



# Terror Creek Applied Silvicultural Assessment

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF  
AGRICULTURE

FOREST  
SERVICE

ROCKY MOUNTAIN  
REGION

GRAND MESA,  
UNCOMPAHGRE and  
GUNNISON  
NATIONAL FOREST

COLORADO

## Decision Memo

Paonia Ranger District  
Delta County, Colorado

June 2008



**For Information Contact: Carol McKenzie**

Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison National Forests

2250 Highway 50

Delta, CO 8146

970-874-6618

**For Information Visit:** [www.fs.fed.us/r2/gmug/](http://www.fs.fed.us/r2/gmug/)

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. (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 USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

## Background

In Colorado, aspen is the dominant forest cover on 2,635,000 acres. In 2007, Forest Health Management aerial surveys documented approximately 12.8% of Colorado's aspen stands to have rapid crown dieback and stem mortality occurring. Within the Terror Creek area these aerial surveys documented approximately 32% or 4,300 acres of the aspen cover on National Forest System land in a state of rapid decline.

This rapid decline in aspen is attributed, in part, to the following group of biotic agents: Cytospora stem canker (usually caused by the fungus *Valsa sordida*), aspen bark beetles (*Trypophloeus populi* and *Procryphalus mucronatus*), poplar borer (*Saperda calcarata*), and bronze poplar borer (*Agrilus liragus*), all of which typically affect stressed trees (Worrall et al., 2007). Recently this type of rapid decline in aspen has been termed "Sudden Aspen Decline" (SAD) to distinguish it from other types of aspen declines attributed to fire exclusion and the associated succession of conifer species, and extreme browsing pressure from large ungulates like deer and elk (Romme et al., 1995; Kay, 1997; Bartos, 2001; Ripple and Larsen, 2000; Kulakowski et al., 2004; Kaye et al., 2005; Smith and Smith, 2005).

Aspen typically regenerates by profuse root suckering following a disturbance. It is not uncommon to have aspen clones produce tens of thousands of suckers per hectare following clearfell harvesting (Shepperd 1993). Uncut, intact aspen stands typically have about 2,500 suckers per hectare in southwestern Colorado (Crouch, 1983). In stands with heavy mortality attributed to SAD, Worrall et al. (2007) found sucker densities at or below the range typical of uncut stands, indicating that there has been little to no suckering response to the overstory mortality. This lack of a suckering response raises questions regarding the root condition of SAD-impacted stands and their ability to regenerate. Shepperd et al. (2001) found that the root systems of non-regenerating aspen do decline when the clones do not periodically self regenerate. If root system mortality is also occurring in stands affected by SAD, entire aspen clones could be lost in a short amount of time since initially it appears that self regeneration is not occurring. However, if aspen could be stimulated to sucker before all overstory stems are lost, clones might survive.

The potential loss of aspen clones in some aspen dominated landscapes, like the Terror Creek area, could be quite profound to aspen ecosystems and local economies. Aspen has long been recognized for its rich diversity of understory plant species and diversity of bird and mammal habitats. Aspen is also extremely important to many local economies for its scenic value, production of forage for domestic livestock, production of wood products and water absorption capacity for downstream domestic and agricultural purposes. If affected aspen clones are to persist on the landscape then intensive management activities may be needed to induce a more severe disturbance and initiate a sprouting response from the remaining "healthy" portions of the clone.

## Purpose and Need

The purpose and need of this project is to conduct an applied silvicultural assessment to determine aspen sprouting response and survival following clearcut harvesting of aspen stands with varying levels of crown dieback and mortality attributed to SAD; and, based on results, develop management guidelines to prioritize aspen stands for treatment.

An applied silvicultural assessment means “any vegetative or other treatment carried out for information gathering and research purposes”, as defined in the Healthy Forest Restoration Act (HFRA), HR 1904, Title IV Insect Infestation and Related Diseases, Section 404.

## **Decision**

I have decided to implement the Terror Creek Applied Silvicultural Assessment as described in the attached study plan: Applied Silvicultural Assessment: Quaking Aspen Affected by Sudden Aspen Decline in Southwestern Colorado.

Specifically, the study plan involves clearcut harvesting on National Forest System lands administered by the Paonia Ranger District, Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison (GMUG) National Forests. A total of nine treatment units will be selected for inclusion in the study. This will be a paired study in that stands selected for treatment will be split, so that one portion will be randomly selected for clearcut harvest treatment and another will remain untreated. Stands proposed for treatment will be stratified into three categories of crown dieback and mortality (0-20%, 20-60% and 60+ %). Preliminary identification of candidate stands has been completed using 2007 aerial photos of the Terror Creek area and insect and disease aerial survey data from 2007, 2006 and 2005 (Map 2). Field verification will follow to obtain final stand selections that meet the study criteria. The acreage to be clearcut within each treatment shall not exceed 40 acres. The maximum amount of area that is approved for clearcut harvesting is 360 acres.

Timber will be harvested using ground-based logging systems. The Terror Creek area is well roaded with open and closed system roads, including National Forest System Roads (NFSR) 701, 701.3B, 701.3C, 701.3E, 703, 703.1A, 701.3A, and 705.1A. No new specified road construction or road reconstruction will occur. If closed roads are utilized to access potential treatment units then these roads will be reclosed by the timber sale purchaser. Potentially ½ mile of temporary roads will be needed to access the two eastern-most units identified as potential treatment units (Map 2). These temporary roads would of course only be necessary if the two units involved are selected for treatment by meeting the design criteria necessary to complete the silvicultural assessment. Both roads would be extensions of existing roads in the area. Both roads would be obliterated after use by restoring the contour, scattering slash material over the site, reseeding and assuring adequate long-term drainage.

The timber sale associated with Terror Creek Applied Silvicultural Assessment would follow established procedures regarding protection of soil, water, wildlife and other resources as required in the Forest Plan, Watershed Conservation Practices Handbook and standard timber sale contract provisions. Additional design features not covered in these documents are as follows:

### Wildlife

- Goshawk surveys will be conducted each spring before logging starts.
- If a goshawk nest is discovered then a 30-acre no-harvest buffer will be provided. No activities shall be allowed within ¼ mile of an active northern goshawk nest from March 1 to July 31 if they will cause nesting failure or abandonment (Forest Plan standard and

guideline). No more than 25% of the post fledging area around the nest will be disturbed until August 30.

- Logging operations will be prohibited from April 1 to June 15.

#### Roads, Travel Management and Recreation

- Winter hauling and snowplowing may be permitted so that treatment units within the same replication can be reasonably harvested in the same year thus reducing variation of research results due to differing site conditions between harvest years. The winter haul route will be on Stevens Gulch Road (NFSR 701) which is also a designated snowmobile trail. Colorado state law prohibits the use of snowmobiles on roads open to wheeled traffic. To comply with this law, the Stevens Gulch snowmobile trailhead will be relocated further up the road to Windy Point and the Forest Service will issue a closure order for snowmobile use on the plowed section of the Stevens Gulch Road up to Windy Point. Other restrictions that will apply if winter hauling and snowplowing were approved are:
  - The purchaser/contractor will be responsible for posting signs along the Stevens Gulch Road advising the public of closure restrictions.
  - The purchaser/contractor will be required to maintain access to the Windy Point snowmobile trailhead during operations. If snowplowing operations create berms that block access to the snowmobile trail then the purchaser/contractor will be required to remove the berms so that snowmobile riders can safely enter and exit the trail.
  - The Stevens Gulch Road will be plowed to its full width or turn outs plowed open so that public vehicles and log trucks could safely pass.
  - Log hauling and snowplowing will not be allowed on the following dates to avoid conflicts and safety concerns during periods of heavy winter recreational traffic:
    - \* All day Thanksgiving Day, the following Friday, Saturday, and Sunday.
    - \* All day December 24 through January 1.
    - \* Friday, Saturday and Sunday of the annual Snowmobile Poker Run held generally on the second weekend in February.
- To avoid conflicts with hunter use in the area, log hauling will not be allowed on Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday of the opening weekends of the muzzleloader season, the first big game rifle season and the second big game rifle season.

#### Silviculture and Slash Treatment

- Recent ( $\leq 5$  years) standing dead aspen will be required to be removed.
- Treatment replications will be grouped into one payment unit under the timber sale contract. The purchaser/contractor will be required to harvest an entire payment unit prior to opening the next payment unit. The purchaser/contractor will be required to harvest payment units in the same operating season.
- Tops and limbs will be lopped and scattered in harvest units to a maximum depth of 24 inches.
- Stumps will be cut to a maximum height of 12 inches.

- No more than 30% of the ground surface will be covered in large cull logs. Excessive amounts of cull logs will be piled at landings. A minimum of 10 to 20 tons per acre of large cull logs will be scattered through the harvest units.
- In order to control big-game browsing pressure that may influence aspen sucker survival, temporary big-game fences will be constructed around harvest units.

### Noxious Weeds

- The timber sale purchaser/contractor will not move any “Off-Road Equipment”, which last operated in an area that is infested with one or more invasive species of concern onto the timber sale area without having first taken reasonable measures to make sure each such piece of equipment is free of soil, seeds, vegetative matter, or other debris that could contain or hold seeds.
- The purchaser/contractor will seed exposed areas of raw soil as designated by the Forest Service. Certified weed-free seed will be used. The seed mix will be prescribed by a Forest Service Range Management Specialist.
- The sale area will be surveyed and treated for noxious weeds in the second and third years after logging is completed.

### **Reasons for Categorical Exclusion**

My decision occurs under the authority of the Healthy Forest Restoration Act (HFRA), HR 1904, Title IV Insect Infestation and Related Diseases, Section 404. Section 404(d)(1) of the Act provides for categorically excluding from documentation in an environmental impact statement and environmental assessment under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, applied silvicultural assessments and research treatments carried out under this section. The environmental analysis is subject to the extraordinary circumstances procedures established by the Secretary pursuant to section 1508.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

A proposed action may be categorically excluded from further analysis and documentation in an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment only if there are no extraordinary circumstances related to the proposed action. The mere presence of one or more of these resource conditions does not preclude use of a categorical exclusion. It is (1) the existence of a cause-effect relationship between a proposed action and the potential effect on these resource conditions and (2) if such a relationship exists, the degree of the potential effects of a proposed action on these resource conditions that determines whether extraordinary circumstances exist.

Based on my review of the analysis in the project file and the rationale described below, I have determined that this is an action with no associated extraordinary circumstances, which have a significant effect on the human environment. Further analysis and documentation in an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement is not warranted.

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

Federally listed species - There is only one federally listed terrestrial species that has the potential to be found in the project area, the Canada lynx. Implementation of the project “may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect” the Canada lynx. The “may affect” is based on the potential loss of “other foraging” habitat if SAD impacted aspen stands do not regenerate. Other impacts such as disturbance during denning or increased mortality risk are insignificant and discountable due to the distance of the project from suitable denning habitat, and the low probability of loss of lynx from traffic or incidental shooting as a result of this project.

Other species considered in the Biological Assessment are black footed ferret, yellow-billed cuckoo, clay-loving wild buckwheat, and Uinta Basin hookless cactus. As these species do not occur in the project area and no habitat for them will be impacted by the project, these species were not further analyzed in the Biological Assessment. These species would all have no effect determinations.

There is one federally listed aquatic species present in the project area. Greenback cutthroat trout are present downstream of treatment units. Effects to greenback cutthroat trout are the same as those disclosed for the Colorado River cutthroat trout. Implementation of the project “may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect” greenback cutthroat trout. Other aquatic threatened or engendered species are not present in the analysis area. Since water depletions will not occur with the proposed project there will be “no effect” to Colorado pikeminnow, razorback sucker, bonytail chub, and humpback chub.

Sensitive species - Potential effects of this action on sensitive species have been analyzed and documented in Biological Evaluations. There are several terrestrial sensitive species that are or are potentially present in the project area (pygmy shrew, American marten, Northern goshawk, boreal owl, flammulated owl, olive-sided flycatcher, purple marten, boreal toad, Northern leopard frog). For these species the Terror Creek Applied Silvicultural Assessment “may adversely impact individuals,” but is “not likely to result in a loss of viability in the Planning area, nor cause a trend toward federal listing.” There is one aquatic sensitive species that is present in the project area: Colorado River cutthroat trout (CRCT). The Terror Creek Applied Silvicultural Assessment “may adversely impact individuals,” but is “not likely to result in a loss of viability in the Planning area, nor cause a trend toward federal listing” for CRCT. None of the sensitive plant species that are present on the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison National Forests are known or expected to occur in the Terror Creek project area and they will not be affected by the project.

b. Flood plains, wetlands, or municipal watersheds

No flood plains, wetlands, or municipal watersheds have been identified within treatment units or within the project area. Treatment units will not be within 100 feet

of perennial and intermittent stream courses as per Watershed Conservation Handbook (WCP) measures and design criteria (WCP Handbook 2509.25, Chapter 10, 12.1).

c. Congressionally designated areas, such as wilderness, wilderness study areas, or national recreation areas

The project area and treatment units do not occur in any congressionally designated area.

d. Inventoried roadless areas

Portions of the Terror Creek area are within the 1979 Priest Mountain Inventoried Roadless Area (IRA) (Map 3). The Forest Service is currently directed to manage these lands according to the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule, known as the "Roadless Rule". The Roadless Rule specifies that a road may not be constructed or reconstructed in IRAs except under specified conditions. No roads will be constructed or reconstructed in the Priest Mountain IRA to access treatment units so the road construction restrictions listed in the Roadless Rule (36 CFR 294.12 (2001)) have been met. Timber harvesting in an IRA is required to meet the circumstances described under 36 CFR 294 paragraph 13(b) and one of the circumstances described in paragraphs 36 CFR 294 13(b)(1) through (b)(4). The Terror Creek project is consistent with the Roadless Rule because the cutting and removal of designated timber is expected to be infrequent (36 CFR 294 13(b)). Harvesting will occur over a very short time period (1 to 2 years) and there are no other future proposals to harvest timber within Priest Mountain IRA. The cutting and removal of timber will only occur in the substantially altered portion of the Priest Mountain IRA (36 CFR 294 13(b)(4)).

Public comments received during the scoping period has been varied regarding the determination that portions of the Priest Mountain IRA have been substantially altered by past management activities (see Response to Comments). The Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.14(c), specifies that this subpart (the Rule) does not revoke, suspend or modify any project or activity decision made prior to January 12, 2001. Prior to the 2001 Roadless Rule, the GMUG National Forest issued two NEPA decisions where it was determined that the Terror Creek (also referred to as Cunningham Creek) area of the Priest Mountain IRA had been substantially modified. These decisions are the 1991 Terror Creek Second Decade Vegetation Treatment Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact and the 1993 Oil and Gas Leasing Final Environmental Impact Statement Record of Decision. In addition to these two decisions, the GMUG National Forest has recently analyzed its inventory of roadless/undeveloped lands as a part of the Forest Plan Revision. This roadless analysis indicates that 14,193 acres within the Priest Mountain IRA have been altered from road construction, timber harvest, water developments and water transmission lines. This altered area primarily lies within the Terror Creek project area.

In response to public comments, an additional roadless analysis has been completed for the Terror Creek Applied Silvicultural Assessment area that compares the roadless characteristics listed in the Roadless Rule (36 CFR 294.11) to the existing resource conditions in the project area. The findings from this analysis are consistent with the previous NEPA decisions. I reaffirm these previous decisions: Within the Priest

Mountain IRA, approximately 4,847 acres bounded by the following features (Map 4): National Forest boundary with private land on the south, Priest Mountain IRA boundary on the east, the 6<sup>th</sup> order watershed boundary between Terror Creek and Alder Creek on the north, and Overland Ditch on the north and on the west, have been substantially altered from past management activities. Additional harvesting within this area does not constitute an extraordinary effect on roadless characteristics since these characteristics have previously been altered.

e. Research natural areas

The project area and treatment units do not occur in a Research Natural Area.

f. American Indian and Alaska Native religious or cultural sites

The area has been inventoried for cultural properties and sacred sites. No American Indian or Alaska Native religious or cultural sites were identified in the project area.

g. Archaeological sites, or historic properties or areas

The area has been inventoried for cultural properties and sacred sites. No archaeological sites or historic properties or areas were identified in the project area.

## Public Involvement

Identification of this proposal first appeared to the public in the January 2008 issue of the Forest's Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA). The SOPA is a quarterly publication that is posted to the forest internet site to notify the public of proposed actions.

The proposed Terror Creek Applied Silvicultural Assessment was provided to the public and other agencies for comment from February 5, 2008 through March 7, 2008. As part of the public involvement process, the agency published a Legal Notice "Scoping/Opportunity to Comment" in the Delta County Independent on February 6, 2008. A total of four comment letters were received during the public comment period. A "Response to Comments" has been prepared and is attached to this Decision Memo.

Based on public comments one additional meeting was held to discuss concerns raised about entering the altered portion of the Priest Mountain Inventoried Roadless Area. This meeting occurred on April 22, 2008.

## Findings Required by Other Laws

**Forest Plan Consistency:** The Terror Creek Applied Silvicultural Assessment is consistent with the overall management direction provided within the 1991 Forest Plan, as amended. Factors that were considered in determining whether this project is consistent with the Forest Plan are as follows:

1. The project responds directly to Forest Plan goals listed in Chapter III, pages 2 to 4. Specifically, the objective of the Terror Creek Applied Silvicultural Assessment is to determine aspen sprouting response and survival following clearcut harvesting of aspen stands with varying levels of crown dieback and mortality attributed to SAD; and, based on results, develop management guidelines to

prioritize aspen stands for treatment. Meeting this objective will assist the Forest in managing forest “vegetation in a manner to provide and maintain a healthy and vigorous ecosystem resistant to insects, diseases and other natural and human causes.” The planned activities will not detract from or jeopardize any of the Forest Plan goals.

2. The Terror Creek Applied Silvicultural Assessment is consistent with Forest Plan Management Direction, Standards and Guidelines, and with the following Management Area Prescriptions:

**4D: Aspen Management.** The management emphasis is to maintain or improve aspen and to provide wood fiber, wildlife habitat, visual quality and plant and animal diversity. The assessment is designed to develop management guidelines to prioritize aspen stands for future silvicultural treatments in order to maintain aspen. Wood fiber will be provided to local industries. Roaded natural recreation opportunities will not be affected by treatments. Livestock grazing is compatible with aspen management.

**9A: Riparian.** Riparian areas will not have timber harvested from within the Water Influence Zone (WIZ).

3. Timber harvest occurs on lands suited for timber production or occurs in areas where timber harvest is permitted and is necessary to help achieve other resource management objectives (1991 Forest Plan Map, Gunnison National Forest).
4. The silvicultural system of clearcut harvesting is consistent with the Forest Plan (Forest Plan page III-40).
5. The scope of analysis for management indicator species is determined by forest plan management direction, specifically, its standards and guidelines (Chapter II) and monitoring direction (Chapter IV). The GMUG National Forest’s Forest Plan (Forest Plan) establishes monitoring and evaluation requirements that employ both habitat capability relationships and, at the appropriate scale, population data. The analysis completed for this project examined how the project directly, indirectly and cumulatively affects selected MIS habitat and populations and how these local effects could influence Forest-wide habitat and population trends (Biological Assessment and Management Indicator Species Assessment for Terror Creek Applied Silvicultural Assessment). Further, the analysis indicates that the project contributes to meeting Forest Plan direction as it relates to MIS.

**National Forest Management Act Consistency:** The Terror Creek Applied Silvicultural Assessment will harvest timber from National Forest System lands. Under 16 U.S.C. 1604(g)(3)(E), I find that the project meets the following management requirements:

1. Soil, slope, or other watershed conditions will not be irreversibly damaged (resource reports filed in project record);
2. The Terror Creek area has a 20 year history of successful aspen management indicating that in the past aspen stands and site conditions were fully capable of regenerating new aspen stands following clearcut harvesting. Aspen stands are being affected by SAD and it is unknown if and to what stocking levels the SAD

affected aspen stands will regenerate. The purpose of the assessment is to determine aspen sprouting response and survival following clearcut harvesting of aspen stands with varying levels of crown dieback and mortality attributed to SAD.

3. Streams, streambanks, shorelines, lakes, wetlands, and other bodies of water are protected from detrimental changes in water temperatures, blockages of water courses, and deposits of sediment where harvests are likely to seriously and adversely affect water conditions or fish habitat (resource reports filed in the project record);
4. The harvesting system to be used was not selected primarily because it will give the greatest dollar return or the greatest unit output of timber and

Under 16 U.S.C. 1604 (g)(3)(F), I find that Alternative 1, meets the following requirements:

1. Clearcut harvests proposed for treating timbered stands are appropriate to meet the objectives and requirements of the Forest Plan (page III-40).
2. An interdisciplinary review has been completed and the potential environmental, biological, aesthetic, engineering, and economic impacts have been assessed on each timber sale area and the cutting methods are consistent with the multiple use of the general area (resource reports filed in the project record).
3. Cut blocks, patches or strips are shaped and blended to the extent practicable with the natural terrain (Maps in the project record).
4. Cuts will be carried out according to the maximum size limit requirements for areas to be cut during one harvest operation. Individual clearcut units will not exceed 40 acres.
5. Timber cuts will be carried out in a manner consistent with the protection of soil, watershed, fish, wildlife, recreation, esthetic resources, cultural and historic resources, and the regeneration of timber resources (resource reports filed in the project record).
6. Aspen stands proposed for harvest are affected by SAD and have increasing amounts of crown dieback and mortality. These aspen stands have met culmination of mean annual increment due to declining growth and increasing mortality.

**Endangered Species Act:** See the above section “Rationale for Categorical Exclusion under NEPA” and the discussion regarding “Federally listed threatened or endangered species or designated critical habitat, species proposed for Federal listing or proposed critical habitat, or Forest Service sensitive species.”

**Sensitive Species (Forest Service Manual 2670):** See the above section “Rationale for Categorical Exclusion under NEPA” and the discussion regarding “Federally listed threatened or endangered species or designated critical habitat, species proposed for Federal listing or proposed critical habitat, or Forest Service sensitive species”.

**Roadless Area Conservation, Final Rule 2001:** See the above section “Rationale for Categorical Exclusion under NEPA” and the discussion regarding inventoried roadless areas.

**Clean Water Act:** This Act is to restore and maintain the integrity of waters. The Forest Service complies with this Act by using Best Management Practices as detailed in Forest Service Handbook 2409.25: Watershed Conservation Practices. This decision incorporates Best Management practices to ensure protection of soil and water resources. These activities do not require application for permits.

**Wetlands (Executive Order 11990):** No wetlands are impacted by this project.

**Floodplains (Executive Order 11988):** No floodplains are impacted by this project.

**National Historic Preservation Act, Archaeological Resources protection Act, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act:** The area has been inventoried for cultural properties and sacred sites. No American Indian or Alaska Native religious or cultural sites were identified in the project area. No archaeological sites or historic properties or areas were identified in the project area.

**Environmental Justice (Executive Order 12898):** This Order requires consideration of whether projects would disproportionately impact minority or low-income populations. This decision complies with this Act. Public involvement occurred for this project, the results of which I have considered in making this decision. Public involvement did not identify any adversely impacted local minority or low-income populations. This decision is not expected to adversely impact minority or low-income populations.

## **Implementation Date**

If no appeal is received within the 45-day time period, implementation of this decision may begin on, but not before, the 5<sup>th</sup> business day following the close of the appeal-filing period.

## **Administrative Review or Appeal Opportunities**

This decision is subject to appeal by parties who expressed interest during the analysis process and prior to the close of the 30 day comment period.

A notice of appeal must be in writing and clearly state that it is a Notice of Appeal being filed pursuant to 36 CFR 215.7, and must meet all requirements of 36 CFR 215. Appeals must be filed within 45 days of the date of legal notice of this decision in the Delta County Independent.

The publication date of the legal notice in the Delta County Independent is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an appeal (36 CFR 215.15 (a)). Those wishing to appeal should not rely upon dates or timeframe information provided by any other source.

Appeals may be delivered by the following means:

<b>U.S. Postal Service delivery, delivery services or hand delivery</b> (Office hours are 8:00 to 4:30) Appeals Deciding Officer U.S.D.A., Forest Service Rocky Mountain Region 740 Simms Golden, Colorado 80401
<b>E-mail delivery</b> To: <a href="mailto:appeals-rocky-mountain-gmug@fs.fed.us">appeals-rocky-mountain-gmug@fs.fed.us</a>  (Electronic appeals must be in Microsoft Word, Word Perfect or plain text file format.)
<b>Facsimile delivery</b> (303) 275-5134

## Contact Person

For additional information concerning this decision, you may contact Carol McKenzie, at the Forest Headquarters Office, phone (970) 874-6694 or email [cmckenzie@fs.fed.us](mailto:cmckenzie@fs.fed.us).

My conclusion is based on information presented in this document and the entirety of the Project Record.

/s/ *Levi Broyles*

6/27/2008

*LEVI K. BROYLES*

*Date*

District Ranger, Paonia Ranger District