



Forest Service

Ashley National Forest
Supervisor's Office

355 North Vernal Avenue
Vernal, UT 84078
435-789-1181

File Code: 1920

Date: October 14, 2020

Route To: 1920; 1950

Subject: 1986 Ashley Forest Plan Correction

To: Ashley National Forest Staff

This letter is to notify you that I have approved a correction to our existing 1986 Land and Resource Management Plan. An inconsistency exists between the current Forest Plan language, and the language contained in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Alternative J, the preferred alternative, which was subsequently authorized in the Record of Decision. This correction will remedy that inconsistency.

Should you have any questions regarding this correction, please contact LeAnn Colburn, our Forest Environmental Coordinator.



SUSAN EICKHOFF

Forest Supervisor



Enclosures

.

CORRECTION NO. 1
1986 ASHLEY NATIONAL FOREST
LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The 1986 Ashley National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) contains an inconsistency regarding the use of the term sensitive species. Given this inconsistency, it has been determined that an administrative correction is warranted.

Administrative Corrections, as defined at 36 CFR 219.31(b), may be made at any time, are not plan amendments or revisions, and do not require public notice or the preparation of an environmental document under Forest Service National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) procedures. Administrative Corrections include the following:

- Corrections and updates of data and maps,
- Updates to activity lists and schedules as required by 219.30(d)(1)-(6),
- Corrections of typographical errors or other non-substantive changes, and
- Changes in the monitoring methods other than those required in a monitoring strategy (Sec. 219.11(c)).

This Administrative Correction falls under the categories of "corrections and updates of data and maps" and "non-substantive changes".

Background Information

Forest Plan standard for Wildlife Objective 3 (Forest Plan, page IV-30) states "*Resource activities will be allowed if they will not adversely affect any T and E or sensitive species.*"

The Record of Decision for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) authorized Alternative J, which was the Balanced Resource Alternative, which is the current Forest Plan. The inconsistency occurs in the language that was written in the EIS and authorized in the ROD pertaining to wildlife management. Specifically, Chapter II – Comparison of Alternatives specifically states the following for wildlife and fish:

"No action will be taken in any alternative that will adversely affect a Threatened or Endangered species." (pg. II-36 of the FEIS)

Forest Plan Correction

Because the ROD authorized Alternative J, which the above excerpt pertains to, the language contained within the Forest Plan is incorrect. Considering this information, I am issuing the enclosed correction. Please replace page IV-30 in your copy of the Forest Plan with the enclosed page IV-30 which corrects the standard for Wildlife Objective 3 to read: "*Resource activities will be allowed if they will not adversely affect any T and E species.*" I am making this correction to the Forest Plan, so that is consistent with the Final Environmental Impact Statement and the Record of Decision that authorized the Forest Plan.

Should you have any questions regarding this correction, please contact our Forest Environmental Coordinator at the number listed above.

Sincerely,



SUSAN EICKHOFF

Forest Supervisor

WILDLIFE AND FISH – CONTINUED

Objective	Standards and Guidelines	Management Areas														
		a	b	d	e	f	g	h	i	k	l	n	N ₁	p	r	
	Maintain all streams for a biotic condition index (BCI) of 75 or above and a habitat index (HCI) of 42 or above.		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Complete aquatic inventories using General Aquatic Wildlife Survey (GAWS) and R-1 stream channel stability ratings on stream orders 3, 4, and 5. Complete inventory of all streams.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Mitigation activities associated with the CUP will be designed and implemented to protect or enhance habitat values for existing fish and wildlife species.		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X					
	Where feasible, emphasis for terrestrial mitigation from the CUP will be in the area of land acquisition or habitat enhancement projects.		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X					
	Emphasis for aquatic mitigation from the CUP will be the establishment of minimum stream flows and the physical enhancement of streams affected by the CUP.		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X					
3. Manage the habitat of all T&E or sensitive plant and animal species to maintain or enhance their status.	Resource management activities will be allowed if they will not adversely affect any T and E-sensitive (Correction No. 1, October 2020) species.		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X					X
	Participate with state wildlife agencies in evaluating the potential for re-establishment of the peregrine falcon.	X	X	X	X	X	X									X
	Give priority to structural habitat improvement work in stream containing Colorado River cutthroat trout strains.	X	X	X	X	X	X					X				X