

**DRAFT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

**VICTORY RANCH RIVER RESTORATION PROJECT
WASATCH AND SUMMIT COUNTIES, UTAH**

**US BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
PRO-EA-04-001**

November 2003

**Reclamation Contact:
Tennille Flint
Provo Area Office
302 East 1860 South
Provo, Utah 84606
(801) 379-1288**

Contents

Chapter 1 - Purpose and Need	1
1.1 Purpose of the Environmental Assessment and Introduction	1
1.2 Background and History	4
1.3 Purpose and Need	5
1.4 Authorizing Actions, Permits and Licenses	5
1.5 Interrelated Projects	7
1.5.1 Past Projects	8
1.5.2 Future Projects Included in the Cumulative Impact Analysis	9
Chapter 2 - Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives	9
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Description of No Action Alternative	9
2.3 Description of Proposed Action	10
2.3.1 Overview	10
2.3.2 Proposed Action Features	10
2.3.2.1 Preservation	14
2.3.2.2 Livestock Grazing Removal	14
2.3.2.3 River Restoration –Spacing	14
2.3.2.4 Rerouting of the Weber/Provo Canal – Hydrology	14
2.3.2.5 New Victory Ranch Entrance Bridge - Continuity	14
2.3.2.6 Removal of the Fitzgerald Bridge	15
2.3.2.7 Removal of Dikes – Connectivity	15
2.3.2.8 New Dikes	15
2.3.2.9 Construction of Side Channel - Complexity	15
2.3.2.10 Construction of Channel Barbs	16
2.3.2.11 Reconstruct Selected Existing Diversion From the River	16
2.3.2.12 Revegetation Throughout the River Valley	16
2.3.3 Construction Schedule	17
2.3.4 Construction Materials and Staging Areas	18
2.3.5 Construction Transportation Requirements	18
2.3.6 Construction Standard Operating Procedures	19
2.3.7 Long-Term Operation and Maintenance Procedures	22
2.4 Alternatives Considered But Eliminated From Detailed Analysis	22
2.4.1 Elimination of Transbasin Diversion During High Flows	23
2.4.2 Reduction in Volume of Transbasin Diversions	23
2.5 Comparative Analysis of Proposed Action and No Action Alternative	23
2.6 Summary of Components of the Proposed Action	24

Contents (continued)

Chapter 3 - Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences	24
3.1 Introduction	24
3.2 Water Resources and Water Quality	26
3.2.1 Introduction	26
3.2.2 Issues	26
3.2.3 Affected Environment	26
3.2.4 Impact Analysis	27
3.2.4.1 Introduction	27
3.2.4.2 No Action Alternative	27
3.2.4.3 Proposed Action	27
3.2.4.4 Impact Summary	28
3.3 Aquatic Resources	29
3.3.1 Introduction	29
3.3.2 Issues	29
3.3.3 Affected Environment	29
3.3.4 Impact Analysis	29
3.3.4.1 Introduction	29
3.3.4.2 No Action Alternative	30
3.3.4.3 Proposed Action	30
3.3.4.4 Impact Summary	31
3.4 Wetlands and Terrestrial Habitat	32
3.4.1 Introduction	32
3.4.2 Issues	32
3.4.3 Affected Environment	32
3.4.4 Impact Analysis	32
3.4.4.1 Introduction	32
3.4.4.2 No Action Alternative	32
3.4.4.3 Proposed Action	33
3.4.4.4 Impact Summary	35
3.5 Threatened & Endangered Species (and State Sensitive Species)	35
3.5.1 Introduction	35
3.5.2 Issues	35
3.5.3 Affected Environment	35

Contents (continued)

Chapter 3 - Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences (continued)

3.5.4	Impact Analysis	36
3.5.4.1	Introduction	36
3.5.4.2	No Action Alternative	36
3.5.4.3	Proposed Action	36
3.5.4.4	Impact Summary	38
3.6	Cultural Resources	38
3.6.1	Introduction	38
3.6.2	Issues	38
3.6.3	Affected Environment	39
3.6.4	Impact Analysis	41
3.6.4.1	Introduction	41
3.6.4.2	No Action Alternative	41
3.6.4.3	Proposed Action	41
3.6.4.4	Impact Summary	42
3.7	Land Use Plans and Conflicts	42
3.7.1	Introduction	42
3.7.2	Issues	42
3.7.3	Affected Environment	42
3.7.4	Impact Analysis	43
3.7.4.1	Introduction	43
3.7.4.2	No Action Alternative	43
3.7.4.3	Proposed Action	43
3.8	Recreation	43
3.8.1	Introduction	43
3.8.2	Issues	43
3.8.3	Affected Environment	43
3.8.4	Impact Analysis	44
3.8.4.1	Introduction	44
3.8.4.2	No Action Alternative	44
3.8.4.3	Proposed Action	44
3.9	Transportation	44
3.9.1	Introduction	44
3.9.2	Issues	44
3.9.3	Affected Environment	44
3.9.4	Impact Analysis	45
3.9.4.1	Introduction	45
3.9.4.2	No Action Alternative	45
3.9.4.3	Proposed Action	45

Contents (continued)

Chapter 3 - Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences (continued)

3.10	Health, Safety and Noise	46
3.10.1	Introduction	46
3.10.2	Issues	46
3.10.3	Affected Environment	46
3.10.4	Impact Analysis	46
3.10.4.1	Introduction	46
3.10.4.2	No Action Alternative	47
3.10.4.3	Proposed Action	47
3.11	Visual Resources	47
3.11.1	Introduction	47
3.11.2	Issues	47
3.11.3	Affected Environment	47
3.11.4	Impact Analysis	48
3.11.4.1	Introduction	48
3.11.4.2	No Action Alternative	48
3.11.4.3	Proposed Action	48
3.12	Socioeconomics	49
3.12.1	Introduction	49
3.12.2	Issues	49
3.12.3	Affected Environment	49
3.12.4	Impact Analysis	49
3.12.4.1	Introduction	49
3.12.4.2	No Action Alternative	49
3.12.4.3	Proposed Action	49
3.13	Indian Trust Assets and Environmental Justice	49
3.13.1	Indian Trust Assets	49
3.13.2	Environmental Justice	50
3.14	Mitigation and Monitoring	50
3.14.1	Provo River and Riparian Environment	50
3.14.2	Wetlands and Water Features	52
3.14.3	Threatened and Endangered Species	52
3.14.4	Cultural Resources	52
3.14.5	Monitoring	52
3.15	Cumulative Impacts and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	53
3.15.1	Introduction	53
3.15.2	Proposed Action and Interrelated Victory Ranch Resort	53
3.15.2.1	Water Resources	54
3.15.2.2	Aquatic Resources	57

Contents (continued)

Chapter 3 - Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences (continued)	
3.15.2.3 Wetlands and Terrestrial Habitat	58
3.15.2.4 Threatened and Endangered Species	60
3.15.2.5 Cultural Resources	61
3.15.2.6 Land Use Plans and Conflicts	61
3.15.2.7 Recreation	62
3.15.2.8 Transportation and Utilities	62
3.15.2.9 Health, Safety and Noise	62
3.15.2.10 Visual Resources	63
3.15.2.11 Socioeconomics	63
3.15.2.12 Indian Trust Assets and Environmental Justice	63
3.15.2.13 Cumulative Impacts Summary	63
3.16 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	65
3.16.1 Introduction	65
3.17 Irreversible and Irrecoverable Commitment of Resources	65
Chapter 4 - Consultation and Coordination	65

Lists of Tables

1-1	Contracts and Agreements Needed by Victory Ranch for the Proposed Action	5
1-2	Permits and Approvals Required by Victory Ranch for Proposed Action	6
2-1	Summary of Revegetation Plan	17
2-2	General Construction Schedule for River Restoration	17
2-3	Components of the Proposed Action	24
3-1	Summary of Changes to Aquatic Habitat (open water habitat)	30
3-2	Wetland Impacts, Conversions and New Water Features	34
3-3	Archeological Sites Found on Victory Ranch	40
3-4	Summary of Impacts of the Proposed Action to Cultural Resources	41
3-5	Cumulative Impacts of the Proposed Action and Victory Ranch Resort	64

List of Maps

Map 1	Project Location Map	2
Map 2	Proposed Action Area - Property Ownership and BOR Easement	3
Map 3	River Restoration Design Overview	11
Map 4	Proposed Alignment of Weber/Provo Canal	12
Map 5	Revegetation Plan	13
Map 6	River Golf Course	55
Map 7	Proposed Trail Alignment	56

Appendix A - List of Preparers

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

AADT	Average Annual Daily Traffic
ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
APE	Area of Potential Effect
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
cfs	Cubic feet per second
Corps	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
DWR	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
IGCMP	Integrated Golf Course Management Plan
JSSD	Jordanelle Special Service District
MCLs	Maximum Contaminant Levels (drinking water standard)
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
ORV	Off Road Vehicle
Reclamation	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
SHPO	Utah State Historic Preservation Office
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
SR	State Route
SWP3	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
T&E	Threatened and Endangered Species (Federally listed)
UPDES	Utah Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
USGS	United States Geological Survey
VR	Victory Ranch

Chapter 1

Purpose and Need

1.1 Purpose of the Environmental Assessment and Introduction

This document is an Environmental Assessment (EA) for Restoration of the Provo River through the Victory Ranch (Proposed Action). The owners of the Victory Ranch are proposing rehabilitation of the Provo River and associated habitat from the bridge on SR 32 east of the Jordanelle Reservoir, upstream to 1000 East in Francis, Utah, a distance of 5 miles. In the 1940s, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) obtained easements along the Provo River to flood certain land and to construct dikes to contain high flows that come from diverting the Weber and Duchesne Rivers. The Proposed Action cannot therefore be implemented without Reclamation authorization. Before such authorization can occur, Reclamation must prepare an EA pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Council on Environmental Quality's and Department of Interior's regulations implementing NEPA to determine whether the Proposed Action would have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

Victory Ranch owns or controls most of the land along the 5 miles of river above Jordanelle with the exception of a parcel at the south end of the project owned by the LDS Church and two small areas locally known as Lemon's Grove and Trout River Ranch. The location of the Victory Ranch Resort is shown on Map 1. Land ownership along the Provo River and Reclamation easements are shown in Map 2. The boundary area of the Proposed Action is also shown on Map 2.

This EA examines the Proposed Action, the No Action Alternative and cumulative impacts that could occur as a result of other past, present or future projects in the area. The EA provides sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) or a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). The EA and FONSI are intended to satisfy disclosure requirements of NEPA and will serve as the NEPA compliance document for the Proposed Action. An EIS would be required if the EA determines that implementing the Proposed Action would result in significant impacts. This EA is also intended to serve as the Biological Assessment under the provisions of Section 7 consultation requirements of the Endangered Species Act, 16 USC 1531-1544.

This chapter describes the background, history, previous environmental documentation, and purpose and need of the Proposed Action.

Map 1

Map 2

1.2 Background and History

Historically, the Provo River in the Proposed Action project area offered good fish and wildlife habitat. This was due, in part, to an unregulated and unaltered river. Bends in the river provided deep holes for fish and dense streamside forest for many species of birds and other wildlife. This river habitat was first altered in 1932 with the completion of phase 1 of the Weber/Provo Canal to import 210 cfs of water from the Weber River to the Provo River. This canal was enlarged in 1948 to a capacity of 1000 cfs, allowing diversion of the Weber River's high flows into the Provo River for storage in Deer Creek Reservoir. With this input, flooding on the Provo River increased dramatically.

In 1954 the Duchesne Tunnel was completed which diverts high flows from the Duchesne River into the Provo River. Following completion of this diversion, flooding along the Provo River was again increased dramatically with approximately 600 cfs added during high flows. By simply subtracting the high flows from the Weber and Duchesne diversions using peak flow records at the gage near Hailstone just below Victory Ranch, the estimated 2-year flood without the Weber and Duchesne water would be 931 cfs and with the added water it is 2,431 cfs (600 cfs from the Duchesne and 1,000cfs from the Weber).

To control flooding, Reclamation initiated a flood control project including channel realignment, channel enlargement, dike construction and repair, and purchase of flood easements. The objective of these projects was to increase channel capacity to 3,000 cfs between the Duchesne Tunnel to the Weber/ Provo Canal, and to increase channel capacity to 4,300 cfs between the Weber/Provo Canal and Deer Creek Reservoir.

The Provo River Water Users Association (PRWUA) performs annual maintenance work in the channel of the Provo River, reworking cobble to maintain channel capacity at some locations, reworking channels near diversion headworks to keep them functional, and reinforcing downstream toes of diversion dams to prevent undercutting by upstream-migrating headcuts caused by excessive shear stress and associated sediment transport.

In 1993 the Jordanelle Dam was completed. With its completion, high flows in the Provo River between Jordanelle and Deer Creek Reservoirs were greatly reduced. In 1999, the Provo River Restoration Project through Heber Valley was initiated by the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission as mitigation for the Central Utah Project.

1.3 Purpose and Need

The Proposed Action would respond to the following need: To improve the condition and function of the 5-mile section of the Provo River that runs through the Victory Ranch property by moving the inflow of the Weber/Provo Canal approximately one mile downstream and by creating space, continuity and complexity currently lacking due primarily to past practices of diking and dredging.

The purposes served by the Proposed Action are:

1. Reduce the headcuts caused by excessive shear stress and reduce associated sediment transport down stream to the Rock Cliffs state park.
2. Improve and protect fish and wildlife habitats, including spotted frog habitat.
3. Mitigate some of the impacts of high flow diversions to the Provo River.
4. Reduce maintenance required for flood control and irrigation diversions.

Also, the project applicant wishes to support recreation demand for fly fishing by Victory Ranch Resort patrons.

1.4 Authorizing Actions, Permits and Licenses

Construction and operation of the Proposed Action would require various contracts and agreements that would be negotiated by Victory Ranch with Reclamation, private companies, and individuals. Victory Ranch would need to obtain various approvals, permits and licenses from Wasatch County and state and federal regulatory agencies. This section summarizes these requirements. Table 1-1 lists the contracts and agreements needed for construction and operation of the Proposed Action.

Table 1-1 Contracts and Agreements Needed by Victory Ranch for the Proposed Action	
Contract or Agreement	Purpose
Bureau of Reclamation	To authorize modification the Weber/Provo Canal and flood control features on the Provo River through Victory Ranch
Farm Management Company	To purchase, lease or obtain an easement for River Restoration on land not currently owned by Victory Ranch
Ted Cahoon	To purchase, lease or obtain an easement for Weber/Provo Canal relocation on land not currently owned by Victory Ranch

Table 1-2 lists the federal, state and local permits and licenses required and the agencies or departments that administer them.

**Table 1-2
Permits and Approvals Required by Victory Ranch for Proposed Action**

Agency/Department	Permit/Approval	Required for
Federal agencies		
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Individual Permit (Clean Water Act, Section 404)	Discharge of dredge/fill into waters of the United States, including wetlands
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Section 7 Consultation (Endangered Species Act, 16 USC 15311544)	Ensure Endangered Species Act compliance
Bureau of Reclamation	License	For construction of proposed river restoration elements
State Agencies		
Department of Natural Resources Division of Water Rights	Stream Channel Alteration permit (Utah Code Annotated Section 73329)	Change in river or stream (including roads, bridge or pipeline construction across a streambed)
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources	Consultation	spotted frogs
Department of Environmental Quality Division of Water Quality	General construction activity stormwater permit	Stormwater discharge associated with construction activities
	401 Certification (Clean Water Act, 33 USC 1342, as the project requires U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 404 permit	Discharge into waters and wetlands (see U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit)
Utah State Historic Preservation Office	Section 106 Consultation (National Historic Preservation Act, 16 USC 470) A MOA may be needed, parties to be determined.	Historic, architectural, archaeological or cultural characteristics of properties that meet National Register criteria
Utah Department of Transportation	Right-of-way and encroachment permit	Construction of acceleration and deceleration lanes at project entrance
Utah Occupational Safety and Health Administration	Construction permit	Worker safety and health

Table 1-2 (continued)
Permits and Approvals Required by Victory Ranch for Proposed Action

Other Agencies		
Wasatch County Planning Department	Conditional Use Permit	Activities which are conditional in a particular zone
Summit County Planning Department	Conditional Use Permit	Activities which are conditional in a particular zone
Wasatch County Engineering Department	Grading Permit	Excavation and fill activities
Summit County Engineering Department	Grading Permit	Excavation and fill activities
Uintah & Ouray Ute Tribe Northwest Band of the Shoshone Nation	Tribal Consultation	National Historic Preservation Act 36CFR 800

1.5 Interrelated Projects

This section describes projects that could cause cumulative impacts related to the Proposed Action. These projects are referred to as interrelated projects.

The NEPA and CEQ Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR Part 1500-1508) require federal agencies to consider the cumulative impacts of their actions. These are defined as the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such actions. Cumulative impacts can result from actions that are individually minor but collectively significant over a period of time (40 CFR 1508.7).

Section 1.5.2 describes future projects that have been included in the cumulative impacts analysis. Interrelated projects could combine with the Proposed Action to create cumulative impacts on the environment. Section 3.13 discusses the cumulative impacts interrelated projects may cause in conjunction with the Proposed Action.

1.5.1 Past Projects

The natural flow in the Provo River was increased in 1932 with the completion of phase 1 of the Weber/Provo Canal to import 210 cfs of water from the Weber River to the Provo River. This canal was enlarged in 1948 to a capacity of 1000 cfs, allowing diversion of the Weber River's high flows into the Provo River for storage in Deer Creek Reservoir. With this input, flooding on the Provo River increased dramatically.

In 1954 the Duchesne Tunnel was completed which diverts high flows from the Duchesne River into the Provo River. Following completion of this diversion, flooding along the Provo River was again increased dramatically with approximately 600 cfs added during high flows. By simply subtracting the high flows from the Weber and Duchesne diversions using peak flow records at the gage near Hailstone just below Victory Ranch, the estimated 2-year flood without the Weber and Duchesne water would be 931 cfs and with the added water it is 2,431 cfs (600 cfs from the Duchesne and 1,000 cfs from the Weber).

To control flooding, Reclamation initiated a flood control project including channel realignment, channel enlargement, dike construction and repair, and purchase of flood easements. The objective of these projects was to increase channel capacity to 3,000 cfs between the Duchesne Tunnel to the Weber/ Provo Canal, and to increase channel capacity to 4,300 cfs between the Weber/Provo Canal and Deer Creek Reservoir.

A flow duration relation was computed for the mean daily flow record of the USGS gage on the Provo River near Hailstone, Utah (station number 10155000). The relation is for the reach below the Weber/Provo Canal and cannot be converted directly into a relation for the river above that point. However, since transbasin diversions occur only during periods of high discharge, the curve is probably appropriate for moderate to low discharge periods for all of Victory Ranch. A mean daily discharge of 50 cfs was exceeded over 94% of the time for the period of record, whereas a discharge of 750 cfs was exceeded only 11% of the time. Mean daily discharges over 2,000 cfs were exceeded only 1.3% of the time.

Changes resulting from construction and operation of the past projects along the Provo River through Victory Ranch have been included in the baseline conditions being used to measure impacts of construction of the Proposed Action. Therefore, since impacts are measured from a baseline (i.e., existing conditions), impacts from past projects are not included as a separate item in the cumulative impact analyses.

1.5.2 Future Projects Included in the Cumulative Impact Analysis

The Victory Ranch Resort (Map 1) is directly linked to the Proposed Action in that the river restoration work is funded by the resort. However, the resort development plan does not necessarily require restoration of the river. Several other developments around the Jordanelle Reservoir are proposed or under construction including: Mayflower North Properties, Mayflower South Properties, East Park subdivision, Deer Cover Resort, Deer Crest hotel, Pioche Village, Deer Meadow, Hideaway Hollow, The Aspen, Deer Canyon Preserve, Sorenson Properties, Todd Hollow and Tuhaye. Most of these projects are residential developments and they are unrelated to the Proposed Action.

Planned activities for which Reclamation authorization is required include an intake pipeline to be built by Jordanelle Special Service District to draw water from Jordanelle Reservoir, and a lease of power privilege that would allow Heber Light and Power and the Central Utah Water Conservancy District to construct a power plant to generate electricity at Jordanelle Dam. Neither of these projects would contribute impacts to or be affected by the Proposed Action.

The Victory Ranch Resort encompasses 5803 acres, including 732 acres of the Provo River Valley and the area of the Proposed Action (the River Restoration Project). The resort property was acquired over the past 10 years and is largely composed of the historic Double Bar A Ranch, Fitzgerald Ranch and Victory Ranch (which accounts for the name of the Victory Ranch Resort). When build out is completed, the resort would include three golf courses, 432 resort housing units, 76 employee housing units and 217 lots for single family homes. Approximately 83% of the resort area would be open space including the 513-acre preservation area of the Proposed Action.

Chapter 2 Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

2.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the features of the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action, identifies alternatives eliminated from detailed analysis and presents a comparative analysis of the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action.

2.2 Description of No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no river restoration of the Provo River through Victory Ranch would occur. The PRWUA would continue annual maintenance work in the channel, reworking channel cobble to maintain capacity at some locations, reworking channels near diversion headworks to keep them functional, and reinforcing downstream

toes of diversion dams to prevent undercutting by upstream-migrating headcuts caused by excessive shear stress and the associated downstream sediment transport. Water from the Weber/Provo Canal would continue to discharge into the Provo River about one mile upstream from the bridge on SR 32 continuing the sediment transport in the river. Additional flows from the Duchesne Tunnel would continue to cause headcuts and excess sediment transport in part because the river would remain confined by the dikes that were constructed by Reclamation.

2.3 Description of Proposed Action

2.3.1 Overview

Reclamation holds easements along the Provo River to flood certain land and to construct dikes to contain high flows. The Proposed Action cannot therefore be implemented without Reclamation authorization. Under the Proposed Action some functions of the Provo River through Victory Ranch would be restored by removing many of the existing dikes to allow the river room to move. The flow of the Weber/Provo Canal would be placed in a new canal south of SR 32 that would discharge to the Provo River a mile further down stream, thereby reducing the sediment transport load. A 50 cfs side channel would be constructed paralleling the Provo River in the upper half of the project area reducing the eroding high flows in the main channel. The existing Fitzgerald bridge in the upper project area would be removed and the existing Victory Ranch bridge in the lower project area would be replaced with a longer bridge. These features are shown on Map 3.

2.3.2 Proposed Action Features

The following features comprise the Proposed Action in the Provo River Valley:
Restoration and Preservation

1. Preservation of 513 acres within the river valley project area (Map 2)
2. Removal of livestock from the Project area
3. Provide space for the river to meander by removing dikes (point 7 Map 3)
4. Reroute the Weber/Provo Canal (Map 4)
5. New entrance bridge with span length to remove constriction (point 2 Map 3)
6. Remove Fitzgerald bridge and associated constricting dikes (point 3 Map 3)
7. New dikes (points 4, 5, & 6 Map 3)
8. Construct side channel (point 10 Map 3)
9. Construct channel barbs (point 11 Map 3)
10. Reconstruct selected existing diversion
11. Revegetation throughout river valley (Map 5)

Map 4

Map 5

2.3.2.1 Preservation

The Victory Ranch includes 732 acres of the Provo River Valley of which 513 acres are within the VR River Restoration project proposed for preservation in its natural condition under a conservation easement. The preserved areas are referred to as the upper river preserve, between the upstream end of the project and Lemon's Grove at the bend in the river and the lower preserve, in the section downstream from Lemon's Grove to the SR 32 highway bridge near the entrance to the Rock Cliffs state park at the Jordanelle Reservoir.

2.3.2.2 Livestock Grazing Removal

Removal of livestock grazing is a component of the Proposed Action. Grazing has had a clear impact on the shrub layer within the forest, and it has also prevented establishment of new trees within the river corridor. Removal of grazing would promote habitat complexity within the riparian forest and promote survival of a wide range of organisms.

2.3.2.3 River Restoration -Spacing

Sufficient space must be given to any river if it is to function naturally. It is proposed that the entire valley width be available for the river in the upper reach and that sufficient space is given for overbank flooding through the Victory Ranch Resort golf course in the lower reach just below Lemon's Grove on either side of the area of the Proposed Action.

2.3.2.4 Rerouting of the Weber/Provo Canal - Hydrology

Healthy rivers need a hydrology that lends itself to a naturally functioning ecosystem. The hydrology of the Provo River above Jordanelle Reservoir is an example of a system that has experienced extreme hydrologic alteration. The added water from the Duchesne Tunnel and the Weber/Provo Canal has essentially doubled the flood magnitude for the frequently occurring floods. This water has profoundly affected the geomorphology of the river, by promoting high levels of sediment transport and causing channel instability. It is proposed that the water from the Weber/Provo Canal be delivered as far downstream as is feasibly possible, before being added to the flow of the Provo River. Weber River water would be routed down the south side of the highway from the Weber/Provo Canal bridge to a point just upstream of the SR 32 highway bridge near the Rock Cliffs state park entrance road (#1, Map 3). Routing this flow in its own channel would benefit more than a mile of the Provo River and reduce sediment delivery to the state park. There would be no change in flows in the Provo River downstream of the bridge on SR 32 as a result of this project.

2.3.2.5 New Victory Ranch Entrance Bridge - Continuity

The term "continuity" refers to the longitudinal continuum of the channel and channel bed. The Provo River on Victory Ranch has several areas where longitudinal continuity is disrupted. The Victory Ranch main access road bridge is a major disruption of continuity. It is proposed that the old bridge be removed and replaced with a new bridge with a span that is sufficient to prevent any constriction of the river (#2, Map 3).

2.3.2.6 Removal of the Fitzgerald Bridge

Another longitudinal discontinuity occurs where the Fitzgerald footbridge crosses the river upstream of Lemon's Grove. It is proposed that the footbridge and abutments be removed and that the area surrounding the footbridge be restored to a more natural channel form (#3, Map 3). The bridge provided ORV access for the former land owner and was not for public use. If, in the future, it is determined that a new bridge is needed, a bridge with wider abutments would be built.

2.3.2.7 Removal of Dikes - Connectivity

Lateral connectivity of the Provo River to its floodplain has been lacking in many areas of Victory Ranch due to dikes. It is proposed that these dikes be removed (#7, Map 3). These dikes provide flood protection within the Project area and their removal would not adversely affect downstream land owners. The access road to the ranch house near the upstream limit of the property (#8, Map 3) would be relocated farther from the river to extend the area that could flood at high flow.

2.3.2.8 New Dikes

Three locations along the Provo River would benefit from construction of short dikes. The first site is located downstream of Lemon's Grove (#4, Map 3). A new section of dike would be built to maintain sediment transport through the reach and a French drain would be installed through the dike at the site to allow some water to seep through the dike to provide water for a series of wetlands that would be constructed behind the new dike.

The second site is located at another unconfined reach about 1600 feet below the first site (#5, Map 3). A short section of dike would be constructed to steer the flow to the north and prevent avulsion. Similar to the previous site a French drain would be installed through the new dike at the existing point of diversion to allow water to seep through the dike to provide flow for irrigation water.

The third site is located approximately 4100 feet downstream of the second site (#6, Map 3). A short section of low dike would be constructed to steer the flow away from the bank. Again, a French drain would be constructed through the dike to provide water for a small wetland feature behind the site.

2.3.2.9 Construction of Side Channel - Complexity

It is proposed that the following aquatic features be constructed to replace lost habitats and enhance the existing habitats by adding complexity to the system. A side channel would be constructed that allows water from the Provo River to flow through the meadow on the south side of the existing river in the upper project area above Lemon's Grove (#10 Map 3). This channel would be constructed so as to provide a wide variety of hydraulic habitats for native and game fish species and water from this channel would

also be used to feed a number of wetlands across the meadow. Water for this side channel would be diverted from the Provo River at the south edge of the project area approximately 200 feet upstream of the ranch house access bridge through an appropriately configured concrete diversion structure that causes no longitudinal discontinuity on the Provo River channel. In other words, the “in channel” portion of the diversion structure would be constructed of natural materials (rock) and it would be built “at grade” so as not to influence bedload transport through the reach. A diversion structure offers several benefits over a more natural channel split. It would allow for management of the quantity of flow that is diverted into the side channel and it would also allow a more controlled flood to be released into the side channel each year.

2.3.2.10 Construction of Channel Barbs

Selected sites along the river could benefit from some limited bank stabilization combined with large-scale revegetation. Channel barbs (small rock structures protruding from the bank) would be combined with willow-wattle plantings to promote stabilization of banks at areas where channel erosion is deemed to be excessive. One such site exists along the south side of the river downstream of the Victory Ranch main access bridge (#11 Map 3). The river here has been diked on the north side (recommended for removal) and erosion along the south side has been accelerated by bed aggradation and the lack of overbank flooding to the north. Limited bank stabilization could be done on the south side to prevent continued erosion in that direction. This stabilization would be designed so that river habitat is enhanced and vegetation along the banks is increased.

2.3.2.11 Reconstruct Selected Existing Diversion From the River

Selected existing irrigation diversions that have been washed out would be reconstructed to provide water for new side channels and irrigation.

2.3.2.12 Revegetation Throughout the River Valley

A revegetation plan has been produced as part of the restoration effort for the river valley (Map 5). A five year monitoring and maintenance plan is proposed to ensure the revegetation goals are met. The major components of the revegetation plan are summarized below in Table 2-1.

Habitat Type	Seedling Type/Density	Acres*
riparian forest thickets	mostly shrubs/3 ft. centers	2.5
new riparian forest	trees/12 ft. centers, shrubs/6 ft.	8
riparian forest infill to increase diversity	trees and shrubs/50 ft. centers	63
dense willow communities	willows/6 ft. centers	3
wetland complex - meadow/pond/stream	native grass/sedge seed 50 lbs/acre	25
upland meadow replace forage grass	native grass seed 50.5 lbs/acre	40

* Acreage estimates are approximate

2.3.3 Construction Schedule

It is anticipated that the project would require three years to complete. Construction activities in the river would occur from mid summer through late fall when the flows in the river are reduced. Construction activities not associated with the river channel (such as excavation of the new Weber/Provo Canal alignment) could occur during other months. Table 2-2 shows the general construction schedule for the Proposed Action.

Feature	Construction Schedule
New Weber/Provo Canal	Years 1-2
Provo River channel work/dike removal (lower section)	Years 1-2
Off-channel work (lower section)	Years 1-2
Revegetation (lower section)	Years 1-3
New side channel (upper section)	Years 2-3
Provo River channel work/dike removal (upper section)	Years 2-3
Revegetation (upper section)	Years 2-4
Monitoring and maintenance period (both sections)	Years 2-8

The Proposed Action would be constructed in two phases, the lower river valley segment first and then the upper river valley segment. Each segment would be constructed from upstream to downstream.

The new side channel and the rerouted Weber/Provo Canal would initially receive small amounts of water to wash sediments into larger flows of the Provo River. Salvageable materials excavated from existing dikes, the construction of side channels, and the relocated Weber/Provo Canal would be sorted and stockpiled on site for use in the construction of new dikes, barbs and channels. This would include boulders and large rocks from existing dikes, river cobble, woody material from existing vegetation and top soil. Locations for stocking materials onsite would be selected to minimize impacts on existing or proposed land uses and environmental features. Construction spoil would be disposed off-site at a site approved by Wasatch County to receive such material.

To the extent possible, construction would be scheduled such that work in the existing Provo River channel would not occur during the high flow period of May through July. Timing of side channel, rerouted canal, new dikes and barbs would minimize impacts.

No utilities are buried in the construction zone, and suspended utilities crossing the river would be protected in place during construction.

2.3.4 Construction Materials and Staging Areas

Two staging areas would be used for the project construction. During the construction of Phase I, the area adjacent to the red barn on SR 32 would be used for equipment and material storage and parking for workers. During the construction of Phase II, the staging area would be at the area proposed for the Victory Ranch Equestrian Center and adjacent to the existing caretaker dwelling.

The following equipment may be used to construct the Proposed Action:

- Backhoe - Cat 426 or equivalent
- Compactor - Cat 816B or equivalent
- Dozer - Cat D7 or equivalent
- Excavator - Cat 235 or equivalent
- Excavator - Cat 245 or equivalent
- Loader - Cat 966C or equivalent
- Motor Grader - Cat 14G or equivalent
- Scraper - Cat 621 or equivalent
- Truck - rear dump
- Truck - flatbed
- Truck - pickup

2.3.5 Construction Transportation Requirements

Construction transportation requirements of the VR Restoration Project include an estimated 10 round trips per day. Most materials would be salvaged and used on site, minimizing off-site hauling.

2.3.6 Construction Standard Operating Procedures

Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) would be followed (except for unforeseen conditions that would require modifications) during construction, of the Proposed Action to avoid or minimize adverse impacts on people and natural resources. The SOPs and features of the Proposed Action have been formulated to avoid or minimize adverse impacts. Chapter 3 presents the impact analysis for resources after SOPs have been successfully implemented.

Air Quality

The contractor would follow the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's recommended control methods to minimize dust generation including periods of watering of equipment staging areas, dirt and gravel roads. Construction machinery and operation and maintenance vehicles would be routinely maintained to ensure that engines remain tuned and emission-control equipment is properly functioning as required by law. The Contractor would comply with Utah State air quality regulations.

Cultural Resources

Victory Ranch shall direct all parties carrying out construction activities for the project to protect historical properties and shall require such parties to inform all contractors performing work within the Victory Ranch Project area: 1) of the existence of known historic properties in the vicinity of any ground-disturbing activities; 2) to take measures to protect such historic properties; and 3) that the area may contain unidentified properties that are eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or that may contribute to a NRHP eligible district.

If during construction archaeological or human remains are discovered, all construction in the area would cease immediately and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) would be contacted. SHPO would also be contacted if it appears that construction activity would affect a known NRHP eligible property or contributing property in a previously unanticipated manner. Victory Ranch would take all reasonable measures to avoid or minimize harm to such properties and would stop work in the vicinity of an inadvertent discovery until it concludes consultation with the SHPO. If a property is discovered during construction which has not been evaluated for the NRHP, Victory Ranch shall treat the property as eligible or contributing until such time as an official determination of eligibility is made. Victory Ranch would consult with the SHPO to develop actions that would take the effects of the project into account with regards to newly discovered properties or known NRHP eligible or contributing properties. Victory Ranch, in consultation with SHPO, shall develop a written data recovery or mitigation plan for the affected property that takes into account the requirements of the project, considerations of safety, environmental protection and other applicable issues. This plan shall be submitted to SHPO and other interested parties, such as Native American tribes, who would notify Victory Ranch within the mutually agreed upon time frames if the plan does not conform to the measures developed in consultation. Victory Ranch would modify the project or any element thereof as necessary to implement the written plan.

Energy Conservation

Standard energy conservation measures would be used during construction, operation and maintenance, such as avoiding unnecessary idling and keeping equipment tuned and maintained. To conserve fuel consumption, crews would use the shortest possible transportation routes that are environmentally acceptable and safe.

Erosion Control and Restoration

A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWP3) would be written for the project and submitted to the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Water Quality for a UPDES Storm Water General Permit for Construction Activities. Storm Water monitoring would be conducted throughout the duration of the project as required by the UPDES Permit.

Erosion control and restoration procedures would be implemented in all areas disturbed during construction, including temporary access roads. The contractor would restore disturbed surfaces to as close to pre-construction conditions as possible and avoid and minimize erosion. Sediment barriers would be installed to keep wetlands, water bodies and the Provo River free of sedimentation from construction. These barriers would be constructed of silt fences, weed-free staked hay or straw bales, or sandbags, as approved by the Wasatch and Summit Counties Engineering Departments.

Existing topsoil would be carefully removed and stored during construction and replaced after construction activities are completed. Topsoil stripping activities would cease during excessively wet weather. Additional topsoil would be added, if needed, to promote vegetation growth. The owner would be required to submit to Wasatch & Summit Counties for approval a drainage and erosion control plan for all stockpiles. This plan would be specific for each proposed area and would be provided to project workers at the construction sites.

Revegetation work would be carried out according to requirements of the SWP3 for permanent stabilization and restoration of disturbed areas. Contractors would follow procedures outlined in the revegetation section of the river restoration design.

Health and Safety

The Utah Occupational Safety and Health Act and the conditions of the Federal Occupational Safety and Health Standards would be followed during construction, operation and maintenance. Copies of those publications would be provided to project workers at the construction site. Warning signs, temporary barriers, and fences would be provided in areas used by the public where construction activities are underway. Prior to construction, the contractor would be required to submit for approval a safety plan with measures to be implemented for construction personnel and the public. Construction workers would be required to park vehicles in designated areas. The contractor would

place gates and fencing at all access points from SR 32 to control access to the construction zone. The contractor would be responsible to ensure that these gates are locked during non-construction periods.

Noise

Mufflers on construction equipment would be checked regularly for proper function to minimize noise. The contractor would follow Utah Occupational Safety Standards to protect workers and the public from harmful noise exposure.

Recreation Resources

The only recreation activity currently conducted in the project area is restricted access fishing with a fishing guide. Fishing would be restricted to those areas of the river where no construction activities are underway and must be supervised by the fishing guide.

Utilities

Utilities damaged by construction activities would be restored to at least pre-construction condition. Signs would be posted warning heavy equipment operators of overhead utility lines.

Visual Resources

The project would restore the river to a more natural condition in function and look. Disturbed areas would be reclaimed to match undisturbed areas along the river as much as possible.

Water Quality

A SWP3 including a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan would be written for the project and submitted to the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Water Quality for a UPDES Storm Water General Permit for Construction Activities. The SWP3 specifies construction practices and storage and handling of materials where there is potential for contact with storm water or disturbing stream channels, riparian areas, wetland and floodplains. These plans specify Best Management Practices for nonpoint source water pollution control. Storm Water monitoring would be conducted throughout the duration of the project as required by the UPDES Permit.

Wildlife Resources

Materials excavated during construction would be stored only within the construction boundary or other approved sites, and not in sensitive wildlife habitats. Contractor personnel would not be allowed to possess firearms on the construction site. All excavations would be inspected at the end of each day's work schedule to insure they would not trap animals. Disturbed areas would be revegetated with plant species compatible with wildlife known to occur in the project area. Hazardous materials such as gasoline, diesel fuel and lubricants would be stored in safe areas away from sensitive

plant communities and fish and wildlife habitats. Trash or food items would not be stored within the construction area to avoid attracting wildlife to the work area.

Miscellaneous

The contractor would follow the requirements of any required permits or agreements. The contractor would be required to submit a plan for location and management of all construction staging areas to the owner for approval before starting any construction activities. Maintenance and refueling of equipment used during construction or maintenance would be performed only in areas approved by the project engineer. In the event of a toxic spill, the National Response Center (800-424-8802) and the Utah Environmental Response and Remedial Division (801-536-4100) would be promptly notified. All portable toilet facilities would be placed on an impermeable layer to prevent contact with surface or groundwater. The contractor would enforce usage of portable toilets by all personnel. Prior to construction, the contractor would be required to submit a fire prevention and control plan for approval that meets all state and local requirements. The contractor would remove waste materials and garbage from construction areas as needed and store or dispose of them in approved off-site disposal site. Areas outside of the construction area would be posted by signs and protected from damage during construction.

2.3.7 Long-Term Operation and Maintenance Procedures

The Provo River Water Users Association (PRWUA) would continue to be responsible for maintenance of the Provo River Project under the terms of its 1936 repayment contract with Reclamation, including channel maintenance in the Provo River within the Proposed Action area. Victory Ranch would coordinate with the PRWUA as needed to ensure that maintenance of features constructed under the Proposed Action would not interfere with PRWUA's responsibilities. Conversely, PRWUA would coordinate with Victory Ranch, as it does with all landowners along the Provo River, to ensure that channel maintenance activities do not harm Victory Ranch's facilities.

2.4 Alternatives Considered But Eliminated From Detailed Analysis

As the Proposed Action was being formulated, other alternatives to the Proposed Action were examined but found to be unfeasible and were thus eliminated from detailed analysis. This section summarizes the other alternatives and the reasons for their elimination in accordance with 40 CFR 1502.14(a).

2.4.1 Elimination of Transbasin Diversion During High Flows

This alternative would change the timing of transbasin discharges to the Provo River from high water to later in the season. This alternative was eliminated because existing water rights would not allow for the change.

2.4.2 Reduction in Volume of Transbasin Diversions

This alternative would reduce the volume of water discharged to the Provo River from transbasin diversion thus reducing the high flow in the river, the associated sediment transport and the impact the high flows have on the stability of non armored river banks. This alternative was eliminated because existing water rights would be diminished and replacement water is not available.

2.5 Comparative Analysis of Proposed Action and No Action Alternative

This section summarizes only a comparison of impacts of the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative.

The No Action Alternative involves no change in existing conditions. The Weber/Provo Canal would not be moved, nor would any river restoration work take place. Annual high flows in the river would continue to impact non-armored channel banks resulting in the loss of stream side vegetation, high sediment transport and reduced habitat for fish.

The Proposed Action would improve the condition and function of the river segment by moving the inflow of the Weber/Provo Canal approximately one mile downstream and by creating space, continuity and complexity currently lacking due primarily to past practices of diking and dredging. The purposes served by the Proposed Action are: 1) reduce the headcuts caused by excessive shear stress and reduce associated sediment transport down stream to the Rock Cliffs state park; 2) improve and protect fish and wildlife habitats, including spotted frog habitat; 3) mitigate some of the impacts of high flow diversions to the Provo River; 4) reduce maintenance required for flood control and irrigation diversions, and 5) support recreation demand for fly fishing by Victory Ranch Resort patrons.

2.6 Summary of Components of the Proposed Action

This section describes the features of the Proposed Action. Each of the topics shown in Table 2-3 below are discussed in detail in chapter 3.

Resource	Proposed Action
Water Resources	Sediment in Provo River reduced by moving input from Weber/Provo Canal a mile down stream.
Aquatic Resources & Wetlands	Dike removal allows river to flood. New side channel takes some of the damaging high flows. Ponds and channels for spotted frog habitat.
Terrestrial Habitat	513 acres preserved, grazing removed and revegetation to rehabilitate riparian habitat
T&E Species	Land preservation, creation of spotted frog habitat, sage grouse habitat avoided and improved by removing livestock.
Cultural Resources	Prehistoric sites avoided, two bridges, pens, hay barn & a house removed with mitigation for impacts under MOA with SHPO
Land Use Plans	No conflict with existing land use plans
Recreation	No changes to public access restrictions
Transportation	Highway level of service remains optimal
Health, Safety & Noise	Construction activities
Visual Resources	Construction equipment and vegetation changes would be visible
Socioeconomics	Construction would create some temporary employment
Indian Trust Assets	None present
Cumulative Impacts	Victory Ranch Resort is an interrelated project. It covers 5803 acres and proposes three golf courses, 432 resort housing units, 76 employee housing units, 217 home lots and approximately 83% open space. At least 12 other unrelated developments are planned or under construction around Jordanelle Reservoir. The Proposed Action does not result in or contribute to unacceptable cumulative effects.

Chapter 3 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the affected environment (baseline conditions) of resources of the human environment that would be impacted by the Proposed Action as described in Chapter 2. It also documents the environmental consequences (impacts) on the quality of the human environment. Baseline conditions are the existing physical conditions of the impacted resources in the impact area of influence. The human environment is defined in this study as environmental resources including fish, wildlife, threatened and endangered

species, cultural resources and social and economic conditions occurring in the impact area of influence.

The analysis presented in this chapter compares impacts that would occur with the Proposed Action and with continued existing conditions under the No Action Alternative. The impact analysis incorporates the Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for construction described in Chapter 2.

The following studies were completed to determine impacts of the Proposed Action as well as the Victory Ranch Resort development. Impacts related to the Victory Ranch Resort project are discussed in Section 3.13, Cumulative Impacts. Copies of these reports, as well as the 404 permit application are available upon request.

Wetlands – Locations and classifications of Corps of Engineers jurisdictional wetlands were mapped throughout the project area to determine how best to minimize wetland impacts. In the Provo River Valley, 337 acres of wetlands and waters of the US identified within the project area.

Wetland Delineation, Victory Ranch on the Provo River, Wasatch County, Utah, August 10, 2001.

Spotted Frogs – All wetlands of the Provo River corridor within the project area were surveyed for spotted frog activity in 2001 during the spring breeding season (April 13-May 21), in the summer (July 24-30) and in the fall (September 12-24). In addition thirteen spotted frog breeding sites and fifteen non-breeding sites were subject to a habitat assessment to characterize typical spotted frog habitats. A total of 43 spotted frog egg masses (28% of all egg masses recorded by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources above Jordanelle Reservoir that year) were located within the proposed preservation area.

Status of Columbia Spotted Frog and Boreal Toad on Victory Ranch, Utah, January 14, 2002.

Ute Ladies'-tresses – A detailed survey of Ute ladies'-tresses was conducted in the project area between August 7 and September 3, 2001 to record sightings of plant colonies and potential habitat. No Ute ladies'-tresses were observed during the surveys. The report concluded that approximately 118 acres of wetlands were potential habitat ranging from moderate to high potential or high potential if irrigated.

Ute Ladies'-tresses Surveys, Proposed Victory Ranch Project, Wasatch County, Utah, October, 2001.

Cultural Resources Survey of Structures – Structures in the project area were recorded in 2001 and 2002. Several structures, including the Weber/Provo Canal are considered eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. A cultural resources inventory for the project area and the Victory Ranch Resort development was completed and submitted to SHPO in 2003.

Architectural Documentation of Selected Historic Structures for the Proposed Victory Ranch Project, Wasatch and Summit Counties, Utah, (Cultural Resources Report 5177-01-20118) February, 2002.

Draft Cultural Resources Inventory of 3700 Acres in the Proposed Victory Ranch Development Area, Summit & Wasatch Counties, Utah, August 2003.

Restoration Design – A feasibility level restoration assessment has been completed to determine the appropriateness of a variety of restoration alternatives and to help guide future detailed design and restoration activities. The Proposed Action is based on this report.

Technical Report, Victory Ranch Feasibility Assessment and River Restoration Design Components, February 4, 2002.

Bird Survey – A bird survey within the project area was completed in May and June, 2001. A total of 57 species were recorded and a great blue heron rookery is present in the upper preservation area. No federally threatened or endangered species, nor species listed as sensitive by the state of Utah were encountered. The bald eagle is likely present during winter but is not known to breed in the project area. Yellow-billed cuckoos have recently been sighted in Heber Valley. It is conceivable that historically this species occurred on Victory Ranch, although it is currently not likely to occur in these reaches based on the degraded condition of the riparian corridor.

Breeding Bird Populations of the Provo River Corridor on Victory Ranch, Utah, 2001 Status Report, Analysis of Habitat Associations and Restoration Recommendations, February, 2002.

3.2 Water Resources and Water Quality

3.2.1 Introduction

This section addresses potential impacts on water quality and water resources that would result from the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action.

3.2.2 Issues

The following issues raised during the scoping process are addressed in the impact analysis:

- Impacts of the Proposed Action on water quality and quantity.
- Impacts on water consumption and water quality with continued irrigation and livestock grazing under the No Action Alternative.

3.2.3 Affected Environment

The impact area of influence for surface water resources covers the Provo River and associated waters within the Project area. Baseline conditions for the affected area include water consumption for irrigation, water quality impacts of unrestricted livestock grazing and water quality impacts of transbasin diversions during high flows. These conditions are documented in the reports listed above in Section 3.1.

3.2.4 Impact Analysis

3.2.4.1 Introduction

Potential impacts on water quality caused by the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action were compared. Measures that would mitigate for Proposed Action impacts are taken into account.

Specifically, the restoration design addresses sediment transport related to unnaturally high seasonal flows in this segment of the river as well as the impacts of grazing on water quality. Changes in water consumption were examined to compare the demands of current irrigation use with proposed diversions altered or moved during the restoration project to serve irrigation needs on the Victory Ranch Resort.

The following impacts on water resources would be considered significant:

- A change in water quality causing State water quality standards to be violated.
- If annual sediment loads in the river were increased.

3.2.4.2 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative unrestricted irrigation diversions would continue to provide water for pasture irrigation. Grazing of approximately 450 cattle would continue to contribute to erosion and add nitrogen to surface waters. Dramatic consumption of grasses and destruction of forest understory also would continue to impede natural filtration and processing of nutrient inputs.

3.2.4.3 Proposed Action

Water currents, bed loading and turbidity: River restoration is designed to improve conditions within the Provo River channel by giving it sufficient space and continuity to function as a naturally braided river. The river system as it exists now is a braided channel choked with boulders. Sinuosity is out of balance partly due to dikes and bridge structures and the channel bed is unstable because the water volume is augmented at peak flows which transport large quantities of rock and sediment leaving seasonally low flows dwarfed in a sea of rock. The primary methods to reduce channel erosion and sediment transport are to remove high flows from the main channel by creating an off-river side channel along most of the upper preserve and moving the Weber/Provo Diversion discharge point to the SR 32 highway bridge at the downstream end of the project. Since the canal would join with the Provo River above the SR 32 bridge, there would be no change to off-site hydrology dynamics below the bridge. Continuity would also be improved by removing constrictions associated with two bridges within the project area.

Flooding and Connectivity: Some river connections to existing side channels are artificially constructed and maintained for irrigation purposes with flows directed into upland meadows. Many of the existing irrigation diversions would be abandoned or

modified to give off-river channels natural flow patterns. Dikes would be removed to allow overbank flooding and reconnect the river with its floodplain.

Storm Water and Development Runoff: Temporary construction site erosion controls would be installed using best management practices and following a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWP3) developed for the site in accordance with Utah Division of Water Quality regulations. Particular care would be used to protect existing natural wetlands and water features from sediment-laden runoff. Additionally, limits of disturbance would be marked to ensure construction equipment does not enter existing natural wetland areas designated to remain undisturbed. Regular inspections and maintenance to erosion controls would be conducted throughout all construction phases and until new vegetation has established sufficiently to stabilize disturbed areas.

Water Consumption: Aquifer recharge is estimated to be similar to current conditions because most of the irrigation water currently used for pasture in the river valley would remain in the river, side channels, ponds and wetlands created or preserved by the restoration effort. Some irrigation diversions would be reconstructed for future irrigation needs at Victory Ranch.

3.2.4.4 Impact Summary

The No Action Alternative would provide no change in the current rate of Provo River channel erosion and associated sediment deposition at the Rock Cliffs state park. Phosphorous and nitrogen inputs associated with grazing and excessive erosion would continue.

Under the Proposed Action, Provo River channel erosion would be reduced, particularly in the river reach between the current Weber/Provo Canal and the SR 32 bridge. Erosion of associated off-channel water features would also decrease due to removal of grazing impacts.

3.3 Aquatic Resources

3.3.1 Introduction

This section addresses potential impacts on aquatic resources that would result from the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action.

3.3.2 Issues

The following issues raised during the scoping process are addressed in the impact analysis:

- Impact on the aquatic environment during construction of the Proposed Action.
- Impacts on the acreage of aquatic features.
- Impacts on the quality of aquatic features.

3.3.3 Affected Environment

The impact area of influence for aquatic resources include all surface water features within the Proposed Action project area. Baseline conditions for the affected area include the condition of the Provo River with existing dikes, transbasin hydrologic impacts, irrigation diversions in their current conditions characterized by washed out head gates and current land use practices. Game fish, non-game fish, macroinvertebrates and amphibians (other than spotted frog) were not surveyed within Victory Ranch. Based on data collected in 1993 below the Jordanelle Reservoir (URMCC, 1997) brown trout are the most common game fish species, rainbow trout were much less common and mountain whitefish are also present. Longnose dace, redbside shiner, mountain sucker and mottled sculpin were the most common non-game fish collected in the Provo River below the Jordanelle Dam. There is no specific or quantitative information on the presence or abundance of amphibians in the Provo River other than spotted frog. Other amphibians reported as present include Woodhouse toad, leopard frog, boreal chorus frog and tiger salamander. All amphibian species are associated with pond, emergent marsh and stream riparian habitats.

3.3.4 Impact Analysis

3.3.4.1 Introduction

The River Restoration Feasibility Study and Conceptual Design and other reports listed in Section 3.1, as well as information from the Provo River Restoration Project (PRRP) through Heber Valley serve as the basis for determining baseline conditions. Potential impacts on the quantity and quality and of the aquatic environment caused by the No Action alternative and the Proposed Action were examined based on general guidelines concerning river conditions contributing to habitat quality. To a large extent, recommendations in the VR River Restoration Feasibility Study are based on the author's experience with the PRRP just a few miles downstream.

The following impacts on aquatic resources would be considered significant:

- A net loss of aquatic habitat acreage.
- A reduction in habitat diversity.
- An overall reduced quality of aquatic habitat after taking into account habitat quantity and quality improvements related to the restoration project.

3.3.4.2 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative current land use practices and hydrologic conditions would persist with few foreseeable changes to the aquatic environment. Current conditions affecting the aquatic environment are the high water inputs (600 cfs from the Duchesne Tunnel and 1000 cfs from the Weber/Provo Canal) as well as unrestricted grazing, dikes, bridges and irrigation diversions.

3.3.4.3 Proposed Action

Construction Temporary impacts to the aquatic environment would occur due to increased turbidity and sedimentation during construction. Standard operating procedures similar to those used on the Provo River Restoration Project in Heber Valley would be implemented to minimize sediment impacts. The impact would be minimal and probably not measurable compared to baseline conditions.

Physical Habitat Direct long term physical changes to the aquatic habitat are summarized in Table 3-1 and discussed below.

Table 3-1 Summary of changes to Aquatic Habitat (open water habitat)	
Habitat Type	Net Change in Habitat Area*
Off channel open water (perennial ponds and vegetated shallows)	+4 acres
Side channel surface water (perennial stream)	+4 acres
Spotted frog habitat (without accounting for beaver activity)	+4 acres

* Acreage estimates are approximate

All of the constructed aquatic habitat built as ponds and vegetated shallows would be in the upper river preserve. The proposed side channel paralleling the river in the upper preserve accounts for the gains in channel surface area.

Areas mapped as wetlands are also mapped as potential spotted frog habitat in baseline mapping, but include seasonally saturated wet meadows. In the table above and in this discussion, changes to spotted frog habitat refer to aquatic habitat; areas that could actually be occupied by eggs, tadpoles or frogs as well as aquatic features that may serve

as migration corridors. Wet meadows that almost never have standing water are not counted as aquatic habitat. The new Weber/Provo Canal alignment would impact approximately 2000 square feet of this aquatic of habitat suitable for spotted frogs, though none were found in the potential impact area. The canal would join with the Provo River above the SR 32 bridge, therefore there would be no change to off-site hydrology dynamics below the bridge.

Ponds and vegetated shallow areas to be created in the restoration project are counted as new potential spotted frog habitat. In the upper preserve past beaver control and dam destruction practices would be discontinued. It is expected that this change would allow for substantial creation of spotted frog habitat which is counted in Table 3-1 above.

The expanded river bed area is not based on the full potential space provided for future river migration by dike removal. The estimate conservatively counts only the footprints of expansions where dikes and bridges currently create significant constrictions confining even high flows to a single channel. The proposed short sections of new dikes would convert some channel bottom areas to oxbow-type wetland and these have been subtracted to estimate the net change to river bed area.

Habitat Quality Under the Proposed Action, all aspects of aquatic habitat quality are predicted to improve or at least experience no adverse effects compared to baseline conditions. Proposed restoration would improve quality of the aquatic environment by providing legal protection of the environment, greater space for the river, improved hydrology, increased aquatic habitat acreage, greater continuity and increased complexity. Some of the adverse impacts of high water inputs can be mitigated primarily by removing the Weber water from approximately one mile of river, reducing severe erosion impacts and by adding the side channel in the upper river preserve to increase habitat diversity and reduce the adverse affects of high flows in the main channel.

3.3.4.4 Impact Summary

The No Action Alternative would provide no changes to aquatic conditions and processes currently being experienced.

The Proposed Action would not change the high water inputs from the Duchesne Tunnel or the Weber/Provo Canal, but the effects of these inputs would be somewhat mitigated. It would improve both the quantity and overall quality of aquatic environments.

3.4 Wetlands and Terrestrial Habitat

3.4.1 Introduction

This section addresses potential impacts on wetlands and terrestrial habitat that would result from the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action.

3.4.2 Issues

The following issues raised during the scoping process are addressed in the impact analysis:

- Impact of the Proposed Action on wetlands and terrestrial habitat.
- Impacts of the No Action Alternative on wetlands and terrestrial habitat.

3.4.3 Affected Environment

The impact area of influence for wetlands and terrestrial habitat covers the Proposed Action area. Baseline conditions for the affected area include habitat quantity and quality data for jurisdictional wetlands, riparian forest and wet meadow complexes as well as uplands in the Project area. These conditions are documented in the reports listed above in Section 3.1.

3.4.4 Impact Analysis

3.4.4.1 Introduction

Potential impacts to wetlands and terrestrial habitat caused by the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action were compared. Measures that would mitigate for Proposed Action impacts are taken into account.

The following impacts on wetlands and terrestrial habitat would be considered significant:

- A net loss of wetland quantity and/or quality after mitigation measures are taken into account.
- A significant reduction of riparian forest quantity and/or quality after mitigation measures are taken into account (significant is considered greater than 5% of the total available habitat within the project area).
- A significant reduction of habitat designated by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources as critical range for wildlife (significant is considered greater than 5% of the total available habitat within the project area).

3.4.4.2 No Action Alternative

Current land use practices would continue to negatively impact wetlands and terrestrial habitat quality primarily due to livestock grazing. Natural habitat dynamics are also impacted by ranch management practices detrimental to beaver induced creation of wetlands.

3.4.4.3 Proposed Action

Upland Wildlife Approximately five miles of the Provo River would undergo reconstruction and restoration efforts. This effort would provide a more naturally functioning riparian system. Uplands would no longer be irrigated or grazed. The river corridor through the Victory Ranch Resort is deer and elk summer range. The Proposed Action would have no negative impacts except those of disruption during construction. In compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, construction activities would not occur in forested riparian areas during the nesting and breeding season. Removal of livestock grazing would be beneficial to upland wildlife habitat.

Riparian Habitat: A riparian bird population and habitat assessment was conducted throughout the river valley. The bird habitat assessment was used as a tool to assess the condition of riparian habitat for the following reasons. A healthy riparian corridor has a certain complement of breeding birds, which utilize a variety of microhabitats within the riparian zone for nesting or foraging (e.g., shrub understory, subcanopy, overstory, wetlands, wet meadows, river channel, etc.). When entire sets of species are missing or rare in a system (e.g., shrub understory nesters), it is generally due to a lack of available habitats. Additionally, riparian birds have been shown to act as a good “umbrella” indicator for other animals. If conditions improve for riparian songbirds, then a suite of other animals, such as butterflies, rodents, and several bats, generally benefit, too as the improvements address their habitat requirements as well.

Many breeding birds encountered at Victory Ranch are not rare or even sensitive but there are exceptions. These include nesting Great Blue Herons, nesting birds of prey and Sandhill cranes. The reason riparian songbirds are particularly useful in assessing the existing conditions is that their species composition and abundance helps elucidate the problems that restoration or habitat protection need to address. For instance, the riparian forest has been grazed for decades, which led to a large-scale loss of the riparian shrub understory. As a result, shrub nesters are underrepresented or entirely missing in some areas.

Removal of cattle from the river valley would substantially improve habitat as well as increase the acreage of riparian forest by allowing regeneration. This assertion is supported by the presence of young trees in and around mature forested areas on a portion of the historic Victory Ranch where grazing was discontinued for a time several years ago. The young trees generally extend 30 to 50 feet beyond the edge of the mature forest and are present within the forest as well. In areas that have not had a rest from grazing the difference in forest composition is dramatic, with a conspicuous lack of understory and almost no age and species diversity.

Preliminary bird survey data indicates the following bird species would benefit from riparian restoration and increase in numbers as riparian areas recover from cattle impacts.

MacGillivray’s warbler, Swainson’s thrush, fox sparrow, dusky flycatcher, ruffed grouse, wild turkey, as well as the whole suite of neotropical migratory songbirds that stop over in riparian habitats, e.g., Wilson’s warbler, orange-crowned warbler, Lincoln’s sparrow, black-throated gray warbler, American redstart.

Wetland Impacts. Wetland impacts and conversions of wetlands to ponds or other water features are associated with the Proposed Action. Features created by the restoration effort would easily mitigate for these impacts with dike removal, constructed wet meadows, ponds and channels. Most water features which are currently diverted or otherwise controlled for irrigation would be allowed to function in a more natural condition with more natural drainage patterns. Changes to water and wetland features are summarized in Table 3-2 below.

Table 3-2 Acres of Wetland Impacts, Conversions and New Water Features							
	Wetland Fill	River Fill	Wetland to Pond or Shallow	Wetland to Channel	River to Wetland	New Water Feature	Upland to wetland
Weber Channel	0.19			0.85		7.43	
Fitzgerald Footbridge							0.26
New Ponds			1.53			1.92	
New Channel				1.71		1.19	
New Short Dikes		2.34			1.93		
Dikes Removed							11.06
Total Acres Impacts	2.53						
Total Acres Conversions				6.02			
Total Acres Created						21.86	

3.4.4.4 Impact Summary

The No Action Alternative would have no direct impacts to wetlands. Degradation of wetlands and terrestrial habitats associated with livestock grazing would continue.

Under the Proposed Action, 2.53 acres of wetlands/open water would be filled and 6.02 acres would be converted to/from other types of wetland/water features. Fill impacts would be mitigated for by creating 11.32 acres of wetlands and 10.54 acres of water features including the new Weber/Provo Canal alignment. These are well over the minimum 3 to 1 ratio typically required for wetland mitigation. Additionally, most of the river valley (513 acres) would be perpetually preserved in its natural state, all livestock would be removed and extensive habitat restoration and revegetation would occur.

3.5 Threatened & Endangered Species (and State Sensitive Species)

3.5.1 Introduction

This section addresses potential impacts on Federally listed Threatened and Endangered (T&E) species and Utah listed Sensitive Species that would result from the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action. T&E species potentially in the project area include bald eagles (winter only), yellow-billed cuckoo, and Ute ladies'-tresses. Columbia spotted frog, a candidate species and a Utah Sensitive Species are known to be present in the project area. The Bonneville cutthroat trout, also a species of concern, has a low potential for occurrence in the project area.

3.5.2 Issues

The following issues raised during the scoping process are addressed in the impact analysis:

- Impacts of the Proposed Action on T&E and sensitive species.
- Impacts of livestock grazing and land management practices on T&E and sensitive species under the No Action Alternative.

3.5.3 Affected Environment

The impact area of influence includes rare and endangered species potentially present within the VR River Restoration area as follows:

Spotted frogs and Ute ladies'-tresses - wetlands in the Provo River Valley.

Bald eagles - the Provo River Valley is potential habitat for winter range only.

Yellow-billed cuckoo – riparian areas are potential habitat.

The affected environment baseline conditions are summarized below and documented in the referenced reports:

Spotted frogs - Spotted frogs are present within the project area (*Status of Columbia Spotted Frog and Boreal Toad on Victory Ranch, Utah, January, 14, 2002*)

Ute ladies'-tresses - No Ute ladies'-tresses were found within the project area. Approximately 118 acres of wetlands are considered potential habitat ranging from moderate to high potential or high potential if irrigated (*Ute ladies'-tresses Surveys of Proposed Victory Ranch Project, Wasatch County, Utah, October 2001*)

Bald eagles - No evidence of bald eagle nests were found in the project area (*Breeding Bird Populations of the Provo River Corridor on Victory Ranch, Utah, February, 28, 2002*) The riparian forest along the river is assumed to be viable winter habitat.

Yellow-billed cuckoo - No yellow-billed cuckoo were found in the project area (*Breeding Bird Populations of the Provo River Corridor on Victory Ranch, Utah, February, 28, 2002*)

3.5.4 Impact Analysis

3.5.4.1 Introduction

Potential impacts on T&E species caused by the No Action Alternative or the Proposed Action were compared and measures that would mitigate for those impacts are taken into account.

Specifically, when baseline conditions were documented in the various studies noted above, site specific recommendations were made concerning minimizing impacts and improving baseline habitat conditions.

The following impacts on T&E and sensitive species would be considered significant:

- A significant reduction of habitat quantity and/or quality specific to these species after mitigation measures are taken into account (significant is considered greater than 5% of the total available habitat within the project area).

3.5.4.2 No Action Alternative

The entire project area is subjected to livestock grazing which would continue under the No Action Alternative. Ranching practices have included summer-long unrestricted grazing of riparian areas along with destruction of beaver dams which has been noted as a primary cause for loss of spotted frog habitat in the area.

3.5.4.3 Proposed Action

T&E Species: The project site includes potential habitat for two federally listed threatened, species, Ute ladies'-tresses (*Spiranthes diluvialis*) and bald eagles (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*). Additionally, Columbia spotted frogs (*Rana luteiventris*) are present, which are a candidate for Federal T&E listing and are also a Utah Sensitive Species.

Detailed surveys have been completed to locate populations of Columbia spotted frogs, evidence of bald eagle nesting sites and Ute ladies'-tresses and to map potential habitat areas. Impacts to bald eagle winter range are predicted to be negligible because restoration construction work would generally not take place in winter months.

Columbia spotted frogs - These amphibians have been studied by assessing populations and habitat availability. Spotted frog populations are assessed through identifying egg masses and assuming one male and one female for each egg mass. Surveys for spotted frog activity were conducted during the spring breeding season (April 13-May 21), in the summer (July 24-30) and in the fall (September 12-24). As a result of these studies, beavers (*Castor canadensis*) are also monitored in a sense that their actions directly affect habitat availability. The reasons for assessing populations and habitats of spotted frogs lies primarily in the fact that they are rare and sensitive, and that any impacts need to be minimized in order to avoid driving them to extinction. Spotted frogs occur in several locations. Some egg masses are very near proposed restoration construction areas (dike removal and the new Weber/Provo Canal alignment). These areas would be avoided and protected from sediment using erosion controls and construction site limit of disturbance fencing. Work near these areas would be restricted from March through June to avoid the breeding season and potential disturbance of egg masses.

The purpose of assessing the frogs' current distribution and habitat use in three seasons (spring, summer, and fall) is to be able to work on solutions for avoiding negative impacts to sites used by the existing population. Finding such a solution is, based on previous experience, feasible in the context of this type of project and the current effort in determining the exact distribution and habitat use of the frogs has been a necessary prerequisite for planning. The majority of spotted frogs and spotted frog habitat have been found in the upper river section.

Construction of the new Weber/Provo Canal alignment would impact 0.05 acres (2000 square feet) of potential spotted frog habitat. No spotted frogs or egg masses were found in this area during the survey period. The Proposed Action is designed to create spotted frog habitat in numerous locations (estimated to be approximately 4 acres) which would be hydrologically connected and primarily designed such that they exclude predatory fish. Most of the created frog habitat would be in the upper river section where almost no human impacts or beaver control are anticipated in conjunction with potential cumulative impacts of future land use.

Ute ladies'-tresses - A survey of Ute ladies'-tresses was conducted August-September, 2001 in the project area to record sightings of plant colonies and potential habitat. No Ute ladies'-tresses were observed during the surveys. Areas mapped as potential habitat generally lie within areas mapped as wetlands and waters of the US. Potential habitat as well as delineated wetlands are largely avoided.

3.5.4.4 Impact Summary

The No Action Alternative would continue to degrade habitat quality for T&E species and State Sensitive Species. Habitat quantity would be largely unaffected except the continued practice of beaver control would result in continuation of declining habitat quality.

The Proposed Action may affect but is not likely to adversely affect T&E or State Sensitive species or critical habitat. It would preserve 513 acres of riparian habitat in its natural condition. Restoration work would increase spotted frog habitat and improve fish habitat, including potential habitat for the Bonneville cutthroat trout. Removal of grazing would benefit bald eagle habitat and Ute ladies'-tresses.

3.6 Cultural Resources

3.6.1 Introduction

This section addresses potential impacts on cultural resources that would result from the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action. The lead Federal agency for the Victory Ranch Resort project, because of their responsibilities under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, is the Corps who is therefore responsible under 16 U.S.C. 470-1 for the protection of historic properties (36 CFR Part 800, Section 106) compliance for the entire project. Reclamation is responsible for Section 106 compliance for the Victory Ranch River Restoration portion of the project within the larger proposed development area. However, Reclamation has assumed responsibility, on behalf of the Corps, as well as for its own requirements, for the initial Section 106 work, including SHPO and Tribal consultation, and the drafting of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) among the Victory Ranch Resort, the Corps, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) if they choose to participate, and the SHPO for Section 106 compliance and mitigation procedures being completed on the entire Victory Ranch Resort prior to any ground-disturbing activity.

3.6.2 Issues

The following issues raised during the scoping process are addressed in the impact analysis:

- Impacts of the Proposed Action on cultural resources including standing structures, the Weber/Provo Canal, dikes and archeological sites.

3.6.3 Affected Environment

The impact area of influence is the Proposed Action area and the Victory Ranch Resort. A Class I cultural resources survey of selected structures in the area of potential effect (APE) that may be disturbed by the Proposed Action was conducted by P-III Associates in 2001 (*Architectural Documentation of Selected Historic Structures for the Proposed Victory Ranch Project, Wasatch and Summit Counties, Utah, February 2002*). A Class III cultural resources inventory of the Victory Ranch Resort was completed in 2003 (*Draft Cultural Resources Inventory of 3700 Acres in the Proposed Victory Ranch Development areas, Summit and Wasatch Counties, Utah, August 2003*). The 2003 Class III cultural resources inventory includes the structures inventoried in 2001. Therefore, the 2003 report defines the baseline conditions.

In the 2003 inventory of 3700 acres of the Victory Ranch, 41 archeological sites were identified and 19 of them are considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Of the 19 eligible sites, 7 are historic and 12 are prehistoric sites. The prehistoric sites (eligible and non-eligible) range all the way from the Archaic, through the Formative Period, to a Protohistoric, possibly Ute, sweat lodge (site #42WA351). The historic sites (eligible and non-eligible) are all historic structures, features and trash scatters. A list of all of the archeological sites found on the proposed Victory Ranch Resort is presented in Table 3-3. Of the 41 sites found, 8 are within the area of the Proposed Action. All are historic features and 7 of them are eligible for the NRHP. No prehistoric sites were found in the area of the Proposed Action.

Table 3-3 Archeological Sites Found on Victory Ranch			
Site No.	Site Type	Period	Eligible
42SM455	Railroad grade (Utah Central Railway)*	Historic	Yes
42SM456	Farmstead (Richardson)*	Historic	Yes
42SM457	Farmstead (Prescott)*	Historic	Yes
42SM458/42WA359	Canal (Weber-Provo Diversion Canal)*	Historic	Yes
42SM459/42WA360	Bridge (Fitzgerald Ranch)*	Historic	Yes
42SM460/42WA361	Bridge (Prescott Ranch/Victory Ranch)*	Historic	No
42WA324	Farmstead (Larson)*	Historic	Yes
42WA325	Ranch complex (Fitzgerald)*	Historic	Yes
42WA326	Lithic artifact scatter	Prehistoric	Yes
42WA327	Lithic artifact scatter with groundstone	Prehistoric	Yes
42WA328	Lithic artifact scatter with groundstone	Prehistoric	Yes
42WA329	Lithic artifact scatter	Prehistoric	No
42WA330	Lithic artifact scatter	Prehistoric	Yes
43WA331	Lithic artifact scatter	Prehistoric	No
42WA332	Lithic raw mat. procurement locus/artifact scatter	Prehistoric	Yes
42WA333	Trash scatter	Historic	No
42WA334	Trash scatter	Historic	No
42WA335	Lithic artifact scatter/trash scatter	Pre/Historic	No/No
42WA336	Lithic artifact scatter	Prehistoric	Yes
42WA337	Trash scatter	Historic	No
42WA338	Lithic raw mat. procurement locus/artifact scatter	Prehistoric	Yes
42WA339	Mine (Ring mine)	Historic	No
42WA340	Lithic raw mat. procurement locus/artifact scatter	Prehistoric	Yes
42WA341	Lithic artifact scatter	Prehistoric	Yes
42WA342	Trash scatter	Historic	No
42WA343	Lithic raw mat. procurement locus/artifact scatter	Prehistoric	Yes
42WA344	Lithic artifact scatter	Prehistoric	No
42WA345	Lithic artifact scatter	Prehistoric	No
42WA346	Lithic artifact scatter	Prehistoric	No
42WA347	Lithic artifact scatter	Prehistoric	No
42WA348	Lithic artifact scatter	Prehistoric	No
42WA349	Lithic artifact scatter	Prehistoric	No
42WA350	Lithic artifact scatter	Prehistoric	No
42WA351	Sweathut and hearth	Prehistoric	Yes
42WA352	Lithic artifact scatter	Prehistoric	No
42WA353	Trash scatter	Historic	No
42WA354	Lithic artifact scatter	Prehistoric	No
42WA355	Lithic raw mat. procurement locus/artifact scatter	Prehistoric	No
42WA356	Lithic raw mat. procurement locus/artifact scatter	Prehistoric	No
42WA357	Lithic artifact scatter	Prehistoric	Yes
42WA358	Quarry/gravel pit (High Bluff Quarry)	Historic	No

* Site is within the area of the Proposed Action

3.6.4 Impact Analysis

3.6.4.1 Introduction

The procedures identified in 36 CFR 800.5, Assessment of Adverse Effects, were used to determine the effects of the Proposed Action on eligible NRHP sites.

Impacts are considered significant if they adversely affect sites that are deemed eligible for or are already listed on the NRHP.

3.6.4.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would have no effect on cultural resources.

3.6.4.3 Proposed Action

The table below lists the 8 archeological sites within the area of the Proposed Action, which are eligible for the NRHP and the anticipated impacts of the Proposed Action and the Victory Ranch Resort. The most prominent feature, a red barn, would be preserved in place, stabilized and rehabilitated in consultation with the SHPO which is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standard Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (48 FR 44716-37).

Ref. No.	Feature	Eligible	Impact
42SM455	Railroad grade (Utah Central Railway)	Yes	Avoid
42SM456	Farmstead (Richardson)	Yes	Avoid
42SM457	Farmstead (Prescott - white house)	Yes	Remove*
42SM458	Canal (Weber-Provo Diversion Canal)	Yes	Alter
42SM459	Bridge (Fitzgerald Ranch)	Yes	Avoid
42SM460	Bridge (Prescott Ranch/Victory Ranch)	No	Remove
42WA324	Farmstead (Larson - red barn etc.)	Yes	Avoid**
42WA325	Ranch complex (Fitzgerald)	Yes	Avoid

*Victory Ranch Resort Impact

**The red barn will be avoided, other features will be removed

An MOA is being executed and treatment plans developed to address mitigation for impacts. The MOA is among the Victory Ranch Resort, the Corps, the ACHP if they choose to participate, and the SHPO. The MOA would address both present and future development plans in regard to the preservation and protection of cultural resource sites located within the proposed project area.

If it appears that construction activity would affect a known NRHP eligible property or contributing property in a previously unanticipated manner the SHPO would be contacted. Construction Standard Operating Procedures address protection of surface or subsurface inadvertent discoveries of cultural materials or human remains. If during

construction cultural materials or human remains are discovered, all construction in the area would cease immediately and the SHPO would be contacted.

3.6.4.4 Impact Summary

The No Action Alternative would have no impact on cultural resources.

For the Action Alternative, the SHPO has concurred with Reclamation's finding of No Adverse Effect, contingent upon execution of the MOA described above.

3.7 Land Uses Plans and Conflicts

3.7.1 Introduction

This section identifies conflicts between the Proposed Action and No Action Alternatives and existing land use plans.

3.7.2 Issues

The following issues raised during the scoping process are addressed in the impact analysis.

- VR River Restoration compliance with county land use plans and goals.

3.7.3 Affected Environment

The impact area of influence for land use plans and conflicts is the Proposed Action area (Map 2). The following land use plans are applicable to the area of the Victory Ranch Resort, and the area of the Proposed Action.

Wasatch County Jordanelle Basin Land Use Plan, Adopted in 1998. This plan designates the general distribution, location and extent of uses for housing, business, industry, agriculture, open space and other categories of public and private land uses.

Eastern Summit County General Plan, Adopted in 1996. This plan designates the general distribution, location and extent of uses for housing, business, industry, agriculture, open space and other categories of public and private land uses.

Victory Ranch Master Plan, Approved by the Wasatch County Commission on August 27, 2001. This plan identifies and shows the location of the elements of the Proposed Action.

3.7.4 Impact Analysis

3.7.4.1 Introduction

Proposed project features were compared with existing land use plans and zoning requirements to analyze impacts.

The following impacts on existing land use plans would be considered significant:

- If the Proposed Action required amending existing master plans or causes a conflict with zoning restrictions.

3.7.4.2 No Action Alternative

Land use under the No Action Alternative would not impact the existing master plans or zoning restrictions.

3.7.4.3 Proposed Action

Construction and operation of the Proposed Action would not require any changes in the Jordanelle Basin Land Use Plan or the Eastern Summit County General Plan or zoning restrictions.

3.8 Recreation

3.8.1 Introduction

This section addresses potential impacts on recreation resources that would result from the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action.

3.8.2 Issues

The following issues raised during the scoping process are addressed in the impact analysis.

- Impact on fishing opportunities
- Impact on boating opportunities

3.8.3 Affected Environment

The impact area of influence is the Proposed Action area. This area supports recreation resources including fishing, hiking and horse riding which under existing conditions are not available for public use. The entire area of influence is private land and the land owner's permission is required to legally enter the property. The Proposed Action area is currently managed for cattle production and available recreation opportunities are incidental as afforded by the existing environment. There are no facilities present specifically to provide recreation.

3.8.4 Impact Analysis

3.8.4.1 Introduction

The Proposed Action features and construction activities were compared with the location of existing recreation opportunities in the area of influence. Potential impacts were determined by evaluating the type of construction activities, restriction in use during construction and season of the year that construction would occur.

The following impacts on recreation would be considered significant:
A permanent loss of existing recreation facilities or resource use opportunities.

3.8.4.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would have no impact on fishing opportunities in the VR River Restoration area. Current conditions affecting fish habitat would remain and the land owner's practice of restricting fishing access would continue.

3.8.4.3 Proposed Action

Restoration work in the river channel is expected to occur during the driest months over a two year period. Construction of the Proposed Action would affect the existing recreational opportunities for fishing during the construction season. Little work would be directly in the river and impacts to fish habitat are predicted to be minimal. Fish habitat is predicted to improve substantially after restoration work is complete. The most common short term impact would be restricted access in active construction zones. The land owner's current practice of restricting fishing access would continue during and after the construction phase.

3.9 Transportation

3.9.1 Introduction

This section addresses potential impacts to the transportation systems and utilities that would result from the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action.

3.9.2 Issues

The following issues raised during the scoping process are addressed in the impact analysis.

- Traffic impacts on major and minor roads accessing the project area.
- Impacts to existing utilities in the project area.

3.9.3 Affected Environment

The impact area of influence for transportation includes public access roads that would be used during and after construction of the Proposed Action. The impact area of influence for utilities includes any utilities that would be moved, replaced or experience interruptions during construction. The affected environment includes major and minor

public roads and utilities accessing the project area. Major roads included US 40 a four lane road, SR 32 and SR 248, which are two lane roads in the area of concern. Minor roads include existing dirt and gravel roads off SR 32 that provide access to the project area.

Baseline two way Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) for the latest year available was 1,455 for SR 32 at US 40, 2,277 for SR 248 at Francis and 10,550 for the four lane US 40 at the intersection with SR 32.

Utilities in the project area include Utah Power & Light electrical lines that cross the Provo River at 1000 East in Francis.

3.9.4 Impact Analysis

3.9.4.1 Introduction

The transportation analysis was performed by examining different factors that could cause traffic delays. Traffic volumes for major public roads were determined by dividing the maximum number of construction trips by the AADT to obtain the percentage increase in traffic. Potential delays caused by turning of construction vehicles or construction across roadways were also examined.

Transportation and utility impacts would be considered significant if construction activities associated with the Proposed Action or No Action Alternative would result in one or more the following:

- Vehicular travel delays on SR 32 of more than 15 minutes at any one time.
- Physical damage to roads that is not repaired to a level equal or better than pre-construction conditions
- Service interruptions to any utility line.
- Damage to a utility line that is not repaired to a level equal or better than pre-construction condition

3.9.4.2 No Action Alternative

Traffic volumes would be expected to remain at current levels for the No Action Alternative. No impacts to utilities would occur as a result of the No Action Alternative.

3.9.4.3 Proposed Action

A transportation plan was developed and it was determined that the number of one way construction trips under the Proposed Action during peak construction periods would be a maximum of 10. This is 0.68 percent of the current traffic volume on SR 32, 0.42 percent of the traffic volume on SR 248 and 0.08 percent of the traffic volume on US 40. Construction traffic turning on and off SR 32 may cause minor delays, but no more than 3 minutes. The overhead power lines along 1000 East at the crossing of the side channel would be signed and the SOPs in Section 2.3.7 would be followed. No interruption of

service is anticipated.

3.10 Health, Safety and Noise

3.10.1 Introduction

This section identifies potential impacts of noise, safety and health risks from the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action.

3.10.2 Issues

No issues concerning health, safety and noise were raised during the scoping process.

3.10.3 Affected Environment

The impact area of influence is within and adjacent to the Proposed Action area. Baseline conditions include noise, health and safety hazards of current land use in and around the project area.

Safety impacts related to wildland fires in the river valley are considered to be low because the vegetation along the Provo River Valley normally does not dry out to a hazardous degree and fire fighting access is good. The safety risk associated with traffic accidents is considered to be low because major routes have recently been improved to handle large traffic volumes at Level of Service A (the safest rating category).

The primary existing sources of noise are associated with traffic on SR 32 and Lower River Road, a small saw mill on the north side of SR 32 and operation of a gravel pit on Lower River Road. Traffic noise can be heard through the impact area of influence, but is not considered a public safety issue. Equipment operation at the saw mill and gravel pit are audible only near the plants, and public exposure to this noise is considered safe.

3.10.4 Impact Analysis

3.10.4.1 Introduction

Impacts were determined by comparing existing risks with the increase or decrease in hazards associated with the Proposed Action. Specifically, noise, health and safety hazards during construction were analyzed.

The following impacts on noise, health and safety would be considered significant:

- An increase in the risk of flooding sufficient to threaten human life or health.
- A significant increase in vehicular accidents including construction equipment and off road vehicles.
- Violation of local, state or federal noise level standards.

3.10.4.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not increase health, safety or noise hazards.

3.10.4.3 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action likely would not significantly increase the risk of traffic accidents on access roads based on traffic data presented in Section 3.9 indicating the road Level of Service would remain at Level A (the safest category).

During the construction period warning signs and fences would limit public access to construction, staging and storage areas. The SOPs and construction procedures would minimize the risk of accidental injury to non-construction personnel. The contractor would be required to submit for approval a fire prevent and control plan that meets all state and local requirements. If the approved plan is properly implemented, the risk of wildland fire to workers and the public would not be considered significant. Noise exposure during construction would be limited primarily to equipment. Noise SOPs require use of periodic checking of mufflers on all construction equipment and conformance with noise control measures in the Reclamation health and safety standards manual (USBR 1993) to protect workers from unsafe exposure. Public exposure to construction noise would not be an issue since the public would not have access to construction areas. Therefore, noise exposure would not have a significant impact on the public or worker's health and safety. No significant impacts on public health and safety are likely to occur from construction of the Proposed Action taking into account hazard mitigation methods.

3.11 Visual Resources

3.11.1 Introduction

This section identifies potential impacts to visual resources under the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action.

3.11.2 Issues

No issues concerning visual resources were raised during the scoping process.

3.11.3 Affected Environment

The impact area of influence is within the Proposed Action area as well as viewpoints from SR 32, Lower River Road and the bluffs above the river in the town of Francis. Baseline conditions include current land use and ranching operations in the river valley.

3.11.4 Impact Analysis

3.11.4.1 Introduction

Impacts were determined by comparing existing conditions with the Proposed Action during and after construction.

There are no established quality objectives for visual quality so a significant contrast to baseline conditions was used for significance criteria. The following permanent impacts would be considered significant:

- A significant change in acreage of forest cover.
- A significant change in acreage of open space.

3.11.4.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not significantly change existing visual conditions in the near future. If grazing continued for more than 20 years a gradual loss of mature cottonwood trees may occur because few tree seedlings survive the impacts of grazing.

3.11.4.3 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would require removal of less than five percent of the forest cover and more than five percent of forest would be replaced. Long-term the forest cover is expected to be maintained better than under existing conditions because grazing has essentially eliminated young trees to replace aging cottonwoods. Open meadow acreage would remain essentially the same except that some upland meadow would be wetland meadow. Changes to terrestrial habitat and aquatic habitat are summarized in Table 2-1 and Table 3-2 respectively.

Restoration construction would be split into two segments, the upper and lower areas. Most of the work would be along SR 32 where the Weber/Provo Canal would be relocated. This part of the project is expected to be completed in one summer. No permanent significant adverse visual impacts are likely to occur from the Proposed Action. Impacts during construction are predicted to be minimal and limited to a three year period. These would include temporary impacts from machinery, staging areas and the actual construction work.

3.12 Socioeconomics

3.12.1 Introduction

This section identifies potential impacts on social and economic factors under the No Action and Proposed Action Alternatives.

3.12.2 Issues

No issues concerning socioeconomics were raised during the scoping process.

3.12.3 Affected Environment

The impact area of influence is the local surrounding communities, most notably Francis, Woodland, Kamas and Heber. Baseline conditions include existing conditions in retail, construction and farm sectors of the local economy.

3.12.4 Impact Analysis

3.12.4.1 Introduction

Impacts were determined by estimating how the Proposed Action would affect population, agricultural economics and employment.

Impacts would be considered significant if gross revenue or impacts to social groups substantially disrupts livelihood or lifestyle of the local communities.

3.12.4.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not significantly affect existing socioeconomic conditions.

3.12.4.3 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would remove grazing from the project area which typically is used for up to 450 cows annually in late summer. Construction would cause a minor increase in temporary employment. No significant impacts on socioeconomic conditions are likely to occur from the Proposed Action. The socioeconomic impacts of constructing the Proposed Action are considered much smaller in scope, but similar in nature to those of the Provo River Restoration Project through the Heber Valley.

3.13 Indian Trust Assets and Environmental Justice

3.13.1 Indian Trust Assets

Indian Trust Assets are legal interests in property held in trust for the benefit of Indian tribes or individuals. Lands, minerals, hunting and fishing rights, and water rights are common examples of trust assets.

The United States has a trust responsibility to protect and maintain rights reserved by or granted to Indian tribes or Indian individuals by treaties, statutes, and executive orders. The United States, with the Secretary of the Department of the Interior as the trustee, hold many assets in trust for Indian tribes or individuals. Reclamation policy is to protect American Indian Trust Assets from adverse impacts from its programs and activities when possible. This policy was undertaken as directed in Executive Order 13175 and the Commissioner's memorandum of November 1993.

No issues concerning Indian Trust Assets were identified in the scoping process. The area to be affected by the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative is private land with a Reclamation easement for flooding, channel reconstruction or diking. Reclamation is consulting with the Uintah and Ouray Ute Tribe of Ft. Duchesne, Utah regarding Indian Trust Assets concerns for the proposed project area. This Tribe claims the proposed project area as aboriginal territory (Indian Land Areas Judicially Established 1978).

3.13.2 Environmental Justice

On February 11, 1994, the President of the United States issued Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations. The policy requires the analysis and evaluation of impacts of any proposed project, or decision on minority and low-income populations and communities as well as the equity of the distribution of the benefits and risks of those decisions.

Socioeconomic data analyzed for Wasatch and Summit Counties indicates that people of Hispanic and other minority races constitute 1% percent of Wasatch County's and 1% percent of Summit County's population (1990-2000 census data). There are no minority representatives located within the area of the proposed project area. There are no low-income or minority groups located within the proposed project area. No issues have been identified that would impact low-income or minority groups.

3.14 Mitigation and Monitoring

Mitigation efforts address impacts of the Proposed Action which is designed to have minimal adverse impacts and to improve river function and the riparian environment.

3.14.1 Provo River and Riparian Environment

Based on a restoration feasibility analysis, the river restoration designers have determined that in the reach above the Jordanelle Reservoir, any attempt to force the Provo River into a single threaded meandering channel would almost certainly fail. The physical setting of the Provo River channel precludes the single threaded meandering form, thus, any restoration activities planned for the river should accept the existing braided channel type and seek only to enhance it.

The restoration designers' assessment of the Provo River above Jordanelle Reservoir suggest that the main channel has the appropriate channel form for the geomorphic setting it occupies. Although the river has clearly been impacted by human activities, as a whole, it retains considerable ecological value. In many instances, disturbed rivers do not have the ability to return to an ecologically functional condition. But, in the case of the Provo River above Jordanelle Reservoir, the main river channel can easily recover from the disturbances that have impacted it if the major sources of that disturbance are removed (i.e. cattle grazing and excess flood water from the Weber/Provo Canal). While water from the Duchesne Tunnel would still be added to the high flows of the Provo River, these flows alone have had substantially less negative effect on the river than have the combined flows of both the Duchesne and the Weber/Provo Canal. Extremely invasive restoration techniques, such as excavation of a new main channel, are not appropriate for most of the river in the area of the Proposed Action and such techniques would probably do more harm than good. Only isolated sections of the main channel that are unlikely to recover on their own would require these extreme measures to achieve the desired restoration objectives.

Modifications to the river channel would primarily involve removing confining features such as dikes and bridge structures. Side channels and associated riparian areas would be created or restored to a more naturally functioning condition compared to current conditions subjected to grazing and alterations associated with irrigation. The Weber/Provo Canal would be re-routed down the south side of the highway from the Weber/Provo Canal bridge to a point just upstream of the highway bridge near the Rock Cliffs state park entrance road. By routing this flow in its own channel, more than a mile of the Provo River could be improved and sediment delivery to the state park could be considerably reduced.

Additional mitigation of environmental impacts include revegetation with native trees and shrubs in all areas within the project area disturbed by construction. Forage grasses would be replaced in part by native species in disturbed areas as well as selected undisturbed areas. However, replacing forage grasses in undisturbed areas requires use of herbicides and/or removal of topsoil, neither of which are appropriate for areas near wetlands or water features. Therefore, the forage grass eradication effort would not include these sensitive areas. Infestations of weeds, particularly those identified by the state and county as noxious weeds, would be aggressively managed primarily using herbicides. Mechanical removal would be necessary within 20 feet of surface water where herbicide applications are inappropriate. The herbicides of choice for upland weed control would most commonly be Roundup or Rodeo, both of which have been used on the Provo River Restoration Project in Heber Valley.

3.14.2 Wetlands and Water Features

Direct wetland impacts associated with the Proposed Action would be compensated for in the river restoration design with in kind wetland creation as well as constructed channels and ponds (see Table 3-2).

3.14.3 Threatened and Endangered Species

The Proposed Action would impact 0.05 acres (2000 square feet) of potential spotted frog habitat where no frogs were found during the surveys conducted in spring, summer and fall of 2001. However, nearly four acres of potential spotted frog habitat would be constructed. Discontinuing beaver control in the upper section is predicted to allow more spotted frog habitat to develop naturally.

3.14.4 Cultural Resources

Victory Ranch owners would refine design plans where feasible to avoid impacts to all NRHP-eligible properties identified in the project area in consultation with the Corps of Engineers and Reclamation if the site is located within the Proposed Action area. If avoidance is not possible, the Corps and/or Reclamation, in consultation with Victory Ranch owners would identify impacted properties requiring further treatment proceeding as outlined in the MOA. If the site is located within the Proposed Action area, a treatment plan would be developed in consultation with the Corps, Reclamation, the relevant Indian tribe if necessary and Utah SHPO. Upon approval of the treatment plan and prior to ground-disturbing activities in the area of the impacted sites a data recovery plan would be implemented.

3.14.5 Monitoring

A long-term management plan for the river valley would include monitoring of bird and spotted frog populations, riparian habitat, and river function. The land owner would be responsible for ensuring the monitoring is conducted each year. Monitoring of the restoration project would be conducted during the years of construction and for five years after restoration work is completed. During the construction phases the monitoring plans would show as-built maps of restoration work accomplished each year.

Monitoring would include annual vegetation and hydrology surveys as well as photo documentation in the areas altered by restoration work. A bird survey would be conducted during the last year of monitoring because bird populations are expected to take several years to change. The bird survey procedures would follow the procedures of the pre-project survey. Surveys for spotted frog egg masses would be conducted in year 3 and year 5 after restoration work is completed. A detailed monitoring plan would be designed based on the restoration plan. It would be submitted to the Corps of Engineers no later than August of the first year of construction and the first monitoring report would be submitted by December in the first construction year.

3.15 Cumulative Impacts

3.15.1 Introduction

The NEPA and CEQ Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR Part 1500-1508) require federal agencies to consider the cumulative impacts of their actions. These are defined as the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such actions.

Cumulative impacts can result from actions that are individually minor but collectively significant over a period of time (40 CFR 1508.7). Cumulative impacts are based on net impacts (i.e., impacts left after mitigation has been applied), not gross impacts. If the cumulative analysis were based on gross impacts, the actual cumulative impacts would be misrepresented.

Potential future development projects around the Jordanelle Reservoir that have been considered along with the Proposed Action in analyzing cumulative impacts include the Mayflower North Properties, Mayflower South Properties, East Park subdivision, Deer Cover Resort, Deer Crest hotel, Pioche Village, Deer Meadow, Hideaway Hollow, The Aspen, Deer Canyon Preserve, Sorenson Properties, Todd Hollow and Tuhaye. The Victory Ranch Resort is linked to the Proposed Action and is therefore discussed in detail in this section. The Proposed Action, in context with future projects does not present unacceptable cumulative impacts. The Proposed Action would preserve land in its natural state and improve riverine habitat benefiting fish and wildlife.

3.15.2 Proposed Action and Interrelated Victory Ranch Resort

The area of the Proposed Action lies within the Victory Ranch Resort. The Victory Ranch Resort development encompasses 5803 acres, including approximately 730 acres of the Provo River Valley, from the SR 32 bridge near the Rock Cliffs state park at Jordanelle Reservoir extending upstream along the south side of SR 32 and Lower River Road for approximately 5 miles. The upstream project boundary is at 1000 East in Francis, Utah (Map 1).

The primary purpose of the Victory Ranch Resort is to provide a destination resort convenient to a major airport that offers golfing, fishing and access to downhill skiing. These activities would be provided along with a variety of other recreational opportunities at the resort including horseback riding, bird watching, sport clay shooting, rock climbing, mountain biking, hiking, camping and cross-country skiing. (Note the sport clay shooting range is in upland sage nearly a mile away from the Provo River.) The purpose of the river restoration project (the proposed action analyzed in this EA) is to improve the fishery and riparian habitat in support of catch and release fishing and bird watching opportunities. However, the resort development plan does not necessarily require restoration of the river. The need for the Victory Ranch Resort project is

evidenced by favorable marketability reflecting the demand for this type of recreational resort. The project would provide about 300 jobs and a net tax contribution to Wasatch County of over 18 million at full build out with relatively few impacts on county services.

Three ranches were acquired over the past 10 years and when combined they create the resort development area composed of alpine mountains, sage covered hills and part of the Provo River Valley. Approximately 83% of the area would be open space, most of which would remain in its natural condition and be protected from future development by conservation easements. Resort housing includes 133 villas, 299 cottages, 217 lots for single-family homes, 76 employee housing units and lodging within a golf course clubhouse. The major recreational amenities include three golf courses, a fishing access trail along the Provo River, riding stables and an activities center. A mountain trail system for non-motorized use would accommodate mountain biking, horseback riding, cross country skiing, hiking and access to 6 designated camping huts within the resort. One golf course would be located in the river valley adjacent to the proposed realignment of the Weber/Provo Canal (Map 6). The fishing access trail also runs through the river valley within the area of the Propose Action (Map 7).

3.15.2.1 Water Resources

Water used for an irrigated hay field would be used to irrigate the Lady Long Hollow golf course at the hay field location above the river valley. Water for the Mountain golf course, located above the river valley, would be pumped from the Provo River which requires approval from the Utah State Engineer for a change in the area of use. An irrigation diversion would be constructed near the Fitzgerald bridge to supply irrigation water to this area. This diversion replaces a washed out irrigation diversion just upstream from the Fitzgerald bridge. The River golf course, located in the river valley adjacent to the lower section of the Proposed Action would be irrigated using river water previously applied to the same area for grazing. Culinary water would be taken from a 1000-foot deep well to be drilled in the river valley. This also represents a change of use and requires approval of the Utah State Engineer. Total water consumption would not change because the anticipated uses are calculated not to exceed uses covered by existing water rights including accounting for evaporation and loss of return irrigation flow. The State Engineer would not approve any changes which would expand Victory Ranch current water rights.

Map 6

Map 7

3.15.2.2 Aquatic Resources

The River golf course would be constructed adjacent to the lower section of the Proposed Action outside of the river valley preservation area, which also defines the area of the Proposed Action. In order for Provo River channel dynamics to occur, careful planning of the proposed golf course and its associated features has been incorporated into the proposed design. Space for overbank flooding and channel migration has been included in much of the proposed floodway corridor primarily by removal of dikes on the north side. Provo River channel function should be essentially unimpaired by the proposed golf course layout.

Nutrients and Pesticides – The following studies were prepared to ensure the River golf course is designed and managed to minimize adverse environmental impacts.

Golf Course Risk Assessment - *Water Quality Risk Assessment for the River Golf Course on Victory Ranch Recreation Resort*, February, 2002.

Golf Course Management Plan - *The Integrated Golf Course Management Plan for the River Golf Course on Victory Ranch Recreation Resort*, February, 2002.

The Integrated Golf Course Management Plan (IGCMP) specifies design requirements such as grading, buffers, irrigation and fertilization systems and long-term management practices. The IGCMP has been reviewed by the Utah Division of Water Quality and the Jordanelle Technical Advisory Committee created by the Governor to monitor the water quality of the Provo River. This committee is made up of representatives of down stream water users such as the Salt Lake County Water Conservancy District, the Salt Lake Metropolitan Water District, Central Utah Project, Wasatch County, PRWUA, etc.

The turf chemical (pesticides and fertilizers) sections of the IGCMP provides risk based analysis, modeling potential nutrient and pesticide transport utilizing site specific data on soil saturation rates, subsurface and surface hydrology and climate. Risk management measures have been developed to protect sensitive species and receptors. The IGCMP is based on the philosophy that by properly growing-in and maintaining healthy turf using a variety of techniques, one minimizes the need for pesticides. Cultural, mechanical, and chemical controls are recommended. An integrated pest management program recommends thresholds for pesticide applications based on pest infestation intensity. There is a focus on slow-release nitrogen (N) fertilizers and "spoon feeding" water soluble N (i.e., frequent applications of very low doses). The criteria for the Risk Assessment was based on protection of spotted frogs which requires threshold levels well below drinking water Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs). Upon review of the IGCMP, the Fish and Wildlife Service indicated concern for two fungicides, Trifloxystrobin and Azoxystrobin. Use of these products was therefore removed from the IGCMP. None of the ponds within the golf course are counted as aquatic habitat because they are specifically not designed as habitat. These ponds are designed without valuable habitat features because golf course runoff is directed into them for reuse via the

irrigation system back onto the course. The entire golf course is designed to drain into these ponds in storm events. Channels created within the River golf course also are not considered new additions to aquatic habitat as some replace irrigation diversions.

The Proposed Action would remove both the Victory Ranch and Fitzgerald bridges and their abutments and the area surrounding these bridges would be restored to a more natural channel form. During these activities, steel casings would be installed under the river at each of these locations to carry future sewer lines. Dwellings currently serviced by pit toilets in Lemon's Grove would be required to hook onto the sewer line to remove their potential adverse impacts to water quality.

The golf course and the riverside trail are designed to avoid areas expected to flood and to accommodate side channels and other water features as required by the restoration design. Boardwalks would be used on the fishing paths at wetlands and to cross channels to allow for unrestricted flood flows.

Increased runoff from the Victory Ranch Resort roads and structures would be mitigated by capturing storm water in detention areas to avoid adding to peak flows in natural drainages and to increase infiltration. A Water Quality Management Concept Plan has been developed for the project with specific guidelines for drainage facilities design criteria to convey and detain runoff and control erosion at the source (Sowby & Berg, 2001). To the extent possible, the detention areas would be designed to support vegetation to help trap sediment and cycle nutrients. Most of the structures and infrastructure are located outside of riparian areas and runoff would be directed through detention areas before entering riparian zones and natural channels.

3.15.2.3 Wetlands and Terrestrial Habitat

The most significant environmental impacts to wetlands and terrestrial habitat are related to development of the River golf course. The clubhouse and as much of the course as possible (23% of the turf area) have been placed on the low bench above the river valley. The remainder of the course lies within 194 acres of the river valley. Approximately 70 acres (36% of the 194-acre area) would be turf. The other 64% would be natural vegetation.

Wetland impacts related to the Victory Ranch Resort development include River golf course impacts (1.66 acres of fill and 0.15 acre of wet meadow conversion to open water). Roads would impact 0.48 acres primarily for crossings of intermittent drainages. Total impacts are 2.29 acres. A 9-acre wet meadow complex would be constructed within the upper river preservation area to mitigate for the development impacts. Installation of water and sewer lines would temporarily impact 1.4 acres of wetlands. These would be restored to their former condition and subsurface utility trenches would periodically include clay barriers so they do not act as drains or subsurface water conduits.

A fishing access trail for resort patrons is proposed through the river valley. The alignment avoids the river banks, wetlands, floodways and forested areas to minimize impacts to these features. The main trail would be constructed to accommodate travel by golf carts. It would generally be 6-feet wide, surfaced with gravel or road base and include boardwalk to allow flooding where crossing wetland or drainage features. Footpaths would run from the main trail to the river at selected locations. The number and spacing of footpaths is designed to minimize habitat impacts and to discourage foot traffic beyond designated paths (Map 7). Because pedestrians may leave the established trails, they have been located to avoid prime spotted frog habitat. If particularly sensitive areas are identified, woody and/or thorny vegetation may be added to discourage wandering.

Removal of riparian forest in the River golf course area would impact 10% of the riparian forest within the project area for the Proposed Action. By any measure, the increase in habitat value/habitat units resulting from removal of livestock in a riparian area easily exceeds the 10% loss of grazed forest. Consequently a substantial environmental gain is represented. Additionally, the river restoration plan has an extensive revegetation and reforestation component including adding species and age diversity to 63 acres of existing forest heavily impacted by grazing and by planting about 14 acres of new forest.

The removal of grazing and change in land use would produce certain tradeoffs related to wildlife populations. Forage and plant diversity would improve with the removal of approximately 2700 sheep and 350 cattle from the ranch while leaving approximately 5159 acres as open space. All livestock would be removed from the Provo River Valley and the mountainous parts of the resort except for up to 100 head of cattle confined in the 2703-acre Alpine open space area (the highest part of the resort). However, development of 644 acres and increased human activity would displace some species from localized areas. Utah Division of Wildlife Resources maps indicate most of the Victory Ranch Resort is summer range for deer, elk, moose and sage grouse. Winter range for moose is widespread and approximately 300 acres of deer winter habitat is mapped south of SR 32 of which more than half is proposed for development. However, most of the proposed development in deer winter range is low density home lots and a golf course. Overall, the net loss of range is estimated to be less than 5% of the areas mapped as critical habitat.

Upland habitat would be directly impacted and fragmented in development areas but with 83% open space, impacts to upland game are expected to be minimal. Throughout the ranch and particularly in the 2703-acre alpine open space area, wildlife habitat is expected to improve primarily because livestock grazing would be nearly eliminated, ORVs would not be allowed and hunting would not be allowed. The alpine open space area would be open to hiking, biking, camping (limited to 6 huts), cross country skiing and horseback riding. There would be confined within the alpine open space area up to 100 cattle which would have a minimal impact.

Victory Ranch would be actively operated as a resort which provides a unique opportunity for perpetual management plans and a level of control of human impacts which would not be possible if the area were subjected to residential lot development with each lot under individual ownership. For example, ORVs or snowmobiles would not be allowed within the resort except as needed by resort staff for maintenance work.

The Propose Action (river restoration) and the development of the Victory Ranch Resort are interrelated. While the resort could fulfill its projected needs without river restoration, the river restoration would not occur except in conjunction with the resort project. Some impacts are predicted to be beneficial, most notably in regards to the river restoration effort, and cumulative adverse impacts would be minimal. Only minimal impacts have been identified to wetlands, potential spotted frog habitat and cultural resources. Although these impacts are minimal, mitigation is also proposed to further reduce the impact.

3.15.2.4 Threatened and Endangered Species

Surveys have been completed to locate populations of rare or endangered species (spotted frogs, boreal toads, sage grouse and Ute ladies'-tresses) throughout the Victory Ranch Resort development. The development layout avoids identified areas of occurrence and habitat well suited to these species.

Spotted Frogs – All spotted frog populations and most spotted frog habitat lies within the VR River Restoration preservation area with the following exception. Two frog populations were identified near the River golf course and a wet meadow located between golf course features was reportedly occupied in the early 1990s but not since that time. The golf course has been designed to avoid these areas. The two known populations are approximately 600 feet from the nearest golf course features. The golf course grading and drainage plan has been designed to ensure there is no hydrologic connection to wetland complexes with spotted frogs. The area of historic use is in the center of the large wetland meadow within the golf course where no construction is proposed. Golf course fairways located on the fringes of the meadow are in seasonally saturated pasture having no standing water or vegetated shallows for frog habitat. The golf course grading and drainage plan protects this area from runoff originating on golf course features.

Boreal Toads – No evidence of boreal toads were found in the Victory Ranch Resort development area.

Ute ladies'-tresses were not found on the site, but quality natural wetland habitat was mapped and is largely avoided.

Sage Grouse - A reconnaissance of likely sage grouse winter range and strutting areas throughout the development site was conducted on May 1, 2001 by Grant Jense, Division

of Wildlife Resources (DWR) and Harriet Whitson, Wise Earth. The reconnaissance was conducted by vehicle and on foot. A potential strutting area was identified on the west side of section 6 (Map 1) but only 6 droppings were found in the area. In the southwest quarter of section 7 there were 20 droppings counted and this area is considered active winter range. Potential strutting areas were examined in upper Lady Long Hollow and the parallel drainage to the south, but no evidence of sage grouse use were found. Because they are considered potential strutting and brood habitat, these drainages were surveyed again on horseback on May 16, 2001. At that time 10 droppings were found, 2 in Lady Long Hollow near the proposed Lady Long Hollow golf course and 8 in the south drainage where no development is proposed. A few sage grouse were observed east of these drainages during a site tour in September, 2003. Other areas found to have evidence of sage grouse use, as well as most of the likely strutting and brood habitat, are outside of proposed construction areas. The high use wintering area in the southwest corner of section 7 is more than one-half mile from the nearest proposed structures. While sage grouse may also use other areas as well, habitat quality would benefit from removal of livestock and habitat quantity would be preserved because most of the Victory Ranch Resort is open space. Livestock grazing is considered a significant detriment to sage grouse habitat due to destruction of herbaceous vegetation important for forage (Beck, 1997).

3.15.2.5 Cultural Resources

A Class I and Class III cultural resources inventory and final report of Victory Ranch has been completed and sent to the SHPO for consultation and concurrence on the eligibility determinations recommended for the 41 sites recorded within Victory Ranch. An MOA is being executed and treatment plans stipulated to address mitigation procedures for present, changed, or future development designs in areas where significant cultural resource sites would be adversely impacted. Construction Standard Operating Procedures presented in Section 2.3.7 address protection of surface and subsurface inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources and human remains.

3.15.2.6 Land Use Plans and Conflicts

The Jordanelle Basin Land Use Plan requires a conditional use permit for any development with densities greater than 1 unit per 160 acres. The conditional use permit allows the county to impose conditions on development features. The Victory Ranch Resort requires a conditional use permit from both Wasatch and Summit Counties. This does not conflict with land use planning requirements.

3.15.2.7 Recreation

The Victory Ranch Resort creates recreation opportunities for resort visitors. New recreation opportunities would include increased fishing opportunities in the new side channel, golfing, horse riding, hiking, camping, cross country skiing, tennis etc. There would be no change to availability or quality of recreation opportunities for the public.

3.15.2.8 Transportation and Utilities

A transportation plan developed for the Victory Ranch Resort estimates average daily traffic would increase by 3756 vehicles per day when the resort is fully operational. This additional traffic would not change the service ratings of US 40, SR 248 and SR 32. They would remain at the current level of service (Level A) which is the safest category. Construction transportation requirements for the Victory Ranch Resort project are estimated at 100 round trips per day. The installation of a bridge on the gravel road section of 1000 East Francis to cross the proposed side channel would require a gravel road detour to be constructed around the west end of the bridge during its construction which would not delay traffic.

Utilities in the project area include Utah Power & Light electrical lines that cross the Provo River at 1000 East, Francis. SOPs defined in Section 2.3.7 include a commitment to repair all roads and utilities if they are damaged by construction activities.

3.15.2.9 Health, Safety and Noise

During the construction period warning signs and fences would limit public access to construction, staging and storage areas. The SOPs and construction procedures would minimize the risk of accidental injury to non-construction personnel. Resort construction likely would not significantly increase the risk of traffic accidents on public access roads based on traffic data indicating the added traffic would not change the road level of service which is at Level A (the safest category).

The contractor would be required to submit for approval a fire prevention and control plan. If the approved plan is properly implemented, the risk of wildland fire to workers and the public would not be considered a significant impact. Noise exposure during construction would be limited primarily to equipment. Noise SOPs require use of periodic checking of mufflers on all construction equipment and conformance with noise control measures in the Reclamation health and safety standards manual (USBR 1993) to protect workers from unsafe exposure. Public exposure to construction noise would not be an issue since the public would not have access to construction areas.

Current wildland fire risks in the upper ranch are somewhat high due to relatively dry conditions, grazing impacts selecting for woody shrubs, poor fire fighting access and poor control of ORV trespassing which introduces potential ignition sources to the area. The risk of wildland fires would decrease with restricted access by ORVs and increased accessibility to fight wildland fires. An increased human population would be in the area

and risks to human health related to wildfires is mitigated by having two routes of vehicle egress, a culinary water system that provides fire hydrants and storage for fire fighting, and by building a fire station within the Victory Ranch Resort.

3.15.2.10 Visual Resources

The Victory Ranch Resort would include one golf course in the river valley that would be partially visible from SR 32 and the bluff above the north side of SR 32. This feature would be located primarily in existing meadow changing the view from pasture to managed turf intermixed with unmanaged meadow area. Some resort lodging units would also be visible from the bluffs. The resort would not impact views of ridgelines. The impacts affect less than ten percent of the resort area acreage.

3.15.2.11 Socioeconomics

The Victory Ranch Resort would employ approximately 300 people and provide recreation and recreation lodging to 1951 guests if at full capacity. Actual occupancy is estimated at 64 percent of full capacity (1250 guests). These guests are expected to contribute revenue to the local retail economy primarily for skiing, dining and shopping.

3.15.2.12 Indian Trust Assets and Environmental Justice

The Victory Ranch Resort is private land with a Reclamation easement for flooding, channel reconstruction or diking. Reclamation is consulting with the Uintah and Ouray Ute Tribe of Ft. Duchesne, Utah regarding Indian Trust Assets concerns for the proposed project area.

There are no low income or minority representatives located within the project area. During the scoping process, no issues were identified that would impact Indian trust assets or minority groups. No unacceptable cumulative impacts have been identified.

3.15.2.13 Cumulative Impacts Summary

Table 3-5 summarizes cumulative impacts of the Proposed Action and the Victory Ranch Resort. No unacceptable cumulative impacts have been identified.

Resource	Changes from Existing Conditions	Impacts	
		PA	VR
Water Resources	Water for pasture irrigation would change to golf course irrigation and restoration water features. Irrigation water rights would be transferred to rights for wells to provide culinary water. Total consumption would not change.		
Aquatic Resources & Wetlands	Provo river modifications new side channels and ponds are expected to improve aquatic habitat. Wetland acres - PA - 2.53 fill, 6.02 conv., 21.86 new wetland/water. VR - 2.14 fill, 0.15 conv., 9 new.	M	M
Terrestrial Habitat	Preservation of 513 acres in the river valley along with removal of grazing is expected to improve riparian habitat. Grazing would be removed from the development land as well. Some habitat would be displaced by roads and structures (<20% of land area)	T	U
T&E Species	The PA includes creating nearly 4 acres of spotted frog habitat and would impact about 2000 square feet of existing habitat. Where wet meadows are filled potential Ute-ladies'-tresses habitat would be lost but more acres of potential habitat would be created.	M	M
Cultural Resources	One house, some pens, a barn and two bridges would be removed. The most prominent feature (red barn) would be preserved in place, stabilized & rehabilitated. An MOA would outline procedures for unavoidable impacts of present and future development designs.	M	M
Land Use Plans	No conflict with existing land use plans		
Recreation	No changes to public access restrictions. Increased recreation opportunities for resort guests only.		
Transportation	Highway level of service remains optimal		
Health, Safety & Noise	Minimal effect during construction only	T	T
Visual Resources	Views of about 35% the VR development area would include golf courses and structures.	T	U
Socioeconomics	About 300 jobs would be created and 1250 visitors would be present most of the year.		
Indian Trust Assets	Consultation with relevant Indian tribes is in progress.		

PA Proposed Action

VR Victory Ranch

M Mitigated adverse impact

T Temporary adverse impact

U Unavoidable adverse impact remains after mitigation

3.16 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

3.16.1 Introduction

This section describes unavoidable adverse impacts that would occur under the Proposed Action. This includes temporary impacts, mitigated impacts and impacts that remain after mitigation. It is the unavoidable adverse impacts that remain after mitigation for which a determination is made as to whether these impacts are unacceptable or if a FONSI is appropriate.

During construction of the Proposed Action there would be temporary impacts to terrestrial habitat, noise levels, and visual resources. Mitigated impacts of the Proposed Action include; 1) loss of wetlands-mitigated for by creation of new wetlands, 2) loss of spotted frog habitat-mitigated for by protecting other existing habitat and creation of new habitat, and 3) removal of structures eligible for the NRHP-mitigated for by documentation of the structures and their history. When mitigation is taken into account, no remaining unacceptable adverse impacts have been identified.

3.17 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources

This section describes the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources and the potential for conservation that would occur under the Proposed Action. Most of the materials used for the Proposed Action would be rock and recovered from demolition of dikes and channel excavations. Irretrievable resources include fuel for construction equipment and materials for new diversion structures.

Chapter 4 Consultation and Coordination

This chapter describes the consultation and coordination for the Proposed Action EA. It summarizes the consultation and coordination that was undertaken regarding the Proposed Action, alternatives to the Proposed Action and the associated Victory Ranch Resort project.

Reclamation initiated coordination for the Proposed Action with a scoping document circulated on June 26, 2003 to approximately 45 interested individuals, organizations and agencies. Eight comment letters were received and those comments have been considered in developing this EA. Reclamation also is consulting with the Uintah and Ouray Ute Tribe of Ft. Duchesne, Utah regarding Indian Trust Assets concerns for the proposed project area.

In 2001 an application was submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for a 404 Permit for the Victory Ranch Resort project including the river restoration component (the Proposed Action). The first formal scoping meeting introducing the Victory Ranch Resort project to regulatory agencies was held at the Fish and Wildlife Service office in Salt Lake City on April 5, 2001. Most of the discussion was on the river golf course impacts, river restoration options, water quality, aquatic resources and the riverine habitat in general. Comments provided at the meeting were addressed during the spring and summer months by conducting several field studies as well as researching existing data concerning habitat and wildlife. Project design modifications were also produced to further minimize impacts and address regulators concerns on a variety of issues. A Public Notice was posted on the Corps website with a comment period from December 7, 2001 through February 5, 2002. The Public Notice was also mailed to adjacent property owners, as well as selected Federal, state and local regulatory agencies. Copies of the Permit Application were sent to organizations and individuals who requested the document. Eleven comment letters were received by the Corps of Engineers from individuals, organizations and agencies and the comments were considered in developing this EA. The Corps of Engineers intends to complete their EA for wetland impacts at the same time BOR finalizes this EA.

Public Hearings were held on May 31, 2001, by the Wasatch County Planning Commission and on August 6, 2001, by the Wasatch County Board of Commissioners. At these hearings public comment was taken orally and recorded by a court recorder. A 14 day period for written comment was also provided. Forty three parties submitted comments to Wasatch County and those comments were considered in developing the EA.

The Victory Ranch Resort project was also featured in news articles in the Salt Lake Tribune and the Park Record in the summer of 2001 as well as in other publications. The developers of the project recognized the importance of interacting closely with the local community, environmental groups and local, state and federal regulators. Substantial effort has been made to ensure the concerns of these groups were addressed early in the planning and permitting process in part by inviting interested parties and regulators to tour the site and discuss project components. Specific documentation of regulatory agency and public involvement is available upon request.

References

- Ammond, Elizabeth, 2002, *Breeding Bird Populations of the Provo River Corridor on Victory Ranch, Utah, 2001 Status Report, Analysis of Habitat Associations and Restoration Recommendations, February, 2002.*
- Ammond, Elizabeth, 2002, *Status of Columbia Spotted Frog and Boreal Toad on Victory Ranch, Utah, January 14, 2002.*
- Beck, J.L., and Mitchell, D., 1997, *Brief Guidelines for Maintaining and Enhancing Sage Grouse Habitat on Private Lands in Utah*, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Guidance Document, 16 April 97, p. 2.
- Birnie, Robert, 2002, *Architectural Documentation of Selected Historic Structures for the Proposed Victory Ranch Project, Wasatch and Summit Counties, Utah, (Cultural Resources Report 5177-01-20118) February, 2002, P-III* Associates, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Borman, M., Massingill, C., and Elmore, E.W., 1999, *Riparian Community and Bank Response to Management: A comparison of Old and New Surveys in the Prineville District*, Bureau of Land Management, Graduate Research, Department of Rangeland Resources, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR.
- Cohen, Stuart, et. al., 2002, *Water Quality Risk Assessment for the River Golf Course on Victory Ranch Recreation Resort, February, 2002*, Environmental and Turf Services Inc., Wheaton, Maryland.
- Gecy, Leslie, 2001, *Ute ladies'-tresses Surveys, Proposed Victory Ranch Project, Wasatch County, Utah, October, 2001.* Western Wetland Systems, Heber, Utah.
- Gourley, Chad & Allread, Tyler, 2002 *Technical Report, Victory Ranch Feasibility Assessment and River Restoration Design Components, February 4, 2002.* Otis Bay Riverine Consultants.
- O'Connor, Michael, J., 2002, *The Integrated Golf Course Management Plan for the River Golf Course on Victory Ranch Recreation Resort, February, 2002,* Environmental and Turf Services, Inc., Williston, Vermont.
- Sowby & Berg, 2001, *Victory Ranch Water Quality Management Concept Plan, 04 May 2001,* Sowby & Berg Consultants, 45 N. 490 W., American Fork, Utah.
- URMCC, 1997, *Final Environmental Impact Statement on the Provo River Restoration Project, Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission.*
- Whitson, Harriet, 2001, *Wetland Delineation, Victory Ranch on the Provo River, Wasatch County, Utah, August 10, 2001.* Wise Earth, Park City, Utah.

Appendix A List of Preparers

<u>Team Member/Affiliate</u>	<u>Highest Degree / yrs in field</u>	<u>Role</u>
Harriet Whitson Wise Earth	MS Soil Science / 14 yrs	EA team leader, wetlands NEPA compliance, vegetation
Tyler Allred Otis Bay	MS Watershed Science / 9 yrs	aquatic habitat, surface water resources
Steve Sowby Kenneth Berg Dale Berg Sowby & Berg Consultants	MS Civil Engineering / 31 yrs MS Civil Engineering / 6 yrs MS Landscape Architecture / 31 yrs	transportation infrastructure, mapping land use plans & conflicts, visual resources, recreation
Elizabeth Ammon	Ph.D Wildlife Ecology / 12 yrs	T&E species, wildlife habitat
Leslie Gecy Western Wetland Systems	MS Plant Ecology / 17 yrs	T&E species, vegetation
Stuart Cohen LaJan Barnes Quingli Ma Environmental and Turf Services	Ph.D Organic Chemistry / 25 yrs MS Hydrology / 21 Ph.D Environmental Soil Physics / 10	water quality, public health Water quality, public health Water quality, public health
Robert Birnie P-III Associates	MS Anthropology / 25 yrs	cultural resources
Gary Colgan	MS Geoscience / 17 yrs	ground water resources