United States Department of Agriculture
Forest Service
Pacific Southwest Region
Regional Office, R5
1323 Club Drive
Vallejo, CA 94592
(707) 562-8737 Voice
(707) 562-9240 Text (TDD)

File Code: 1570-1
Appeal No.: 10-05-00-0055-A215
Date: June 9, 2010

Chad Hanson, Ph.D.
Director
John Muir Project
P. O. Box 697
Cedar Ridge, CA 95924

CERTIFIED - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Dear Dr. Hanson:

On April 26, 2010 you filed a Notice of Appeal (NOA) on behalf of John Muir Project of Earth Island Institute pursuant to 36 CFR 215. Sierra Forest Supervisor Edward C. Cole signed the Record of Decision (ROD) approving Alternative 3 of the Sugar Pine Adaptive Management Project Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) on March 10, 2010.

I have reviewed the entire appeal record, including your written Notice of Appeal (NOA), the ROD, FEIS, DEIS, and supporting documentation. I have weighed the recommendation from the Appeal Reviewing Officer (ARO) and incorporated it into this decision. A copy of the Appeal Reviewing Officer's recommendation is enclosed. This letter constitutes my decision on the appeal and on the specific relief requested.

FOREST ACTION BEING APPEALED

The Sierra Forest Supervisor selected Alternative 3, as analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Alternative 3 includes the following activities:

- Makes one non-significant Land and Resource Management Plan amendment.
- Commercial and biomass thin from below on an estimated 760 acres natural conifer stands.
- Commercial and biomass thin an estimated 65 acres of ponderosa pine plantations.
- Biomass thin an estimated 240 acres of conifer stands (4 to 10 inch dbh).
- Pre-commercial hand thin and remove fuel ladders, hand pile, and burn approximately 17 acres.
- Pre-commercial thin, tractor pile and burn approximately 30 acres of natural conifer stands.
- Masticate brush fields and masticate pre-commercial thin reproduction areas on approximately 245 acres.
- Masticate brush fields, fuel ladders, and pre-commercially thin reproduction areas on approximately 395 acres.
- Perform fuelbreak maintenance on approximately 40 acres.
- Pre-commercial thin/release plantations on approximately 115 acres.

- Plant and hand release of approximately 40 acres site prepared openings.
- Prescribed understory burn, as a primary fuels treatment, approximately 215 acres.
- Complete maintenance operations on approximately 28.2 miles of National Forest Transportation System (NFTS) roads.
- Complete reconstruction operations on approximately 9.8 miles of NTFS roads.
- Construct approximately 0.5 miles of temporary road.
- Construct approximately 0.2 miles of new NFTS road
- Prescribe burn and/or mechanically treat infestations of noxious weeds, where located within the project treatment areas.

APPEAL REVIEWING OFFICER'S FINDINGS and RECOMMENDATION

The ARO, John Exline, found that the project is an appropriate and reasonable response to direction in the Sierra National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan and is in compliance with the plan.

The purpose and need for the project were clear. The Forest Supervisor's decision logic and rationale were clear and well documented. The Forest Supervisor was responsive to public concerns.

ARO John Exline, recommended affirmation of the Forest Supervisor's decision on all issues and denial of all requested relief.

DECISION

I agree with the ARO's analysis as presented in the recommendation letter. The issues are similar to the comments made during the comment period. All appeal issues raised have been considered. I affirm the Forest Supervisor's decision to implement Alternative 3. I deny all requested relief.

The project may be implemented on, but not before, the 15th business day following the date of this letter (36 CFR 215.9(b)). My decision constitutes the final administrative determination of the Department of Agriculture [36 CFR 215.18(c)].

Sincerely,

/s/ Robert G. MacWhorter
Robert G. MacWhorter
Appeal Deciding Officer
Deputy Regional Forester

Enclosure

United States Department of Agriculture | **Forest Service** | **Pacific Southwest Region** | **Regional Office, R5**
1323 Club Drive
Vallejo, CA 94592
(707) 562-8737 Voice
(707) 562-9130 Text (TDD)

File Code: 1570-1 **Date:** June 3, 2010

Subject: Sugar Pine Adaptive Management Project
Appeal No. #10-05-00-0055-A215
Sierra National Forest

To: Appeal Deciding Officer

I am the designated Appeal Reviewing Officer for this appeal. This is my recommendation on disposition of the appeal filed by Chad Hanson on behalf of John Muir Project of Earth Island Institute, appealing the Sierra National Forest Supervisor, Edward C. Cole's Record of Decision (ROD) for the Sugar Pine Adaptive Managment Project Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). The decision was signed on February 22, 2010 and the legal notice of the decision was published on March 10, 2010.

DECISION BEING APPEALED

The project area is located within the Bass Lake Ranger District located in Madera and Mariposa Counties, California. The project was developed to address the need for:

- fuel reduction that protects human communities from moderate/high intensity wildfires as well as minimizing the spread of wildfires that might originate in urban areas spreading onto National Forest System lands,
- conifer stands being resilient to attack from insects, diseases, drought conditions, and wildfire.

The Sierra National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP 1992, as amended in January 2004) provides direction for projects developed and planned utilizing an ecosystem approach that compares the current condition of key ecosystem elements to the desired conditions set by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Record of Descision (2004 SNFPA ROD). Under the auspices of the Plan, a landscape analysis for the Fresno River watershed was completed in July 2005. The Sugar Pine Adaptive Management Project brings forward the opportunites provided in the Fresno River Landscape Analysis where management actions could bring key ecosystem elements closer to their desired condition by:

- strategically placing area treatments on the landscape to reduce the intensity and spread of wildfires across the landscape and near communities,
- providing a buffer between wildlands and communities at risk for safe and effective fire suppression activities to occur and,
- reducing inter-tree competition (stand density), within the lower and mid-canopy layers to improve tree vigor and growth.

The Sierra Forest Supervisor selected Alternative 3, as analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Alternative 3 includes the following activities:

- Makes one non-significant Land and Resource Management Plan amendment.
- Commercial and biomass thin from below on an estimated 760 acres natural conifer stands.
- Commercial and biomass thin an estimated 65 acres of ponderosa pine plantations.
- Biomass thin an estimated 240 acres of conifer stands (4 to 10 inch dbh).
- Pre-commercial hand thin and remove fuel ladders, hand pile, and burn approximately 17 acres.
- Pre-commercial thin, tractor pile and burn approximately 30 acres of natural conifer stands.
- Masticate brush fields and masticate pre-commercial thin reproduction areas on approximately 245 acres.
- Masticate brush fields, fuel ladders, and pre-commercially thin reproduction areas on approximately 395 acres.
- Perform fuelbreak maintenance on approximately 40 acres.
- Pre-commercial thin/release plantations on approximately 115 acres.
- Plant and hand release of approximately 40 acres site prepared openings.
- Prescribed understory burn, as a primary fuels treatment, approximately 215 acres.
- Complete maintenance operations on approximately 28.2 miles of National Forest Transportation System (NFTS) roads.
- Complete reconstruction operations on approximately 9.8 miles of NTFS roads.
- Construct approximately 0.5 miles of temporary road.
- Construct approximately 0.2 miles of new NFTS road
- Prescribe burn and/or mechanically treat infestations of noxious weeds, where located within the project treatment areas.

APPEAL SUMMARY

The Sugar Pine Adaptive Management Project was listed in the Schedule of Proposed Actions July 1, 2008 through April 1, 2010. The Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register on October 12, 2007. The scoping letter was mailed to approximately 33 local tribal organizations, other agencies, individuals, and groups potentially interested in or affected by the Proposed Action on August 29, 2007.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was published on June 26, 2009. The Notice of Availability was published in the Federal Register on July 17, 2009. Copies of the DEIS were sent to over 54 individuals, organizations, tribes, and government agencies. The DEIS was also placed on the Sierra National Forest web page. There were 13 comments received by the close of the comment period on August 31, 2009. An additional two comment letters were received after the close of the comment period. Chad Hanson on behalf of John Muir Project of Earth Island Institute submitted timely comments and is eligible to appeal this decision.

The legal notice of decision was published March 10, 2010; the deadline for filing appeals was April 26, 2010. The current appeal was filed on April 26, 2010 and is timely.

On June 1, 2010 Dr. Hanson and District Ranger Dave Martin met near the project area. No issues were resolved.

As relief the appellant requests that the FEIS and ROD be withdrawn and a Supplemental EIS be prepared.

ISSUES AND RESPONSES

<u>Issue 1:</u> The FEIS fails to divulge current basal area density of large snags in the project area and fails to divulge the impact on large snag basal area in 10, 20, and 30 years post thinning (this is important fisher habitat needs). (Appeal, pp. 1-2)

Response: The Biological Evaluation/Biological Assessment (BEBA, pp. 123-124) notes that all trees and snags greater than 30 inches dbh will be retained during mechanical treatments except where they pose a safety hazard, and that trees greater than 21 inches dbh will be retained in adequate quantity to ensure future availability for resting and denning. Snag retention is based on landscape position. There are no set limits per acre because of landscape variability. General guidelines for snag retention are four snags per acre for mixed conifer and pine types. No snags greater than 15" diameter will be felled unless presenting a safety hazard (ROD Appendix A, pp. 4 – 5; FEIS, pp. 19 - 21). Need for adequate snag retention is mentioned on page 7 of the FEIS. Hazard tree was defined on page 26 of the FEIS. Currently there are approximately 43 dead trees per acre (most not defined as "snags") within the project area. Approximately 1 hazard tree (snag) per acre would be removed, all next to roads (FEIS, pg. 66).

Table 29 of the BEBA (pp. 108-109) provides a list of dead trees per unit. Dead hardwoods have not been accounted for in Forest Inventory Analysis (FIA) data. Dead conifer and hardwood trees exist in large quantities on the landscape per the BEBA (pp. 107 - 108). Standard and guidelines state that snag retention levels are determined for the project across the landscape, and snag density will vary depending on land allocation, desired condition, landscape position, potential prescribed burning and fire suppression line location, and site condition (FEIS, pg. 19). Recommended retention levels are listed in the BEBA (pg. 17) and Appendix F (pg. 161). All standing snags not identified as hazard trees will remain for all treatment alternatives (FEIS, pg. 20).

I find the Forest Supervisor sufficiently analyzed project effects on the number of current and future snags in the project area.

<u>Issue 2:</u> The FEIS fails to adequately analyze cumulative effects to fisher. (Appeal, pg. 2)

The appellant did not bring up this issue in his comments on the DEIS, but in his appeal, Dr. Hanson had four areas of concern:

2a) Failed to analyze the cumulative effect of future projects using the same amendment.

Response: The Forest Plan amendment made for this project only applies to this project and the effects of the forest plan amendment for this project were disclosed in the FEIS (pp. 70-72 and pp. 77-79) and the Biological Evaluation/Assessment (pp. 121-124). Attempting to guess which future proposed actions (if any) might include a similar amendment is too speculative to meaningfully discuss.

2b) The Forest failed to identify the locations of the 3 new densites.

Response: The 3 new fisher densite buffer locations are displayed on Map 13 in the FEIS.

2c) The FEIS did not analyze the cumulative impacts of future thinning projects that are planned for 15-20 years from now.

Response: Thinning projects 15-20 years in the future are not reasonably foreseeable actions that need to be considered in the cumulative effects analysis.

2d) The FEIS fails to analyze the cumulative effects of the proposed stand density reduction on large snag densities in the future decades and the resulting impacts on fishers.

Response: The BEBA on pages 105 through 110 contains a detailed analysis of Resting/Denning live trees available to fisher pre-treatment and post-treatment. These are trees that will have to potential to become future snags. The analysis determined that even Alternative 2 would maintain a number of large trees that would exceed the need by 250% (BEBA, pg. 109). Implementation of Snag Retention (S&G #11) guidelines on pages 19-20 of the FEIS will help to provide a continuous supply of snags and live decadent trees suitable for cavity nesting wildlife across the landscape.

The cumulative effects analysis follows the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations as noted on pages 31 to 32 in the FEIS and pages 121 and 122 of the Biological Evaluation/Assessment.

I find the cumulative effects for fisher were adequately analyzed.

<u>Issue 3:</u> The FEIS fails to ensure scientific accuracy and integrity regarding fisher analysis. (Appeal, pp. 3-4; Supplemental Comments, pp. 1-2)

Response: The best available science is reviewed extensively on pages 64-88 of the BEBA. Suitable habitat is analyzed by treatment unit and female fisher home range (BEBA pp. 98-106). The most current and highly site-specific information derived from the SNAMP study is referenced repeatedly throughout the document.

The Biological Evaluation/Assessment provides a full analysis on all suitable fisher habitats within the project area (pp. 88-124, pp. 163-177). This includes information regarding the current condition of fisher habitat, along with scientific reports, Sierra Nevada Adaptive Management Project (SNAMP) pre-treatment data ("best science available") and new fisher den site locations. The current condition section listed the number of large snags present, as defined in the BEBA, pg. 105 as trees greater than 21" dbh (BEBA, Tables 28 and 29, pp. 105 - 108). Design Criteria Common to All Action Alternatives (FEIS, pp. 16-26) has been revised to clearly reflect their intent and desired results. Direct and indirect effects are enumerated extensively (FEIS, pg. 65). Cumulative effects are described for fisher (FEIS, pp. 70 - 72, pp. 77-79 and BEBA, pp.121-124). There are extensive descriptions of fisher ecological needs and characteristics, range, current threats, effects analysis (BEBA, pp. 64 - 88), project design features listed to minimize impact on fisher habitat and current fisher population (FEIS, pp. 64 - 65, BEBA, pp. 89 - 93), criteria listed for assessment of fisher and habitat (BEBA, pg. 94), detailed assessment for each of the criteria (FEIS, pp. 66-68, BEBA, pp. 94 - 124), unit by unit analysis for potential California Wildlife Habitat Relations (CWHR) habitat changes (BEBA, appendix G, pp. 163 - 169) and unit by unit analysis for potential changes to CWHR habitat for female fisher home range (BEBA, appendix H, pp. 170 - 177).

Based on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) entered into in February, 2005, by the Pacific Southwest Region, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), and State of California Resource Agency, regarding projects of adaptive management nature, the FWS is interested in participating in the adaptive management process at both a technical and management level. This includes the development and review of individual project implementation monitoring as exemplified by the SNAMP study. Field technical assistance discussions occurred with the FWS on September 17 and October 17, 2008. Four FWS recommendations were included as design features common to all alternatives. These recommendations were based on previous consultation with the FWS on July 27, 2006 for the proposed Kings River Project (BEBA, pg. 12). The Biological Evaluation/Assessment provides clear and logical rationale for the determination made for fisher (pg. 125).

I find the analysis for fisher is scientifically accurate for this project.

<u>Issue 4:</u> The Forest Service failed to supplement the EIS as required when 3 new fisher den sites were discovered in harvest sites (Appeal, pg. 4)

Response: According to the CEQ regulations at 40 CFR 1502.9(c), supplements to a draft environmental impact statement should be made if there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts.

The appellant correctly claims that three new fisher den sites were found after the release of the DEIS for the Sugar Pine Adaptive Management Project in the summer of 2009. The information was considered before the decision was made and the responsible official did not find the information significant in regard to bearing on the proposed action or its impacts.

The DEIS on page 2 of Chapter 1 described the Sugar Pine Project as one of two Adaptive Management Projects proposed under the SNFPA ROD (2004) that will study the effects of management on fisher. This adaptive management study is known as the Sierra Nevada Adaptive Management Project (SNAMP). Research crews have been collecting pre-treatment data, including current fisher movement patterns and 2008/2009 denning sites (both birthing and maternal) of Pacific fisher that have been radio collared and intensively monitored within and outside of the project area (FEIS, pg. 3). Previous to SNAMP no fisher den sites had been located on the Sierra National Forest. Since fisher den sites are almost never found during normal surveys, for research purposes it was important to treat the study area with the information that would be available during normal project development. Therefore, the research study plan recommended den site buffers be treated like the rest of fisher habitat within a WUI, with the only exception that new den site locations would be used "to develop a den site buffer whereby a Limited Operating Period from March 1 to June 30 will be implemented" (DEIS, pg. 2) to protect female fishers from disturbance during the denning period. Alternatives 2 and 3 were designed to meet the research requirements and Alternative 4 was designed to analyze the effects of following Standard and Guidelines (S&G 86) from the SNF LRMP/SNFPA ROD 2004 by only treating surface and ladder fuels within fisher den site buffers. In effect, alternatives 2 and 3 would proceed as if no present or future fisher den sites were found in the WUI with the exception that actual den sites would be buffered and a LOP implemented.

In his appeal, Dr. Hanson alleges that the proposal to amend the Forest Plan was not made in the DEIS and not vetted through the NEPA process. Both the DEIS and FEIS disclosed that Alternatives 2 and 3 included a Forest Plan amendment to Standard and Guideline # 86 from the Sierra Nevada Framework (DEIS pg. 2, FEIS pp. 13-14). The amendment was necessary to allow treatment for forest health in the new den site buffers. Dr. Hanson did not raise any concerns about the forest plan amendment in his comments on the DEIS.

The National Forest Management Act, Section 219.10 gives the Forest Supervisor authority to amend a Forest Plan with "appropriate public notification and satisfactory completion of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) procedures." The Forest Supervisor followed the correct NEPA procedures by giving public notice in the DEIS (pg. 2) of the intent to amend the Forest Plan, the public had the opportunity to comment on the Forest Plan amendment during the official comment period for the DEIS, and the Forest Supervisor responded to several comments received about the proposed Forest Plan amendment in his Response to Comments, pp. 259 and 262.

The analysis of the effects of the project on fisher included the new den site buffers (FEIS Map 13). The effects analysis for alternatives 2 and 3 included the treatments allowed by amending Forest Plan Standard and Guideline #86 and alternative 4 shows the effects without the amendment. It is important to note that fishers to not re-use dens from one year to another. Female fishers make use of multiple dens (natal and maternal) in any given year.

I find that the inclusion of three new fisher den site buffers is not significant new information because the new sites do not change the proposed action, alternatives to the proposed action, or the effects analysis; therefore, a supplement to the DEIS was not required. I also find that the Forest Supervisor followed the correct NEPA and NFMA procedures to amend the Forest Plan to allow mechanical forest health treatments in fisher den site buffers.

<u>Issue 5:</u> The Forest Service is failing to ensure the viability of the fisher. (Appeal, pg. 4)

Response: The Biological Evaluation/Assessment (BEBA) has been revised and updated to include the "best science available" (scientific reports and SNAMP pre-treatment data) regarding fisher movement patterns, den site locations and habitats used by fishers within the Sugar Pine Project area. Design Criteria Common to All Action Alternatives (FEIS, pp. 16 - 26) have been revised to clearly reflect intent and desired results. Based on comments, additional design criteria have been included: 1) to expand a Limited Operating Period to all suitable Pacific fisher denning habitat within the Sugar Pine Project boundary; 2) to provide adequate snag and down woody material retention; and 3) to provide shrub cover and understory diversity (ROD, pp. 4 - 5). These treatments were developed with an ecosystem restoration approach that relies primarily on creating and maintaining the desired conditions for Pacific fisher (ROD, pg. 6).

For Alternative 3, changes in weighted fisher habitat scores are predicted in seven of the project's 44 units. The changes are minor, however, with the percent of habitat suitability retained ranging from 98.57 to 99.75 percent in each of the affected seven units (BEBA, pg. 100). The project further includes fisher-specific measures to 1) limit the amount of behavioral disruption (BEBA, pp. 89-90), 2) maintain and enhance biological diversity, including retention of oak trees, large tree groups, snags and coarse woody material (BEBA, pg. 91) and 3) maintain habitat connectivity (BEBA, pp. 91-94).

The forest management proposed in this FEIS is part of the Sierra Nevada Adaptive Management Project (SNAMP) research, which assesses fisher and fisher habitat three years prior to treatment, during treatment, and two years post-treatment. Details of this adaptive management research are included in the Terrestrial Wildlife Biological Evaluation/ Assessment (FEIS, pg. 63). Direct and indirect effects are enumerated extensively (FEIS, pg. 65). Cumulative effects are described for fisher (FEIS, pp. 70 - 72, BEBA, pp. 77 - 79 and 121 - 124). There are extensive descriptions of fisher ecological needs and characteristics, range, current threats, effects analysis (BEBA, pp. 63 - 89), project design features listed to minimize impact on fisher habitat and current fisher population (FEIS, pp. 64 - 65, BEBA, pp. 89 - 93), criteria listed for assessment of fisher and habitat (BEBA, pg. 94), detailed assessment for each of the criteria (FEIS, pp. 66 - 68, BEBA, pp. 94 - 124), unit by unit analysis for potential CWHR habitat changes (BEBA, Appendix G, pp. 163 - 169) and unit by unit analysis for potential changes to CWHR habitat for female fisher home range (BEBA, Appendix H, pp. 170 - 177).

Based on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) entered into in February, 2005, by the Pacific Southwest Region, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Fish and Wildlife Service, and State of California Resource Agency, regarding projects of adaptive management nature, the FWS is interested in participating in the adaptive management process at both a technical and management level. This includes the development and review of individual project implementation monitoring. Field discussions occurred with the FWS on September 17 and October 17, 2008. Four recommendations were included as design features common to all alternatives. These recommendations were based on previous consultation with the FWS on July 27, 2006 for the proposed Kings River Project (BEBA, pg. 12). The Biological Evaluation/Assessment provides rationale for the determination made for fisher (pg. 124).

I find project level design criteria balance the need for fuels treatment to prevent large-scale catastrophic habitat loss with the need to minimize effects to existing fisher habitat, thereby effectively ensuring continued fisher viability.

<u>Issue 6:</u> The FEIS fails to adequately disclose the positive effects of mixed-intensity fire, including high-intensity patches, including benefits to spotted owls. (Appeal, pp. 4-5)

Response: The Record of Decision (ROD) and FEIS state the purpose and need for this project is fuel reduction (in the surface and ladder fuels) to protect human communities from moderate/high intensity wildfires as well as minimize the spread of wildfires that might originate in urban areas into the forested lands. The reasons for this need are to increase the efficiency of firefighting efforts and reduce risks to firefighters, the public, facilities and structures, and natural resources from moderate/high intensity wildfires. And the need for conifer stands to be resilient to attack from insects, diseases, drought conditions, and/or wildfire. Another reason for this need is that conifer stands are well above normal stocking levels (stand densities) resulting in a decline in growth, health and resiliency thus increasing a stand's potential for higher rates of mortality (ROD, pg.1, FEIS, pg. 3). The Biological Evaluation/Assessment analyzed the effects of the project as it relates to this purpose and need (BEBA, pp. 29 - 34). Due to the project objectives meeting the purpose and need, an analysis of the effects (positive or negative) of mixed-intensity fire, including high-intensity patches, is not needed in regards to spotted owls.

I find this issue outside the scope of this project.

<u>Issue 7:</u> The FEIS fails to adequately explain why trees over 10" dbh are proposed for removal-recent scientific studies have found that precommercial thinning of trees 8-10 inches in diameter effectively reduces fire intensity. (Appeal, pp. 5-6)

Response: The first chapter of the FEIS begins by laying out the objectives based on the purpose and need of the project (FEIS, pp. 3 - 4). In Chapter 2 of the FEIS, under Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study, "varying the upper diameter limit for mechanical thinning to ensure a 50-60% plus canopy cover is maintained and by which wildfire intensity and spread are reduced" explained why further study was not considered (FEIS, pg. 27). The FEIS does consider thinning and its effectiveness for all action alternatives (FEIS, pp. 153 - 155, 159 - 160, 137 - 144). The removal of trees above the 8 - 10" diameter class is necessary for the creation of an effective fuel treatment over time focusing on desired species composition and providing adequate horizontal and vertical crown separation to modify potential fire behavior which are in line with the project objectives (FEIS, pp. 145 - 160). The FEIS states that to meet the Fire and Fuels objectives, the removal of trees in the "lower and limited mid-level canopy" is needed (FEIS, pg. 12).

I find the analysis effectively analyzed the diameter of trees and the treatment intensity that is necessary to meet the project objectives and purpose and need.

FINDINGS

Clarity of the Decision and Rationale -- The Forest Supervisor's decision and supporting rationale are clearly presented in the Record of Decision. His reasons for selecting Alternative 3, are logical and responsive and consistent with direction contained in the Sierra National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan as amended by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Record of Decision (February, 2004).

The purpose of the proposal as stated above is clear and the benefits are displayed.

Effectiveness of Public Participation Activities and Use of Comments – Public participation was adequate and well documented. A Notice of Intent and Notice of Availability of the DEIS were published in the Federal Register. The project was added to the quarterly Schedule of Proposed Actions. The Forest mailed scoping letters, hosted public meetings, and distributed draft and final EISs to interested groups and individuals. The Sierra National Forest has maintained current information on planning and activities on its web page. Responses to the comments received are detailed and included as part of the EIS. The decision of the Forest Supervisor indicates he considered and responded to public input.

RECOMMENDATION

My review was conducted pursuant to and in accordance with 36 CFR 215.19 to ensure the analysis and decision is in compliance with applicable laws, regulations, policy, and orders. I reviewed the appeal record, including the comments received during the comment period and how the Forest Supervisor used this information, the appellant's objections and recommended changes.

Based on my review of the record, I recommend the Forest Supervisor's decision to implement Alternative 3 be affirmed on all issues in this appeal. I recommend that the Appellants' requested relief be denied on all issues.

.

/s/ John D. Exline

JOHN D. EXLINE
Appeal Reviewing Officer
Acting Forest Supervisor, Lassen National Forest