

DECISION NOTICE
And
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

2007 PLANTATION THINNING

USDA FOREST SERVICE
MT. HOOD NATIONAL FOREST
CLACKAMAS RIVER RANGER DISTRICT
CLACKAMAS COUNTY, OREGON

An Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared for the 2007 Plantation Thinning. The proposed action involves thinning plantations. This area is located in T.5S., R.5E.; T.5S., R.6E.; T.6S., R.6E.; T.7S., R.6E.; T.7S., R.5E.; Willamette Meridian. (All section number references are to sections of the EA unless specified otherwise.)

The following five purposes of this project are derived from the Mt. Hood Forest Plan as amended:

- Enhance riparian reserves on 1,225 acres in the project area; (s. 2.2.1.1)
- Enhance late-successional reserves on 1,237 acres in the project area; (s. 2.2.1.2)
- Enhance diversity on 4,374 acres in the project area; (s. 2.2.1.3)
- Increase health and growth that results in larger wind-firm trees on 2,188 acres of matrix in the project area; (s. 2.2.1.4)
- Provide forest products consistent with the Northwest Forest Plan goal of maintaining the stability of local and regional economies. (s. 2.2.1.5)

DECISION and RATIONALE

I have decided to implement portions of Alternative B and Alternative C. (s. 3.2 & 3.3). Based on comments received, I have decided to construct some, but not all of the new temporary roads listed under Alternative B. I have also decided to close and decommission some, but not all of the roads listed under Alternative C. I have also decided to implement the 50-foot wide protection buffers included with Alternative C for intermittent streams. Since both alternatives include the same acres of plantation thinning, I have decided to include them all. The elements of this modified alternative are within the range of the alternatives considered and evaluated in the EA and no further analysis is necessary. Tables are included in Appendix E of the EA to show this modified alternative.

My staff at the Clackamas River Ranger District has engaged in discussions with the public on many occasions including the Clackamas Stewardship Partners. I made a commitment early in the planning process to provide information to the public as it became available and to have a forum to listen to comments. Alternative C and the modified alternative that I am selecting are derived in part from the issues that were raised at these meetings.

I have decided to thin and harvest wood fiber in plantations from approximately 4,374 acres (2,188 acres of matrix land, 1,225 acres of the dry upland portion of riparian reserves, and

1,237 acres of late-successional reserves, some acres overlap) (s. 2.2). Thinning will be designed to enhance diversity by applying variable density prescriptions.

I have decided to build new temporary roads in Units 52, 58, 126 and 130 and use the logging methods described with Alternative B, (s. 3.2.9). Approximately 0.4 mile of temporary road will be built, (compared to none with Alternative C and 2.6 miles with Alternative B).

I have decided to not build new temporary roads in Units 44, 80, 146, 160,162, 168, 178, 182, 218, 238, 256, 264, 284, 318, 322, 328, 338, 346 and 348 and use the logging methods described with Alternative C, (s. 3.3.3).

The existing temporary roads that will be reused (6.8 miles) are the same with Alternatives B and C and I have decided to reopen and use them, (s. 3.2.7.1). I have also decided to build the temporary roads that would be located on top of existing skidtrails that are already disturbed (0.5 mile) as described in s. 3.2.9 for units 44, 58, 100, 142, 224, 234, 276 and 336 and as described in s. 3.3.3 for units 130 and 178.

The temporary roads reopened and used as described above will be obliterated and revegetated after completion of the project.

Several system roads that are closed with berms or other devices will be temporarily opened to allow access and will be closed again upon completion (approximately 6 miles) (s. 3.2.7.3). I have also decided to repair and stabilize the system roads described in s. 3.2.7.3.

I have decided to decommission approximately 4.3 miles of roads; the same roads listed under Alternative C. I have decided to close 40 miles of roads with berms which is less than the 45 miles listed under Alternative C. I have decided to close 10.1 miles of roads year-round with new gates which is less than the 11.3 miles listed under Alternative C. I have decided to change the current seasonal closure of one existing gate to a year-round closure affecting 6.5 miles; the same listed under Alternative C. Some of the roads I have decided to decommission are currently closed with berms and some roads have ineffective closures and I have decided to make them more effective. Appendix E contains a revised table that lists the roads, their current status and the closure type I have decided to implement.

I have decided to increase the protection buffers for intermittent streams to a minimum of 50 feet.

This project has adopted the concepts for riparian reserve delineation described in the watershed analyses (s. 2.2.5). Widths will be 180 feet for non-fish-bearing streams and 360 feet for fish-bearing streams. The Active Ancient Landslides landform will also be included as riparian reserves. The Watershed Analyses were developed with the data at hand at the time with minimal field observation. While the recommendations of the Watershed Analyses have been followed, field verification of stream location, fish presence and active ancient landslides has been conducted in the vicinity of proposed actions, therefore the maps in the EA differ slightly from the Watershed Analysis maps (Maps are in Appendix F). This should not be considered a “change” but a refinement based on better site-specific information. I have decided that the refinement of riparian reserves is appropriate and meets the objectives of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy.

Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Design Criteria in section 3.5 of the EA are included with this alternative. No significant impacts were found that would require further mitigation.

The selected alternative meets the purpose and need discussed in the EA (s. 2.2):

Enhance Riparian Reserves – 1,225 acres. The thinning of plantations in riparian reserves will accelerate the development of mature and late-successional stand conditions. There will be no-harvest buffers on each side of streams (s. 3.2.2, s. 3.2.3, s. 3.2.4, s. 3.3, s. 4.2.4.2 & s. 4.2.5).

Enhance Late-Successional Reserves – 1,237 acres. The thinning of plantations in late-successional reserves will accelerate the development of mature and late-successional stand conditions (s. 3.2.5, & s. 4.5.1).

Enhance Diversity – 4,374 acres. The thinning of plantations will introduce diversity in all units through variable spaced thinning. Diversity and variability will be introduced in several ways including varying the spacing of leave trees within units and between units, and creating small skips and gaps (s. 3.2.1).

Health and Growth – 2,188 acres of matrix. The plantations are dense and experiencing a slowing of growth due to overcrowding. Thinning will increase health and vigor and enhance growth that results in larger wind firm trees (s. 4.3).

Forest Products – The thinning of plantations will provide forest products consistent with the Northwest Forest Plan goal of maintaining the stability of local and regional economies now and in the future. It will provide approximately 43.7 million board feet of timber. It will also result in vigorously growing stands that would be capable of providing future forest products (s. 3.6, 4.3 & 4.11).

It is my decision to select a modified alternative over the other alternatives considered for the following reasons:

- It fully accomplishes the purpose and need.
- This decision is responsive to issues raised by the public including the Clackamas Stewardship Partners. Even though Alternative B is a reasonable proposed action, I have decided to make changes based on what I heard. This modified project will accomplish many good and needed actions due to the collaboration with concerned citizens.
- The concern about effects to water quality and fisheries from road construction raised by Key Issue #1 has been resolved to my satisfaction (s. 2.5.1). The chance that measurable amounts of sediment would enter any stream as a direct result of road construction or logging activity is negligible. This is because the proposed roads are located on stable landforms, do not cross streams and would be obliterated. Even though Alternative B results in minimal effects to resources (s. 4.2.0.1), I have decided to reduce road

construction in response to public concerns. The modified alternative will delete 85% of the road mileage proposed for construction with Alternative B. The roads that I decided to build are ones that access a relatively large area that would otherwise have to be logged with expensive helicopter systems (s. 4.11). This decision would result in 75 fewer acres of helicopter logging compared to Alternative C (s. 3.3.3).

- The concern about road decommissioning raised by Key Issue #2 has been resolved to my satisfaction (s. 2.5.2). The roads that I have decided to decommission are the same as listed under Alternative C. There are many more roads in these watersheds that may eventually be decommissioned, but I feel that the current proposal is appropriate at this time. The roads that I considered for decommissioning at this time were roads that do not access other plantations that would need to be thinned in the near future. I also chose to limit road decommissioning at this time to roads that have no stream crossing culverts. To have included those would have increased the effect to anadromous fish to “likely to adversely affect” which would have required very lengthy consultation with NOAA Fisheries. It would be more efficient to package those types of decommissioning projects in a restoration EA.
- The concern about road closures raised by Key Issue #2 has been resolved to my satisfaction (s. 2.5.2). The roads that I have decided to close with berms and gates are less than the list for Alternative C. There are 12 open-road density analysis areas only 4 of which are over the Forest Plan goals. Approximately 16 miles of road closures would bring these areas to the Forest Plan goal levels (s. 4.5.5.17). Alternative C would have closures that bring open road density to below the level of 2.0 miles per square mile in winter range and below the level of 2.5 miles per square mile in summer range (s. 4.5.5.17). Based on public concerns about access to the Forest for recreation, I have decided to close fewer roads. The following is a road specific rationale for the changes from what was listed for Alternative C:
 - Road 4620-260 and tributary roads – With Alternative C, one closure on road 4620-260 would have closed 5.46 miles of roads blocking access to 770 acres of forest. I have decided to keep open a portion of 4620-260 and all of 4620-280 and 310. This would close 2.91 miles and keep open 2.55 miles. This area is used for hunting, dispersed camping and the gathering of special forest products (s. 4.15.3). The summer range areas affected (SR 38 and SR 39) would still be within Forest Plan open-road density objectives. Compared to Alternative C, costs would be greater because four berms would be needed to close the side roads instead of one berm and there would be greater disturbance of wildlife, greater access for recreation and greater road maintenance cost. Compared to Alternative B, there would be reduced disturbance to wildlife, less access for recreation and reduced road maintenance cost.
 - Road 6320-170 and tributary roads – With Alternative C, one gate and two berms would have closed 9.2 miles of roads blocking access to 1,500 acres of forest (the gate allows access for power line maintenance). I have decided to move the gate and one of the berms. This would close 7.27 miles and keep open 1.93 miles. This area is used for hunting, dispersed camping and the gathering of special forest products (s. 4.15.3). The summer range area affected (SR 39) would still be within Forest Plan open-road density objectives and the winter range area affected (WR 26) would not.

Compared to Alternative C, costs would be greater because three berms would be needed to close the side roads instead of two berms and there would be greater disturbance of wildlife, greater access for recreation and greater road maintenance cost. Compared to Alternative B, there would be reduced disturbance to wildlife, less access for recreation and reduced road maintenance cost. In the winter range area affected, open-road density would be 3.3 miles per square mile with Alternatives A and B, 2.0 miles per square mile with Alternative C, and 2.3 miles per square mile with these changes I have decided to make.

- Road 5411-180 – With Alternative C, four closures on roads 5411-180, 162, 170 and 190 would have closed 4.2 miles of roads blocking access to 800 acres of forest. I have decided to keep open road 5411-180 and close the others. This would close 2.52 miles and keep open 1.68 miles. This area is used for hunting, dispersed camping and the gathering of special forest products (s. 4.15.3). The summer range area affected (SR 36) would still be within Forest Plan open-road density objectives. Compared to Alternative C, costs would be less because three berms would be needed instead of four, there would be greater disturbance of wildlife, greater access for recreation and greater road maintenance cost. Compared to Alternative B, there would be reduced disturbance to wildlife, less access for recreation and reduced road maintenance cost.
- The concern about protection buffer widths has been resolved to my satisfaction. Even though a 30-foot wide buffer on intermittent streams is sufficient to protect riparian resources, water quality and fish, I have decided to increase the protection buffers to 50 feet in response to public concerns (s. 3.2.3, s. 3.3, s. 4.2.4.2).

Description of Other Alternatives and Reasons for Non Selection:

- **Alternative A** is the no-action alternative (s. 3.1). It was not selected because it would not provide any of the benefits described in the purpose and need. If no action is taken in riparian reserves, stands would have reduced capability to produce the size and quantity of coarse woody debris sufficient to sustain desired physical complexity and stability of the riparian reserves and associated streams (s. 4.2.3 & 4.3.4). If no action is taken in late-successional reserves, stands would be very slow in their acquisition of late-successional characteristics (s. 4.5.1.5). If no action is taken, stands would become overcrowded resulting in trees with reduced vigor, increased mortality and increased wind damage susceptibility. Trees would stagnate and stay relatively small resulting in a period of low structural diversity (s. 4.3.4 & s. 4.4.3). If no action is taken, we would forgo the opportunity to provide any forest products consistent with the Northwest Forest Plan goal of maintaining the stability of local and regional economies (s. 4.11).
- **Alternatives B and C** differ in terms of temporary road construction and road closures. As described above, I have chosen a mixture of the features of these two alternatives.

- **Other Alternatives Considered** (s. 3.4)

The EA discusses 13 comments that were received suggesting the consideration of other alternatives or ways to modify this project. Details of the suggestions and responses are in the EA at s. 3.4 as well as Appendix A. I will briefly respond to some of them here.

Some suggested that the project is too big to do an adequate analysis and that it should be reduced in size or split into multiple EAs. I carefully considered the size and scope of this project and feel the current project size is appropriate because it is an efficient use of agency budget and personnel. It has also allowed me to see cumulative effects at a broader landscape scale. The proposal to thin 4,374 acres of plantations may seem extensive to some but the proposal is actually very narrow in scope because the plantations are homogeneous and the time is right to thin them now.

Some suggested that the roads listed in the Roads Analysis as high risk with low access needs be decommissioned or that the project be reconfigured into a restoration EA. I have carefully considered the scope of this project and how much decommissioning to include with this EA (s. 3.4.12). The Forest has used restoration EAs in the past and we have decommissioned hundreds of miles of roads. I am committed to restoration and further decommissioning but the appropriate place to make decisions about complex decommissioning issues is in a separate restoration EA. I feel that it is appropriate to use these roads now for this project even though they may eventually be decommissioned.

Some suggested that any time a resource would be affected in any way that a portion of the project should be deleted to avoid that effect. For example when it comes to the consideration of effects to earthflow stability, fish, spotted owl dispersal habitat, deer and elk thermal cover or snags, some feel that the effects are inappropriate. I feel that the effects to these resources have been disclosed and I have found them to be not significant. I also feel that the long-term benefits of thinning these plantations will far outweigh the short-term impacts.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (40 CFR 1508.27)

Based on the site-specific environmental analysis documented in the EA and the comments received from the public, I have determined that this is not a major Federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment; therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is not needed. This determination is based on the design of the selected alternative and the following factors:

- **THREATENED, ENDANGERED, AND SENSITIVE SPECIES** - Formal consultation with U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service concerning the **northern spotted owl** has been completed for this project. The Biological Opinion written by U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and dated October 31, 2006 concluded that this project is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the northern spotted owl and is not likely to adversely modify spotted owl critical habitat.

While there would be a short-term removal and degradation of dispersal habitat, in the long term, stands would develop mature forest characteristics sooner.

Consultation with NOAA Fisheries has been completed for this project. The letter of concurrence indicates that threatened **fish** and listed critical habitat would have an effects determination of “May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect.” It also indicates that Essential Fish Habitat established under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Recently would have an effects determination of “Not Adversely Affect.” (s. 4.2.8).

There will be no significant adverse effects to sensitive species (s. 4.2.7.10, 4.5.3 & 4.8). The project will not jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species nor will it cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability for any proposed or sensitive species.

- **CONSISTENCY WITH MT. HOOD FOREST PLAN** – The selected alternative is consistent with direction found in the Mt. Hood National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan as amended (Forest Plan).
 - It is consistent with standards and guidelines specific to the relevant land allocation and it is consistent with the applicable Forest-wide standards and guidelines. **Exceptions are noted below.** (s. 2.2.4 & 4.0).
 - **Aquatic Conservation Strategy** - I have considered the relevant information from the watershed analysis. I have also considered the existing condition of riparian reserves, including the important physical and biological components of the fifth-field watersheds and the effects to riparian resources. I find that the selected alternate is consistent with the recommendations of the watershed analysis, is consistent with riparian reserve standards and guidelines, and will contribute to maintaining or restoring the fifth-field watershed over the long term (s. 4.2.7.5 & Biological Assessment).
 - It is consistent with **late-successional reserve (LSR)** objectives. The Regional Ecosystem Office (REO) reviewed this project and found it to be consistent with LSR standards and guidelines (s. 2.2.6, s. 3.2.5 & s. 4.5.1.15).
 - The proposed plantation thinning units are less than 80 years of age and therefore surveys for **survey and manage** species are not required (s. 2.2.2).
 - I have considered the impacts to Forest Management Indicator Species s. 4.5.0.2. Management Indicator Species for this portion of the Mt. Hood National Forest include northern spotted owl, pileated woodpecker, pine marten, deer, elk, salmonid smolts and legal trout. The 2007 Plantation Thinning would not affect any Pileated Woodpecker/Pine Marten (B5) habitat management areas or any Designated Habitat for Deer and Elk Winter Range (B10) or Summer Range (B11). This project has been designed to be consistent with the standards and guidelines pertaining to Management Indicator Species. The direction that relates to site-specific project level planning found in the 2005 planning rule for National Forest System Land and Resource

Management Planning for management indicator species has been followed (36 CFR 219.14f).

- It is consistent with the National Forest Management Act regulations for **vegetative management**. There will be no regulated timber harvest on lands classified as unsuitable for timber production (36 CFR 219.14) and vegetation manipulation is in compliance with 36 CFR 219.27(b).

Exceptions - The Forest Plan describes the process for documenting an exception to “Should” standards and guidelines (p. Four-45). “Action is required; however, case by case exceptions are acceptable if identified during interdisciplinary project planning environmental analyses.”

I approve the following exceptions:

- The project is consistent with Forest Plan objectives for long-term **soil productivity**. However, additional soil impact will occur on areas where there is existing soil disturbance. Most units that were logged with ground-based equipment in the original clear cut harvest would remain above 15% detrimental soil condition. I am approving an exception for Forest Plan standards and guidelines FW-22, FW-28 and FW-30. I considered using helicopters to log these units but found the benefits to be insignificant and the additional cost to be unwarranted. Units that are above 15% will have obliteration of temporary roads and landings that are used by the contractor. Rehabilitation has been considered for old skid trails but the soil scientist and silviculturist do not recommend restoration of old skid trails at this time because of the risk of damaging tree roots and because productivity has not been impaired. The no-action alternative would have areas that remain above 15% with no opportunity for restoration.

The objective of maintaining long-term site productivity will still be met. Even though there was no standard for long-term soil productivity when the original clearcuts were logged, the stands continue to grow well and are projected to continue to grow well after the proposed thinning. Recent stand exams show that plantations that have detrimental soil conditions above 15% have very similar growth rates compared to nearby similar plantations that are below 15% (s. 4.6.9.6, s. 4.6.12.1).

- The project is consistent with Forest Plan objectives for **earthflow** stability. However, additional soil impact will occur on areas where there is existing soil disturbance. The analysis shows that many units on earthflows already exceed 8% detrimental soil condition and they will remain above 8% after project implementation. I am approving exceptions for Forest Plan standards and guidelines B8-36, B8-40, FW-18 and FW-20 (s. 4.6.12.1). Ground-based yarding will be used on most earthflow plantations where ground-based systems were used in the original logging. I considered using helicopters to log these units but found the benefits to be insignificant and the additional cost to be unwarranted. The no-action alternative would have areas that remain above 8% with no opportunity for restoration. The objective of earthflow stability will still be met because thinning will result in healthy and vigorous stands with strong well-developed roots (s. 4.2.7.4 & s. 4.3). Temporary roads and landings in earthflow units that are

used by the contractor will be obliterated. Rehabilitation has been considered for skid trails but the soil scientist does not recommend restoration of skid trails at this time because of the risk of damaging tree roots.

- The project will close many miles of **roads** and will reduce harassment of deer and elk. I made a decision early on in the planning process about the scope of this project: It is a plantation thinning project and not a transportation system management project. Even though I have decided to add some road closures to this project based on public comment, I have not decided to make all potential road management decisions at this time. This decision will move the landscape closer to the open-road density goals of the Forest Plan. With the selected alternative, one of the 12 deer and elk analysis areas would remain above the open-road density objectives described in FW-208 (Appendix E). With Alternative C all of the areas would be consistent with this goal and with Alternatives A and B, four areas would be above this goal. Winter range analysis area WR26 currently has an open-road density of 3.3 miles per square mile and the selected alternative would reduce it to 2.3 miles per square mile (the goal is 2.0). An exception for FW-208 is not needed however. FW-208 does not contain a requirement that all proposed actions include road closures. The project will not add to the open-road network therefore FW-208 is not applicable. The temporary roads I decided to build are not in WR26 and they would be closed upon completion of the project. Road closure is not part of the purpose and need for this project but I have decided to take action on approximately 61 miles of roads because they were requested by public input. The rationale for not closing all of the roads proposed with Alternative C is explained on page 4 of this document.
- **WATER QUALITY AND FISHERIES** - The analysis shows that the temporary roads used for this project pose minimal risk because they do not cross any streams, and are on stable, dry terrain. The location on gentle terrain, seasonal restrictions, the obliteration after logging, and erosion control efforts combine to reduce risk. Sediment, if any, would not occur in quantities great enough to result in harm to downstream fish or change water quality. The proposed action meets Riparian Reserve standards and guidelines and state water quality standards and the Clean Water Act. All of these objectives, standards and laws were established to ensure there would be no significant reduction to water quality or fish habitats. Thinning in Riparian Reserves is designed to benefit riparian resources by accelerating the development of mature and late-successional stand conditions (s. 4.2).
- **CUMULATIVE EFFECTS** - The analysis considered not only the direct and indirect effects of the projects but also their contribution to cumulative effects. Past, present and foreseeable future projects have been included in the analysis (s. 4.1). The analysis considered the proposed actions with BMPs and design criteria. The EA elaborates on cumulative impacts related to resources such as water quality, soils and wildlife. No significant cumulative or secondary effects were identified.
- **CULTURAL RESOURCES** - Field surveys have been conducted. The heritage resource report concludes that there will be no effect to any properties on or eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (2006-060605-003, 2006-060605-005, 2007-060605-002). Documentation has been forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Office (s. 4.13).

- **WILDERNESS LEGISLATION** – Currently Congress is considering a Wilderness bill. It may create a Wilderness directly adjacent to this project. The lines on draft maps indicate that the intent for this area is to exclude plantations from the Wilderness proposal. At this time there does not appear to be a conflict between Wilderness proposal and the proposed plantation thinning. The Wilderness bill language does not require a buffer between the Wilderness and management actions.
- **WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS** – There are several units (149 acres) in the Clackamas Wild and Scenic River corridor (s. 2.2.4). This corridor is also a State Scenic Waterway. The thinning of plantations is consistent with the standards and guidelines for this river and would protect the river’s outstandingly remarkable values (s. 4.15.4). Some units are in the area considered eligible for Wild and Scenic River designation under the Forest Plan (s. 4.15.5). The proposed plantation thinning would protect the outstandingly remarkable values for the eligible rivers. The Wilderness bill currently being considered would create wild and scenic rivers (the same ones considered eligible in the Forest Plan) (4.15.5). If the rivers are designated by future Wilderness legislation, plantation thinning is likely to be consistent with the goals for these wild and scenic rivers.
- **OTHER** –The effects are not likely to be highly controversial and do not involve highly uncertain, unique, or unknown risks. This action will not set a precedent because other similar actions have occurred in the past. The project was not found to threaten a violation of any Federal, State, or local law. The project complies with Executive Order 12898 regarding environmental justice (s. 4.14). No disproportionately high adverse human or environmental effects on minorities and/or low-income populations were identified during the analysis and public information process. No significant irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources were found (s. 4.16). The project will not affect public health or safety (s. 4.10). Adverse and beneficial impacts have been assessed and found to be not significant. No significant effects to consumers, civil rights, minority groups, women, prime farmland, rangeland, forestland, wetlands, or floodplains were identified.

Comments:

The legal notice for the 30-day comment period for this project was published in the Oregonian on December 18, 2006. I have considered the substantive comments that were received. The responses to the comments are contained in Appendix A of the EA.

Appeal Rights:

This decision is subject to appeal pursuant to Forest Service regulations at 36 CFR 215. Any individual or organization that submitted comments or expressed interest during the comment period may appeal. Any appeal of this decision must be in writing and fully consistent with the content requirements described in 36 CFR 215.14. The Appeal Deciding Officer is Linda Goodman, Regional Forester. An appeal should be addressed to the Regional Forester at any of the following addresses. Postal: ATTN.: 1570 APPEALS, P.O. Box 3623, Portland, OR 97208-3623; Street location for hand delivery: 333 SW 1st Ave, Portland, OR (office hours: 8-4:30 M-F); fax: 503-808-2255. Appeals can also be filed electronically at: appeals-pacificnorthwest-regional-office@fs.fed.us. Electronic appeals must be submitted as part of the actual e-mail message, or as an attachment in Microsoft Word (.doc), rich text format (.rtf), or portable document format (.pdf) only. E-mails submitted to email addresses other than the one listed above, or in formats other than those listed, or containing viruses, will be rejected. It is the responsibility of the appellant to confirm receipt of appeals submitted by electronic mail.

The Appeal, including attachments, must be postmarked or received by the Appeal Deciding Officer within 45 days of the date legal notice of this decision was published in the Oregonian. For further information regarding these appeal procedures, contact the Forest Environmental Coordinator Mike Redmond at 503-668-1776.

Project Implementation:

Implementation of this decision may occur on, but not before, 5 business days from the close of the 45-day appeal filing period described above. If an appeal is filed, implementation may not occur for 15 business days following the date of appeal disposition (36 CFR 215.10).

The EA can be downloaded from the Forest web site at <http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/mthood> in the Projects & Plans section.

For further information contact Jim Rice, Estacada Ranger Station, 595 NW Industrial Way, Estacada, OR 97023. Phone: (503) 630-6861 Email: jrrice@fs.fed.us

Recommended By:

Responsible Official:

Andrei Rykoff

March 12, 2007

Gary L. Larsen

ANDREI RYKOFF
District Ranger

Date Published

GARY L. LARSEN
Forest Supervisor