegetation Types .....	67
Map 20 - Spruce-fir and Aspen/Spruce Stand Structures. ....	68
Map 21 – 1999 through 2001 Spruce Beetle Survey .....	72
Map 22 - Spruce Vegetation Types .....	78
Map 23 - Roads Analysis Current and Proposed Transportation System.....	114
Map 24 - Forest Plan VQO And Condition Inventory.....	123
Map 25 - Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) .....	134
Map 26 – Watershed Analysis Area .....	141

## APPENDICES

- Appendix A – Design Features, Best Management Practices, and Monitoring
- Appendix B – NFMA Consistency
- Appendix C – Project Photographs
- Appendix D – Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions
- Appendix E – Water Collection Area Design
- Appendix F – Curve Design
- Appendix G – Other Issues