

### **CHAPTER 3: THE UINTA NATIONAL FOREST POSTWAR TO PRESENT**

World War II marked a shift in Forest Service management and policy. Phenomenal demands on forest resources during the war and after required a different approach to resource management.

Additionally, the last men to begin their Forest Service careers under Gifford Pinchot were retiring. “The war was the last hurrah for many forestry pioneers and brought a change of direction for American forestry” (Steen 1991:246).

To better manage Forest Lands during the latter half of the twentieth century, land managers conducted broad research studies to find more efficient and up to date ways of managing the resource. Within the Department of Agriculture, the Interbureau Committee on Post-War Programs acted as a forum to exchange ideas and conduct inter-agency planning. Issues relating to timber, range, wildlife, water and recreation were discussed. Congress became involved in directing change as well.

Mining, timber, recreation and other demands were increasing with populations in the west and Forest officials had to achieve a balance between these uses. In 1960, the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act was passed which provided the Forest Service with a specific Congressional directive establishing priorities for resource use. The Act stated that “the National Forests are established and shall be administered for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish purposes.” Multiple use

was defined as “the utilization of resources in combination to meet needs” and stipulated that economic return was not, in all cases, to be the limiting factor. Multiple use, which had long been practiced by the Forest Service, was now Federal law (Steen 1991).

In addition, the Federal Government passed other pieces of legislation that had a great effect on the way Forest Service management decisions were made. In 1969, Congress passed the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) to ensure that the impacts of any activity on the natural environment were carefully looked at before proceeding. The president was required to set up a Council on Environmental Quality and Federal Agencies were required to make advance reports, including Environmental Impact Statements, for major planned actions. This requirement proved to have an unprecedented effect on the planning and implementation of public land management decisions.

Congress passed the National Resources Planning Act, in 1974, requiring a nationwide assessment of public forest and range lands every ten years and the development of a Forest Service management program every five years. In 1976, the National Forest Management Act became law. The Act emphasized land management planning, timber management actions and public participation in Forest Service decision making. It required the development of land management plans for each National Forest which detailed alternatives and proposals for management, based on multiple use, for each resource. In 1984, the Uinta National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, commonly referred to as the Forest Plan, was created

in compliance with Federal land management laws. The Forest Plan reduced logging to a sustained yield level, left watershed management at a “locally preferred level,” and recommended nearly 70,000 acres for designation as wilderness including Mount Nebo and the Mount Timpanogos Scenic Areas (Holmes 1990). The Uinta Forest Plan was the first completed in Region 4 and was one of the first Forest Service plans completed nationwide.

## **TIMBER**

In the 1940's, the Interbureau Committee on Post-War Programs decided that the most urgent need confronting land managers at the time was to stop the destructive logging practices adopted to satisfy war time demands. In 1944, in response to staggering demands on timber for aircraft frames, ship decking, crates, and dozens of other military uses, Congress passed several pieces of legislation that would change the direction of timber management. The Sustained-Yield Management Act allowed the Forest Service and lumber companies to enter into long-term agreements promising a constant supply of timber to feed the company's mill at or above appraised value, without competitive bids. This guaranteed supply was authorized only when community stability required federal timber not available through conventional sales. Supporters of the Sustained-Yield Act felt the cost of supporting whole communities in the event of a mill shut down outweighed the costs of lost revenue from noncompetitive timber sales.

Additionally, an amendment to federal income tax law was passed which

authorized lumbermen to report income from timber sales as capital gains instead of income. Since capital gains taxes were a fraction of those levied on income, private foresters could realize a substantial profit. The law stated that capital gains could not be reported on an operator cutting his own timber. The law then encouraged stable ownership of private forest lands, a practice essential to the effective management of private timber resources (Steen 1991).

In 1949, a bill was introduced by the ex-Secretary of Agriculture Senator Clinton P. Anderson. The bill was titled “A Bill to Provide for Establishment of Forest Practices for the Conservation and Proper Use of Privately Owned Forest Lands and for Other Purposes.” This was to be the first significant step toward Federal regulation of the nation's timber. The battle that ensued was fought within Congress and between the American Forest Products Industries, State and private foresters, lumber men and the Forest Service. In 1952, the debate was settled by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. In an atmosphere of patriotism and intense distrust of communist governments overseas, President Eisenhower stated he did not want “federal domination of the people through federal domination of their natural resources.” Many felt resource conservation had to be achieved without succumbing to “dictatorship or national socialism (Steen 1991).”

Immediately after World War II, the Intermountain Region adopted a policy of “over cutting” in an attempt to convert local and national economies from war time to peace time production. In some cases, timber was cut beyond the sustained yield. Insects and disease served to accelerate this cutting program. During this time period,

about six million board feet were cut annually on the Uinta, with most of the wood used in the construction of new homes. By 1949, timber harvesting was dropped down to 3,849,000 board feet (Holmes 1990).

Up until the late 1980's, timber harvesting was based on even-aged management. Timber stands that matured would be harvested leaving behind only young trees. While this practice was not as drastic as clear cutting, it did have a significant effect on the area cut. By the 1990's, the emphasis shifted to Uneven-Aged management. Timber is now harvested with established guidelines on how many trees can be harvested within specified size ranges. Areas cut retain much of their previous integrity. The National Environmental Protection Act has had a significant influence on timber harvesting on the Uinta. Effects on Threatened or Endangered wildlife species, watersheds and recreational values are all considered before timber is harvested.

Timber management has undergone another significant change as well. The Forest Plan has taken the emphasis off of commodity production and placed it on the management of Forest vegetation. This management approach focuses on stewardship and ecosystems. Years of fire suppression created problems with insect infestation, disease, and an increased danger of destructive fires due to large numbers of dead trees and undergrowth. Managing forest health through insect and disease control is accomplished in a way to accomplish range, wildlife and recreation goals. In this way, concerns like watershed and habitat protection become part of the timber management process. In addition, trees that are less viable as a timber source,

like Douglas-fir and white fir, are now managed along with the traditional timber producing species. More emphasis is being placed on lodgepole pine as well. The lodgepole communities on the Uinta National Forest represent the extreme southeastern boundary of North America's lodgepole range. Aspen is actively managed as an important part of the ecosystem through regeneration and the prevention of encroachment by other species. Timber production is now a by-product of managing forest health, not the primary goal of timber management.

Currently, there are two significant projects on the Uinta in which forest vegetation is a significant component and illustrate how timber and vegetation management are now integrated. The Trapper Hollow Project on the Heber Ranger District was developed to address several different needs. Lack of natural small fires has resulted in an unusually large infestation of bark beetles within many Douglas and white fir stands and an increase in the potential in this area for large, devastating fires. Aspen stands, which provide important habitat and watershed maintenance are experiencing encroachment by subalpine fir. Recreational use of the area is expected to increase as a result of the reconstruction of Highway 35 (the Wolf Creek Highway) and the increased accessibility. The Trapper Hollow Project is a coordinated attempt to effectively answer all of these challenges through sound ecosystems management. Timber, wildlife and recreation managers along with others are working together to come up with a viable plan for long-term management that focuses on vegetation management.

The White River Area Analysis

looks at all resource components of the overall landscape within the White River drainage on the Spanish Fork Ranger District including watershed, wildlife, timber, range, recreation and the local economy, and considers the area's biological component, natural disturbance regimes and the human component to be interrelated. This area analysis recognized that all these systems are dependent on a healthy and balanced cover of different kinds of vegetation and will encourage decisions that manage not only timber and other plants within an ecosystems framework, but management in other areas as well.

The future of the timber program on the forest will focus on continued stewardship and management of forest vegetation as part of an overall ecosystem. Efforts are currently under way to use controlled burning as a management tool in insect and disease control/prevention, aspen stand management and general regeneration of understory plants in several areas on the Forest.

### **Youth Forest of 1964**

In June 1964, a forest plantation known as the Hobble Creek Youth Forest was established. It was located in Chase Creek beyond Hall's Fork in the Upper Hobble Creek section of the Spanish Fork Ranger District. The new forest replaced an old growth timber stand which had been over-cut, overgrazed and then burned over.

Initially an area in Chase Canyon was planted with 5,000 seedlings. Later, 20,000 more Douglas-fir and lodgepole pine trees were planted by the youth in a project sponsored jointly by the Utah Federation of Women's Clubs and the Forest Service. It is now known as the



*Jeri Winger, Virginia Benson, Women's Special Activities Coordinator for the Regional Office, and Forest Supervisor Clarence Thornock pose in front of the Youth Forest sign in 1964. USDA Forest Service.*

Ruby Christensen Memorial Youth Forest to honor a nationally recognized conservationist from Springville, Utah.

At the renaming and rededication ceremony in 1969 under the direction of the Utah Federation of Women's Clubs, Regional Forester Floyd Iverson stated:

*Today we are making a sentimental journey into the past. But in a larger sense, it is a journey into the future - and it proceeds from a historic spot. This is the place that in times past has provided materials vital to the well-being and survival of the pioneers who struggled to settle the valleys below and to prepare the way for all of us to live the good life that is possible here today.*

*History is again in the making. Through the cooperative efforts of the descendants of these same pioneers, these mountains are being reforested that they may continue to render high standards of*

*service to people* (U.S. Department of Agriculture 1972).

Henry DeBruin, Division of Information and Education of the Forest Service, Washington, D.C., read a letter from Edward P. Cliff, Chief of the U.S. Forest Service. Mr. Cliff wrote, in part:

*I can think of no tribute more appropriate to the memory of Ruby Christensen than the dedication of this living memorial in her honor. Being a "youth forest" makes it doubly fitting, for it was during her first term as president of the Utah Federation that the first youth forest planting took place on the Fishlake National Forest. Ruby received many honors during her lifetime, but I feel certain that she would rate this as one of the finest* (U.S. Department of Agriculture 1972).

## **GRAZING AND WATERSHED**

In the late 1940's and early 1950's, land managers became increasingly alarmed about the continued deterioration of the rangeland due to overgrazing by cattle and sheep. The time had come to take necessary steps to reduce the number of cattle and sheep in order that the range could be rehabilitated and managed for long term health. As it was in the 1890's, the Forest officials were not very popular. Many disagreements between Forest officers and livestock owners developed, meetings were held and letter after letter written. Forest officers were not alone in this concern for the rangeland.

In a 1947 lecture titled "*Is Utah*

*Sahara Bound?*", Dr. Walter P. Cottam, Professor of Botany at the University of Utah, expressed his deep concern as follows:

*In every plant community myriads of biological forms present influence of action and interaction which bind the whole into a social organism extremely delicate in its balance. The removal of one biological species or the ascendancy of another through such outside influences as grazing is bound to upset this fine balance in nature and to set in motion successional changes which may and often do alter completely the original vegetational aspect...*

*The most important fact, however, is that the total plant cover decreases under heavy grazing use, thereby exposing the soil to the forces of erosion...Under severe grazing, less palatable herbs and*



*The Butterfield sheep camp on the west slope of Mt. Timpanogos, 1958. USDA Forest Service.*



*Loading seed for Santaquin Canyon project, 1952. Forest Supervisor James Jacobs, James Stover from Boise, Leon Howard from Nephi, and Clair Hartnett, a pilot from Boise. This seeding method allowed managers to utilize 28,000 lbs of seed in thirty four and a half hours of flight time. USDA Forest Service.*

*shrubs tend to replace the more palatable forage...*

*Utah will attain a stabilized prosperity only when and if the public consciously adopts, maintains and enforces a program of resource use...*

*The land resources of water, soils, and vegetation and animal life are but vital aspects of an intricate whole. When vegetation is destroyed, soil erodes, floods occur, animals perish, and the power of the land to support plant life progressively diminishes...(Cottam 1947).*

The late 1940's saw a significant drop in the numbers of livestock grazed and a reduction in available range for reseeding, coupled with agreements with permittees to rest some allotments. But

these steps alone did not solve the problems with the range. The next step was to eliminate common use; the practice of



*Over-grazed range on the Berg sheep allotment, October 1945. USDA Forest Service.*



*Repairing flood damage to the road in American Fork Canyon, 1953. Flooding and erosion had significant impacts on fish habitat as well as recreational facilities. USDA Forest Service.*

grazing cattle and sheep in the same areas. Through the 1950's, range managers manipulated permits and bargained with permittee's to the point that common use was eliminated by 1958. This process was



*Contour trenching near the head of the Dry Fork of Rock Canyon, September 1957. USDA Forest Service.*

not easy and great sacrifices, both professional and personal, were made by Forest Service employees and livestock owners alike. Management modifications like this were critical for the recovery of plant communities on range allotments.

Even with these improvements, problems with water production and floods continued on Utah Valley watersheds. Because of population, industrial and agricultural growth in the valley, watersheds became increasingly important (Isbell 1972). In 1957, the Uinta National Forest entered into an agreement with Provo and Springville Cities and Utah County to reactivate the rehabilitation work that had been started by the CCC in 1933 on the watershed areas east of Utah Valley. The Provo Peak Watershed Rehabilitation Project, as this agreement was known, included all watershed areas between the Provo River and the Spring Creek and

Jennings Hollow tributaries of Hobble Creek Canyon. The cities and the county agreed to reconstruct and maintain the debris basins at the mouths of Rock Canyon, Slate Canyon and Little Rock Canyon. The Forest Service was to accomplish rehab work upstream and sheep grazing was terminated under an open-end non-use agreement. In the five years that followed, the Forest Service completed nearly 900 acres of contour trenching, over 400 acres of grass seeding, 12.5 miles of gully plugs, 10 acres of furrowing, 10 acres of head cut control, 10.5 miles of road construction, and 5 miles of trail erosion control at a total cost of \$81,978 (Uinta National Forest 1966). Completion of this project resulted in an increased site productivity for wildlife and a more productive watershed for the growing population in the valley.

In 1959, a similar project, the American Fork-Dry Canyon Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Project was undertaken. Many of the watershed areas east of Alpine, Pleasant Grove and Lindon were contour trenched and reseeded with a variety of grasses. This project greatly improved habitat and watershed in the north end of Utah Valley (Uinta National Forest 1965).

Between 1957 and 1967, numbers of permitted cattle and sheep were drastically reduced Forest wide. In conjunction with these projects, some allotments were closed altogether. The results of the combined efforts of Forest officials, City and County governments, and private individuals and organizations was summed up in 1970 by Dr. Walter Cottam in an interview with the Salt Lake Tribune:



*The head of Dry Canyon shortly after the completion of contour trenching, November 1959. USDA Forest Service.*

*I just can't believe how these ranges have improved. The aspens are reproducing again, the grasses are lush and full and up to a horse's belly. Go to Mt. Nebo or the Fish Lake area, for instance, where they had been stripped of cover, they are now lush with growth again. I've known these mountains for many decades. But they are not the same mountains now. The Forest Service has done a magnificent job. And I think the same recovery job could be done with other aspects of our environmental problem, given the same incentive, public support and governmental persistence (U.S. Department of Agriculture 1972).*

Today the range program continues to adjust management on a case by case basis to meet the continued growing demands of more diverse users. In 1993

the Uinta National Forest completed the Rangeland Ecosystem Forest Plan Amendment EIS which established specific criteria for allotment management. While site specific resource problems continue to be of a concern, the rangelands of the Uinta National Forest are likely in the best condition, ecologically, that they have been in during the last century. In the future, the range program will continue with range stewardship guided by the Forest Service's ecosystems management philosophy and approach.

### **WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES**

By 1945, wildlife habitat was seeing significant improvement through better livestock and range management and an increased understanding through research of the relationships between wildlife and the rest of the ecosystem. In fact, one primary objective, at the time, was to determine use patterns of both wildlife and livestock and their compatibility. Wildlife biologists were especially concerned with the conditions of big-game wintering ranges. The Uinta, along with nearly every other Forest in the Intermountain Region, engaged in wildlife-livestock forage studies in cooperation with Forest and Range Experiment Stations, nearby universities, the State Department of Fish and Game and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Predator control, on the other hand, begun at the turn of the century to benefit the livestock industry, was not benefiting game populations. In 1920, game populations began increasing significantly, in part due to the absence of predators like coyotes, mountain lions and bears. In the 1930's and 40's, game populations had grown beyond the land's carrying capacity.

In addition, World War II compounded these problems by causing a decline in hunting, a result of the rationing of rubber, gasoline and ammunition. Ranger Merrill Nielson recorded his attempts to get an "either sex" permit passed to help relieve the overpopulation problem.

*During the late thirties and forties, the deer populations started to increase rapidly. This increase was first noted during the winter months on the low range from Little Rock Canyon to the "Forks" of Hobble Creek, and across the "Front" from Hobble Creek to the mouth of Spanish Fork Canyon. The deer were congregating in large numbers on the low winter range and were killing the browse plants by overgrazing.*

*At this time, the State Fish and Game Department officials, as well as the sportsmen, were very much opposed to killing does. Between 1940 and 1948 we did get some recommendations approved for taking some does, but sportsmen would not shoot them. As a result, the deer populations increased faster than ever. Then in the winter of 1948-49, there was an unusually heavy snowfall, the weather was extremely cold for many days at a time, and large numbers of deer were congregated on the low range above the cultivated fields. As the snow became deeper, many of the deer moved down into orchards where they ate the tender buds of the fruit trees. Christmas trees were hauled on the range for the deer; and even though the twigs and*

*needles were dry, the deer ate most of the trees. The State Fish and Game Department hauled hay and pellets to several feed grounds on the winter range. In January the deer started to die. By the middle of March, over 2,500 deer had died between Little Rock Canyon and the mouth of Spanish Fork Canyon...Fifteen hundred were hauled to an animal by-product plant. These were only the deer that had died near the roads. The men from the supervisor's office and my assistant and I spent one day counting dead deer on the steep slopes north of Springville. We counted 500. Assistant Grant Williams and I spent several days riding and hiking in the area south of Hobble Creek, and we counted more than 500 dead deer on this area. The winter loss was a severe blow to the Hobble Creek deer herd...Big sagebrush was being completely killed out because of overgrazing by deer.*

*About this time, the "either sex" law went into effect...The State Fish and Game Department was now behind the Forest Service 100 percent in making recommendations for special hunts and extended seasons to reduce the deer populations...(U.S. Department of Agriculture 1972).*

A major wildlife habitat improvement project was approved for the Tank Hollow area during the fall of 1961. Due to heavy grazing, nearly all herbaceous plants had been eliminated. The result was heavy mortality among browse animals like



deer. The objectives of the project were to improve wildlife habitat and provide access to the area for hunting. In November and December of 1962, the project was implemented and consisted of juniper control, contour trenching, deep furrowing, grass seeding (broadcast), brush gully checks, browse seeding (by hand) and road construction. As with many of these projects, part of this work was accomplished by volunteers. The Spanish Fork Livestock Association agreed to a voluntary adjustment in grazing and livestock were eliminated from all areas in Tank Hollow except for a 600 acre reseeded pasture. In November of 1971, additional work was performed in Tank Hollow when 600 acres were chained and aerial seeded by helicopter. This area was used to test a relatively new method of chaining that district personnel helped develop with some army surplus equipment (Isbell 1972:69-70).

In the fall of 1965, the Forest Service and State Division of Fish and Game began work on the Diamond Fork

Fisheries Project. This project focused on a portion of the stream with especially low trout numbers, and sought to improve them through the construction of pools and stream bank stabilization. This, together with the elimination of grazing in the area, increased trout numbers and habitat quality significantly (Isbell 1972).

The greatest advances in wildlife management in the last thirty years came as a result of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in 1969 which had profound implications on wildlife habitat management. Adverse impacts on wildlife by a proposed project were now clearly defined and mitigated. In 1973, the Endangered Species Act gave new protection to wildlife and plant species that were thought to warrant special protection. The Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act, also known as Resources Planning Act (RPA), became an important guide for habitat management in 1974. This Act ensured that adequate provisions and funding to meet immediate and future Forest research needs, including wildlife. To meet the direction defined in the RPA process, a Region wide "Wildlife Action Plan" was established to develop a Regional wildlife program (U.S. Department of Agriculture 1980).

An example of this broad scale planning occurred in the mid-1980's. Wildlife planners believed wildlife habitat could be improved through the selective harvesting of aspen, oak, and maple in specified areas. These improvements were recommended in cooperation with the Utah Department of Wildlife Resources and coordinated among other resource programs on the Forest. This allowed habitat improvements and enhanced production of other resources.

### **Mt. Nebo Bighorn**

In 1972, the Forest Service proposed the reintroduction of bighorn sheep onto the Wasatch Front. Bighorn sheep, which are native to the area, disappeared by the 1930's due to over-hunting and diseases spread by domestic sheep. An Environmental Analysis on the project, completed in January of 1973, indicated the need to fill the ecological niche left vacant for so many years by the sheep. Potential areas for the reintroduction ranged from Mill Creek Canyon, on the Wasatch-Cache National Forest, to the south slopes of Mount Nebo on the Uinta. In August of 1976, the Uinta entered into a cooperative agreement with the Division of Wildlife Resources to reintroduce bighorn sheep obtained from Montana. In September, the Division indicated that they would rather see the Bighorns reintroduced on Nebo due to the heavy population centers adjacent to the other areas. In 1977, approximately 25 sheep were reintroduced. State-of-the-art bighorn transplants now routinely include several releases to ensure a properly functioning core population. Unfortunately that was not well understood in the mid seventies. The failure to augment the core population with subsequent transplants, competition with deer and predation prevented the population from establishing itself. By the early 1990's the original bighorns had died of old age and the population died out.

### **Mountain Goats**

Rocky Mountain goats were first released in Utah in 1967 in the Twin Peaks area, north of Little Cottonwood Canyon, in the Wasatch Mountains by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources. Six goats,



*Mountain goat on Mt. Timpanogos. USDA Forest Service.*

two yearling males and four adult females, from the northern Cascades of Washington State, were released. Mountain goats from this transplant dispersed south and populated the Lone Peak area and Box Elder Peak. In The herd had become large enough in 1986 that goats were captured and transplanted to the Tushars Mountains and Mount Holly on the Fishlake National Forest. In 1988, eight Lone Peak/Twin Peaks goats were transplanted to the Bald Mountain and Lakes region in the Uinta Mountains on the Wasatch-Cache and in 1992, thirteen more were taken to the Whiterocks Drainage on the Ashley National Forest. By 1995, the population of the Lone Peak/Twin Peaks goats was estimated at 200 animals, the largest in Utah.

A herd was established on Mount Timpanogos in 1981 with the transplant of ten goats from Olympic National Park in Washington. The goats were released at the Timpooneke Trailhead at the northern end of Mount Timpanogos. In 1986, a single goat from this herd was captured to

augment the herd being established on the Fishlake National Forest. In 1990, five more goats were sent to augment the herd on Cascade and Provo Peaks. The Timpanogos herd was estimated at 100+ animals in 1995, the second largest in Utah.

A herd was established in 1988 on Cascade and Provo Peaks with the transplant of seven goats from the Olympic National Park in Washington. The herd was augmented in 1990 with five more goats from the Mount Timpanogos herd, and in 1995 the estimated population of this herd was 40 animals.

Currently, the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources is proposing to fit mountain goats in the Lone Peak and Timpanogos Wilderness Areas with radio telemetry collars to study the impacts the goats may have on soil and vegetation. Little is known about the ecology and impacts of mountain goats in these areas since they are not native. A study is needed to address general concerns about the impacts mountain goats may have on other aspects of the ecosystem.

### **1990 Rotenone Treatment of Strawberry Reservoir**

Strawberry Reservoir has undergone many changes. Fish introductions, land management practices, and water level increases have all affected fish populations at different times. Fish introductions probably had the greatest influence. In the 1940's, the word was out: "Native trout really go for live bait!" Chubs, perch, carp, and suckers probably found their way into the reservoir via minnow buckets. These nongame fish multiplied, and over the next 20 years, the trout population decreased. Nongame fish were chemically

removed in 1961 and their elimination greatly improved trout fishing. However, in the early 1970's, nongame fish reappeared and trout fishing began a slow decline. In 1990, the fish population in Strawberry Reservoir was 95% chubs and suckers.

In order to return Strawberry Reservoir to one of Utah's premier trout fisheries, the Forest Service and Utah Division of Wildlife Resources determined that the following goals needed to be met. These included eliminating chubs and suckers from the reservoir, introducing fish to maintain a quality trout fishery and restoring tributary habitat so that trout could reproduce naturally.

To eliminate chubs and suckers, the reservoir needed to be chemically treated. In August 1990, the reservoir and tributaries were treated with 900,000 pounds of rotenone, a powdered chemical which was mixed with water. At the application rates used, rotenone removed the fish and many invertebrates. The treatment had a low toxicity level for birds and mammals, and livestock were able to safely drink the water.

The treatment project was very successful and on October 20, the reservoir was restocked with 1,500,000 Bear Lake cutthroat, kokanee salmon, and rainbow trout. These fish have thrived in the reservoir and its tributaries. Many of the invertebrates have also begun to reappear in the drainage. Strawberry has once again become one of Utah's premier trout fisheries.

## RECREATION AND WILDERNESS

At the end of World War II, the Forest's potential to provide recreation became its primary value in many minds. During that time, the population along the Wasatch Front began to grow at a much faster rate and the close proximity of so much beautiful land became important as an escape from urban life. The Forest itself



*Recreation remains one of the Uinta National Forests primary uses. USDA Forest Service.*

began investing more planning, thought and money into developing trails, campgrounds and permitting the construction of more organizational camps. The Forest recognized that its greatest value to it publics could be in providing experiences in addition to commodities.

World War II made its mark on recreation management. The Civilian Conservation Corps was disbanded in June of 1942, greatly reducing the construction and maintenance of recreational facilities.

Additionally, gasoline, rubber and ammunition rationing curtailed recreational visits during the war. At the completion of the war, however, recreational use began to steadily increase. Principle recreational activities at the time were picnicking, camping, fishing and hunting. Unfortunately, this increase added to the general deterioration of CCC built picnicking and camping facilities for which maintenance funds had not been set aside at the time of their construction..

In 1947, 170,000 visits by recreators were recorded on the Uinta. By 1957, that number had risen to over one million visits. Recreational uses were still very similar to those in the 1940's, with the addition of winter sports, hiking, horseback riding and organization camping. Summer cabins were being completed at Tibble Fork Reservoir and the Silver Lake Reservoir area at the same time under a permit system that allowed construction of private cabins on National Forest lands.

In the early 1960's, the Uinta prepared a recreation management plan that inventoried all developed and potential recreational sites. This information was then synthesized into short and long range plans to anticipate needs through the year 2000. In 1965, the Land and Water Conservation Act allowed the Forest Service to collect recreation funds through user fees in certain areas, a tax on pleasure boat fuel, and receipts from the sale of certain Federal properties. The user fee system was applied to over half of all campsites and most family units on the Forest.

The 1960's also witnessed the Region 4 program of examining "near natural" areas on Forest lands. The Timpanogos Scenic Area was established in

1961 to recognize its spectacular alpine beauty. In 1967, Cascade Springs was developed as a scenic recreational area. The Whiskey Springs Rest Area was developed at the same time.

By the mid-1980's, close proximity to large population centers made recreation one of the Uinta's prime attractions. Increasing use along with damage caused by the flooding in 1983-84 required the repair and, in some cases, replacement of developed facilities. But, the demand for group sites continued to exceed supply. New facilities were constructed when budgets permitted. Facilities at Currant Creek Reservoir and Black Hawk Campground were two of these projects. In 1989, the lands around Strawberry Reservoir were transferred to the Forest Service, greatly expanding opportunities for developed facilities.

The continued demand for group sites has resulted in the use of dispersed areas like Salamander Flat on the Pleasant Grove Ranger District. Groups supply their own toilets and garbage removal in compliance with the pack-it-in, pack-it-out program. In many cases, the lack of cooperation from groups and individuals to remove garbage has created an additional expense for the Uinta. Seasonal employees often spend the summer months collecting truck loads of trash left by fun seeking forest users.

The current trend is toward smaller government in the United States. The Forest Service, however, is expected to provide the same recreational services. Supply analysis indicated that the Forest is capable of producing over three million recreation visitor days (RVD's) and that capacity will be reached around the year 2020. As the Forest recreational



*Recreation use continues to grow and diversity as the Uinta National Forest enters its 100<sup>th</sup> year of resource management. USDA Forest Service.*

opportunities increase in popularity among growing populations in Utah, it becomes more difficult to maintain existing recreational facilities. As a result, the trend in the Forest Service has been to use private concessionaires' to manage some facilities. Permits are granted for concessionaires to manage and collect revenues from facilities that are in place. Revenues collected can then go back into the maintenance of facilities, where fees collected by the Forest Service have to go to the Federal Treasury.

With increased demand for recreation use and declining Federal funding, users are becoming more willing to pay for recreational use on public lands.

In 1995, Fee Demo legislation was passed in Congress that allowed the Forest Service to establish pilot Fee Demo projects in some recreational areas and capture revenues from dispersed recreational activities. As a result, the Uinta began charging a \$2.00 fee for use at various recreational sites around the Forest including Payson Lakes, Aspen Grove, Tibble Fork and Strawberry Reservoir. Plans are currently in place to charge a fee for the use of American Fork Canyon. Fee collection booths will be placed at the mouth of American Fork Canyon and at Mount Timpanogos Campground above Aspen Grove in the spring of 1997.

Another opportunity to make recreation dollars available to improve facilities management is embodied in Public and Private Ventures (PPV's). Under this program, the Forest Service will be allowed to set up long-term leases with private interests to manage recreational facilities. To be successful, a facility must have use enough to generate revenue and ideally would have the potential for expansion. Lodgepole Campground on the Heber Ranger District was set up as a pilot test for the PPV program.

The future of recreation on the Uinta will also be influenced by the 2002 Winter Olympics. As a result, there is national emphasis on both northern Utah and the event's impact on recreation. The Uinta National Forest will receive funds over the next several years to develop trails and facilities to deal with a projected increase in recreational use immediately before and continuing after the 2002 Winter Olympics.

### The Timp Hike

One notable recreational feature on the Uinta was the annual hike to the summit of Mount Timpanogos, at 11,750 feet in elevation. This activity was inherited from the Wasatch National Forest when the lands between Provo Canyon and Lone Peak were transferred to the Uinta in 1954 (see appendix B). “The hike received national recognition for being the only one of its kind on any national forest in the country” (Holmes 1990:165).

The annual hike was begun in 1912 by Eugene Roberts, Athletic Director at Brigham Young University. He advocated a philosophy of well being that integrated physical activity, fellowship, spirituality and involvement with nature. All these came together in the Timp Hike which generally included a pre-hike ceremony the evening before with song and dramatic readings that celebrated nature. One of these tales was “The Legend of Mount Timpanogos,” a story created by Roberts to give the event added meaning. Many of the natural features along the trail were incorporated into the tale (Romaine 1984: 159).

Fifty-six people participated in the Timp Hike in 1913; by 1930, six thousand people attended the pre-hike program and 752 climbed to the summit the next day. The hike was popular with BYU students and Utah Valley community members alike, and was sponsored by BYU, the Provo Chamber of Commerce, the Lions, Kiwanis, Rotary and other community groups, as well as the Forest Service. This popularity began to take its toll on the mountain in the 1950's, when hiker numbers averaged well over a thousand. In 1958, a new record was set when 2,200 people made it to the summit (Kelsey

1989). The stone, concrete and metal Emerald Lake Shelter was completed in 1960 to provide restrooms and emergency shelter to these masses of people.

The hike continued to grow, and in 1968, over 2,700 climbers reached the



*A Party of hikers on Mt. Timpanogos, 1915 or 16.  
Photo courtesy of Jerry Springer.*

summit. The following year nearly as many made the summit, with close to 8,000 people on the mountain at once. Over 3,500 people reached the summit in 1970, a year that forced the hike organizers to end the annual event for the sake of the fragile alpine ecology of Mt. Timpanogos.

During its history, the Timp Hike was bigger than any other community hike in the world. It attracted considerable national and international attention on Utah as summarized by a 1926 *Provo Herald* article:

*Provo City first broke into  
my consciousness through publicity  
associated with your very interesting*

*mountain climb known as the "Timpanogos Hike." A few years ago a large photograph showing what appeared to be three thousand people climbing a glacier in single file came out in several of our leading Massachusetts papers.*

*Below the picture was a paragraph of explanation where-in it was stated that every summer at Mt. Timpanogos, Provo, Utah, thousands of people do homage to a majestic mountain peak by climbing to its summit and staging a community festival in its honor...*

*This is why your little city, obscure except for its university, jumped into notice when pictures of its mountains and its community hike got into our papers. Newspaper men are voracious feature hunters, and they were quick to recognize the news value of Timpanogos Hike. Such a strange ritual of natural worship was an easy sale. A whole community moving to the top of a high mountain is a new form of western adventure bound to excite universal interest (Cash 1959: 54-55).*

During its time, over 55,000 people climbed to the top of Timp. Although two people died, one accidentally and one of a heart attack, all in all the event is remembered warmly by those who participated. It was one way Utah Valley residents experienced the beauty of their most visible landmark firsthand. (Charmaine Thompson, January 1997)

## **Diamond Fork**

The area where Diamond and Palmyra Campgrounds are located was homesteaded by two men named Franklin Pace and Cal Angus. The homesteaders owned land up to the bridge above Diamond Campground. This area later fell into the hands of the Becksteads, Dell and Mose, who farmed it. They raised hay, grain and some potatoes. A Gardner family purchased the ranch from the Becksteads and used it until the Palmyra Stake of the Mormon Church and the Spanish Fork Livestock Association decided they would buy the land. This they did on January 4, 1939. The area was made into a recreation site and was later sold to the Forest Service at a little more than one-half its original cost. The value of the land for farming had been surpassed by its value for recreation.

Many church picnics and parties were held in the Palmyra area. Baseball games were played on the ball diamond east of the picnic area, and teams from Salem, Lakeshore, Palmyra, and Spanish Fork held championship games there. As early as 1940, 2,550 campers and 17,500 picnickers were estimated to have used the area.

The Diamond Campground was built by the Forest Service in the early 1960's. Some of the roads, trails and table areas were surfaced when originally built. The roads were again refinished during the summer of 1971.

At one time, a bridge connected Palmyra with the area which is now the lower part of Diamond Campground on what was the old highway right-of-way. A nearby spring supplies Diamond with drinking water while water for Palmyra must be piped from a spring some distance away.

## Wilderness

The Forest Service pioneered the wilderness preservation system in 1924 when it set aside the Nation's first "Wilderness," the Gila primitive area. This was expanded greatly, in 1964, when President Johnson signed into law the Wilderness Act which provided for an initial Wilderness Preservation System of 54 areas occupying 9.1 million acres nationwide (Zinser 1995).



*Lake Hardy with Boxelder Peak and Mt. Timpanogos in the background. USDA Forest Service.*

In 1978, Congress passed the Endangered American Wilderness Act which was designed to protect areas with outstanding natural characteristics from growing populations, industrial and economic growth, and uses inconsistent with the enhancement of their wilderness character. Areas designated as Wilderness under this Act were then managed under the auspices of the Wilderness Preservation



*Mt. Nebo Wilderness Area. USDA Forest Service.*

System. On February 24, 1978, the Lone Peak Wilderness Area was created under this legislation and was the first Wilderness area to be established in Utah. One outstanding aspect of this designation is that the Act allows for motorized access and road maintenance by local municipalities for the minimum maintenance activities necessary to guarantee the continued viability of watershed facilities that currently exist or may be necessary in the future within the Wilderness Boundary. The Lone Peak area provides water for domestic, industrial, and agricultural purposes from six watersheds. The Lone Peak Wilderness Area is characterized by spectacular alpine settings and towering granite cliffs. Vegetation includes Gambel oak, maple, Douglas fir, subalpine fir, limber pine and choke cherry. Wildflowers are common in the high canyon meadows during the late spring and early summer. Wildlife in the area includes mountain goats, elk, moose, mountain lion and black bear. Management of the Lone Peak Wilderness is directed toward maintaining a wilderness identity and a critical watershed.

In 1984, Congress passed the Utah

Wilderness Act to designate certain National Forest system lands in the State of Utah for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System. The Timpanogos Wilderness Area and the Mount Nebo Wilderness Area were created under this legislation.

Mount Timpanogos rises to 11,750 feet, the second highest mountain in the Wasatch Range. The region contains massive peaks and buttresses and numerous waterfalls exit hanging valleys, or cirques, created by ancient glaciers. Today, a remnant of the glaciers is tucked between Timp's highest peaks above Emerald Lake. Vegetation ranges from hardy alpine plants to wildflowers, spruce and fir. Wildlife species include cougar, elk and mountain goat. This wilderness is being managed to maintain wilderness character and serves to protect valuable watershed for Utah Valley.

Mount Nebo is the highest mountain in the Wasatch Range, with the Mona Summit being the highest point on the knife-like Nebo ridge at 11,877 feet. The slopes of Mt. Nebo are home to large herds of deer and elk as well as other animals. The boundaries of the Mount Nebo Wilderness area were drawn to provide access to the Privateer Mine and allow for the construction of a reservoir in Sullivan Canyon. Mount Nebo is a primary watershed for Juab and Utah counties. Management is directed toward maintaining water quality, extending dispersed recreation opportunities and protecting other resource values such as wildlife and fisheries.

## **THE CHANGING ROLE OF FIRE AND URBAN INTERFACE**

Recently, Federal emphasis in fire has shifted from a purely suppression-based organization to one of fire management. The emphasis has been taken off of immediate fire control (control in the first 24 hours) to an appropriate suppression response which takes into account economics, damage as net value change before and after, wildlife benefits after the fire, and threat to life and property. Fire management today recognizes the benefits of fire in managing forest health. These benefits are then weighed against the cost of suppression and damage. Emphasis is also being placed on ecosystem health and methods to improve it across the forest.



*Home developments near the Forest Boundary present new challenges for fire managers on the Uinta. USDA Forest Service.*

The primary method is currently prescribed burning to control insects and disease in an effort to improve habitat and insure a properly functioning ecosystem.

As a result of this new philosophy, the fire organization is rapidly becoming integrated into general forest management. This shift in fire management philosophy is reflected in public education, which now focuses on expressing the positive effects of fire as well as the negative effects.

Education also reflects another concern in fire, Urban Interface. The expanding population along the Wasatch Front means subdivisions are sprouting up very close to Forest boundaries. Fires started in the subdivisions often cross into Forest lands. As a result, the frequency of human caused fires on the Forest is increasing. In 1996, roughly 75% of the fires on the Uinta were human caused. In addition, 100 years of fire suppression have made many areas adjacent to and within the Forest lands extremely prone to destructive fires. Many of the new homes being built on the benches are in these areas.

The Uinta National Forest has a good working relationship with local agencies, including Utah County, local cities and the State of Utah. In some cases, the positive relationship between Forest Service Law Enforcement Officials and local law enforcement agencies have resulted in successful arson convictions. The Forest Service is currently coordinating with State and local agencies to provide for comprehensive fire management through education, suppression, and fuels management.

## **EXPANDING RESPONSIBILITIES AND RECENT MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES**

### **Law Enforcement**

The first Forest Rangers were charged not only with the administration of public resources, but for the protection of them as well. On August 8, 1898, William R. Kreutzer, a young ranch hand from Colorado, became the first Forest Ranger. He and those who followed in his footsteps were faced with the daunting task of enforcing new and unfamiliar Federal rules and regulations. To accomplish this goal, early Forest Rangers had to rely on vague authorities of the Service's enabling legislation, deputizations from local agencies and the citizens arrest. Law enforcement challenges were compounded as early Rangers often had to enforce laws against trespassers and various agency administrators alike.

Forest Rangers were often the target of local hostilities. The imposition of land use fees and regulations were seen as an affront to the God-given right of free and unrestricted land use. "Many of these conflicts blew-up into what are now retrospectively referred to as the great Western Range Wars (Berkowitz 1995:73)."

In 1905, when the Forest Reserves were transferred to the Department of Agriculture, some significant changes occurred in the Service's staffing. Gifford Pinchot saw to the dismissal of corrupt and incompetent administrators and built a reliable force of Forest Supervisors and Rangers. Actions by Pinchot and Congress clarified the Law Enforcement authority of Rangers. In fact, Forest Rangers were often called to support local law

enforcement agencies and were frequently the only form of law enforcement in remote logging camps and boomtowns.

Soon the Forest Service began to hire full time criminal investigators who tracked down poachers, arsonists, moonshiners, and other criminals. Throughout the years, however, the Forest Service law enforcement program remained loosely organized and defused until recently. A national law enforcement conference for the Forest Service was held in 1969 and a task force was created to prepare a plan to improve the program. It was recommended to establish a separate law enforcement organization with a distinct line of authority directly from Washington. This proposal was not received well by some and, consequently, was not adopted.

By the early 1970's, law enforcement personnel were required to attend the basic police school at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Georgia. Many of these graduates found themselves permanently occupied with the eradication of marijuana crops and drug labs on Forest lands. In 1986, Congress passed the Anti-Drug Abuse Act which authorized Forest Service Law Enforcement Officers to conduct investigations and initiate related actions outside of the Forest boundary for offenses committed within the boundary.

During this time, efforts to protect Forest resources continued, sometimes in conflict with the activities of other forest managers. In 1993, the Washington Office of the Forest Service issued an order that the law enforcement program would no longer answer to Regional or Forest level managers, but would instead follow a direct line of authority from the Director for Law

Enforcement and Investigations in Washington. The 1969 proposal is now Forest Service policy (Berkowitz 1995). Preserving a positive internal relationship with Regional and Forest level managers while performing law enforcement duties has introduced new challenges for Forest Service Law Enforcement Officers.

Today the Law Enforcement organization is in a pioneering phase of professionalizing the organization and becoming more efficient and progressive. On the Uinta, the law enforcement program continues to deal with the issues that face an urban interface forest, which include an increase in crime and resource destruction, particularly in the areas of off-road vehicle use, vandalism, littering and sanitation.

The law enforcement program on the Uinta maintains an excellent relationship with County and local law enforcement agencies. This is important as local law enforcement agencies play an increasing role in law enforcement on the Uinta and other recreational lands. A recent Federal grant to fund County officers for a Canyon Patrol Team in Utah County has increased the effectiveness of law enforcement on the Forest.

### **Cultural Resource Management**

The American people and their agents, the U.S. Congress, have long recognized the value of archaeological and historic sites on federal land. These sites belong collectively to the American people because of their ability to help us all to see, understand, appreciate and learn from the experiences of past peoples. Unfortunately, the course of settlement and development destroyed a large part of our past. This realization of loss was initially recognized by Congress in 1906 with the Antiquities

Act, the first of a series of laws meant to protect the sites that do remain.

Since then, other laws (particularly the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, amended 1976 and 1980) have made Federal land managers particular stewards of the past. These laws require that decisions concerning all actions on federal land take into account the effect of those actions on archaeological and historic sites over 50 years old, and that they make long-term plans for protecting and maintaining all sites under their care. Their basic intent is this: to insure sites on federal land are protected, researched, interpreted and the information and experiences they offer is available to the American people.



*Forest Service employees Jake Schoppe, Kari Hatch and Shaun Nelson excavating a military site dating to 1903 in Strawberry Valley. USDA Forest Service.*

The Uinta National Forest contains a wide diversity of archaeological sites. The oldest known sites are Native American camp sites dating to about 8,000 years ago. The most recent include Civilian Conservation Corps features and other sites such as homesteads and silver/lead mines. The most common sites found on the Forest are historic (post-European settlement) and contain the

potential to increase our understanding of mining life, early homesteading, charcoal-making, logging and water diversion and control. Although many of the Native Americans who lived in Northern Utah spent the majority of their time in places such as Utah and Juab Valleys, the mountains provided important supplemental food, clothing, tools and medicine, and was the setting of many religious and folk stories. The sites on the Forest that were used by Native Peoples are very important for understanding the full dimension of these people's lives.

The Forest's Heritage Resource Management program is the way through which we are caring for this unique mix of archaeological and historic sites and bringing the experiences of past peoples back to life. The program has several different focuses. The most basic is locating and documenting (mapping, photographing and describing) heritage sites as a part of general project planning. Whenever a Forest Service project involves disturbing the ground, an inspection is made of the area for archaeological sites. If any are found, they are recorded and the effect that the project might have on them is determined. In most cases, the project is redesigned to avoid the site. If that is not possible, the site is excavated or researched in such a way as to save any information the site might offer. An example of this is the excavation of a Native American camp which happened to be in the new Wolf Creek Highway alignment (Reed 1994). This project provided one of our first glimpses into Native American use of the area between the Uinta and Wasatch Mountains.

This kind of archaeological work was begun in 1974 and continues today.

Prior to 1990, all project-related archaeological work was done by professionals borrowed from the Regional Office in Ogden or from the Wasatch-Cache National Forest. A significant change happened in 1989, when the Uinta Management Team committed both to hiring an archaeologist and to using the Forest's heritage for a greater benefit. As a result, the Heritage Program has expanded to include other focuses.



*Passport in Time volunteers at the 1888 Strawberry Valley Military Site. USDA Forest Service.*

One of these is using sites on the Forest to do research on how past people used the Forest's resources. For example, during the summer of 1989, researchers from Brigham Young University conducted excavations in Bone Cave in American Fork Canyon in partnership with volunteers from the Utah Valley Chapter of the Utah Statewide Archaeological Society (USAS). This commitment to research surfaced again in American Fork Canyon in 1993 when closure of 107 mine openings for safety reasons meant both documenting all those mines and creating a historical analysis of the hard job of maintaining mine operations in the canyon (Crosland and



*Members of the Army of the West, Second Cavalry, provide visitors with a first hand look at life in the military during 1888. USDA Forest Service.*

Thompson 1994).

Another program focus has been on involving as many people as possible in Forest heritage programs and in providing them with meaningful ways to appreciate and contribute to preservation of the past. This effort has included adult education courses, primary school presentations, field projects for college classes and lectures to local community groups. However, the primary means for public involvement has been the Forest Service's national "Passport in Time" (PIT) program. One of the first national pilot projects in this program was held on the Uinta National Forest in 1990 at the "1888 Strawberry Valley Military Site" PIT project which continued for another seven summers and included a large public open house. Members of the Trails West Artifact Society, the Army of the West, Second Cavalry and USAS were valuable partners on that project.

Other PIT projects on the Forest have included "Rediscovering the CCC in Utah Valley" in 1993 which was a partnership with the Utah State Historical Society and members of the Pleasant Grove

Historical Commission. This project documented CCC features in and around Utah Valley, produced a brochure on the CCC and conducted oral interviews with CCC enrollees. The “Living High in Forest City” project mapped and test excavated the old mining town of Forest City in American Fork Canyon. Additional volunteer projects on the Forest have included documenting all of the Native American rock art and locating and mapping archaeological sites on the Vernon Management Unit.

A growing program focus is integrating information about past human activities on the Forest into current project planning. Several past actions, including logging, grazing, mining and fire suppression, have had a significant influence on the current condition of the Forest. Understanding the specific relationships between these actions and the resulting patterns in vegetation and watershed function is helping return these communities to a more stable condition.

The program is also responding to the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 by helping to identify and rebury the remains of Native Americans who were buried on lands that later became the Uinta National Forest. The most famous of these individuals is the Ute Chief Black Hawk, buried by his family in the mountains at the south end of Utah Valley in 1870. His skeleton was dug up in 1911 and thereafter donated to a local museum. The descendants of Black Hawk’s brother, Mountain, were able to claim the great man’s remains and, with the help of the citizens from Spring Lake, rebury him in the same area where he lived out his youth.

Like other resource programs on the

Uinta National Forest, the Heritage program has grown to be more responsive to and partnered with Forest users who are likewise interested in the heritage of peoples along the Wasatch Front. It is a partnership that brings satisfaction to the people of the present and honor to those in the past. (Charmaine Thompson, January 1997)

### **Human Resource Programs**

The Uinta National Forest has long been recognized for its outstanding Human Resource Programs. For the past 10 years, the programs have been recognized nationally for their accomplishments. So what contributes to this success?

#### Youth Conservation Corps

The Youth Conservation Corps (YCC) was established by Congress to provide employment opportunities for 15-18 year old youth on their National Forests. The program objectives include accomplishing needed conservation work on public lands, providing gainful employment for youth of all social, economic, ethnic, and racial backgrounds, and developing an understanding and appreciation of the Nation’s natural environment and heritage.

Approximately 30 youth work on the Uinta National Forest each summer. These crews enjoy an 8-week course that includes project work and an environmental education experience. These individuals receive exposure to all program areas including range, recreation and wildlife.

Each year this program contributes approximately \$300,000 in work accomplished to the Forest.

## Volunteers

The “Volunteers in National Forest Act” was passed in 1972 to provide an opportunity for the public to work with the Forest Service. Under this authorization, the Uinta National Forest has hosted between 8,000 and 14,000 volunteers annually. These dedicated people come from all across the country as well as locally to contribute their time, expertise, and materials.

Projects have included construction of a day-use area valued at \$350,000 for an actual cost of only \$13,000, several hundred miles of trail improved, reintroduction of wildlife species, archaeological digs, environmental education programs and rehabilitation of disturbed watershed areas.

These projects that contribute \$500,000 or more annually have been consistently recognized nationally as the best programs in the nation during the past 10 years. Without the volunteer program, these projects would not be completed.

## Senior Community Service Employment Program

This program administered by the Department of Labor, gives the Forest Service authority to employ seniors in the community who are 55 years or older. This program for low income individuals provides an opportunity for supplemental income as well as much needed skills for the Forest Service.

Approximately 50 individuals work 1300 hours per year operating and maintaining recreation facilities, staffing information centers and Forest Service offices, maintaining vehicles, and building and maintaining signs. These skilled workers are often paired with youth

workers and volunteers to share their experience and knowledge. Thanks to the dedication of SCSEP workers, many facilities are operational that would otherwise have to be closed. (Loyal Clark, January 1997)

## **CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT**

Utah is considered a desert state and is dependant on the limited water resources and healthy watersheds provided by the high country within the State. The National Forests in Utah are the intercepting barriers that catch the life-giving water from summer thunder storms and winter snow storms.

Conceived in the 1950's, the mission of the Central Utah Project (CUP) is to develop central Utah's water resources through the timely implementation of the CUP Completion Act in an economically responsive manner that emphasizes public involvement, environmental values and conservation of resources.

The Central Utah Water Conservancy District has been given the charge to plan and implement the mission of the CUP. The Forest Service is considered both a client and a consultant to help complete the necessary steps involved with the Central Utah Project Completion Act.

The Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project is designed to bring water from the High Uintas to the Wasatch Front through a series of tunnels, pipelines and dams. Water will then be supplied to municipal and agricultural demands. The Bonneville Unit includes three major areas that affect National Forest System lands.

The Uintah Basin Replacement Project (UBRP) is designed to build a series

of larger, lower elevation reservoirs to store additional irrigation water and tribal water. This will also provide opportunity to channel additional water to the Wasatch Front. With the new reservoirs there will no longer be the need for the high mountain lakes that now store the critical water. The project will require stabilization of the high mountain lakes in the High Uinta's Wilderness and adjacent areas of the Ashley National Forest.

The Wasatch County Water Efficiency/Daniels Replacement Project (WCWE/DRP) is designed to provide additional water for irrigation in Heber Valley and better quality water to the Wasatch Front. The new Jordanelle Dam will provide a more efficient way of providing irrigation water to the Heber Valley. Jordanelle will also contribute culinary water to the Heber Valley and the Wasatch Front.

Specific to the Uinta National Forest, a series of canals and pipelines carrying water from Jordanelle Reservoir will replace the water now transferred from the Strawberry River into Daniels Canyon. Strawberry River will soon return to its natural condition prior to when water was diverted near its headwaters. With its natural flow of water, fisheries and wetlands along the entire length of the river will be enhanced. Provo River will also be enhanced both in the Heber Valley and through Provo Canyon.

The Spanish Fork-Nephi Project is designed to provide water to south Utah County and eastern Juab County for irrigation through a series of dams and pipelines. The Diamond Fork pipeline, Monks Hollow Dam, Highline Canal, and various secondary water systems for communities such as Spanish Fork,

Mapleton, and Springville are all part of the Spanish Fork-Nephi system. This system will provide better fisheries for Diamond Fork and Spanish Fork Rivers through mitigation and enhancements of those stream channels.

The entire Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project is designed to provide more and better quality water to the Wasatch Front. Through the building of various reservoirs, aqueducts and pipelines, and the transfer of water rights from old systems to the new facilities will increase the amount of high quality water for municipal, industrial and agricultural uses.

Through implementation of the CUP completion act, there will be substantial impacts to the National Forests. These impacts must be mitigated to conserve the beauty and biological resources present in these areas. The Utah Reclamation, Mitigation, and Conservation Commission (URMCC) was established by the President of the United States. A board of directors was appointed and a staff hired to oversee the mitigation of impacts created by the Central Utah Project. The URMCC, through its planning process, is working with the National Forests in Utah to fund and enhance fish, wildlife and recreational projects associated with areas impacted by CUP. The Uinta National Forest is currently working with the URMCC in Strawberry Valley and Diamond Fork Canyon. (Bevan Killpack, January 1997)

## **STRAWBERRY VALLEY MANAGEMENT AREA**

One of the most recent and significant land acquisitions to occur on the Uinta National Forest involved the Strawberry Valley Management Area. The acquisition represents the Uinta National Forest's commitment to a philosophy of stewardship based on multiple use and ecosystem management. The lands in Strawberry Valley were transferred to the Forest Service against a unique backdrop of historical land ownership and management controversy. The following is a summary of the report entitled Strawberry: History of the "Pure Valley," written by John Frandsen of the Heber Ranger District, Uinta National Forest in 1994.

In 1864, Strawberry Valley became part of the Uintah Valley Indian Reservation by order of President Abraham Lincoln which consolidated other reservations established in 1856 for the Utes and Goshutes. Federal Treaties were signed reserving these lands for the sole occupation and use by the tribes in exchange for their ancestral lands. The Indian Agency was established in the Uinta Basin and most of the Ute groups located around it to take advantage of rations distributed there. Strawberry Valley, nearly 50 miles from the Agency Headquarters, was less frequented by the Utes and thus vulnerable to trespass. By 1880, settlers in Heber Valley were trespassing onto the western edge of the Uintah Reservation and illegally grazing cattle in Strawberry Valley. In addition, military encampments were located in the valley, partially to show the Utes the military capabilities at hand should they cause problems for the settlers in the area.

In 1892, the Indian Office decided Strawberry Valley should be leased to the Heber Valley ranchers or others since the Utes didn't actively graze the area and it would be too much trouble for the Indian Office to keep the trespassers out. The valley was eventually leased by the Utes, through the Indian Office, to Charles F. Homer of New York City. This had little effect on the trespassing situation however.

At the same time, Heber Valley ranchers were diverting water from the Strawberry Valley into Daniel's Creek and Heber Valley. The canal was constructed between 1879 and 1882. In 1883, the Strawberry Canal Company was incorporated and the Hobble Creek ditch and Willow Creek canal were constructed, though the Willow Creek canal was not completed. In 1893, farmers and laborers from Heber Valley organized the Willow Creek Canal Company and completed the Willow Creek canal. By 1904, nearly 1000 acres were being irrigated wholly or in part by illegally diverted water.

Attempts had been made, however, to legitimize the diversion of water. In 1894, Joseph L. Rawlins attempted to secure a special act of Congress to make the diversion of water from the reservation legal. The bill stalled in committee, but Congress authorized a commission to negotiate with the Utes to relinquish ownership of all lands not allotted to the Utes under individual ownership. The Dawes Severalty Act gave each head of a Ute family an allotment of 80 acres and 40 acres to each individual. The remainder would be opened to non-Indian use. The commission never had time to meet with the Utes on the matter and the situation in Strawberry Valley remained unchanged. In 1898, another commission was appointed

for the purpose of allotting lands in severalty but a majority of Ute consent would be necessary for the terms of the act to be carried through. Ute consent was not obtained and a stalemate ensued.

In 1896, Utah was granted statehood and Joseph Rawlins became Senator for Utah and continued in his efforts to obtain a right of way through Reservation lands for the canal companies. He finally succeeded in 1899 with an amendment attached to an Indian appropriation which gave the canal companies a right of way through Strawberry Valley with the condition that the Utes would be left with water they required for agricultural and domestic uses. Later, the U.S. Geological Survey was sent to investigate the situation and see if the Utes were getting water sufficient to cultivate crops. Cyrus C. Babb directed the investigation between 1899 and 1901 and reported on the illegally diverted water. His supervisor, F.H. Newell commented in the report that, though the water was illegally diverted, it did not cause any significant hardship for the Utes and was not serious enough to be considered a problem that warranted much attention.

In 1901 Theodore Roosevelt, a strong supporter of western irrigation and agricultural development, became President. Representative Francis Newlands of Nevada began to draft legislation that would solve most of the problems that previous water legislation had created. The result was the Newlands Bill which proposed to take money from the sale of public lands in the sixteen arid states and place it into a Reclamation Fund to be used by the Secretary of Interior to pay for new water projects. The bill was reworked into the National Reclamation Act and Fredrick Haynes Newell was named the

first Director of the new Reclamation Service.

In 1902, a group of local officials in Utah County drafted a plan to divert even more water from Strawberry Valley into Utah Valley. The plan included the construction of a reservoir in Strawberry Valley and the construction of a four-mile tunnel to transfer the water to Utah Valley. The Strawberry Valley Project, as it came to be known, was pressed at the Utah Irrigation Congress, where Fredrick Newell suggested that Utah would have a better chance of getting Reclamation funding if the Irrigation Congress would decide on one reservoir plan and lobby for it. Newell suggested to the Arid Land Reclamation Commission, created by the Utah State Legislature, that they form an association of water users, who stood to benefit through the Strawberry project, that the government could interact with. By June of 1905, this new association would be incorporated as the Strawberry Water Users Association.

At about the same time, Senator Rawlins was introducing additional legislation in a continued effort to open up the reservation. Utah Representative George Sutherland argued that as no treaty with the Utes had ever been ratified, the reservation could be taken without negotiation or consent since the Utes were not the rightful owners. Congress once again authorized the Secretary of Interior to allot the land in the Severalty Act of 1902. President Roosevelt refused to sign the act because of its preference toward certain mining interests and its failure to give the Utes grazing land in connection with their allotments.

The stalemate continued until 1903 with the Supreme Court decision Lone

Wolf vs. Hitchcock. This ruling stated that Congress had complete authority over Indian relations and therefore had power to pass laws which exceeded treaty stipulations. Immediately, Congress appropriated funds to carry out the 1902 severalty act and stated that if Ute consent could not be obtained, the Secretary of Interior could proceed to allot lands and open the reservation without it. This act addressed President Roosevelt's concerns by providing 250,000 acres of grazing land located just south of Strawberry River. In 1904, acting Indian agent C.H. Hall requested the Indian Service to persuade Congress to change the location of the 250,000 acre grazing lands to the Deep Creek area because of the Reclamation Service's plans to divert water into the Provo district. The date for opening the reservation was postponed until March 10, 1905.

Meanwhile George L. Swendsen, the Reclamation Service district engineer sent letters to the Reclamation Service, the Forest Service and the Indian Service requesting that they support setting aside Strawberry Valley as a reservoir site. The Forest Service was also interested in obtaining a portion of the Uintah Reservation. Chief grazing officer Albert F. Potter was sent by Gifford Pinchot to find land suitable for additional Forest Reserves and Potter had sited the Strawberry Valley as a possibility (See Appendix B for land acquired by the Forest Service when the Uintah Reservation was opened).

The opening date was postponed again, this time until September 1, 1905 and an act was passed in Congress allowing President Roosevelt to set land apart as an addition to the Uintah Forest Reserve and

to set aside any lands necessary to protect the water supply "for the Indians or for general agricultural development." The act also relocated the 250,000 acre grazing lands to the Deep Creek area as per Hall's request.

In July of 1904, President Roosevelt issued a proclamation which set the opening of the Uintah Valley Reservation on August 28, 1905. On August 3, 1905, the president withdrew 200,633 acres from disposal for agricultural purposes and for a "reservoir site necessary to conserve the water supply for the Indians, or for general agricultural development." On August 14, 1905, the President specifically reserved land for the Strawberry Valley Project. Other lands were opened for settlement under the terms of the Homestead Act. Potential settlers would file applications which were drawn at random for 160 acre parcels of Ute reservation land. In Provo, 37,702 people registered for a chance at the land. Strawberry remained unaffected by settlement as most of the valley lands were reserved through Roosevelt's earlier proclamations.

When the Reclamation Act of 1902 passed, the demand for water projects far exceeded the capabilities of the Reclamation Service and the Reclamation Fund. Each western state would be entitled to a single project and the Strawberry Valley Project was chosen in the State of Utah, the first of many Federal water projects. This project was unique when compared to the projects funded by the Reclamation Service in other states because the lands that benefited from the Strawberry Valley Project were privately owned, where as other Reclamation projects provided water to "public domain" lands, opened subsequently to homesteading. Regardless,



*Preparatory construction of Strawberry Reservoir, 1906. USDA Forest Service.*

the Strawberry Project was chosen for Reclamation Support for several reasons. First, the formation of the Strawberry Water Users Association had given the Reclamation Service a cohesive group to work with. Second, the opening of the Uintah Reservation coincided with project approval. This freed up large amounts of unappropriated water and also made possible securing the reservoir site. Third, the project was smaller and simpler, making completion and repayment to the Reclamation Service more likely.

A contract with the Strawberry Water Users was entered into, signed by the Secretary of Interior on March 6, 1906 and preparatory construction began.

Heber Valley ranchers who had grazed on the withdrawn lands before the Strawberry Project now requested to continue using the lands for grazing. The Reclamation Service had no precedent or statute to validate the legality of leasing the withdrawn land to the cattlemen. The decision was finally made by Assistant Attorney General Frank L. Campbell to allow the Secretary of Interior to lease the withdrawn lands at his discretion. On March 10, 1906, the Secretary decided to lease withdrawn lands to the highest bidder.

By July, a contract was entered into with James Clyde, James Murdock, Davis Smith and Davis Murdock of Heber City for \$10,408 per annum.



*Construction of the dam at Strawberry Reservoir, 1907. USDA Forest Service.*

The final cost of the project was estimated at \$1.25 million, but by 1910, it was evident that real costs would exceed that figure. To complicate matters, the Indian Agent for the Utes began asking for lease money received from Strawberry Valley grazing. Though the land had been withdrawn from entry, the title still remained with the Utes. The Strawberry Water Users disputed the claim arguing that grazing fees should be used to repay project costs which, by then, almost tripled the original estimates. They asked Senator Sutherland to push a measure through Congress which would allow the Reclamation Service to purchase the grazing land as part of the reclamation project's construction costs. Sutherland introduced the bill in 1910 and it failed.

Two months later, he managed to attach an amendment to the Fiscal Year 1911 Indian Appropriations Act which read:

*All right, title, and interest of the Indians in the said lands are hereby extinguished, and title, management, and control thereof shall pass to the owners of the lands irrigated from said project whenever the management and operation of the irrigation works shall so pass under the terms of the reclamation act (Act 4-4-1910, 36 Stat. 269).*

While Sutherland's amendment provided for the water users to assume "title," management and control of the Project Lands, the Reclamation Act

specifically indicated that title to reclamation works would remain with the Government unless Congress otherwise directed. Regardless, in the summer of 1912, the water users were informed, by Senator Smoot and State Senator Henry Gardener, that the title to 60,000 acres in Strawberry Valley was theirs. This arrangement allowed the water users to collect grazing revenues from project lands to cover project costs. The understanding of the water users was that the project would mean eventual title to the project works and the thousands of acres of withdrawn lands which surrounded them. Many others disagreed.

Under the high bid lease structure that was established, ranchers from Heber Valley were forced to pay the water users rents much higher than those on neighboring forest lands. Few rangelands were left un-stocked so Heber Valley ranchers had little choice. Because of the high rental fees, ranchers had to stock their allotments with as many sheep and cattle as they could to pay rental fees and still make a profit. This resulted in deteriorating range conditions early on.

In October of 1912, with construction on the reservoir and tunnel nearly complete, Newell sent a letter to the water users requesting a plan for repayment. Disputes arose among the water users over who would pay. The Secretary of Interior responded to the dispute by establishing a deadline for the settlement of the dispute and a feasible plan for repayment. The deadline, May of 1913, came and went and the Reclamation Service delayed taking any action.

By the summer of 1917, the reservoir was full and the Reclamation Service drew up a tentative contract to turn

the care, maintenance and operation of the project over to the water users as specified in the Reclamation Act.

In April of 1922, George A. Fisher testified, on behalf of the Heber ranchers, before the House Committee on Public Lands in favor of Bill H.R. 10861 which proposed to pass all the project lands covered by the 1910 Act to the Uinta National Forest. Additionally, the bill would provide that 10 percent of receipts from the National Forest should be paid into the Reclamation Fund to reimburse the money paid to the Utes under the 1910 Act. This bill would repeal the 1910 Act to the extent that it was inconsistent with H.R. 10861. Fisher testified that Wasatch County ranchers had paid the water users \$82,000 over the amount reimbursed to the Utes according to the 1910 payment contract. Because the lands had been paid for using this money, the land was free to be transferred to the Forest Service. This, in effect, would bring grazing fees down to what the ranchers could afford. Fisher further argued that Forest and project lands were divided entirely by section lines, having no real meaning in practical administration. He felt, as did others, that the watershed should be managed as a single unit by a single agency. The Forest Service was a perfect candidate for management as watershed protection was one of the agencies primary purposes. George Fisher argued that protection of the watershed could only be accomplished through proper management of grazing. This represented a goal that could not be achieved on any lands where the objective was to benefit from them financially.

The water users protested, claiming they had vested rights to the lands in Strawberry Valley. Senator Will H. King,

who was asked by the water users to champion their claim, replied by stating that there were no legal rights granted to the water users. In a letter to sent to Lee R. Taylor, King stated:

*The water users have not paid for the lands in the sense that they have bought them. The expense of extinguishing the Indian title was charged to their project, which replaced the title in the government free from all Indian claims for use of the project, to the extent required as a watershed, but for no other purpose.*

H.R. 10861 was favorably reported overall by the House committee. However, a dissent report was filed by a minority. The bill was never considered beyond the committee stage.

In December of 1924, Congress passed the Fact Finders Act which changed the conditions under which management and operation were to pass to the water users. It stated that the water users would assume care, operation, and maintenance of the project works and facilities whenever two-thirds part of the Association members agreed to a repayment contract. Under this contract, the water users soon met the criteria for the transfer of management. But, the Fact Finders Act also provided that “title, management, and control” of the watershed lands were not to pass to the Association under the 1910 Act until at least 51% of project costs had been repaid to the Federal Government. These provisions were in seeming contradiction with one another. Regardless, the Government and water users entered into agreement to transfer care, operation and

management to the water users.

In November of 1928, the contradiction was clarified by an amendment which explained that although 51% of the project costs had not yet been repaid, “care, operation, and maintenance” (management and control, but not title) of the watershed lands would be transferred to the Association.

Starting in 1926, the High Line Canal Company, or “Strawberry Grazing Company,” which was organized by Heber Valley ranchers, leased allotments on the Project Lands. In 1929 bids for new leases were open and applications to graze more than 100,000 sheep were placed by both Heber Valley stockmen and Association members. The carrying capacity was established at 25,000 sheep so the Association decided to provide allotments only to its members. Revenues from grazing on Project Lands were then credited toward the construction costs as per the 1924 Act. The Act stated that no profits could be distributed to members until the project costs had been fully paid. However, it was in the opinion of the Solicitor that the express prohibition of profit before repayment did not imply an authorization for profit distribution after payment. They did not feel profit distribution was what Congress had intended.

As a result of the 1928 amendment, the management of 60,000 acres was turned over to the water users. During the depression of the 1930's, revenues dropped off and the Association began to discuss options to lower Association costs with the Bureau of Reclamation. The Reclamation Projects Act of 1939 extended the repayment period for Reclamation Projects nationwide and a year later the water users

were able to sign a new contract. This contract not only extended the repayment period, but redesignated the Project Lands as “grazing lands” instead of the former “watershed lands.” The 1940 contract also stated that title to the Project Lands and Reclamation works would remain with the U.S. Government even though management authority rested with the water users. In 1946, an Act was passed which stated that revenues generated by the project could not be distributed to individual water users before or after retirement of the project debt.

In the 1960's, the Central Utah Project was authorized. This meant the enlargement of Strawberry Reservoir and the subsequent loss of revenue generating grazing lands. The Strawberry Water Users Association responded, in November of 1973, by filing suite against the Government for compensation for losses of future grazing revenues. The final installment of the \$3,499,734.22 construction loan for the Strawberry Valley Project was paid in November of 1974. The same year, the Association filed suite against the Government to settle several important legal questions:

- 1) Where did title to the grazing lands actually rest?
- 2) Could it distribute profits to its members now that the construction loan had been repaid?
- 3) Did the Association have a right to be reimbursed for grazing land lost under the expanded Strawberry Reservoir in the Central Utah Project?

Based on the 1928 supplemental contract and the 1940 Amendatory Contract, the court decided the Association

did not have an ownership interest in the Project Lands but did have a contractual right to do certain things with those lands. The Bureau also had rights and responsibilities to see that the land was managed as intended and if the lands were transferred to the Forest Service, that agency would be required to honor the contract with the water users.

Meanwhile, recreational use of Strawberry Project lands had been steadily growing. Formal recreation management in the area probably began in 1926 when the Association assumed control. At about the same time, the State was planting the reservoir with trout, but recreational fishing continued to be limited by fish losses. The fish were suffocated as a result of the decomposition of excessive organic matter in the reservoir and high temperatures which resulted from stagnation. Up until the 1960's, ranchers applied herbicides to willows along stream corridors to increase access to the water by livestock. This together with continued overgrazing on the watershed caused an increase in sediment run off and a decrease in the reproductive capabilities of fisheries. Sediments were carried into the reservoir, filtering ultra-violet light and upsetting the vegetation balances in the reservoir. Private fishing camps, leased from the water users, caused their own problems. Sanitation practices were substandard and raw sewage was often dumped into the reservoir, again upsetting the vegetation balance and increasing the decomposition of organic matter. Chubs and suckers out competed native species and in 1961, the entire reservoir had to be cleared of fish. Native species were restocked, but overgrazing and an increase in recreational continued. Recreation and grazing were two uses on a

collision course in Strawberry Valley.

In 1975, the State Division of Health ordered all recreational facilities surrounding the reservoir closed for illegal sanitation. At the same time, Wasatch County began to criticize the water users for their fee collection system. In 1976, the Bureau of Reclamation prepared a recreation master plan for the enlarged reservoir. Discussion began as to who should manage the project lands and for what purpose. Discussion continued between Federal and State agencies and officials, environmental and wildlife groups, and the public. The decision was finally made to manage the lands for watershed protection, recreation, wildlife and fish values. It was decided that the Forest Service would assume management of the project lands. On October 16, 1988, Congress transferred management authority for the Project Lands from the Strawberry Water Users Association to the U.S. Forest Service, Uinta National Forest (See Appendix B for land transferred). This bill:

- 1) Gave management authority to the Forest Service for Project Lands by modifying the Forest Boundary.
- 2) Compensated the Strawberry Water Users Association for their grazing rights on the Project Lands.
- 3) Provided \$3 million for rehabilitation of the Project Lands to be spent over a 5-year period beginning in 1990.

The Project Lands were also given a new title: Strawberry Valley Management Area. The entire Strawberry Valley watershed could now be managed as an ecosystem for the benefit of a diverse group of users. A massive effort was initiated by

the Uinta National Forest to stabilize riparian habitats, rehabilitate fish habitats, seed the upland areas adjacent to riparian areas, control noxious weeds, consolidate the system of roads in the area, dismantle obsolete fences and monitor the restoration of the valley. Concurrent with these efforts was the treatment and restocking of the reservoir with native fish species. Today, Strawberry Valley is a destination spot for thousands of recreationists and one of Utah's premier fishing areas. Other uses include timber harvesting and grazing under controlled conditions.

### **CHILDREN'S FOREST**

The concept for a Children's Forest was born in California out of a need for public participation in ecosystem management. The San Bernardino National Forest developed a program where children are involved in the management of public lands. The Children's Forest is the term coined to define a management area managed to provide the people of all ages with educational opportunities in ecosystems management. The Uinta National Forest is working on designing a similar program for children in Utah. The program seeks to improve access for people of all ages and abilities in addition to offering an equally recreational and educational experience for visitors.

Diamond Fork Canyon has been selected as the pilot location for the project. Diamond Fork was selected because of its proximity to major population bases and the area has a wide range of resources (recreation, range, fisheries, wildlife). Partnerships with communities, corporations, individuals, and educators will implement and sustain the goals of the

Children's Forest.

Eventually Diamond Fork will be an area where children and other community members can come together to learn and play. Children will become actively involved in ecosystem management providing a vehicle for their education and empowerment. The area will become a place of lifelong learning and play with opportunities for participation in the stewardship of the land. Design of the environment will reflect children's needs and will integrate art, science, and education in a uniquely accessible environment.

In the future the Diamond Fork pilot project will be spread to other locations throughout Utah. Children's deserts, wetlands and other ecosystems can be developed to provide education for children about the environment and ecosystems management.

The Children's Forest will be a working forest offering high quality environmental education and outdoor recreation opportunities that promote individual dignity, independence and social integration through public/private partnerships, responsible ecosystem management and universal design concepts. (Rebecca Hirschi, January 1997)

### **NATIONAL AND STATE CHRISTMAS TREES FROM THE UINTA**

#### **1968 National Christmas Tree**

In 1968, a 74-foot Engelmann spruce was sent to the White House to be the 1968 National Christmas Tree. The tree was cut under the direction of the Utah State Forester's office on November 12,

1968, from an area about a mile east of Daniel's Canyon summit in Wasatch County on the Strawberry Ranger District at an elevation of 7,900 feet. Ranger Phillip D. Glass stated the tree measured 20 feet tall and had a stump of 23.7 inches in diameter. Representative Laurence J. Burton stated:

*We feel it a real honor for Utah to provide the most beautiful tree in the world for the Nation's Christmas Tree... This tree was nothing more than a sapling when the first Mormon pioneers began settling in Heber Valley in the 1850's...*

The tree arrived in Washington, D.C., on November 26 and was turned over to the National Park Service for decoration. "It was a great moment for the State of Utah," said State Forester Paul Sjoblom at the lighting ceremony on December 16. "Many people and organizations donated time, personnel, equipment and money for the project," Sjoblom added. President Lyndon B. Johnson pushed the button lighting the 2,000 blue and 2,000 green lights. Decorations also included 200 large, golden snowflakes (U.S. Department of Agriculture 1972).

#### **1996 State Christmas Tree**

In 1996, the Heber Ranger District provided the Christmas Tree which held center stage in Utah's State Capitol. The 30-foot blue spruce, Utah's State tree, was a gift marking the conclusion of the Utah State Centennial and beginning of the Uinta National Forest Centennial.

On Friday, November 22, a ceremony was held in the Heber City park.

The program recognized partners who were involved in the selection, cutting and transportation of the tree. Also included were remarks by Heber City Mayor Scott Wright, Wasatch County Commissioner LaRen Provost, Heber District Ranger Robert Riddle, Forest Supervisor Peter Karp, and carols sung by local children's choirs.

Robert Woodhead, Deputy Director of Administrative Services, Utah State Office, presented Supervisor Karp with a beautiful plaque. It stated: "In appreciation for participation in the 1996 Utah State Capitol Tree Ceremony and to honor the 'kick off' of the Uinta National Forest Centennial, 1897-1997."

The tree was delivered by D.P. Curtis Trucking of Richfield, Utah, to State Capitol Facilities Coordinator, Joe Ligor, at the State Capitol on the morning of Tuesday, November 26. A crane lifted the tree up the grand staircase, through the south set of doors, and into the Rotunda on the second floor. It was raised by a series of winches and secured with ropes. Approximately 6,000 lights and 1,000 decorations were placed on the tree by maintenance and grounds staff. The ornaments adorning the tree were made by school students from throughout the State of Utah.

The "lights on" ceremony took place Tuesday, December 10. The program included carols sung by the American Fork High School Choir and remarks by First Lady Jacalyn S. Leavitt. Following the program, a call was received from Lieutenant Governor, Olene Walker, in Washington D.C. Mrs. Leavitt then flipped the switch to light the tree. This occurred simultaneously with the lighting of "Utah's Centennial Tree to D.C.," a 70-

foot Engelmann spruce provided to our Nation's Capitol from the six National Forests in Utah honoring the Statehood Centennial. Washington's tree was lit by Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich who thanked Utah for the beautiful tree and wished everyone a very Merry Christmas. (Lola Murray, January 1997)



*Utah State Christmas Tree at the State Capitol, December 1996. USDA Forest Service.*

