Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Livestock Grazing Permit Issuance 2009 Environmental Assessment

Greybull Allotment, Greybull Ranger District
Shoshone National Forest-Cody, Wyoming
Park County, Wyoming

FOR INFORMATION CONTACT:  JOE HICKS
203A Yellowstone Ave.
Cody, WY 82414
307.527-6921

[Final Environmental Assessment available at
http://www.fs.fed.us/r2/shoshone/projects/planning/forest_projects/env_analysis_index.shtml ]
INTRODUCTION

This Decision Notice is for the Greybull Allotment, one of 12 allotments analyzed in the Livestock Grazing Permit Issuance 2009 Environmental Assessment (EA). The decision for the Greybull allotment was deferred pending the completion of cultural resource reporting and concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). This reporting and concurrence process was completed March 3, 2010.

This decision is for the Greybull allotment only; the other allotments were contained in a separate Decision Notice signed January 20, 2010.

This Decision Notice documents the management activities selected for the Greybull livestock grazing allotment on the Shoshone National Forest. This Decision Notice contains a brief summary of the environmental analysis completed for this project and the decision regarding which alternative to implement and the rationale for the decision. Findings required by various laws, and information concerning administrative review are contained in this Decision Notice.

The Environmental Assessment (EA) for Livestock Grazing Permit Issuance 2009, completed for 12 allotments, is incorporated by reference in this decision document. The predecisional EA was prepared and released for public review and a 30–day comment period on August 3rd, 2009. The EA describes the proposed action and alternatives to the proposed action and the effects those alternatives may have on the environment. Additional documentation and analysis for the Greybull allotment is in the project file.

Maps for the affected livestock grazing allotments addressed in this decision are shown in the Final EA Maps 1.2-1.7, pages 23-28.

BACKGROUND

The Proposed Action proposed by the Shoshone National Forest to meet the purpose and need is to continue to permit livestock grazing by incorporating adaptive management on all 12 allotments to meet Forest Plan direction, which provides for a wide range of values and uses. The Proposed Action is designed to maintain or improve resource conditions in rangeland health, vegetation, watershed conditions, and wildlife habitat and avoid adverse effects to cultural resources relative to livestock grazing.

The Proposed Action included 12 allotments totaling 196,202 acres; a total of 10,749 animal unit months (AUMS) would be authorized. The Greybull allotment is 36,493 acres with a total of 2,117 animal unit months.

The EA is required per Public Law 104-19 (Rescission Bill), which directs the Forest Service to develop and adhere to a schedule for National Environmental Policy Act analysis to evaluate commercial livestock grazing and permitting on an allotment management level.
The purpose of this project is to develop and apply commercial livestock management that is consistent with the goals, objectives, standards, and guidelines for the Forest Plan, as amended. The Forest Service rangeland allotment management process calls for periodic review of allotment conditions and management practices.

**DECISION**

Based on review of alternatives in the environmental assessment (EA) completed for this project, as well as comments received from scoping and the 30-day public review of the predecisional EA, Alternative 2—the Proposed Action, as described in Chapter 2, Section 2.4 of the EA has been selected for implementation and is the selected decision for the Greybull allotment. The decision will be implemented beginning with the 2011 grazing season, allowing term permit holders one full year to make proper adjustments per 36 CFR 222.4(a)(8).

The decision incorporates Alternative 2—the Proposed Action in the Final EA by reference. Alternative 2—the Proposed Action, including possible adaptive management actions for each allotment, is described in detail in Section 2.4. Table 2.1 of the Final EA. This table lists possible grazing adaptive management actions. Also in the Final EA, Table 2.2 is a summary of the Proposed Action, including current and proposed management, and Animal Unit Months (AUMs).

Selection of this alternative will provide for improved livestock management, achievement of desired resource conditions and address concerns of potential conflicts with wildlife and other resource users. The decision for each allotment implements best management grazing practices and associated adaptive management actions and available monitoring strategies to:

- Continue authorizing livestock grazing on suitable lands within the allotments.
- Resolve disparities between current and desired conditions.
- Provide the authorized officers, working with the livestock grazing permittees, the best opportunities to adjust management to meet the needs and desired conditions on the ground based upon applied management and monitoring results.

Adaptive management\(^1\) will be applied on all allotments in the analysis, and the results will be monitored for a minimum of three years. The selected alternative can be implemented on a site-specific basis in response to information from monitoring, indicating a need or opportunity to change management. Monitoring procedures to be used are displayed in Section 2.5 of the Final EA. If monitoring indicates that desired conditions or grazing standards are not being consistently met, other management strategies may be selected for implementation. If monitoring indicates that management is meeting standards, or is making measurable progress toward the desired conditions in an acceptable timeframe, the initial management options may continue.

---

\(^1\) “Adaptive management” is defined as natural resource management in which decisions are made as part of an ongoing process. It involves planning, implementing, monitoring, evaluating, and incorporating new knowledge into management approaches based on scientific findings and the needs of society. Results are used to modify future management methods.
All existing rangeland structural improvements will remain in place and be maintained as specified in the term grazing permits or other appropriate documents, unless identified for removal. Additional structural improvements are identified for installation as actions specific to individual allotments. The improvements are identified to help permittees manage their livestock to meet allowable-use standards and resource objectives. If monitoring shows standards and resource objectives can be met without the improvement, the improvement may not be installed. Possible structural improvements include fence, cattle guards, and spring developments. Temporary or permanent electric fence may also be used on any allotment as an adaptive-management strategy.

Project Design Features (PDFs) for the Greybull allotment includes best management grazing practices, associated activities with adaptive management, and available monitoring strategies are part of the Decision, as described in Section 2.4, including the PDFs on pages 31-34 of the Final EA. Additionally, specific design features/mitigation were identified for the Greybull allotment as part of the SHPO concurrence process and are part of this decision. Determinations of “no adverse effect” [36 CFR 800.5(d) (1)] to historic properties relies upon implementation of these mitigations, as outlined in Appendix A. Determinations and mitigations have been concurred upon by the SHPO.

Two historic properties (sites 48PA2772 and 48PA2749) are located within the bare ground exposed by the Little Venus Fire of 2006. It is recommended that these sites be monitored annually to ensure that trampling impacts do not increase, or become adverse.

As the area affected by the fire begins to regenerate vegetation, cattle impacts related to trampling are likely to decrease. If monitoring reveals that additional mitigations are necessary, options include: placing logs in and around site to direct cattle away from resource, seeding the site area to enhance vegetation regeneration, or other options determined appropriate through consultation with the SHPO. If monitoring reveals that impacts are not becoming adverse (e.g., site becomes stabilized through natural re-vegetation), then monitoring would cease.

To reduce indirect effects from artifact collection, and increase resource protection awareness, all future grazing permits will include Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA) and Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) specific language.

Currently, each grazing permit includes general language about the protection of cultural resources. Future permits will include discussion more specific to ARPA violations and repercussions, as well as possible actions permit holders may take when encountering cultural resources. The stipulations will be incorporated into the permit issuance (see Appendix A).
RATIONALE FOR THE DECISION

In making this decision, I considered applicable laws, regulations, and policy, and the information disclosed in the EA, the planning record, and the Forest Plan. I considered how the alternatives meet the Purpose of and Need for Action and address the issues. I also carefully considered public and agency comment to this project.

A total of 326 acres were Class III surveyed in the Greybull allotment. A total of nine archaeological sites were determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurrence for determinations of effect and NRHP eligibility was received March 3, 2010 (SHPO File #0310JRD004). The determination was that grazing impacts do not constitute an adverse effect on historic properties in the Greybull allotment at this time; however, historic properties in the Decision Notice will be monitored to ensure impacts do not become adverse.

I made my decision based upon the best science and information available.

I considered the alternatives presented in the EA, and the potential environmental, social, and economic effects of the alternatives. The alternative selected was made in part, because it best addresses public comments received on the EA and concerns by the interdisciplinary team.

The selected alternative best meets the Purpose of and Need for Action by detailing specifics of authorizing livestock grazing on the livestock grazing allotments within the analysis area. The selected alternative provides for preparation of Allotment Management Plans (AMP) which directs how grazing and related activities will be conducted for the next 10 to 15 years on the allotments. The AMP becomes a part of the Term Grazing Permit, and is therefore subject to all terms and conditions contained within the permit. The selected alternative also implements direction and objectives from the Forest Plan (including compliance with applicable laws, regulation and policies) on the analysis area.

The adaptive-management principles allow for a decision that can remain viable for an extended period, as long as there are periodic reviews of the action for consistency with NEPA-based decisions and findings are within the range of analysis and disclosure in the EA.

The selected alternative best addresses the relevant issues, concerns, and opportunities. Additionally, the Alternative selected accomplishes the following:

- Provides available forage, above that needed for maintenance or improvement of the basic resource, for the continuance of livestock grazing on suitable rangelands in a manner, that, when applied through the adaptive process, will allow the resource to meet or improve toward the desired conditions.

- Uses an interdisciplinary planning and implementation process that identifies site-specific desired conditions, provides a set of strategies to guide management over time, and establishes a resource-focused project-monitoring plan to adjust management when necessary.
- Builds “guided flexibility” into management to allow for future implementation of practices that are in response to needed adjustments in permitted action, as determined through monitoring.

- Focuses on essential factors (monitoring, identifying need for adjustments, implementing adaptive management) to ensure management objectives and/or desired conditions are met. Desired conditions can be checked through monitoring to determine if actions prescribed were followed and if changes are needed in management.

- Changes grazing season in some allotments to more accurately reflect what has actually occurred on the ground in response to climatic conditions and implementation of pasture management practices.

- Requires a minimum of 3 years of monitoring, as needed, to determine if other management and/or permit adjustments are necessary to enable permittees to meet the grazing standards outlined in the action.

- Applies adaptive-management practices, a minimum of 3 years of monitoring data to determine if permanent adjustments in term permits are necessary. This allows permittees an opportunity to meet standards and resource objectives before any permit adjustments.

**PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

Before the analysis process, a scoping document describing the proposed action was distributed to individuals and organizations that have shown an interest in commercial livestock grazing activity on the Shoshone National Forest. The issues identified through scoping were analyzed as appropriate and were documented in the EA (Section 1.9).

The EA was delivered to individuals who requested them for a 30-day review and comment period. We have reviewed the comments received and responded to them, as required. The concerns raised during this review have been adequately addressed and documented in this Decision Notice.

*Key Issues- How Issues Were Considered*

The interdisciplinary team consolidated the issues raised through the scoping process into key issues that were analyzed in detail. These issues were used to identify analysis needs, develop alternatives to the proposed actions, and assess the probable environmental effects of each alternative considered. Other issues or concerns that were considered to be within the scope of analysis were addressed in the EA and some issues raised that were determined to be outside the scope of the analysis were dismissed.

Key issues relative to commercial livestock grazing center on: *How to maintain or improve resource conditions for rangeland health and vegetation diversity, watershed conditions, wildlife habitat and open space, and goods and services.* The issues (See EA, Section 1.10) below were used to develop design criteria and adaptive management actions.

**Issue 1-Rangeland Health**

*What effect will the proposed grazing strategies have on rangeland health and vegetation diversity? How will the Forest Service maintain or move toward desired conditions for*
The selected alternative is the most compatible alternative from a multiple use standpoint. Livestock grazing contributes to goods and services, as well as preservation of open space and ranchland buffers between federal lands and developments and benefits scenic vistas and rural landscapes.
I believe the selected alternative is a balanced decision which minimizes adverse effects to soil and water, cultural values, wildlife, recreation, and other resources.

The selected alternative’s project design and management practices, combined with monitoring, ensure the project’s objectives will be achieved in an environmentally sensitive manner.

**ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

Two alternatives were considered. In addition to the Proposed Action, the Forest Service also evaluated a No Action (no livestock grazing) alternative. A comparison of environmental consequences of these alternatives can be found in the EA (Chapter 3). Based upon the effects of the alternatives, the responsible officials selected one of the alternatives.

**Alternative 1 - No Action**
Under the No Action alternative (No grazing), no commercial livestock grazing would be permitted on any of the allotments considered in the EA.

**Alternative 2 – Proposed Action**
Alternative 2 is the Proposed Action; under this alternative livestock grazing would be permitted on the allotments considered in the EA under an adaptive management system designed to meet desired conditions (Forest Service Handbook 2209.13, Chapter 90, 93.3g).

**FINDINGS**

I have reviewed the environmental effects described in the EA and evaluated whether the selected alternative constitutes a significant effect on the quality of the human environment or whether the environmental impacts would be significant based on their context and intensity as defined by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) using the criteria in the implementing regulations (40 CFR 1508.27).

I have determined that the implementation of the selected alternative will not result in any anticipated effects that exceed the level at which a significant effect on the human, biological, or physical environment in terms of context or intensity would occur. Both beneficial and adverse effects have been considered. The effects from the selected alternative are expected to be minor. The effects are not highly uncertain and do not involve unique and unknown risks. The action will not, in relation with other actions, cause cumulatively significant impacts. This decision causes no irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources.

- **Context** This project is local and would affect only the livestock grazing allotments considered in the EA.

- **Environmental Effects and Intensity** I find that the selected alternative can be implemented without significant effects on economic, cultural, and natural resources as documented in the EA. Adverse
effects on soils, water, air, wildlife, recreation and vegetation are judged to be not significant due to mitigation and monitoring measures.

- **Goals, Objectives, and Outputs** No significant impacts are expected to affect fisheries or other resources. The selected alternative will not affect either the short-term or long-term productivity of the Shoshone National Forest, in terms of sustainability of the resources or outputs associated with them, from the current management direction.

- **Public Health and Safety** The project activities will comply with all state and federal regulations. Air and water quality will not be adversely affected.

- **Unique Characteristics of the Area** I find there are no significant effects on unique characteristics of the Shoshone National Forest such as historic or cultural resources, parklands, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains, wild and scenic rivers, wilderness areas, inventoried roadless areas, or ecologically critical areas. The selected alternative will have no adverse effect on districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, and there is no loss of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.

- **Controversy** While many aspects of livestock grazing tend to be somewhat controversial, the effects of the selected alternative on the human environment are unlikely to be highly controversial. No new or unusual methods or activities are proposed. The action does not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle about future considerations. Similar projects conducted in the future will have to be evaluated under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the significance of the effects of those specific actions.

- **Uncertainty** The analysis shows the effects are not uncertain and do not involve unique or unknown risk. Similar actions have been implemented within the Shoshone National Forest and in other areas in the West. Monitoring will ensure effects are within the expected parameters.

- **Cumulative Impact** I find that the cumulative impacts are not significant because this activity, when considered with other past or reasonably foreseeable actions, is not expected to have a cumulatively significant impact.

- **Civil Rights** There are no civil rights issues, and none of the alternatives have any civil-rights-related effects because the selected alternative actions have no effect on rights protected under civil rights law. Local tribal governments were consulted during the analysis. The project will have no affect on local tribes.

- **Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Species** A Biological Assessment (BA), Biological Evaluations (BE) and a Biological Opinion (BO) was completed for commercial livestock grazing on the Shoshone NF. The BA determined that the proposed action “not likely to jeopardize” the gray wolf and “may effect, but is not likely to adversely affect”, Canada Lynx and Grizzly Bear. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concurred with the determinations in the Biological Assessment.
  
  - It was determined in the wildlife Biological Evaluations (BE) that the proposal will have no impact upon the majority of the Forest’s sensitive species and may impact individuals of some
species but is not likely to cause a trend toward Federal listing or result in loss of viability in the planning area. Species specific information is included in the BE located within the project record.

- It was determined in the BE completed for plant species that the proposed action will have no impact, or may adversely impact individuals, but is not likely to result in a loss of viability on the planning area upon plant species listed as sensitive.

**LEGAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION**

The selected alternative is consistent with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and requirements for the protection of the environment. The selected alternative is also consistent with the Land and Resource Management Plan for the Shoshone National Forest, as amended.

The decision is consistent with other pertinent laws, executive orders, regulation and policy. Continued livestock grazing in the specified allotments as defined in the selected alternative is consistent with requirements of: the Endangered Species Act; Clean Water Act, as amended; National Historic Preservation Act; and Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898.

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT – FONSI**

I concur with the findings and determinations discussed above. Based on the environmental assessment and the above considerations, the selected alternative is not a major action that will constitute a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, it does not require the preparation of an environmental impact statement.

**IMPLEMENTATION**

Pursuant to 36 CFR Part 215, if no appeal is filed within the 45 day time period, implementation of this decision may occur on, but not before 5 business days from the close of the appeal filing period. If an appeal is received, implementation may occur on, but not before, the 15th business day following the date of the last appeal disposition.

Pursuant to 36 CFR Part 251 Subpart C, if no appeal is filed, implementation of this decision may occur on, but not before, 5 business days from the close of the appeal filing period. If an appeal is received, implementation may occur during the appeal process, unless the Reviewing Officer grants a stay (§251.91).

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

A copy of the Final EA is available for review at the Wapiti Ranger District, 203A Yellowstone Ave., Cody, WY 82414. The Final EA is also posted on the Shoshone National Forest web site: [http://www.fs.fed.us/r2/shoshone/projects/planning/forest_projects/env_analysis_index.shtml](http://www.fs.fed.us/r2/shoshone/projects/planning/forest_projects/env_analysis_index.shtml)
For additional information or copy of this Decision Notice and the Final EA, please contact Joe Hicks, Rangeland Management Specialist at (307) 527-6921.

**RIGHT TO APPEAL OR ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW**

This decision is subject to administrative review (appeal) pursuant to 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 215. This decision is also subject to administrative review under 36 CFR Part 251 Subpart C by term grazing permit holders or applicants (§251.86). However, term grazing permit holders or applicants must choose to appeal under either 36 CFR 251 or 215, but not both (§251.85).

Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.13 (b), only those individuals or organizations who submitted comments during the comment period may file an appeal. Notices of Appeal that do not meet the content requirements of 36 CFR 215.14 or 36 C.F.R. 251.90 as appropriate will be dismissed.

It is an appellant’s responsibility to provide sufficient activity-specific evidence and rationale, focusing on the decision, to show why the Responsible Official’s decision should be reversed. Appeals (including attachments) must be in writing.

Appeals, including attachments, must be filed within 45 days from the publication date of this notice in the “Cody Enterprise”. Attachments received after the 45 day appeal period will not be considered. The publication date in the “Cody Enterprise” is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an appeal. Those wishing to appeal this decision should not rely upon dates or timeframe information provided by any other source.

**Appeals filed under 36 CFR Part 215**

The appeal must be filed (regular mail, fax, email, hand-delivery, or express delivery) with the Appeal Deciding Officer at:

USDA Forest Service, Region 2
Rocky Mountain Region
Attn.: Appeal Deciding Officer
U.S. Mail: 740 Simms Street
Golden, CO 80401-4720
Hand delivered: 740 Simms Street
Golden, CO 80401-4720
Office Hours: 8:00 am to 4:30 pm MT
Fax number: 303-275-5134

The office business hours for those submitting hand-delivered appeals are 8:00 am to 4:30 pm MT Monday through Friday, excluding holidays. Electronic appeals must be submitted in a format such as an email message, plain text (.txt), rich text format (.rtf), or Word (.doc) to: appeals-rocky-mountain-regional-office@fs.fed.us. In cases where no identifiable name is attached to an electronic message, a verification of identity will be required. A scanned signature is one way to provide verification.
Individuals or organizations who submitted comments during the comment period specified at 215.6 may appeal this decision. The notice of appeal must meet the appeal content requirements at 36 CFR 215.14.

**Appeals filed under 36 CFR Part 251 Subpart C**

Appeals filed under 36 CFR Part 251 Subpart C (including attachments) must be in writing and filed with the Reviewing Officer within 45 days following the date on the notice of the written decision (§251.88). Attachments received after the 45-day appeal period will not be considered. Electronic appeals for 36 CFR Part 251 appeals must be submitted in a format such as an email message, plain text (.txt), rich text format (.rtf, or Word (.doc) to: appeals-rocky-mountain-shoshone-greybull@fs.fed.us.

It is an appellant’s responsibility to provide sufficient activity-specific evidence and rationale, focusing on the decision, to show why the Deciding Officer’s decision should be reversed (§251.90). The Deciding Officer is willing to meet with applicants and holders to hear and discuss any concerns or issues related to the decision (§251.93). Appeals filed under 36 CFR 251 Subpart C must have a copy of the appeal simultaneously sent to the Deciding Officer (§251.88). An appellant may also include in the notice of appeal a request for oral presentation (§251.97) or a request for stay of implementation of the decision pending decision on the appeal (§251.91).

**Where to File a 36 CFR 251 Appeal**

USDA Forest Service-Shoshone National Forest
Attn: Appeal Deciding Officer
808 Meadow Lane
Cody, WY 82414
Fax: (307) 527-6241
Simultaneously send a copy of the appeal to:
Wapiti District Ranger
203A Yellowstone Ave
Cody, WY 82414
Fax: (307) 578-1102

**Deciding Officer**

Signature /s/ Terry Root Date: 3/29/2010
Terry Root
District Ranger, Clarks Fork, Greybull, Wapiti Districts
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, DC 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.
Appendix A

The following is to be incorporated into the permit issuance:

Heritage Sites, including Archaeological Sites and Historic Structures:
It is prohibited to collect surface artifacts, gather surface artifacts into piles, dig into, excavate, disturb, injure, destroy, and in any way knowingly damage any prehistoric, historic, or archaeological resource, structure, site, artifact, or property.

Information about cultural resources (e.g., archaeological sites) is confidential and not to be released to the general public (36 CFR 296.18).

Archaeological remains are protected under the following Acts and Codes of Federal Regulation:
American Antiquities Act (16 USC 431-433)
Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979 (16 USC 470aa-mm),
36 CFR 261.9(a) – damaging federal property
36 CFR 261.9 (b) – removing federal property
36 CFR 261.9 (g) – digging/excavating/disturbing/damaging archaeological or historical sites
36 CFR 261.9 (h) – removal of prehistoric or historic artifacts
36 CFR 296.4 – projection of archaeological resources, uniform regulations

Penalties for disturbing (e.g., artifact surface collection, excavation) cultural resources include:

American Antiquities Act: 16 USC 431-433 Section 1:
Fine not to exceed $500 and/or imprisonment not to exceed 90 days.

Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA): 16 USC 470ee (d):
Fine not to exceed $10,000 and/or imprisonment not to exceed one year; or,
Fine not to exceed $20,000 and/or imprisonment not to exceed two years; or,
Fine not to exceed $100,000 and/or imprisonment not to exceed five years.

36 CFR 261.9(a), (b), (g), and (h):
Fine not to exceed $500 and/or imprisonment not to exceed six months.

36 CFR 296.4
Fine not to exceed $10,000 and/or imprisonment not to exceed one year; or,
Fine not to exceed $20,000 and/or imprisonment not to exceed two years; or,
Fine not to exceed $100,000 and/or imprisonment not to exceed five years.

Cultural Resource Discoveries:
In the event that cultural resources are discovered during any allotment or livestock management activities (e.g., herding, improvement maintenance),
care shall be exercised by the permittee and the Forest Service to ensure that such finds are not disturbed.

The permittee shall inform authorized Forest Service personnel of discoveries as soon as possible. Permit holders should not hesitate to report historic and prehistoric finds to the forest’s archaeologist, range conservationists, district rangers and law enforcement officers. The Forest Service shall work expeditiously to implement procedures to evaluate the significance of discoveries. If the cultural resource(s) is determined to be significant, the Forest Service shall prescribe and implement appropriate actions(s) to preserve or conserve the resource(s). The permittee shall not continue with any activity that may disturb the discovery until permission to proceed is received from the Forest Officer.

It is possible that not all cultural resource discoveries will be discovered in the kind of disturbing context discussed above. Permit holders are encouraged to relay information about cultural resources they may find while participating in any grazing-related activity on forest.

Permit holders are encouraged to take photographs and identify find locations on maps or use Geographic Positioning System (GPS). Once discoveries have been identified by the agency, they can be properly documented, researched, and incorporated into site stewardship programs. Permit holders are encouraged to become site stewards to help protect and monitor archaeological and historical sites on the forest.

Violation of the Acts and Codes of Federal Regulations discussed above may result in the cancellation of the grazing permit.