

Decision Notice
& Finding of No Significant Impact

Brock Cattle and Horse Allotment Environmental Assessment

USDA Forest Service
Walla Walla Ranger District, Umatilla National Forest
Union County, Oregon

Legal Land Description: T4N, R40E, Sections 29 & 32 Willamette Base and Meridian

Decision and Reasons for the Decision

Background

The Brock allotment as it exists today was established in 1997 and consists of 1,222 acres which are divided among two pastures; Transitory and Pearson. The allotment consists of intermingled private and National Forest System lands. The owner of the private land has waived management of their land to the Forest Service, to be managed in conjunction with Forest land and according to Forest management requirements and allotment objectives, as negotiated with the landowner. The allotment is located in Union County within the Umatilla National Forest with one permittee. Grazing in the general area began in the 1880's, and included both sheep and cattle. Allotment acreage, boundaries and number of pastures have changed many times over the years, as have the numbers and type of livestock. Sheep were last grazed on the allotment in 1966, and cattle use has varied between a high of 160 cow/calf pairs in 1951 to the current permitted 65 cow/calf pairs. Cattle numbers have varied during that time based on needs for resource protection, pastures being added or subtracted from the allotment, private land being added to the allotment, and due to timber being harvested on the forested acreage in the allotment, creating temporary forage until trees regrow and shade out forage species.

In 1998, cattle numbers were readjusted to what is currently permitted (65 cow/calf pairs under Term Grazing Permit, 16 cow/calf pairs under Private Land Grazing Permit).

The most recent Allotment Management Plan (AMP) was completed in 1978 and the allotment operates under functional Annual Operating Instructions (AOI). Two long term monitoring sites have been established, one in each pasture in upland areas. Recent monitoring at those sites indicate fair vegetation conditions but a static trend with respect to upland vegetation and concerns regarding longterm species composition and vigor. (EA Chapter 3, pp 36-39).

Purpose and Need

The purpose of this action is to implement direction in both the Forest Plan, as amended, and in Acts of Congress (described below) to provide grazing on National Forest System lands. This analysis will facilitate livestock management by providing more control in riparian areas; and provide more flexibility when drought, fire or other natural events occur that would necessitate changes in management.

The needs associated with this purpose are:

- The Rescission Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-19, Section 504) requires the Forest Service to identify all allotments requiring NEPA analysis, and to prepare and adhere to a schedule for conducting such analysis.
- The need to improve control of livestock resulting in better distribution, more controlled utilization of vegetation, and protection of other resources.
- The provision of a sustainable source of forage for livestock in the project area, thereby contributing to the local and regional agricultural economy.
- The Granger-Thye Act of 1950 (Public Law 81-478) created direction for National Forest System allotment management. The purpose of the Act was to establish controls and stewardship of the public land grazing resource. The act included such measures as authorization to issue grazing permits for terms up to 10 years; authorization to use grazing fee receipts for rangeland improvement; and the establishment of grazing advisory boards. The core of stewardship linked the use of public land to an established, local private landowner who would bring economic stability to local communities and create a sustainable level of production for both forage and wildlife habitat.
- Where consistent with other multiple use goals and objectives there is Congressional intent to allow grazing on suitable lands. (Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960, Wilderness Act of 1964, Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, National Forest Management Act of 1976).

The environmental assessment (EA) documents the analysis and comparison of two alternatives in addition to the Proposed Action (alternative 1): Current Management, also known as the No Action Alternative which continues grazing as it currently exists (Alternative 2), and the No Grazing Alternative, an alternative to discontinue livestock grazing entirely (Alternative 3).

Decision

After careful review of public comments, the environmental assessment, and analysis file, I have decided to implement Alternative 1 (Proposed Action) which is described on pages 2-18 thru 2-23 of the Brock Cattle and Horse Allotment Management Plan Environmental Assessment (EA). The current permitted number of livestock and season of use will continue to be authorized, but will be grazed using a different strategy than the one used currently. The Brock Allotment will be managed using a rotation grazing system. A maximum of 205 Head Months (HMs) will be grazed on the allotment annually under new term grazing and term private land permits. Temporary permits may be issued in future as resource conditions warrant, to authorize additional days on the allotment within the permitted dates, up to a combined permitted maximum of 308 HMs, on a year to year basis, provided desired resource conditions are being achieved. If progress towards desired streambank stability has not been achieved by the 5th year of implementing all other facets of this decision, as determined by the monitoring plan described in the Environmental Assessment, additional management actions may be implemented to move the allotment toward desired conditions. Those additional measures may consist of more stringent requirements that would include reduction in annual streambank trampling to no more than ten percent annually and may include construction of a riparian fence on NFS land to protect streambanks on Fry Meadow Creek in the Transitory Unit. No additional fence would be constructed on the private land portions of the allotment without the landowners permission.

SUMMARY OF THE SELECTED ALTERNATIVE

Tables 2-1 and 2-2 below are taken from Chapter 2 of the Environmental Assessment. Table 2-1 describes permitted annual livestock numbers and days within the allotment. The actual number of days can vary within the June 10 to October 15 dates, depending on forage utilization in key areas, weather and forage conditions but use would not occur outside those dates, nor exceed a total of 205 head months. Table 2-2 displays the actual distribution of grazing use on the allotment.

Table 2-1. Alternative 1. Proposed Permitted Use.

Brock Allotment	Cow/calf	Season of Use*		Head Months
		On Date	Off Date	
Term Grazing Permit	65	6/10	8/25	164
Private Land Permit	16	6/10	8/25	41

*Actual dates of use may vary but use would be limited to a maximum of 77 days within the 6/10 to 8/25 authorized season.

Table 2-2 – Proposed Distribution of Grazing Use

Pasture			Maximum Days in Unit*	Head Months
	Acres	c/c		
Transitory (FS)	599	81 (includes the 16 pair from private land permit)	39	104
Pearson (FS)	328	48	38	60
Pearson (Private)	295	33	38	41

The management requirements and mitigation measures listed in the Environmental Assessment, Tables 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3, and Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines will be implemented as part of the Selected Alternative.

Rationale for Decision

I selected Alternative 1 because it provides the best balance in meeting the purpose and need, achieving the objectives, and addressing the major issues. My rationale is based on the following:

The alternative meets the stated purpose for the project in that it would implement direction in the Forest Plan as amended and in Acts of Congress (as described in the EA) to provide grazing on National Forest System Lands.

The alternative also meets the needs associated with that purpose, which were stated above, in that:

- The Environmental Analysis (EA) for Brock allotment satisfies the requirements of the Rescission Act of 1995: to identify all allotments requiring NEPA analysis and to prepare and adhere to a schedule for conducting such analysis.
- The selected alternative will result in better distribution of livestock, more controlled utilization of vegetation and protection of other resources, as discussed in the EA.
- The selected alternative is expected to result in a trend toward improved vegetative conditions in upland, meadow and riparian areas thereby providing a sustainable source of forage for livestock in the project area, thus contributing to the local and regional agricultural economy, as discussed in the EA.
- Consistent with the Granger-Thye Act of 1950, the alternative establishes new controls and improves stewardship of the public land grazing resource by authorizing a new Term Grazing

Permit and new Private Land Permit for up to ten years, is expected to maintain or increase sustainability in production of both forage and wildlife habitat, and would allow issuance of one-year temporary permits to increase livestock use up to 308 Head Months at such time as resource conditions warrant, contingent on monitoring results after five years implementation of the initial aspects of the decision which include but are not limited to a reduction from the currently authorized 308 Head Months down to 205 Head Months on an annual basis.

- The selected alternative meets Congressional intent to allow grazing on suitable lands, where consistent with other multiple-use goals and objectives. The lands of the Brock allotment were determined to be suitable for grazing under the Forest Land and Resource Management Plan of 1990. Implementation of the selected alternative in the project area has been determined consistent with other multiple-use goals, objectives for resources in or near the allotment including but not limited to native herbaceous upland, meadow and riparian vegetation, soils, Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive (TES) wildlife and fish species and habitats, Management Indicator Species and habitats, hydrologic function, cultural and historic resources, recreation, silviculture (native conifers and hardwoods), rare plants, and invasive species as discussed in greater detail below. Based on the analysis, implementation of the selected alternative would continue to contribute to the social and economic wellbeing of the surrounding communities and counties, and would maintain existing opportunities for many varieties of dispersed recreation in the general area including but not limited to wildlife viewing including birdwatching, hiking, bicycling, hunting and fishing.

The selected alternative also complies with key Laws pertaining to the area associated with the allotment in that:

- Threatened or endangered species will not be affected nor will any species trend toward listing as threatened or endangered.
- The alternative will comply with requirements of the Clean Water Act
- The alternative has received concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Office that the alternative would have No Impact on Historic Resources.

I based my decision on my review of the environmental effects in the Brock Cattle and Horse Allotment Management Plan EA and on the project record. Other documents I considered while making my decision include: 1990 Umatilla National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, PACFISH (both the Environmental Assessment and Decision Notice (USDA-USDI 1995), and requirements in the 2005 Regional EIS for Invasive Species which amended the Forest Plan in October 2005

I also took into consideration public input. The Brock Cattle and Horse Allotment Management Plan project area lies within management areas allocated by the Forest Plan for livestock grazing (Forest Plan pp. IV-142-148, 158-165, and 202-210). Therefore, livestock grazing is a legitimate use of National Forest System lands.

In addition, the selected alternative resolves all three significant issues:

1. Upland herbaceous vegetation conditions are expected to improve based upon adherence to management requirements, mitigation measures, annual and longterm monitoring. Monitoring indicates that upland and meadow rangeland conditions are satisfactory, the analysis concludes that a trend toward desired vegetation conditions can be achieved without eliminating grazing, and Forest Plan standards and guidelines will continue to be implemented that will allow for an upward trend in vegetative conditions.

2. Herbaceous riparian and meadow vegetation conditions are expected to improve based upon adherence to management requirements, mitigation measures, annual and longterm monitoring. The analysis concludes that a trend toward desired vegetation conditions can be achieved without eliminating grazing, and Forest Plan standards and guidelines will continue to be implemented that will allow for an upward trend in riparian and meadow vegetative conditions where site capability allows.
3. The Selected Alternative will effect improvement in bank stability and move the allotment towards Forest Plan objectives for desired riparian vegetation and streambank stability at allotment scale, and will not retard attainment of RMOs at watershed-scale.

I believe this adjustment to the Brock Allotment best meets the purpose and need by providing grazing opportunity while allowing the management of vegetative composition and watershed conditions necessary to meet the Clean Water Act and provide a quality forage resource for both livestock and big game by improving the native species component of the forage base and working to reduce streambank instability. The decision represents management goals and concerns discussed with the permittee and with the private land owner. The number of cattle permitted would not change, however the authorized season could change from year to year depending on annual conditions but total authorized Head Months would not change unless monitoring demonstrated that sufficient progress towards meeting longterm resource objectives had been achieved. I could have added fences to protect streambanks and this could still be an option at some point in the future, but at this time I believe that the other changes we will make will allow us to achieve goals for the allotment without the expense and maintenance requirements associated with a fence.

Riparian habitat is being protected from potential impacts from grazing. There would be continued monitoring to determine when cattle need to be either moved from the pasture or encouraged to disperse. Past monitoring indicates that forage utilization by cattle is meeting Forest Plan standards and guidelines and conditions are satisfactory but static and are expected to show an improving range condition trend with the changes in management (EA Chapter 4, pp 54-56, 58). The continuation of grazing as proposed in this decision would: (1) protect water quality, (2) improve or maintain riparian, stream channel and upland vegetation conditions by reducing annual use and reducing streambank trampling to move allotment conditions towards Forest Plan objectives.

The risk to spread of invasive plants to new areas by cattle would be reduced but not eliminated. The invasive plants prevention plan (EA Chap 2, p. 21-22, appendix H) has measures for reducing the incident of new species or infestations coming from off forest. Measures will be taken to avoid concentrating cattle in dry meadows or other locations that would increase soil disturbance from hoof action. Early detection and reporting by the permittee would identify new sites for early treatments. These measures would reduce the rates of spread and the risk for invasive plants moving into other pastures. (EA Chap 4, p 59-60)

Continuing grazing in the two pastures would not impact big game cover and since big game utilization of forage is incorporated into Forest Plan utilization standards, competition from cattle for forage would not degrade winter range or overall forage productivity. Forage productivity is protected by Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines. (EA Ch 4, pp 62-63, Ch 1, pp 6-8)

Other Alternatives Considered

Four other alternatives were considered in the Brock Cattle and Horse Allotment Management Plan EA. Two were analyzed in detail and two was eliminated from detailed study. Of the two alternatives not

considered in detail, one was not ripe for decision, the other did not address any of the driving issues that had been identified. All five alternatives are described in Chapter 2 of the EA. My reasons for not selecting one of the other two fully developed alternatives are given below:

Reasons for Not Selecting Alternative 2 – Current Management (No Action)

This alternative responds to requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act that a No Action alternative be analyzed for comparison with Action alternatives. Under Alternative 2, current management of livestock would continue in the allotment. I did not select this option because the analysis indicated that progress in achieving vegetation and bank stability objectives was likely to be unacceptably slower than with the Proposed Action.

Reasons for Not Selecting Alternative 3 – No Domestic Livestock Grazing (No Grazing)

This alternative responds to Forest Service policy by providing a no grazing alternative. Under this alternative, domestic livestock grazing on the Brock C&H Allotment would not be authorized. Eight and one-half miles of fence would be removed, one springbox and trough would also be removed. Existing ponds would remain in place for wildlife but would no longer be maintained by the permittee.

I did not select this alternative because the analysis indicates that such a decision would not meet the purpose and need to provide a forage resource for livestock grazing and also indicates that cessation of grazing is not necessary to achieve resource management objectives which could otherwise be met while still providing a sustainable source of forage for livestock in the project area, thereby contributing to the local and regional agricultural economy.

This decision is consistent with the Forest Plan (EA Ch 4, p 22) and all applicable laws, regulations and policies such as the Clean Water Act (EA Chap 4, pp 79-85).

Public, Tribal, and Agency Involvement

The Umatilla National Forest mailed a description of the Proposed Action along with preliminary issues in a scoping package to individuals, organizations, agencies and Tribes on December 1, 2008. At the subsequent request of an interested party, the scoping period was extended until February 5, 2009. A news article was published in the East Oregonian on June 30, 2009. The Proposed Action first appeared in the Winter (January) 2009 edition of the Umatilla National Forest Quarterly Schedule of Proposed Actions. Three letters were received in response to scoping. A summary of these comments and how they were addressed is contained in Appendix K of the EA.

The predecisional EA was mailed to individuals, organizations, agencies, and Tribes for 30 day review on June 30, 2009. A legal notice announcing availability of the predecisional EA appeared in the East Oregonian on June 30, 2009. The EA was posted on the Umatilla web site on June 30, 2009. Three comment letters were received. A summary of these comments and how they were addressed is contained in Appendix N of the EA.

Changes to Predecisional EA

Appendix O provides clarifications and corrections made to the EA. Appendix M describes general recommendations offered to Forest permittees on ways to reduce livestock-wolf conflicts on allotments. These recommendations are not mitigations and their use would be entirely voluntary on the permittee's part. Appendix N contains Forest responses to comments on the predecisional EA. The updated

information falls within the scope of the analysis depicted in the predecisional EA. Therefore, I have decided it is not necessary to issue the updated information for additional comment and review. I considered the updated information in my decision.

Issues Considered in the EA

The ID team identified three major issues for the Brock Cattle and Horse Allotment Management Plan project based upon internal and external scoping. Alternatives were developed based on the major issues and/or based on law and agency policy. The major issues are as follows:

Issue 1. Meadow Condition

Meadow vegetation conditions on some areas of the allotment are unstable. That instability is represented by increasing amounts of early grass and forb species, particularly high frequencies of coneflower and false hellebore relative to mid and late seral grass and forb species in tufted hairgrass sites. False hellebore and coneflower are both early seral native species that increase their presence when more palatable forage species decline under heavy grazing use.

The Selected Alternative was developed to address this issue. Alternative 3 is also responsive to this issue, and must be considered in detail based on agency policy. Alternative 2 is also responsive to this issue and must be considered in detail based on law and regulation.

Issue 2. Upland Condition

Upland forage production by native species on the allotment is declining. A net loss of forage production on grown-over transitory range has resulted in the allotment being overstocked for the native forage base still available. The overstocking is now putting excessive grazing pressure on the remaining forage base of native species, resulting in loss of plant vigor and loss of productivity.

The Selected Alternative was developed to respond to this issue. Alternative 3 is also responsive to this issue, and must be considered in detail based on agency policy. Alternative 2 is also responsive to this issue and must be considered in detail based on law and regulation.

Issue 3. Bank Stability

Grazing may prevent stabilization of currently unstable streambanks. Bank instability is very high along the intermittent stream channel in Fry Meadow and along Fry Meadow Creek. The Selected Alternative was developed to respond to this issue. Alternative 3 is also responsive to this issue and must be considered in detail based on agency policy. Alternative 2 is also responsive to this issue and must be considered in detail based on law and regulation.

Finding of No Significant Impact

My determination of significance is based on careful consideration of the EA and project file as compared to the context and intensity factors listed in 40 CFR 1508.27.

Context

The actions included in the selected alternative are described in Chapter 2 of the EA. The detection of effects may differ by the resource and by the scale of analysis. Therefore, multiple scales and levels of analysis were used to determine the significance of the actions effects on the human environment. The analysis area covers the acres of the Brock Allotment. The selected alternative includes grazing on two of

two pastures. Water qualities and flows would not be measurably impacted. Wildlife and its habitat, fisheries habitat, soil productivity and the regional economy would be affected. The impacts of the Selected Alternative on each of these are disclosed in the EA (Chapter 4). Therefore in context, this project is local in scope.

Intensity

The environmental effects from the proposed grazing are documented in Chapter 4 of the Environmental Assessment. The beneficial and adverse direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts discussed in the EA have been disclosed within the appropriate context, and effects are expected to be low in intensity because of project design including management requirements developed to protect or reduce impacts to resources. Significant effects to the human environment are not expected. The rationale for the determination of significance is based on the environmental assessment. I base my findings on the following:

1. My finding of no significant environmental effects is not biased by the beneficial effects of the action. The interdisciplinary team analyzed and disclosed the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the action on range and forest vegetation (Ch. 4, pp 54-58), Soils (Ch 4, pp 69-70), hydrology (Ch. 4, pp 70-71), TE&S plant species (Ch. 4, pp 59), noxious weeds (Ch 4, pp 59-61), wildlife and wildlife habitat (Ch 4, pp 62-68) and TE&S aquatic species and habitat (Ch 4, pp 72-75). While the EA discloses short-term and minor deviations from the existing conditions, in my experience on similar projects, none of these effects have been found to be significant. All of these effects would result in conditions that are consistent with the Forest Plan.
2. There will be no significant effects on public health and safety, because there would be no measurable impacts to water quality, fisheries, or public health (see EA Chap 4, pp 83-84). The selected alternative is consistent with the Clean Water Act and Forest Plan.
3. There will be no significant effects on unique characteristics of the area, because there are no park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers affected. (see EA Chap 83-84).
4. The effects on the quality of the human environment are not likely to be highly controversial because there is no known scientific controversy over the impacts of the project. There are differing opinions about the role and impacts of grazing on the landscape. The EA reviewed these differences (EA Chap 1, 2, 3 and 4, , Appendix I, concerns from public scoping).. These concerns were addressed in the Aquatic Biological Evaluation and in the hydrology, range, invasive species and wildlife analyses and do not represent a significant disagreement (page references provided in #1 above).
5. We have considerable experience with the type of activity to be implemented. The analysis shows the effects are not uncertain, and do not involve unique or unknown risk. Grazing is one of the most heavily monitored activities on the Umatilla National Forest and effects from grazing are well documented. Specific monitoring on the Brock allotment has show a static trend in range condition, which we expect will improve with the changes in management as explained in the EA. Based on the past monitoring results and the effects disclosed in the EA, the project presents no highly uncertain or unknown risks.
6. The action is not likely to establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects. Grazing has occurred on the Umatilla National Forest for over 100 years and through

continuing monitoring, the effects have been well documented. Grazing in this area is permitted in the Forest Plan. The EA effectively addressed and analyzed all major issues associated with the project. The decision also authorizes the use and maintenance of existing improvement in support of the grazing. Any new improvements would be considered after further analysis.

7. Cumulative impacts are not significant. These actions were considered when cumulative effects for various resources were discussed in Chapter IV. Private lands below the Forest boundary were also considered in determining cumulative effects for some resources as appropriate. Our analysis did not indicate significant cumulative effects to any of the resources considered in the analysis. Forest standards and guidelines would be met and the activity would not cause measurable impacts to water quality or fisheries habitat below the Forest boundary.
8. The action will have no significant adverse effect on districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. A review of the Umatilla National Forest heritage files indicate that the Brock Allotment project area has been surveyed for cultural resources recording 2 historic or prehistoric sites within the project area, one of which is eligible for listing in the National Register. Section 106 responsibilities for this undertaking, permit re-issuance for the Brock C&H Allotment, has been completed and forwarded to the Washington SHPO. Any grazing maintenance activities, including establishment of salting locations, will be looked at as separate undertakings and will require the appropriate tribe and SHPO consultation. A no effect determination for permit re-issuance has been forwarded to the Washington SHPO. (EA Chap 4, p 79)
9. My decision to reduce total annual Head Months use on the allotment and institute a flexible management system of deferred rotation grazing system and management changes guided by annual and longterm monitoring, will result in an action that will have No Effect on any endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species act of 1973. (EA Chapter 4, pp 83; Terrestrial and Aquatic BEs (project file). Proposed grazing may impact redband trout or habitat but would not result in a trend toward ESA listing.
10. My decision is consistent with Federal, State, and local laws and requirements imposed for the protection of the environment [40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)]. Chapter 1 of the EA identified laws, regulation and policy applicable to this EA (Ch. 1, pp 11-13), and Chapter 4 of the EA (pp. 79-85) discloses consistency of the Selected Alternative with the applicable laws and regulations relating to federal natural resource management. Applicable laws and regulations were considered in the EA (Ch. 1, p 11-13, Ch 4 82-85). My decision is also consistent with the Umatilla National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (EA Chap 4 pp 79-81). Chapter 4 of the EA and the Project Record provide supporting information.

After considering the environmental effects described in the EA, I have determined that these actions will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment considering the context and intensity of impacts (40 CFR 1508.27). Thus, an environmental impact statement will not be prepared. This determination is based on the site-specific environmental analysis documented in the Environmental Assessment and supporting documents which describe direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of this decision. I have found that the context of the environmental impacts of this decision is limited to the local area and is not significant. I have also determined the severity of these impacts is not significant.

Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations

This decision to continue grazing in the Brock Allotment is consistent with the intent of the forest plan's long term goals and objectives found in Chapter 4 of the Forest Plan. The project was designed in conformance with land and resource management plan standards and incorporates appropriate land and resource management plan guidelines for forage utilization and management (Land and Resource Management Plan, pages 4-63 to 65 and PACFISH amendment).

Implementation Date

If no appeals are filed within the 45-day time period, implementation of my decision may occur on, but not before, 5 business days from the close of the appeal filing period. When appeals are filed, implementation may occur on, but not before, the 15th business day following the date of the last appeal disposition.

Administrative Review or Appeal Opportunities

This decision is subject to administrative review (appeal) pursuant to 36 CFR Part 215. The appeal must meet content requirements of 36 CFR 215.14. Only individuals or organizations who expressed an interest in the project may appeal. The appeal must be filed (regular mail, fax, email, hand-delivery, or express delivery) with the Appeal Deciding Officer. Any written appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeal Deciding Officer, Mary Wagner, Regional Forester, ATTN 1570 Appeals, P.O. Box 3623 Portland, OR 97208-3623 within 45 days of the legal notice announcing this decision in the East Oregonian Newspaper.

Electronic appeals must be submitted in a format such as an email message, plain text (.txt), rich text format (.rtf), or Word (.doc) to the following e-mail address: appeals-pacificnorthwest-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.

The street location for hand delivery: 333 SW 1st Ave, Portland, OR (office hours: 8-4:30 M-F). Send faxes to 503-808-2255. Office business hours for those submitting hand-delivered appeals are: 8:00 am to 4:30 pm Monday through Friday, excluding holidays.

For further information regarding these appeal procedures, contact the Acting Forest Environmental Coordinator Janet Plocharsky at 541-278-3869.

Contact

For further information, contact Kathy Ramsey, Interdisciplinary Team Leader at the Supervisor's Office, Umatilla National Forest, 2517 SW Hailey Ave., Pendleton, OR 97801, Phone (541) 278-3933, or Kimpton Cooper, Environmental Coordinator, Walla Walla Ranger District, 1415 W. Rose St., Walla Walla, WA 99362, (509) 522-6009.

/s/ Michael L. Rassbach
MICHAEL L. RASSBACH
District Ranger

September 15, 2009
Date