Buck Creek Allotment is located in the west central portion of the Silver Lake Ranger District, approximately 15 miles from the town of Silver Lake, Oregon. The legal description is:

- T28S, R11E, Sec's. 34, 36
- T29S, R11E, Sec's. 1, 2, 3, 4
- T28S, R12E, Sec's. 32, 33
- T29S, R12E, Sec's. 2-36
- T30S, R12E, Sec's. 1-6, 10-12
- T29S, R13E, Sec's. 18-33
- T30S, R13E, Sec's. 6
- T29S, R13E, Sec's. 6

The Allotment is 35,456 acres, of which 23,236 are National Forest systems lands and 12,220 acres are in private ownership. The current permit authorized 250 cow/calf pairs from June 1 to September 30. The private land within the allotment is unfenced and managed with the allotment under a Term Private Land Permit. This private land permit authorizes 220 cow/calf pairs from June 1 to September 30. Cattle are managed across the allotment using eight different pastures or units: Little Antelope, Bear Flat, Coshow, Bridge, Buck Creek, Lower Bridge, Lower Chase, and Rodman; and two small special management pastures: Coshow 1 & 2. See the table below for allotment distribution and time periods.

Area covered with the Buck Creek Allotment is discussed in the Silver Lake Watershed Assessment (2003) and the Bridge/Buck Watershed Analysis (Silver Lake RD, 2005). These documents are used as the reference for general information about the allotment (geophysical, hydrologic, vegetation). Buck Creek Allotment contains portions of the Bear Creek, Buck Creek, Lower Rock Creek, Bridge Creek, and West Fork Silver Creek hydrologic units.

The allotment includes 16 previously-constructed water sources (ponds) and 3 spring developments. The current management of the allotment also includes design features, such as Best Management Practices, which have been successful in meeting and/or moving the allotment toward the Fremont National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) goals and objectives, including Inland Native Fish Strategy (INFISH) objectives.

All acres identified in this analysis and decision are approximate and may vary among resource documents due to measurement procedures used.
Pasture and Season of Use for the Buck Creek Allotment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herd #1</th>
<th>Little Antelope</th>
<th>Pasture</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bear Flat 90% Private Land</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/25-7/15 65-70 heifers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Herd #2 | Coshaw Exclosures 1& 2 | Pasture | XX  | XXXX | XX   |        |      | 7/16-9/10 65-70 heifers |

| Herd #2 | Coshaw | Pasture | XXXX | XXXX | XX   |        |      | 7/16-9/10 65-70 heifers |

| Herd #2 | Bridge | Pasture | Rest | Rest | Rest | Rest | Rest | Rotate rest to Coshaw next year |

| Herd #2 | Buck Creek 60% Private Land | Pasture | XXXX | XXXX | XX   |        |      | 7/16-9/10 65-70 heifers |

| Herd #3 | Willow Springs 100% Private land | Pasture | XX  | XXXX | XX   |        |      | 5/1-5/15 75 pair |

| Herd #3 | Lower Bridge | Pasture | XX  | XXXX | XX   |        |      | 5/1-5/15 75 pair |

| Herd #3 | Lower Chase | Pasture | Rest | Rest | Rest | Rest | Rest | Rotate rest to Lower Bridge next year |

| Herd #3 | Rodman 35% Private land | Pasture | XXXX | XXXX | XX   |        |      | 6/1-7/1 50 pair |

|         | XXXX |        |      |      | XXXX | XX     |      | 6/1-7/1 50 pair |

**X = 1 week**

**Decision**

I have decided to authorize the continuation of current grazing management within the Buck Creek Allotment consistent with Section 339 of the 2005 Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 108-447), the 1995 Rescissions Act (P.L. 104-19), Forest Service regulations, and the Forest Plan, as amended. Mitigations to this decision are the additional fencing at 13-mile and Section 1 Springs, increasing water source protection; and monitoring of two cultural sites for resource maintenance. The allotment management plan may be modified over time, as needed and appropriate, to be consistent with this decision.

**Purpose of and Need for the Decision**

The purpose of the project is to “maintain” current management, which has been demonstrated to be meeting or satisfactorily moving existing management toward desired conditions.
The Forest Plan recognizes the continuing need for forage production and has determined that the Buck Creek Allotment is capable and suitable to support grazing by domestic livestock. There is a need to authorize continued grazing consistent with P.L. 104 of the 1995 Rescissions Act. There is a need to continue authorized livestock grazing in a manner that will continue to meet or satisfactorily move toward Forest Plan objectives. There is a need on the part of the permittee to continue grazing on this allotment.

Findings
I find the authorization of continued grazing under existing management of the Buck Creek Allotment can be categorically excluded from documentation in an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement. My finding is based on information presented in this document and in the entirety of the project record. Section 339 of the 2005 Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 108-447) allows decisions to authorize grazing on an allotment to be categorically excluded from documentation in an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement if all three of the following conditions are present:

1. **The decision continues current grazing management.**
   My decision continues current grazing management, and incorporates the elements of the existing livestock grazing management as described in the “Introduction” section of this Decision Memo and detailed in the Term Grazing Permit.

2. **Monitoring indicates that current grazing management is meeting, or satisfactorily moving toward, objectives in the Forest Plan, as determined by the Secretary.**
   Based on the following resource narratives and the entirety of the project record (which includes monitoring information), I find my decision is consistent with the Fremont National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (1989), as amended, and in compliance with the National Forest Management Act (1976). Project monitoring has determined current management to be meeting or satisfactorily moving existing conditions toward desired resource conditions.

Soils: This decision is consistent with Forest-wide and management area-specific direction (goals, desired conditions, objectives, standards, and guidelines) for soils resources. The trends of Soil conditions are “good” at five sites and Forage condition are “fair” at one site (Range Report, June 2007). Fair and good forage conditions are satisfactory. Actual use in 1998, 2001, 2002 and 2004 indicate grazing use levels are at or below Term Grazing Permit Standards and Guidelines. For erosion control (page 81, goal 2b) the Forest Plan identifies a goal of maintaining effective ground cover. The complementary goals for range and riparian management (pages 75 to 76) are maintaining forage in satisfactory class. For watershed management (page 88),
the goal is complying with the States best management practices for allotments, which are rest-rotation, herding, or deferred grazing practices. These best management practices are in place in the Buck Creek Allotment. Overall the forage, and soil condition findings and allotment practices are consistent with best management practices for water quality and Forest Plan’s requirements for soil and water conservation. Static or upward trend are likely in the foreseeable future for the Buck Creek Allotment and permit for 250 cow/calf pairs. (Project Record, Soils and Water Report, September 2007).

**Water**: This decision is consistent with Forest-wide and management area-specific direction (goals, desired conditions, objectives, standards, and guidelines) for water resources. The Forest Service complies with the Clean Water Act through the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs). This decision incorporates BMPs for grazing to ensure protection of soil and water resources. The Buck Creek Allotment contains streams which are in the Paulina Marsh System/Fort Rock Basin; the primary streams being Bridge and Buck Creeks. Neither of these streams is listed as Water Quality Limited for any parameter on the ODEQ 303 (d) list of Impaired or Threatened Waterbodies. This condition is expected to be maintained with implementation of the project (Project Record, Hydrology Report).

Because of the application of BMPs and monitoring the implementation and effectiveness of these practices, the Buck Creek AMP is in accordance with the Clean Water Act and complies with the Clean Water Act requirements of the 1989 Forest Plan.

**Riparian/Fish**: This decision is consistent with Forest-wide and management area-specific direction (goals, desired conditions, objectives, standards, and guidelines) for riparian and fish resources, and habitat including management indicator species (MIS). Redband trout (sensitive) is the only threatened, endangered, and/or sensitive aquatic species known or suspected to occur in the subwatersheds potentially affected by implementation of this project. Bridge and Buck creeks provide habitat for all life stages of redband trout.

Grazing of the Buck Creek Allotment is consistent with the objectives set forth under INFISH. Proposed grazing activities will not hinder or retard attainment of riparian management objectives (RMOs) and are fully consistent with the goals and applicable INFISH Standards and Guidelines, particularly GM-1 and GM-3. Proper permit administration in response to monitoring associated with continued grazing will prevent degradation of the riparian management objectives and will not retard attainment of riparian management
objectives. The potential effects of the proposed activities on proposed, endangered, threatened, or sensitive species (PETS) and habitats will be mitigated by implementation of the grazing strategies, and standards and guidelines for the allotment (Project Record, Watershed Effects and Short Form Biological Evaluation, July, 2007).

Relevant INFISH standards and guidelines:

**GM-1:** Modify grazing practices (e.g., accessibility of riparian areas to livestock, length of grazing season, stocking levels, timing of grazing, etc.) that retard or prevent attainment of riparian management objectives or are likely to adversely affect inland native fish. Suspend grazing if adjusting practices is not effective in meeting riparian management objectives.

**Agency Compliance:** Minor modifications to grazing practices are done as needed under the Annual Operating Instructions. Major adjustments are done with permit modification. Overtime, numbers and timing of grazing have been modified (current range conditions) and condition and trend monitoring has shown an upward or static trend. Current livestock management and relatively recent designation of riparian habitat conservation areas (RHCA) (USDA, 1995) is bringing about gradual improvements in watershed, fish habitat, and riparian conditions (Project Record, Watershed Effects and Short Form Biological Evaluation, July, 2007).

**GM-2:** Locate new livestock handling and/or management facilities outside of Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas. For existing livestock handling facilities inside Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas, assure that facilities do not prevent attainment of riparian management objectives. Relocate or close facilities where these objectives cannot be met.

**Agency Compliance:** There are not any handling facilities located within a riparian habitat conservation area.

**GM-3:** Limit livestock trailing, bedding, watering, salting, loading, and other handling efforts to those areas and times that will not retard or prevent attainment of riparian management objectives or adversely affect inland native fish.

**Agency Compliance:** As a condition of the Term Grazing Permit, all salting is done away from riparian areas. Sixteen stock ponds and 3 spring developments are available for watering of cattle away from streams. Additionally, this decision improves developments at the 13-mile and Section 1 springs, further protecting the water source. Any needed changes to the management of this allotment are done under the Annual Operating Plans.
Range: Current management has been designed to meet allowable use standard objectives described in the Forest Plan. Monitoring in the uplands shows current management is meeting the applicable percent use standard. Monitoring in riparian areas indicates that current management has met implementation standards (Project Record, Range Management Report, August 2007). Complete monitoring results and photo points are in the Project Record.

Actual use monitoring records and notes for the past five years indicates grazing use levels at or below Forest Plan and Term Grazing Permit Standards and Guidelines. Monitoring of six Condition and Trend Clusters within the allotment indicates current grazing management is leaving the forage resource in mostly good to some fair condition and has resulted in static to upward trends, which are consistent with the Forest Plan (Project Record, Range Management Report, September, 2007).

Enlarging the enclosures around 13-Mile and Section 1 springs will increase water source protection. Improved spring development will allow cattle watering away from the source.

Noxious Weeds: There are no known weed sites inventoried on the Buck Creek Allotment. Canada thistle (*Cirsium arvense*) is known to occur in the area and a small (less than 1 acre) site is currently being treated approximately 1 mile south of the allotment.

The following Forest Plan invasive species prevention standards apply to livestock grazing:

- Prevention of invasive plant introduction, establishment, and spread will be addressed in grazing allotment management plans
- Use available administrative mechanisms to incorporate invasive plant prevention practices into rangeland management. Examples of administrative mechanisms include, but are not limited to, revising permits and grazing allotment management plans, providing annual operating instructions, and adaptive management. Plan and implement practices in cooperation with the grazing permit holder (pg 16)

The Fremont and Winema National Forests' Plans were recently amended by the Pacific Northwest Region (R6) Record of Decision for the Invasive Species Final Environmental Impact Statement. This project is consistent with the management direction in that Record of Decision as follows:

- The allotment management plans developed for the Buck Creek Allotment will address the prevention of invasive plant...
introduction, establishment and spread (Standard 1).
• The annual operating instructions will be used to incorporate invasive plant prevention practices into rangeland management on the Buck Creek Allotment (Standard 6).

**Botany:** Several species on the Regional Forester's Sensitive Species list occur in the Buck Creek Allotment and suspected or documented species are addressed in the Botany biological Evaluation and Specialist Report. Potential habitat for the fungi species *Gomphus bonarii, Gyromitra californica,* and *Mycena monticola* is present in the allotment, but these species are most likely to occur in mixed conifer habitats where canopy closure is high and there is little forage to attract livestock. Occupied habitat for *Mimulus tricolor* and *Penstemon glaucinus* is also present. *Penstemon glaucinus* occurs mainly in high elevation lodgepole pine and/or whitebark pine forests, or ridgetops and alpine sites. These habitat types also tend to not produce understory forage species in quantities sufficient to attract livestock. *Mimulus tricolor* inhabits areas with significant moisture, flowering in early spring prior to cattle turn-out. Grazing at the current management levels may impact individuals or habitat, but will not likely contribute to a trend toward federal listing or loss of viability to the population or species (Botany Biological Evaluation and Specialist Report, September 2007).

**Wildlife:** This decision is consistent with Forest-wide and management area-specific direction (goals, desired conditions, objectives, standards, and guidelines) for wildlife resources and habitat, including management indicator species and migratory birds.

Surveys for evening field slugs (*Deroceras hesperium*), a sensitive species, have been conducted within the project area. Slugs were found in Buck Creek and sent to a mollusk expert for identification. These slugs were not the evening field slug. A second survey found two slugs that were sent to an expert for additional clarification. The final report was not completed by the time this report was written. While there are no known sightings of evening field slugs at the time this report was written, the short grazing time, the management for livestock distribution and availability of vegetation away from water, and the dense vegetation and topography preventing cattle access for most of Buck Creek, it is expected that there would be no impact from grazing on evening field slugs or their habitat, therefore this project meets the Forest Plan standards and guidelines, as amended.

Management Indicator Species (MIS) and their respective habitats serve to show population and habitat trends for other species that use similar forest resources.
• Grazing has no impact on the availability of nest trees or foraging areas for goshawks. It is expected that reissuing the allotment permits would continue to provide adequate prey habitat for goshawks, so would have no effect to goshawks or their habitat.

• Browsing by cattle in riparian areas may locally reduce fruiting production on understory bushes, negatively affecting a direct food source and the bird and small mammal populations which are prey for pine marten. However, reissuing the allotment permits will not change current conditions for pine marten.

• Grazing is not having a large impact on aspen health or regeneration, therefore reissuing the allotment permit will not change current conditions for the Red-naped sapsucker.

• Grazing on the allotments does not remove trees, down wood, or snags in forested or woodland habitat, therefore renewing the allotment permit will not directly or indirectly change nesting or denning or foraging habitat for species dependent on this type of habitat.

• Probable effects on big game forage availability, cover, and distribution meets the Forest Plan standards and would not adversely affect populations or distribution of big game within the allotment. Concerns about available big game winter range forage were determined to be minor as plentiful forage exists within the approximate 8,000 acres of winter range.

The Wildlife Biologist reviewed this decision’s probable effect on Management Indicator Species and found that current conditions, and therefore continued grazing, of the Buck Creek Allotment would be fully compliant with Forest Plan standards (Project Record, Terrestrial Wildlife Report and Biological Evaluation, August, 2007).

Cultural Resources: This decision is consistent with Forest-wide and management area-specific direction (goals, desired conditions, objectives, standards, and guidelines) for cultural resources and is consistent with the programmatic agreement with the State Historic Preservation Office. Following a mitigation to monitor two sites in the Allotment, the project will have no effect on any eligible or potentially eligible cultural resource properties (Project Record, Project Review for Heritage Resources).

3. The decision is consistent with agency policy concerning extraordinary circumstances.

Based on the resource narratives below and the project record as summarized in this decision, I find that this decision is consistent with agency policy concerning extraordinary circumstances (Forest Service
Handbook 1909.15.30.3(2)(a)-(g)).

(a) **Federally listed threatened or endangered species or designated critical habitat, species proposed for Federal listing or proposed critical habitat, or Forest Service sensitive species**

As required by the Endangered Species Act, potential effects of this decision on listed species have been analyzed and documented in Biological Evaluations for Wildlife, Fish, and Plant species (Project Record). In accordance with Section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act, the Wildlife Biologist, Fish Biologist, and Botanist checked for the presence of listed and proposed, threatened, endangered, and sensitive species, or their habitats that may be present in the allotment. Of the species that have either been documented, are suspected to occur, or have the potential to occur within the allotment, the Biological Evaluations resulted in the determinations in shown below.

### Effects determinations to listed species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada lynx (Lynx canadensis)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>NE*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon spotted frog (Rana pretiosa)</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>NI*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia spotted frog (Rana luteiventris)</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific fisher (Martes pennanti)</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>NI*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-billed cuckoo (Coccyzus americanus)</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NE* No effect on a proposed or listed species or critical habitat**

**NI* No Impact to R6 sensitive species individuals, populations, or their habitat**

(b) **Flood plains, wetlands, or municipal watersheds**

The Buck Creek Allotment project does not propose to occupy or modify any floodplains or wetlands. Therefore, continuation of current grazing management is consistent with Executive Orders 11988 and 11990 (Project Record, Hydrology Report). There are no municipal watersheds within the allotment.

(c) **Congressionally designated areas, such as wilderness, wilderness study areas, or national recreation areas**

The area does not contain any Congressionally designated wilderness, wilderness study areas, or National Recreation Areas (Forest Plan).

(d) **Inventoried roadless areas**

The Buck Creek Allotment does not contain any inventoried roadless areas (Record of Decision and Final EIS, Fremont National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, Appendix C).
(e) **Research natural areas**

There are no research natural areas within the Buck Creek Allotment (Forest Plan).

(f) **American Indians and Alaska Native religious or cultural sites and (g) Archaeological sites, or historic properties or areas**

Zone Archaeological Technicians evaluated the records of all known historic properties, including American Indian cultural properties, within the allotment. Most of the lands in the allotment were surveyed under the Bridge/Buck Restoration Project Area the past four seasons. All of the stratification for the range project areas were covered in high probability surveys with 20 meter transects. Adequate surveys covering the past recorded sites were re-visited and monitored for any range impacts. Mitigations in place will prevent effects to any eligible or potentially eligible American Indian religious or cultural sites and any archeological or historic sites or properties. This project complies with the National Historic Preservation Act and the Archeological Resources Protection Act (Project Record, Cultural Resource Monitoring Report, July 2007).

This decision is intended to contribute toward accomplishment of the Fremont National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan desired conditions of permitted livestock grazing by implementing additional improvements to facilitate the management of cattle grazing, especially in riparian areas. Livestock would be used as a management tool to manipulate vegetation and enhance other resources such as increased palatability of forage for wildlife, plantation release, and noxious weed control (Plan, p. 120).

This decision is intended to respond to the Forest Plan Goal to maintain or improve vegetative condition of rangelands through the use of available silvicultural practices and livestock management while providing for other resource uses (Plan, p. 49). It also is intended to respond to the specific range goal of Management Area 5, which is to manage forage for domestic livestock on appropriate lands within established standards and guidelines (Plan, p. 145).

This decision also responds to:

- Management Area 1 (Mule Deer Forage and Cover on Winter Range) by managing livestock use on winter range to provide adequate winter forage for mule deer during the winter months (Plan, p. 133).
- Management Area 5 (Timber and Range Production) by maximizing, to the extent possible, utilization of transitory forage by livestock (Plan, p. 148)
- Management Area 6 (Scenic Viewsheds) by designing improvement projects to meet prescribed visual quality objectives to the extent that projects shall be subordinate to the characteristic landscape as seen from travel route/use area (Plan, p. 156).
Management Area 15 (Fish and Wildlife Habitat and Water Quality) by meeting applicable state and federal water quality standards (Plan, p. 199). Livestock grazing will be managed to not exceed the identified use levels for the forage component (Plan, p. 201). INFISH listed goals to maintain or restore watershed, riparian, and stream channel conditions will be followed (Inland Native Fish Strategy, p. A-1)

I have concluded this decision is appropriately categorically excluded from documentation in an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment as it implements current livestock grazing management, the management of the allotment is shown by monitoring to be meeting or satisfactorily moving toward forest plan objectives, and there are no effects to extraordinary circumstances (as defined in FSH 1909.15) related to the decision that may result in a significant individual or cumulative effect on the quality of the human environment. My conclusion is based on information presented in this document and the entirety of the project record.

**Findings Required by other Laws**

I find that my decision is consistent with all laws, regulations, and policies, including the Forest Plan, as amended. I have disclosed my compliance with the National Forest Management Act, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, Executive Order 11988, and Executive Order 11990 in previous sections of this decision memo.

This decision is not expected to have an adverse effect on potential habitat for migratory birds or on migratory bird populations in the affected area (Executive Order 13186). The risk of adverse effects to ground nesting bird populations is minimal due to the low numbers of cattle grazing in the allotment. Overstory habitat would not be affected by cattle grazing. Compliance with Forest Plan standards for stubble height ensures that adequate cover is available for ground-nesting birds. Ground reconnaissance has verified that plentiful grass and shrubs are retained within the allotments for ground nesting birds. Reissuing the allotment permits will not change current conditions for Neotropical migratory and song birds. Overall, the potential for injury would be small and limited to an occasional individual (Project Record, Wildlife Report).

The decision is not expected to have any disproportional effects on consumers, civil rights, minority groups, women, or low income people because there would be no change in the availability of the allotment for use by these populations (Environmental Justice, Executive Order 12898).

**Public Involvement**

The project proposal was introduced to The Klamath Tribes at the May 8, 2007 Schedule of Proposed Actions meeting between The Klamath Tribal Directors and Representatives, and Staff from the Fremont-Winema National Forests. It was listed in the Schedule of Proposed Actions in August 2007. The proposed action
was provided to the public, interested groups, and other agencies on the Silver Lake mailing list for comment during scoping, from June 21 through July 19, 2007. The scoping process produced one public response (Oregon Wild) and one response from the Klamath Tribes' Wildlife Biologist. The Assistant District Biologist, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), contacted the Acting Forest Wildlife Biologist requesting information about the project. All comments received are part of the project record.

A meeting with the ODFW Assistant District Biologist, the grazing permittee, the Acting Forest Wildlife Biologist, the Forest Range Management Specialist, and the Project Environmental Coordinator was held on July 24, 2007. Review of winter range forage was conducted, addressing the concerns of the ODFW Wildlife Biologist. After discussion and field verification, it was determined the forage away from cattle concentration areas (fencelines and roads) was in good condition.

Another field meeting was held August 29, 2007 with the Wildlife Biologist for the Klamath Tribes, the Acting Paisley/Silver Lake District Ranger, the Forest Range Management Specialist, and the Project Environmental Coordinator. This meeting also focused on winter range forage availability and riparian conditions. After touring parts of the allotment, no further concerns were expressed.

**Administrative Review and Appeal Rights and Implementation**

This decision is not subject to appeal under 36 CFR part 215. However, this decision is subject to appeal pursuant to 36 CFR 251.82(3) by those who hold or, in certain instances, those who apply for written authorizations to occupy and use National Forest System lands. An appeal for initial review may be filed by those who hold or, in certain instances, those who apply for written authorizations to occupy and use National Forest System lands. To appeal this decision under 36 CFR 251, a written Notice of Appeal, meeting the content requirements at 36 CFR 251.90, must be postmarked or received within 45 calendar days after the date of notice of this decision to applicants and holders of written authorization to occupy and use National Forest System land.

When the 45-day filing period would end on a Saturday, Sunday, or Federal holiday, the filing time is extended to the end of the next Federal working day.
An appeal must be submitted by one of the following methods:

By surface mail: USDA, Forest Service
Fremont-Winema National Forests
ATTN: Karen Shimamoto, Forest Supervisor
1301 South G Street
Lakeview, Oregon 97630

By fax: USDA, Forest Service,
Fremont-Winema National Forests
ATTN: Karen Shimamoto, Forest Supervisor
(541)947-6399

By hand: Delivered to the Forest Supervisor’s Office in Lakeview, Oregon from 8 am to 4:30 pm Monday through Friday.

By electronic mail: comments-pacificnorthwest-fremont-silverlake@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.

A copy of the appeal must simultaneously be sent to me. If an appeal is filed, I am willing to meet and discuss concerns. Additionally, if an appeal is filed under 36 CFR 251, an oral presentation concerning the appeal (36 CFR 251.97) and/or stay of implementation (36 CFR 251.91) of the decision may be requested at any time prior to closing the appeal record.

This decision will be implemented immediately upon issuance, and may be implemented during the appeal process, unless the Reviewing Officer grants a stay (36 CFR 251.91).
Contact Person
This Decision Memo and associated project file may be reviewed at the Paisley Ranger District in Paisley, Oregon. For further information contact: Mike Nevill, Forest Range Management Specialist
Paisley Ranger District
P.O. Box 67
Paisley, OR 97636
(541) 943-4442
Email: mnevill@fs.fed.us

/s/    September 26, 2007
BARBARA MACHADO
Acting District Ranger
Paisley and Silver Lake Ranger Districts
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