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Abstract: This document describes the decision for Small-Scale Suction Dredging in Lolo Creek and Moose Creek. The decision is based on the analysis documented in the Draft (now final) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (August 24, 2009) and the Clearwater National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan Final EIS (September 1987).
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