

DECISION NOTICE
and
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

**AUTHORIZATION OF GRAZING ON THE
LONG PRAIRIE ALLOTMENT**

USDA FOREST SERVICE
MT. HOOD NATIONAL FOREST
HOOD RIVER RANGER DISTRICT
HOOD RIVER AND WASCO COUNTIES, OREGON

BACKGROUND

An Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared for authorization of grazing on the Long Prairie Allotment. The legal land description of the area is: T1N, R10E, Sections 31, 35, 36; T1S, R10E, Sections 1-3, 10-15, 22, 23; T1S, R11E, Sections 7, 8, 17, 18; Willamette Meridian. The majority of the allotment is in West Fork Neal Creek and North Fork Mill Creek watersheds.

The Long Prairie Allotment is approximately 5,700 acres and has supported livestock grazing since the inception of the Mt. Hood National Forest in 1906. Vegetation includes mixed conifer forests, meadows, and open, grassy slopes. The area supports a wide variety of human uses including recreation, wood products, and grazing.

Long Prairie is an existing allotment. The purpose of the proposed action in the EA is to continue authorization of livestock grazing in a manner that is consistent with the Mt. Hood Forest Plan, as amended. In addition, there is a need to improve areas that are receiving high use where cattle are congregating along streams and in prairies, and move the allotment toward the desired future condition based on the Mt. Hood Forest Plan.

DECISION

Based upon my review of the alternatives and analysis, I have decided to implement Alternative 3, as described in the EA. This action will authorize grazing and revise the Long Prairie Allotment Management Plan (AMP). The AMP will describe current and desired vegetative and riparian conditions, how domestic livestock grazing, at proper use, will be managed towards achieving desired conditions, and will include: structural range improvements standards and maintenance assignments; requirements for livestock distribution; and, monitoring locations and protocols.

Alternative 3

Alternative 3 proposes to continue authorization of livestock grazing on the Long Prairie Allotment, with specific range improvement projects to better distribute cattle across the allotment and meet the desired future condition for the area. This proposal includes authorizing 52 cow/calf pairs, with a normal grazing season of June 15th to September 30th. The proposed action would convert the allotment to a deferred-rotation grazing scheme, utilizing two, fenced pastures (Long Prairie and Gibson Prairie pastures). Surveyor's Ridge pasture would not be

considered part of this two-pasture scheme; however, it may be used on a limited basis, if necessary, to accommodate unforeseen changed resource conditions in the other pastures (i.e. fire damage to vegetation and/or improvements and the like).

The emphasis of the proposed action is to avoid resource impacts to riparian areas from cattle along West Fork Neal Creek and North Fork Mill Creek within the allotment. It would include the placement of salt blocks in the uplands and construction of an additional water source to improve the distribution of cattle across the allotment. Rather than turning-out cattle exclusively at Long Prairie in the spring, cattle would be turned-out in one of four locations upland from riparian areas.

As another design feature of the proposed action, a fence would be constructed to restrict cattle from the North Fork Mill Creek drainage. Where evidence of streambank trampling exists near the headwaters of West Fork Neal Creek in Long Prairie and North Fork Mill Creek in Gibson Prairie, downed logs would be placed along the streambank to discourage cattle from congregating in those areas. A second fence would be constructed along the northern boundary of the allotment to avoid cattle drift onto the private land.

Mitigation Measures

- Disturbance activities in occupied or unsurveyed, suitable spotted owl habitat between March 1st and July 16th should be scheduled as late in spotted owl nesting season as is operationally feasible.
- The permittee will be required to clean all livestock operations equipment (livestock trailers/stock trucks) prior to moving onto the Long Prairie Allotment. This cleaning shall remove all soil, plant parts, seeds, vegetative matter, or other debris that could contain or hold noxious weed seeds. Only livestock trailers and the equipment necessary to transport said livestock, will be cleaned. All subsequent move-ins of equipment to the allotment shall be treated in the same manner as the initial move-in. This requirement does not apply to service vehicles, water trucks, pickups, cars, and/or similar vehicles (R6/SPS-601.01 Work).
- Identified sensitive plant populations that are not excluded from cattle with fencing will be monitored and if necessary management actions will be taken before cattle are turned out onto the allotment (such as constructing enclosure devices) to avoid any trampling and grazing from cattle. See Botanical Biological Evaluation for details of monitoring plan.
- Monitoring plots will be established for elderberry plants in the allotment. If it is determined that cattle are causing severe damage to elderberry plants, management actions will be taken such as constructing enclosure devices, adjusting cattle distribution, etc..
- All fence work or placement of downed wood along riparian areas that are within the wetted stream channel should take place during the in-water work window which is July 1-September 30 for North Fork Mill Creek, and July 15-August 31 for Neal and West Fork Neal creeks.
- All new fence construction or reconstruction will be designed to facilitate the movement of wildlife. For barbed wire fences, the top barbed wire must be 42” high, which most deer can easily jump. The bottom wire must be smooth, rather than barbed, and is required to be 16” off the ground.

The effectiveness of mitigation measures is discussed in the EA on pages 19 and 20. In addition to mitigation measures, General Water Quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) applicable to the proposed action are detailed on pages 18-20 of the EA, and are included with this decision.

Adaptive Management Monitoring

The proposed action intends to use an adaptive management approach where resource indicators will be monitored over time to determine if management activities are reaching the desired outcome. If not, changes in grazing management practices, including timing, frequency, intensity, and duration could be adjusted to bring grazing activities into line with project objectives. Changes in grazing management will be based on resource recovery with the goal of meeting or moving toward the desired future condition. Monitoring in the Long Prairie allotment includes both implementation indicators (monitored during and at the end of each season) and long-term effectiveness indicators, monitored less frequently (every 3-5 years). A full description of the monitoring indicators can be found in the EA on pages 15 and 16.

The proposed action includes riparian fencing, the construction of an alternative water source, the placement of sand and salt blocks away from riparian areas, and downed wood placed along North Fork Mill Creek to deter cattle from the headwaters. These improvements will serve as the starting point to move the allotment toward the desired future condition. If monitoring indicates that concentration in select areas was continuing, adjustments to the amount and size of downed wood placed along the headwaters of North Fork Mill Creek could be made.

Also as a part of the proposed action, the number of cow/calf pairs on the allotment could be changed to meet management objectives. The starting point will be to authorize 52 cow/calf pairs and monitor long-term indicators to determine if the allotment is showing a resource-recovery trend and moving toward the desired future condition. If analysis and monitoring determined that an incremental increase in livestock numbers could be made while the allotment area continued to have an upward trend in resource recovery, the District Ranger could decide to authorize more cattle without additional NEPA analysis. The maximum animals authorized under this alternative would be 105 cow/calf pairs for a 3.5-month grazing season. The number of cow/calf pairs could also be incrementally decreased if monitoring determined that there was not an upward trend on the allotment based on the number of livestock.

The current permit was authorized in 2003 and expires in 2012. It is not anticipated that any adjustment to livestock numbers would occur before that time. Any increase of cattle on the allotment would only occur if the high-use areas showed a recovery trend and the decision maker was confident that an increase in cattle would not cause any negative impacts to the identified riparian areas of concern or a downward trend in resource condition.

Rescission Act

Congress included language in the Rescission Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-19, Section 504) that requires the Forest Service to identify all allotments for which NEPA analysis is needed, and to prepare and adhere to a schedule for conducting an assessment of grazing actions under NEPA. In response to the Rescission Act, the Forest Service established a fifteen-year schedule for completion of this work. In the meantime, section 504(b) and (c) of the act allows the Forest

Service to continue to issue grazing permits on existing allotments where NEPA has not yet been completed (or may be outdated) as long as the terms and conditions of the permit are not changed. The current permit on the Long Prairie Allotment was authorized in 2003 and expires in 2012.

RATIONALE

I have chosen Alternative 3 (the proposed action) over the no grazing and current management alternatives. A comparison of the alternatives can be found on pages 21-23 of the EA. Key features of these alternatives are summarized below with accompanying rationale for non-selection.

Other Alternatives Considered

Alternative 1 - No Grazing

This alternative would eliminate commercial livestock grazing from the Long Prairie Allotment. Existing improvements that do not serve other purposes would be removed. All other uses in the area such as recreation would remain the same. The complete description of the no grazing alternative is detailed on page 12 of the EA.

This alternative was not selected because it does not meet the purpose and need of providing for grazing on suitable lands. As discussed in the EA, there is Congressional intent to allow grazing on suitable lands where consistent with other multiple-use goals and objectives (Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960, Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, National Forest Management Act of 1976). The allotment contains lands identified as suitable for domestic livestock grazing in the Mt. Hood Forest Plan, and livestock grazing is consistent with the goals, objectives, standards and guidelines of the Forest Plan. It is Forest Service policy to make forage available to qualified livestock operators from lands suitable for grazing consistent with land management plans (Forest Service Manual 2203.1). Additionally, it is Forest Service policy to continue contributions to the economic and social well being of people by providing opportunities for economic diversity and by promoting stability for communities that depend on range resources for their livelihood (Forest Service Manual 2202.1). By regulation, forage-producing lands will be managed for livestock grazing where consistent with land management plans (36 CFR 222.2c).

In addition, cattle grazing on the Long Prairie Allotment is consistent with other uses including hiking, mountain biking, authorized off-road vehicle use, horseback riding, sightseeing, camping, timber production, and special forest product gathering (EA, 121-125).

Alternative 2 - Current Management with Slight Modifications

This alternative would propose no considerable changes to current management. The complete description of this Alternative is on pages 12 and 13 of the EA. Briefly, it would continue to authorize grazing of 105 cow/calf pairs. This includes one active permit for 52 cow/calf pairs and one waived permit (inactive) for 53 cow/calf pairs. The waived permit could be re-issued to a legitimate livestock operator following Forest Service Manual (FSM) procedures. A rest-rotation grazing system would continue to be followed in three separate pastures including Long Prairie pasture, Gibson Prairie pasture and Surveyor's Ridge pasture. Cattle would be turned out

in Long Prairie (in the meadow area) at the beginning of the grazing season and gathered again in the prairie before removal in the fall.

There is currently no fence along the northern boundary of the allotment and new construction is not proposed in this alternative. The permittee would be responsible for keeping cattle within the allotment boundary.

Where evidence of streambank trampling exists, large pieces of downed logs would be placed along West Fork Neal Creek in Long Prairie to deter cattle from creating numerous stream crossings and causing streambank trampling. Large pieces of downed logs would also be placed near the headwaters of North Fork Mill Creek in Gibson Prairie.

I did not select this alternative because it would not provide the same benefits as the proposed action in addressing the purpose and need for action. It would not move the allotment toward the desired future condition as quickly or as effectively as the proposed action. Cattle tend to concentrate in Gibson Prairie and in North Fork Mill Creek drainage in the southern portion of the allotment where there is desirable forage and accessibility to water. In current management the North Fork Mill Creek drainage would not be fenced and cattle would continue to congregate in the creek.

In addition, under current management there is no monitoring system set up to determine a resource recovery trend. While the inactive permit for 53 cow/calf pairs could be reauthorized, there is no formal system in place to help determine if an increase in livestock numbers is appropriate.

Other Alternatives Considered But Not Fully Developed Reduce Authorized Number of Cattle

I considered an alternative that was suggested by Bark and Oregon Natural Resources Council (ONRC) during scoping and the comment period that would permanently reduce the number of permitted cattle on the allotment to the existing permit of 52 cow/calf pairs. The complete rationale for not evaluating this alternative in detail is discussed in the EA on page 10 and is summarized below:

- A forage capacity study completed in 2005 by the Mt. Hood National Forest Range Conservationist shows that forage production is not a limiting factor given the current level of grazing. The forage production survey found that there was enough forage available to sustain 1,756 animal unit months, or approximately 380 cow/calf pairs, without considering other factors;
- The analysis shows that resource concerns raised in the purpose and need are not based on the lack of forage production but on distribution of cattle across the allotment. Permanently reducing the number of cattle alone will not move the allotment toward the desired future condition;
- The identified areas of concern would be addressed through the proposed action. Based on the preliminary analysis (detailing distribution concerns and the associated isolated resource damage), increasing carrying capacity is not ripe at this time; therefore, analyzing an alternative restricting the number of livestock to 52 cow/calf pairs would be redundant to the proposed action.

- If distribution were to improve and an upward resource trend occurred, the effects of authorizing more livestock on the allotment would still be within carrying capacity limits and the effects of the increase should be similar to the existing impacts of 52 cow/calf pairs.

Reduce Allotment Size

I gave consideration to an alternative that would permanently reduce the size of the Long Prairie Allotment. This alternative would have removed a large section on the west side of the allotment that is inside the Surveyor's Ridge Late Successional Reserve (LSR), and a large section in the southeast corner of the allotment that is designated winter range for deer and elk under the Mt. Hood Forest Plan. The complete rationale for not evaluating this alternative in detail is discussed in the EA on page 11 and is summarized below:

- The allotment boundary has been reduced over the last several decades. Since the 1950s, the allotment has been reduced from over 10,000 acres to its current size of 5,700 acres. It is currently the smallest allotment on the Mt. Hood Forest. A further reduction may cause concern with grazing interest groups, as other reductions have occurred across the region;
- The analysis determined that apart from an occasional drift, cattle are not utilizing either the far west end of the allotment (in Surveyor's Ridge LSR) or the winter range area; and analysis suggested that cattle were not causing any negative impacts to the resources located in these areas. Both areas are quite steep and wooded and not amiable to cattle. For this reason, a change in allotment size would not equate to any real changes on the ground;
- In addition, according to both the Mt. Hood Forest Plan and the Surveyor's Ridge Late Successional Reserve (LSR) Assessment, cattle grazing is consistent with winter range (designated in the Forest Plan) and LSR land allocations;
- If the allotment boundary were to be changed, new fence construction would have to occur along the new allotment boundary, adding initial expense to the project, as well as long-term project maintenance.

Current Management with No Modifications

I also considered analyzing current management with no changes. The complete rationale for not evaluating this alternative in detail is discussed in the EA on pages 11 and 12 and is summarized below:

- It was difficult to determine if current management would be consistent with all laws, policies and agency direction in the long term. Although the impacts from existing and historic grazing practices seem to be consistent with riparian and aquatic requirements, including the Clean Water Act, it was difficult to tell if continued management in this way would maintain water quality standards;
- The purpose and need is focused on correcting the lack of distribution across the allotment. The preliminary analysis showed that without any design criteria incorporated into the alternative to deter cattle from riparian areas and prairies, the alternative would not address those needs;

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:

1. Adverse and beneficial impacts have been assessed and found to be not significant. 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 actions have been included in the analysis (EA: 36-39; 42, 43, 45-47, 66-69, 87-89, 95-100, 107-111, 115-118, 124, 125, 128-130). Adverse effects are short-term in nature and will not impair land productivity. Adverse effects from the proposed action have been reduced or eliminated through project design, BMPs, and mitigation measures (EA, 18-20). No significant cumulative or secondary effects were identified.
2. The project will not have a significant effect on public health or safety. Potential conflicts between cattle and recreationists on hiking trails and at camps are expected to be minimal. The effects to recreational use in the area are disclosed in the EA on pages 116 and 117. As disclosed in the EA, there is a potential threat to vehicular traffic on roads and trails within the allotment boundary, but no accidents have ever been reported on the allotment. In addition, recreationists may encounter allotment fencing while riding a horse, traveling on foot, or on an off-road vehicle. If fencing is not maintained, it could affect the safety of recreationists or horses if they become tangled in the fence line; however, this conflict is expected to be minimal or non-existent (EA, 124; Response to Comments #14).
3. There will be no effect to Wild and Scenic Rivers and State Scenic Waterways, wetlands, wilderness areas, research natural areas or any other areas with unique geographic characteristics. The area is not affected by the recent wilderness proposal. There are no inventoried roadless areas within the project boundaries. The project is expected to benefit riparian areas, as well as other areas of concern in the allotment through range improvements (EA, 66-69 and 87-89).
4. The effects of this project are not likely to be highly controversial. The analysis completed and comments received did not identify any significant controversy or disagreement concerning effects of the decision on the quality of the human environment (EA, 6, 7; Response to Comments, Appendix A).
5. The effects of this project are not highly uncertain, and do not involve unique, or unknown risks. The Long Prairie Allotment is an existing allotment and the Mt. Hood National Forest has authorized similar range improvements on the allotment as well as other allotments on the Forest.
6. This action will not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects because other similar actions have occurred in the past. The decision implements the Mt. Hood Forest Plan, as amended (EA, 5 and 6).

7. The activities are not related to any other actions or part of a larger action that would result in any known cumulatively significant impacts on the environment (EA, 38, 39, 43, 46, 47, 66, 68, 69, 88, 96-100, 108-111, 116-118, 125 and 129).
8. A cultural resource survey was conducted on a planning-area scale and documented in Heritage Resource Report 2005-060606-0003. The heritage resource report concludes that there will be no effect to any properties on or eligible to the National Register of Historic Places, or cultural or historical resources. The State Historic Preservation Officer has been consulted as to the determination made and had no objections with this finding (EA, 129 and 131).
9. The proposed action does not adversely affect any endangered or threatened species or critical habitat as determined by the Endangered Species Act of 1973. There is no bald eagle or Canada lynx habitat in the planning area. The area is not identified as a critical habitat unit (EA, 91). Formal consultation with the 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 concluded that this project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the northern spotted owl (EA, 95, 96, 131; FWS Reference Number 1-7-04-F-0184).

I have considered the new information that has been recently published about northern spotted owls in the *Status and Trends in Demography of Northern Spotted Owls* (Foresman et.al., 2004). Disturbance associated with grazing activities was not listed as a reason for their decline; therefore, the new information would not lead to a change in the effects determination and no additional analysis is needed for this project (EA, 96).

The project may affect, but is not likely to affect Mid-Columbia River and Lower Columbia River steelhead trout (EA, 89). The proposed action will have no adverse effect on Essential Fish Habitat for any species in the project area as designated under the 1996 Amendment to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA). Consultation with National Marine Fisheries Service was completed and a letter of concurrence was received on June 7, 2005 (EA, 89, 131; NMFS No. 2005/02210).

There are no threatened or endangered plant species in the planning area (EA, 111).

10. The project does not threaten a violation of any Federal, State, or local law (EA, 5, 69). The project complies with Executive Order 12898 regarding environmental justice. No disproportionately high adverse human or environmental effects on minorities and/or low-income populations were identified during the analysis and public information process (EA, 129 and 130).

OTHER FINDINGS AND REQUIRED LAWS AND REGULATIONS

The proposed action is consistent with Management Area goals, desired future conditions, and standards and guidelines identified in the Mt. Hood National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, as amended (Forest Plan).

It is consistent with **late-successional reserve** (LSR) objectives. A portion of the allotment is located in the Surveyor's Ridge LSR. Grazing is consistent with LSR objectives (EA, 6 and 90)

There will be no significant adverse effects to Forest Service, Region 6 **sensitive species**. A determination of "may impact individuals or habitat, but will not likely contribute to a trend towards Federal listing or cause a loss of viability to the population or species" is warranted to Redband trout, and Columbia dusksnail (EA, 89).

For wildlife species, it was determined that short-term, disturbance activities related to implementing the project may impact wolverine individuals or habitat, but will not likely contribute to a trend towards Federal listing or a loss of viability of the population or species. It was also determined that there would be no impact to the following wildlife sensitive species and their habitat: Larch Mountain and Oregon slender salamander, Pacific fisher, Crater Lake tightcoil, Puget and Columbia oregonium, Dalles sideband, and evening fieldslug (EA, 95). There are 16 fungi species where surveys were not practical and therefore habitat was assumed. For these fungi species, and botanical species *Arabis sparsiflora var. atrorubens*, *Lomatium watsonii*, and *Botrychium minganense*, the botanist determined that the proposed action may impact individuals or habitat, but will not likely contribute to a trend towards Federal listing or a loss of viability of the population or species (EA, 118-121).

I have considered the effects to **management indicator species** (MIS) as disclosed in the EA (EA, 70 and 97-100). Wildlife MIS include mule/blacktailed deer, Rocky Mountain elk, pine marten, pileated woodpecker, western gray squirrel, wild turkey and snag and down log associated species. MIS aquatic species include all salmonids.

The project is consistent with the **Aquatic Conservation Strategy** objectives. 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 Alternative 3 is consistent with riparian reserve standards and guidelines, and will contribute to maintaining or restoring the fifth-field watersheds over the long term (EA, 56 and 89).

The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement to Remove or Modify the Survey and Manage Mitigation Measure Standards and Guidelines was issued in 2004. The Record of Decision moved many species from the requirements of the **Survey and Manage** Standards and Guidelines to sensitive species protocol. The effects to these species have been analyzed in the sensitive species discussions in the EA (Aquatic Species, 87-89; Wildlife Species, 95-97; Botanical Species, 115-118).

The project is consistent with Forest Plan standards for range management, noxious weed management, hydrology, and soil productivity (EA: Range Management, 25; Noxious Weed Management, 43; Hydrology, 56; and Soils, 101).

Public Involvement:

The Long Prairie Allotment proposal was listed in the Mt. Hood quarterly, planning newsletter. A scoping letter detailing the proposed action was sent to interested members of the public on August 20, 2004, and available for comment until September 18, 2004. Scoping comments were received from representatives of Bark, Oregon Natural Resources Council (ONRC), and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), Mid-Columbia Field Office. In addition, as part of the public involvement process, the agency met with the permittee on January 26, 2005 to discuss the proposal.

A preliminary analysis of the effects of the proposed action and alternatives to the proposed action was available on June 27, 2005 for a 30-day comment period. Bark and ONRC sent a combined comment letter; Steve Blackmore, a member of Portland United Mountain Peddlers, sent an email; and Kate McCarthy, a local resident, phoned the district office with comments on the proposal. Using the comments from the public and other agencies, the interdisciplinary team developed a list of issues to address. Some of the key issues included concerns over conflicts with wildlife and/or recreation, the spread of noxious weeds, and potential impacts to botanical species. A complete list and discussion of significant issues can be found on pages 6 and 7 in the EA. Additional discussion of issues can be found in Appendix A, Response to Comments. Issues that were not found to be significant to the proposed action are addressed in a separate document that includes rationale as to why these comments were not detailed in the EA. This can be found in the project file under public involvement.

Appeal Rights:

This decision is subject to appeal pursuant to Forest Service regulations at 36 CFR 215. Any individual or organization that submitted substantive comments 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 First 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 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 Erin Black, Hood River Ranger District, 6780 Highway 35; Mt. Hood/Parkdale, OR 97041; Phone: (541) 352-6002; Email: ekblack@fs.fed.us.

Responsible Official:

/s/ Daina L. Bambe
DAINA L. BAMBE
District Ranger

September 12, 2005
Date Published

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.