DRAFT RECORD OF DECISION
TRESTLE FOREST HEALTH PROJECT
U.S. FOREST SERVICE
ELDORADO NATIONAL FOREST
PLACERVILLE RANGER DISTRICT
EL DORADO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

DECISION

Based on my review of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), the supporting documentation and review of public comments, I have decided to select Alternative 5. The implementation of Alternative 5 will treat approximately 16,000 acres of National Forest System lands using a variety of vegetation treatments to improve forest health and fire resiliency adjacent to the community of Grizzly Flats, including the area surrounding Leoni Meadows. In addition, this alternative includes road reconstruction activities to facilitate treatments and improve water quality, as well as restoration actions associated with dispersed camping, roads, and trails to reduce impacts to soils and watershed conditions.

This decision will implement the activities as described in the FEIS under Alternative 5 (pages 25-26 and map in Appendix A), with the exception of portions of three units (623440, 623441, and 623459) which are removed from the commercial thinning activities. Within the last year, approximately 60 acres within these units, directly adjacent to the community of Grizzly Flats, experienced an increase in tree mortality due to extended drought and beetle infestations that resulted in high proportions of standing dead trees. These standing dead trees were addressed in a recent NEPA decision due to the need to address the imminent threat to local infrastructure and increased fire risk immediately adjacent to the community (Grizzly Beetle Salvage Sale Decision Memo, dated March 17, 2017). Road reconstruction and restoration activities in these areas will be implemented under this decision.

The following is a summary of activities that would be implemented under Alternative 5:

- Commercial mechanical thinning 3,666 acres (3,235 acres within natural stands and 431 acres of plantations) using ground based equipment;
- Non-commercial mechanical thinning 25 acres within conifer plantations;
- Hand thinning and piling approximately 1,112 acres, including 470 acres located within 500 feet of private property boundaries;
- Non-commercial mechanical thinning and brush cutting along Capps Crossing Road (9N30) and Grizzly-Caldor Road / Leoni Road (09N73) (approximately 59 acres and 143 acres, respectively);
- Prescribed understory burning as the primary treatment on approximately 11,102 acres, of which 970 acres is first priority burning;

- Road reconstruction on approximately 70 miles of road;
- Restoration activities associated with dispersed recreation, roads, trails, and abandoned mines at 17 locations within the project area (FEIS pp. 21-23).

Alternative 5 was developed to address both the concerns that thinning of California spotted owl habitats could negatively affect owl populations in the project area and that treatments are needed to provide for effective fire modification strategy and implemented in a relatively short timeframe to protect communities and forest resources. My selection of Alternative 5 considers public comments received during public scoping and circulation of the Draft EIS, public collaboration field trips, and discussions with the Interdisciplinary Team. In making this decision, I intend to implement all resource protection design criteria identified in the Final EIS (pp. 26-35).

BACKGROUND

The project area is located east of the community of Grizzly Flats, including the area surrounding Leoni Meadows, west of Caldor, and north of Big Mountain. The gross area of the project is 20,453 acres, including 1,325 acres of other ownership. The project is located entirely in El Dorado County, California. The area is accessed from Grizzly Flats using the Capps Crossing Road (9N30) or the North South Road (10N83). Elevations range from 3,200 feet on the west side of the project area to 5,800 feet on east side of the project area.

Current conditions within the project area indicate that many areas within the project landscape are not in a resilient condition and are inconsistent with desired conditions as described in the 2004 Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (SNFPA). There is a need to improve forest health and resiliency across the landscape. An interdisciplinary team of resource specialists identified the following needs for the project area:

- There is a need to reduce the threat of large, high-intensity wildfires and threats to Grizzly Flats, Leoni Meadows, and other landowners by reducing fuel loading. There is a need to change potential fire behavior during weather conditions that result in extreme fire intensity and severity across a considerable portion of the landscape to increase the fire resilience of stands and to improve options for fire suppression and wildfire management.
- There is a need to improve forest health and to restore a composition of tree species and size classes that is more resilient to disturbance by applying appropriate silvicultural techniques to increase age class diversity and to favor species better adapted to disturbances typical of this forest type, so that stands are likely to be more sustainable into the future.
- There is a need to protect, increase, and perpetuate old-forest ecosystem habitat components, and for conserving wildlife species.
- There is a need to improve access and to reduce sediment from roads by improving the Forest Transportation System.
- There is a need to design and implement cost-effective project activities.

- There is a need to implement restoration activities to reduce impacts to soil and watershed resources related to dispersed camping, roads, and trails.

In order to address these needs, the interdisciplinary team developed a proposed action (Alternative 2) that included a combination of fuels reduction and forest health improvement actions including commercial and non-commercial mechanical thinning within natural stands and plantations, hand thinning, prescribed understory burning, road reconstruction and maintenance, and restoration activities related to dispersed recreation, roads and trails. In order to address issues identified during public scoping, the interdisciplinary team developed two additional alternatives. Alternative 4 was specifically developed to address the concerns about declining California spotted owl population in the Eldorado National Forest. Higher quality suitable habitat was excluded from commercial mechanical thinning, regardless of the health or resiliency of the stands or treatment feasibility. Alternative 5 was designed to address concerns about the declining California spotted owl population while also addressing comments proposing that treatment should provide for effective fire modification strategy that can be implemented in a relative short timeframe to protect both the community and forest resources.

DECISION RATIONALE

Alternative 5 best meets the purpose and need while addressing concerns related to impacts to the California spotted owl while accomplishing priority fuels reduction and forest health treatments within the Wildland Urban Intermix (WUI) and other forest areas to effectively improve forest resiliency and reduce fire risk in the project landscape.

I considered a number of different criteria when deciding which alternative to select. However, the most important objectives to me are to improve forest health and reduce surface and ladder fuel accumulations across the project area in order to effectively reduce the risk of large, potentially damaging wildfires on communities, infrastructure, and forest resources including the watersheds that provide the domestic water supply for Grizzly Flats. Any action significant enough to truly make a change in the future trajectory of forest conditions and reduce the risk of large, high intensity wildfires on a landscape basis may have short-term unwanted effects. I am sensitive to these concerns and I have considered the question of not only how much treatment is too much, but conversely, at what point a planned treatment level is too little to actually change fire behavior and improve forest health on a landscape basis. I must balance predicted risks and expected benefits.

The risks associated with large, high intensity wildfire are apparent to me. Large wildfires regularly occur on the Eldorado National Forest or adjacent to the forest, and there is ample evidence of the adverse resource impacts caused by large high-intensity fires like the King, Butte, Sand, Fred's, Power, Cleveland, Wrights, Ice House, Pilliken, and others that have burned over the last half century. Wildland fire suppression crews are experiencing more extreme fire behavior in places, like the Trestle project area, where forest fuels have accumulated for decades. The fuel reduction activities proposed in Alternative 5 are designed to moderate fire behavior in treated stands, reduce the rate and extent of spread of high intensity fire, and provide more areas where fire crews can safely fight fire.

Large wildfires affect other resources in variable and complex ways. While I understand that a

healthy forest includes some high intensity burns and that conditions following large intense fires may, for example, favor some species (e.g. those that need early seral vegetation or dead trees), many of the adverse resource impacts are not easily mitigated or repaired once they have occurred. Adverse impacts to watersheds, wildlife habitat, human safety, infrastructure and the many other environmental benefits of a healthy forest can persist for decades or centuries. It is preferable to minimize the risk of large scale, high intensity fires or to moderate their intensity by reducing fuel loads in individual stands and limiting their spread across the landscape by implementing these types of vegetation treatments.

I have also seen the effects of large mortality events from bark beetle impacting the Sierra Nevada mixed conifer forests, the scale of which resulted from both the multi-year drought and overly-dense forests created by years of fire exclusion and lack of treatments. I have watched as the wave of tree mortality has moved from the southern Sierras northward toward the Trestle area. There are currently more than 100 million dead conifer trees across the Sierra Nevada, and it is important to me to see this landscape treated to a level that it can be resilient to beetle attacks during future droughts and not end up in the same situation as many forested areas to the south of the project area.

I considered how each alternative addresses the purpose and need and responds to the significant issues brought forward by the public. Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) meets the purpose and need yet doesn't respond to the public concerns related to impacts to the California spotted owl and in some areas does not provide for the most efficient or effective treatments. Alternative 4 reduces the environmental impacts on the California spotted owl, but excludes efficient and effective treatment of some high priority areas that are needed to make stands more resilient to fire and drought, making this alternative less effective at moderating the fire and other risks in the project landscape. Alternative 5 provides the most balanced approach to address the purpose and need and best addresses concerns raised by the public.

Alternative 5 was developed with input from local community groups, environmental organizations, and industry groups. The Forest met with local fire safe council representatives, local home owners, and members of industry and environmental groups to develop Alternative 5 collaboratively both on the ground and in an office setting. Treatments in this alternative were designed to better protect both the community and important habitat for owls, and to better provide for a resilient landscape. Where concerns were identified for California spotted owl as a result of treatment impacts, owl territories were looked at on a case by case basis using available habitat, history of occupancy, and risk of dispersal to determine and balance trade-offs in increased risk of loss of territorial occupancy with need to protect the community and provide for a healthy, resilient forest on this landscape. Impacts to owls were reduced to the extent that tradeoffs to the ability to modify fire behavior and forest health were not compromised on the landscape or in key positions for fire management, while still providing a higher potential for continued owl occupancy in territories that are important on the landscape.

I recognize that fire, while being a potential threat to the community and desired conditions on this landscape under some conditions, is also an important component of the resilience and health of these ecosystems. This decision includes not only follow-up prescribed burning where mechanical treatments occur, but also builds on those treatments and includes prescribed fire as the primary treatment on a large portion of this landscape. Prescribed burn units were identified as "first priority" and "opportunity" in recognition that prescribed fire treatments across a large

portion of this landscape are not feasible within the shorter timeframe that is desired to meet fuels reduction objectives. While it is my goal to implement prescribed fire over a larger area of this landscape as opportunities and funding allow, Alternative 5 prioritizes initial prescribed fire treatments in the project on 970 acres that do not rely on the implementation of mechanical treatments prior to burning, are in important positions for accomplishing fuel treatments, and, I believe, represent a reasonable amount of acres to treat within the next several years to meet the objectives for those areas of the project.

My selection of Alternative 5 took into consideration the following tradeoffs concerning the purpose and need:

- Alternative 5 treats 2,967 acres of strategically placed landscape area treatments (SPLATs), 6,397 acres of the Wildland-Urban Intermix (WUI), and 3,295 acres within the Grizzly Flat Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP). Surface fuel loadings and ladder fuels would be reduced on these acres, reducing flame lengths to below 4 feet during 90th percentile weather. Untreated acres would remain in their current condition and susceptible to a high severity fire event.
- At the landscape level, Alternative 5 is comparable to Alternative 2 (Proposed Action). While approximately 1,383 fewer acres of mechanical and hand treatments would occur, the location of the reduced acreage is in proximity to the large areas where mechanical understory treatments and prescribed fire activities are still planned. Therefore, at the landscape level, Alternative 5 would efficiently reduce the spread and intensity of a wildfire within the project area and is more effective than Alternative 4.
- Alternative 5 would result in an increase in stand vigor, a reduction in stand density, and a reduction in risk of disturbance on 4,869 acres where thinning (mechanical and hand thinning within natural stands and plantations) would occur. Untreated acres would remain in their current condition and at risk of mortality from competition for resources.
- Alternative 5 would protect, increase, and perpetuate old forest ecosystem habitat components by protecting large trees and important habitat structures, such as down logs and snags. Development of these habitat components would be increased on 462 acres of plantation stands.
- Alternative 5 improves access and reduces sediment delivery from roads by reconstructing approximately 70 miles of roads in the project area. A fairly extensive network of roads exists in the project area, and many are in a suitable condition or need only minor maintenance in order to implement project activities. Alternative 5 also obliterates approximately 4 miles of roads not open to public use and identified as causing negative watershed impacts and not needed for administrative access.
- Alternative 5 will implement the watershed restoration activities associated with dispersed camping, road, and trails at 17 locations within the project area, which would maintain sustainable recreation opportunities, while also reducing impacts to soils and watershed conditions.

In addition to considering the tradeoffs associated with meeting the purpose and need, I considered how the alternatives addressed the significant issues brought forward by the public.

- **Issue:** the proposed action may have significant negative effects on the California spotted owl population due to treatment of high quality habitat coupled with declining population trends in the area.

Alternative 4 and 5 were developed to address this issue. The emphasis of Alternative 5 is to take a more conservative approach to treatment activities to minimize impacts to California spotted owl habitat while still providing for a more effective treatment near the community and in key locations across the landscape to provide for increased implementation feasibility. The selection of treatment areas under this alternative is a reflection of the effort to balance the desirability of late-seral wildlife habitat improvement, forest health and stand density, and fuels reduction.

Of the 15,441 acres of suitable habitat available within the project area for California spotted owl, commercial mechanical thinning treatments under Alternative 5 would affect approximately 3,184 acres of suitable habitat. As compared to the Alternative 2 (Proposed Action), Alternative 5 would reduce impacts on 660 acres of high quality habitat (CWHR size class 4 and 5 with $\geq$ 70% canopy cover) of California spotted owl HRCAs by eliminating commercial mechanical thinning treatments within these areas under this alternative. In addition, Alternative 5 reduces commercial mechanical thinning treatments by eliminating approximately 392 acres of high quality habitat within 0.7 miles of spotted owl activity centers.

While Alternative 4 further reduces the acres of high quality spotted owl habitat affected by commercial mechanical thinning, I did not select Alternative 4 because this alternative was less effective at modifying the wildfire risk or improving forest health across the landscape. I did not select Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) because of the potential to increase the risk of reducing occupancy and use of territories by spotted owls.

- **Issue:** Project may not be operationally feasible due to economic considerations.

Alternative 5 is expected to generate $1,106,122 in estimated timber revenues, which is $349,319 less than Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) and $317,024 more than Alternative 4. The $1,106,122 would accomplish about 82% of the $1,349,324 of other costs, directly associated with the mechanical vegetation treatment units. Approximately $243,000 would need allocated funding or grants to accomplish the work.

Funds to accomplish hand thinning, prescribed burning, or the restoration activities associated with dispersed recreation, roads, and trails would need allocated funding and grants to accomplish this work.

Prescribed burning is expected to cost over $3,000,000, but will be implemented over the next 10 to 15 years. Implementing burning within the “first priority” prescribed burn units would cost approximately $270,000 and is expected to be implemented within the next 5 years.

The Trestle Forest Health Project EIS documents the analysis and conclusions upon which this decision is based.

DRAFT

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

A Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register on March 4, 2013 (78 FR 14072). In addition, the project has been listed in the Eldorado National Forest Schedule of Proposed Actions since 2011, and updated periodically during the environmental analysis. Public scoping was initiated by sending approximately 45 individuals, organizations, and government agencies a project specific scoping notice in March, 2013. During public scoping, the Eldorado National Forest also held a collaborative meeting with members of the public, industry groups, and environmental organizations interested in the project.

Two significant issues were identified during the scoping process that drove the development of additional alternatives: 1) the potential for the proposed action to negatively affect California spotted owl due to the treatment of high quality habitat combined with the declining population trends in the area; and 2) the potential that the project may not be operationally feasible due to economic considerations. A full description of issues significant to the proposed action is found in the FEIS on pages 16-17. Public input received during office meetings and field visits 2014 were used to finalize the alternatives. A collaborative process with input from local community groups, environmental organizations, and industry groups was used to develop Alternative 5, as described under the Background section above.

The 45-day comment period on the Trestle Forest Health Project DEIS began with publication of the Notice of Availability (NOA) in the Federal Register on July 17, 2015. A letter announcing the availability of the DEIS was sent to 56 individuals, organizations, and government agencies, including federally recognized tribal governments. In addition, a legal notice was published in the Mountain Democrat on July 20, 2015 describing the opportunity to comment during the 45-day comment period. In response to the Forest's request for comments, 12 letters were received from individuals and organizations. The response to public comments can be found in Appendix D of the FEIS.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

In addition to the selected alternative, I considered three other alternatives, which are discussed below. Alternative 4 is the environmentally preferred alternative with respect to minimizing the short-term impacts to California spotted owl. A more detailed description of these alternatives can be found in the FEIS on pages 18-24.

Alternative 1 (No Action) – Current management would continue and none of the activities proposed would take place. No actions would be implemented to address the project purpose and need.

Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) – The proposed action includes a combination of commercial mechanical thinning (ground-based and skyline harvest systems) within natural stands and plantations (4,444 acres within natural stands; 418 acres within plantations), non-commercial mechanical thinning (25 acres within plantations), hand thinning within natural stands (1,492 acres), and prescribed burning as follow-up and initial treatment (9,583 acres as initial/primary treatment) to reduce fuel loads and stand densities, road reconstruction (84.1 miles), and restoration of dispersed recreation sites, roads, trails, and abandoned mines (17 locations).

Alternative 4 – Compared to Alternative 2 (Proposed Action), vegetation treatments in Alternative 4 were modified to lower the risk of reducing owl occupancy and use of individual territories. As compared to the Alternative 2 (Proposed Action), Alternative 4:

- Reduced commercial mechanical thinning by 2,140 fewer acres within natural stands and increase commercial thinning in 13 acres within plantations;
- Increased non-commercial thinning by 53 additional acres within natural stands;
- Reduced hand thinning by 369 fewer acres;
- Increased prescribed burning as primary treatment by 3,012 acres;
- Reduced road reconstruction by approximately 20 miles;
- The restoration activites would be the same as the proposed action.

Environmentally Preferred Alternative

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing NEPA require the ROD specify "the alternative or alternatives which were considered to be environmentally preferable" [40 CFR 1505.2(b)]. This alternative has generally been interpreted to be the alternative that will promote the national environmental policy in NEPA's section 101. This is ordinarily "the alternative that causes the least harm to the biological and physical environment; it is also the alternative which best protects and preserves historic, cultural, and natural resources." (36 CFR 220.3)

Alternative 4 could be considered the environmentally preferred alternative with respect to minimizing the short-term impacts to California spotted owl. This alternative would have the least impact from commercial mechanical thinning treatments within high quality suitable spotted owl habitat. However, in the long-term, this alternative could have more impact since it is less effective at promoting forest health and resiliency, leaving more of the project landscape at risk for insect and disease and wildland fire, both of which could affect late-seral habitat components important for California spotted owl.

Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations

This decision is consistent with the Eldorado National Forest Land Management Plan as amended by the 2004 Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment.

National Environmental Policy Act

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) requires that all major federal actions significantly affecting the human environment be analyzed to determine the magnitude and intensity of those impacts and that the results be shared with the public and the public given opportunity to comment. The regulations implementing NEPA further require that to the fullest extent possible, agencies shall prepare EISs concurrently with and integrated with environmental analyses and related surveys and studies required by the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and other environmental review laws and executive

orders. Other laws and regulations that apply to this project are described below.

Clean Air Act

The Clean Air Act of 1970 provides for the protection and enhancement of the nation's air resources. No exceeding of the federal and state ambient air quality standards is expected to result from any of the alternatives. The Clean Air Act makes it the primary responsibility of States and local governments to prevent air pollution and control air pollution at its source. California has a plan that provides for implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of the primary ambient air quality standards. This project is located in an area designated as non-attainment for Ozone. The prescribed burn treatments under Alternative 5 will be conducted under an EPA approved California Smoke Management Program (SMP).

Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act of 1948 (as amended in 1972 and 1987) establishes federal policy for the control of point and non-point pollution, and assigns the states the primary responsibility for control of water pollution. The Clean Water Act regulates the dredging and filling of freshwater and coastal wetlands. Section 404 (33 USC 1344) prohibits the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters (including wetlands) of the United States without first obtaining a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Wetlands are regulated in accordance with federal Non-Tidal Wetlands Regulations (Sections 401 and 404). No dredging or filling is part of this project and no permits are required.

Compliance with the Clean Water Act by national forests in California is achieved under state law. The California Water Code consists of a comprehensive body of law that incorporates all state laws related to water, including water rights, water developments, and water quality. The laws related to water quality (sections 13000 to 13485) apply to waters on the national forests and are directed at protecting the beneficial uses of water. Of particular relevance for the Trestle Forest Health project is section 13369, which deals with non-point-source pollution and best management practices. As described in the EIS (Chapter 3), all actions in Alternative 5 result in the maintenance of the applicable beneficial uses of water in the Water Quality Control Plan for the California Central Valley Water Quality Control Board.

Endangered Species Act

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 USC 1531 et seq.) requires that any action authorized by a federal agency not be likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a threatened or endangered species, or result in the destruction or adverse modification of the critical habitat of such species. Section 7 of the ESA, as amended, requires the responsible federal agency to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) concerning endangered and threatened species under their jurisdiction.

The Biological Assessments and evaluations for botany, terrestrial wildlife, and aquatic wildlife

species finds that Alternative 5 will have “no effect” on Layne’s butterweed, Valley elderberry longhorn beetle, California red-legged frog, Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog, Yosemite toad, Lahontan cutthroat trout, Central Valley spring-run chinook salmon, Sacramento winter-run chinook salmon, and Delta smelt. Based upon this finding, no consultation with the USFWS is required.

National Forest Management Act

The National Forest Management Act (NFMA) of 1976 amends the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 and sets forth the requirements for Land and Resource Management Plans for the National Forest System.

The Forest Service completed the Eldorado National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) in 1989, and subsequently amended by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Record of Decision in 2004. The Forest Plan identifies land allocations and management areas within the project area.

The Forest Plan and its amendments were prepared pursuant to the 1982 version of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) planning regulations (36 C.F.R. § 219 (1983)). The current regulations, adopted in 2012 supersede those regulations, as well as other versions of the NFMA planning regulations (36 C.F.R. § 219.17(c) “This part supersedes any prior planning regulation.”). The current NFMA planning regulations do not apply to this project (36 C.F.R. § 219.7(c) “None of the requirements of this part apply to projects or activities on units with plans developed or revised under a prior planning rule …”). Therefore, the sole NFMA duty applicable to this project is for the project to be consistent with the governing Forest Plan.

I have determined that Alternative 5 is consistent with the Forest Plan and all other requirements of the National Forest Management Act.

National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 is the principal, guiding statute for the management of cultural resources on NFS lands. Section 106 of NHPA requires federal agencies to consider the potential effects of a Preferred Alternative on historic, architectural, or archaeological resources that are eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places and to afford the President’s Advisory Council on Historic Preservation an opportunity to comment. The criteria for National Register eligibility and procedures for implementing Section 106 of NHPA are outlined in the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations (36 CFR Parts 60 and 800, respectively). Section 110 requires federal agencies to identify, evaluate, inventory, and protect National Register of Historic Places resources on properties they control.
This project complies with the Programmatic Agreement among the USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region (Region 5), the California State Historic Preservation Officer, the Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Processes for Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation

Act for Management of Historic Properties by the National Forests of the Pacific Southwest Region (Region 5 PA) (USDA FS 2013). The procedures and stipulations within the Region 5 Programmatic Agreement include the identification and treatment of at-risk historic properties. An "at-risk" historic property is a cultural resource site that has been identified as susceptible to being adversely affected as a result of activities associated with this project. An adverse effect to a cultural resource site is found when an undertaking may alter the characteristics of an historic property that qualify it for inclusion in the NRHP or in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. [36 CFR 800.5(a)(1)]. A property is identified as "at-risk" based on that property's characteristics, proximity to project activities, types of project activities, and landscape features

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW (OBJECTION) OPPORTUNITIES

This proposed decision is subject to objection pursuant to 36 CFR 218, Subparts A and B. Objections will only be accepted from those who submitted project-specific written comments during scoping or the designated comment period on the Draft EIS. Issues raised in objections must be based on previously submitted comments unless based on new information arising after the designated comment period(s).

Objections must be submitted within 45 days following the publication of this legal notice in the Mountain Democrat. The date of this legal notice is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an objection. Those wishing to object should not rely upon dates or timeframes provided by any other source. It is the objector's responsibility to ensure evidence of timely receipt (36 CFR 218.9).

Objections must be submitted to the reviewing officer: Randy Moore, Regional Forester, USDA Forest Service; Attn: Trestle Forest Health Project; 1323 Club Drive, Vallejo, CA 94592. Objections may be submitted via mail, FAX (707-562-9229), or delivered during business hours (M-F 8:00am to 4:00pm). Electronic objections, in common (.doc, .pdf, .rtf, .txt) formats, may be submitted to: objections-pacificsouthwest-regional-office@fs.fed.us with Subject: Trestle Forest Health Project.

Objections must include [36 CFR 218.8(d)]: 1) name, address and telephone; 2) signature or other verification of authorship; 3) identify a single lead objector when applicable; 4) project name, Responsible Official name and title, and name of affected National Forest(s) and/or Ranger District(s); 5) reasons for, and suggested remedies to resolve, your objections; and, 6) description of the connection between your objections and your prior comments. Documents may be incorporated by reference only, as provided for at 36 CFR 218.8(b).

IMPLEMENTATION DATE

If no objection is filed on the project, a Record of Decision may be issued on, but not before, the fifth business day following the close of the objection filing period (36 CFR 218.21). If an objection to this decision is filed in accordance with 36 CFR 218.26, then this Record of

Decision may not be signed until all concerns and instructions from the reviewing official in the objection response have been addressed [36 CFR 218.12 (b)].

The Record of Decision may not be signed until at least 30 days after publication of the Notice of Availability of the FEIS is published in the Federal Register [40 CFR 1506.10 (b)].

After the decision is signed, implementation may begin immediately.

CONTACT

For additional information concerning this decision, contact: Jennifer Marsolais, Forest Environmental Coordinator, Eldorado National Forest, 100 Forni Road, Placerville, California, 95667; jennifermarsolais@fs.fed.us or 530-642-5187.

LAURENCE CRABTREE Date

Forest Supervisor

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at http://www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint_filing_cust.html and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov.

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer and lender.