

## **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. The Victory Ranch Resort development plan would be modified to provide mitigation outside of the river valley to comply with CWA Section 404 requirements for mitigation of development impacts to wetland.

#### **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. Reclamation authorization is therefore required in order for the Proposed Action to be implemented. 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. About 500 acres within the project area left in its natural state (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)

#### **2.3.2.1 Preservation**

The Victory Ranch includes 732 acres of the Provo River Valley of which about 500 acres are within the VR River Restoration project area proposed to be left in its natural condition. The project areas are referred to as the upper river reach, between the upstream end of the project and Lemon's Grove at the bend in the river and the lower reach, 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 from the upper river valley section of the project is a component of the Proposed Action (Removal of grazing in the lower section is already anticipated due to the related Victory Ranch Resort project). 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.

Map 3 – This file is too large for viewing on-line. Please contact Beverley Heffernan (801) 379-1161, in Reclamation's Provo Area Office to obtain a copy on CD.

Map 4 – This file is too large for viewing on-line. Please contact Beverley Heffernan (801) 379-1161, in Reclamation's Provo Area Office to obtain a copy on CD.

Map 5 – This file is too large for viewing on-line. Please contact Beverley Heffernan (801) 379-1161, in Reclamation's Provo Area Office to obtain a copy on CD.

#### **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 Fitzgerald Bridge and Associated Constricting Dikes**

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.

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.

#### **2.3.2.7 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 existing point of diversion to allow some water

to seep through the dike to maintain irrigation flow and 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 maintain 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.

#### **2.3.2.8 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.

#### **2.3.2.9 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.

### 2.3.2.10 Reconstruct Selected Existing Diversions From the River

Selected existing irrigation diversion structures have washed out and though still in use, flow volumes are not well controlled. These diversion points would be reconstructed to provide water for new side channels and irrigation. The new structures are described in Section 2.3.2.7.

### 2.3.2.11 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.

<b>Habitat Type</b>	<b>Seedling Type/Density</b>	<b>Acres*</b>
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 Proposed Action 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.

<b>Table 2-2 General Construction Schedule for River Restoration through Victory Ranch</b>	
<b>Feature</b>	<b>Construction Schedule</b>
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 because the funding mechanism requires this section be completed first, and the upper river valley segment would follow. Each segment would be constructed from upstream to downstream. One advantage to beginning with the lower reach is that moving the Weber/Provo canal will be done in the first stage of the project. Moving the canal flow a mile downstream will reduce erosion in the Provo River channel and therefore reduce sediment deposition downstream from the Highway 32 bridge.

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 rock and soil materials would be salvaged and used on site, minimizing off-site hauling. Sand and gravel would come from Z-Rock located adjacent to the project in Francis. There also would be occasional deliveries of concrete from Binggeli in Heber or Quinns Junction (30 miles round trip) and material deliveries such as silt fencing, fuel and culverts.

### **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. To minimize effects to water quality, SOPs followed for the Provo River Restoration Project will be used when working in the river channel. Please refer to Section 3.3.4.3 for these procedures.

### 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. After construction is completed, 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 Water Use and Long-Term Operation and Maintenance Procedures**

Within the project area, water from the Provo River used for irrigation is applied to pasture land in the River Valley. Under change applications filed with the Utah State Division of Water Rights, some of Victory Ranch's water rights in the Provo River currently used for irrigation of pasture land will be used to irrigate golf courses and for municipal purposes. Most of the area proposed for the Victory Ranch River Golf Course is currently irrigated pasture land. Water diverted from the Provo River is controlled by the Provo River Commissioners who regulate the amount of water diverted based on water rights and available water in the river.

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

## 2.6 Summary of Effects of the Proposed Action

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

<b>Resource</b>	<b>Proposed Action</b>
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	About 500 acres of river valley left in its natural state, grazing removed from the upper valley and revegetation to rehabilitate riparian habitat
T&E Species	Land left in its natural state, 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.