



Ramshorn Prescribed Fire

USDA Forest Service, Eastern Region
Greenbrier Ranger District, Monongahela National Forest
Pocahontas County, West Virginia

The Greenbrier Ranger District is proposing to implement prescribed burning in the Ramshorn project area over the next ten years.

We are conducting a 30-day Notice and Comment period on the proposed Ramshorn Prescribed Fire in accordance with 36 CFR 215. We are sending you a copy of the draft analysis because you previously expressed interest in this project.

Please take a few minutes to review the following information and provide your comments about proposed activities.

I. Proposal Description

A. Summary Description of Proposal

The Greenbrier Ranger district is proposing to conduct prescribed fire within the Ramshorn area. Four areas totaling approximately 3,499 acres have been identified for burning.

B. Purpose and Need

Frequent surface fires ignited by Native Americans, European settlers, and lightning historically maintained open forests of oak, chestnut, and pine over much of the Appalachian Mountains, including portions of the Ramshorn area. Additionally, the majority of the highest ridges in the Ramshorn area targeted for treatment were repeatedly burned by Native Americans and European settlers to maintain pasture, resulting in a savannah-like condition with large, open-grown mature trees interspersed with grasses and herbaceous vegetation.

Reduced fire activity during the twentieth century has contributed to increases in tree and shrub densities and shifts in tree species compositions, thereby reducing the acreage in savannah or open conditions and hindering regeneration of various oak species. These changes have reduced habitat quality for plant and animal species that require open woodland habitat or are dependent on soft mast or hard mast tree species. In the Ramshorn area, the majority of the open habitat has become overgrown and has decreased over the

past 50 to 75 years due to a lack of fire. Open and brushy habitat is important because it provides nesting, foraging, and herbaceous cover habitat for wildlife such as turkey poults and small mammals.

Reintroduction of fire into the appropriate areas would help reconstruct these historic conditions. It would benefit wildlife by creating structural heterogeneity, thereby improving habitat for a variety of bat and bird species. It would create conditions to favor various soft mast species (such as blueberries), and stimulate flowering and fruiting of a variety of soft mast species, thereby improving wildlife foraging habitat.

Fire can be used as a silvicultural tool in an effort to control vegetation that competes with various oaks. Successful oak (*Quercus* sp.) regeneration is a widely recognized forest management problem of serious magnitude throughout the hardwood regions of the eastern and central United States. Both managed and unmanaged forests stands exhibit declining oak abundance as overstory oaks experience natural mortality or are harvested. Consequently, other tree species have become increasingly dominant in existing stands. For example, maple (*Acer* sp.) has exhibited dramatic gains in eastern forests, including the Ramshorn area, over the past three decades, in terms of both stem numbers and growing stock volume. As such, promoting oak seedling establishment for future timber and non-timber management objectives, that is, wildlife management, remains an important objective in sustaining mixed-oak forests.

Forest Plan Goal FM06 (page II-15) states “Use prescribed fire to establish, maintain, control, or restore forest vegetation (e.g., oak regeneration and fire-resilient stands), wildlife openings, savannahs, and grazing allotments.

The primary objectives are to restore, maintain, or enhance wildlife habitat and restore the ecological role of fire for oak and pine systems in these areas. Management would emphasize the restoration and maintenance of the oak-pine and oak-hickory ecosystems using prescribed fire.

C. Project Location and Description

The Forest Service (USFS) proposes to use prescribed fire on approximately 3,499 acres of the Greenbrier Ranger District of the Monongahela National Forest, Pocahontas County, West Virginia (Figure 1). The Ramshorn area is located approximately 1.5 miles from Green Bank. It is bounded by: the North Fork of Tacker Fork Creek to the north; State Highway 6 to the west; the Greenbrier/Marlinton Ranger District boundary to the south; and the West Virginia/Virginia line to the east. This area is part of two Management Prescription (MP) areas as described in the Monongahela National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan, 2006): MP 6.1 (pages III-31 through III-39); and MP 3.0 (pages III-4 through III-8).

The goal of this project is to emulate historic fire disturbance regimes through an initial burn and repeated burns to slowly reintroduce fire to the ecosystem. Burn frequency following initial burns would be based upon monitoring, but would likely be every 3 to 10

years. Treatments would take place in four different areas on approximately 3,499 acres. Our goal is to do one burn block per year for the first four years. Individual burn events would range in size from 327 acres to 1,625 acres. (Table 1).

Table 1. Prescribed burn areas, MP prescriptions, acres, miles of hand and mechanical line

Burn Area Name	MP Area	Acres to be Burned	Miles of Hand Line	Miles of Mechanical Line
Little Ridge	3.0	593	0.25	0.9
Ramshorn	3.0	327	1.65	0
Guinn Ridge	3.0	954	0.1	0
Chestnut Ridge	6.1	1,625	0	0.8
Total		3,499	2.0	1.7

MP 6.1 emphasizes the enhancement of wildlife habitat by favoring tree species and forest communities that are beneficial to wildlife. The prescription also focuses on restoration and management of fire adapted oak-pine and oak-hickory communities. As such, the Chestnut Ridge burn block (1,625 acres) is the highest priority.

MP 3.0 emphasis related to this project includes age class diversity, a variety of forest scenery, and habitat for wildlife species tolerant of disturbances, such as deer, grouse, and squirrel.

General activities in preparation for and execution of the prescribed fires would include: fireline construction; hazard tree removal; prescribed fire ignition; and mop-up.

Firelines: To the extent possible, this project makes use of geographic features such as existing roads/skid trails, ridgelines, and drainages to contain the fire. As such, new line construction would be limited to approximately 2 miles of handline and 1.7 miles of mechanical line (Figure 2). Fireline construction would involve the removal of vegetation to bare mineral soil using hand tools and power tools (e.g., leaf blowers, chainsaws), brush hogs, and dozers. Existing roads/skid trails would require little, if any, preparation. Firelines established for previous burns would be reused. Firelines would typically be 3 to 4 feet in width for handlines and 8 feet (or width of road) for brush hogging and dozer lines. Firelines would be rehabilitated upon completion of burning activities, as determined by MNF specialists following post-burn analyses.

Hazard Trees: Trees along the fireline that could fall across the line onto the unburned side would be cut. These hazard trees would be left near the location where they are cut, such that they do not pose an additional safety or fire risk. If practical, to minimize impacts on wildlife that rely on snags, the location of the fire line may be adjusted slightly to avoid areas with high snag densities.

Prescribed Fire Ignition: Prescribed fire ignition would mostly be accomplished with drip torches that contain a mix of gasoline and diesel fuel. In the future, some areas could be burned using helicopter ignition (i.e., use of ping pong-like balls dropped from a helicopter that ignite the fire). This method is less resource intensive than firefighters covering all the ground on foot with drip torches.

Mop-Up: Mop-up would involve hand and power tools to ensure prescribed fires are out and that no sources of ignition are left behind to start an unwanted fire after activities are complete. ATVs would be used for access to areas within treatment units prior to and during prescribed fires. Temporary ATV access points and trails would be rendered inconspicuous by raking leaf litter over exposed ground, and/or piling debris at entry points, so as to discourage prolonged, illegal ATV use post-project completion.

Prior to each prescribed fire, a prescribed burn plan would be developed that takes into consideration such factors as weather conditions, humidity, fuel loadings, and fuel burn rates at a given moisture content. All the burn prescriptions must be met before a particular prescribed fire can be ignited. Burning pattern and behavior is based on moisture in the fuel. Burns are planned for a mosaic pattern based on moisture content, and would be conducted when conditions would be such that flames approaching stream channel buffers would be expected to extinguish themselves before burning within those areas. The burn intensities would be low to moderate, with flame lengths varying from 1 to 7 feet. These would not be stand-replacing fires like some wildfires. If a prescribed fire were to burn out of prescription or weather conditions change during the fire, FS personnel would implement a contingency plan, which would include total suppression.

Mitigation measures to reduce impacts to aquatic resources

- (1) Appropriate erosion control measures including, but not limited to water-bars, seeding, and mulching would be installed where needed to prevent erosion and sedimentation, especially in the fall when revegetation may take several months.
- (2) If prescribed burning is done in the fall, a test burn would be conducted in the riparian area prior to burn operations to ensure fire would behave as intended, that it would not burn into the stream channel buffer.
- (3) Lighting techniques would be used that would back fire toward stream channel buffers.

Mitigation measures and design features to reduce impacts to plant TES species

- (1) Fire lines as currently drawn on the map would not directly impact any known sensitive plant locations, but they are close in a few places. Implementation personnel would be notified of these locations to ensure that any minor adjustments of line location do not impact known sensitive plant occurrences.

Mitigation measures and design features to reduce the spread of NNIS (non-native invasive species)

(1) The Chestnut Ridge burn block is known to be infested with garlic mustard in several locations, including locations that are proposed for fire line construction. The main road used to access this block (FR 757) is very heavily infested. Therefore, all fire line construction equipment and fire fighting equipment that disturbs the soil or leaf litter in the Chestnut Ridge burn block must be cleaned before it is used anywhere else on National Forest land. This includes, but is not necessarily limited to, bulldozers, tractors, trailers, disk harrows, plows, brush hogs, pulaskis, shovels, rakes, ATVs, etc. Passenger vehicles that become muddy while in use on the Chestnut Ridge block also would be cleaned prior to use on any other area of National Forest land. Equipment and vehicle cleaning should remove all soil, seeds, vegetative matter, or other debris that could contain or hold seeds. Fire personnel working on the Chestnut Ridge block should clean their boots and pant cuffs prior to working on other parcels of National Forest land. Cleaning would be conducted in a location and manner that 1) does not spread seed to unimpacted locations, and 2) does not contaminate soil, surface waters, or groundwater with oil, grease, or other contaminants.

(2) Any seed used for stabilization or other purposes would be a native-based seed mix, must not contain any invasive plants, and would be accompanied by the seed vendor's test results demonstrating that it is substantially free of noxious weed seeds.

(3) Hay would not be used for mulch. Straw, coconut fiber, or synthetic mulch would be used instead for mulch.

(4) Within the burn units, monitor selected populations of rock skullcap and all three known populations of white alum root. Populations outside of burn units also would be monitored as a control. Monitoring would take place one growing season prior to burning, immediately after the burn, and for at least three seasons after burning. Monitoring would attempt to determine the extent to which fire carries through the population and any changes in population density and flowering/fruitletting.

Mitigation measures and design features to reduce impacts to wildlife TES species

(1) Effects monitoring would be conducted after the initial burns and prior to the next cycle of fire to determine fire behavior and impacts on resources.

(2) The District Biologist would be intimately involved with the Fire Shop in developing the burn plan.

(3) If rattlesnakes are determined to be present in the project area, we would avoid conducting burns after mid-April or prior to mid-October around den sites when rattlesnakes may be active. Surveys for rattlesnake dens would be conducted prior to burn plan development and in coordination with fire personnel.

(4) If any rattlesnakes are encountered during the project activities, every effort would be made to avoid the snake but protect it from fire, and any sightings would be reported immediately to a Forest Service Biologist.

Mitigation measures to reduce impacts to sapling size stands

(1) In sapling sized stand (less than 30 years old), fire would be excluded or burned at low intensity to prevent damage to young trees.

The spring fire season for the MNF is between February and May; the fall fire season is between September and December. These months are generally the driest and coldest months and, as such, present the most favorable weather conditions for prescribed fire. We propose to begin burning in the Ramshorn area in the fall of 2008 or spring of 2009.

II. Reasons for Categorically Excluding the Proposal

Decisions may be categorically excluded from documentation in an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment when they are within one of the categories identified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in 7 CFR part 1b.3 or one of the categories identified by the Chief of the Forest Service in Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 1909.15 sections 31.12 or 31.2, and there are no extraordinary circumstances related to the decision that may result in a significant individual or cumulative effect on the quality of the human environment.

It is expected that this proposal would appropriately be categorically excluded from documentation in an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment as it is a routine activity within a category of exclusion, and there are no extraordinary circumstances related to the proposal that may result in a significant individual or cumulative effect on the quality of the human environment. This preliminary conclusion is based on information presented in this document and the entirety of the project file.

A. Category of Exclusion

This proposal could be categorically excluded because it is within the category of exclusion identified in Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 1909.15, Chapter 30, Section 31.2(6):

Timber stand and/or wildlife habitat improvement activities which do not include the use of herbicides or do not require more than one mile of low standard road construction (Service level D, FSH 7709.56).

This proposal would result in prescribed burning that improves timber stands and wildlife habitat by controlling understory hardwoods and improving plant vigor. It does not include any road construction.

B. Relationship to Extraordinary Circumstances

The extraordinary circumstances have been reviewed and are summarized below. Additional details are contained within the project record.

1. Federally listed threatened and endangered species or designated critical habitat, species proposed for Federal listing or proposed critical habitat, or Forest Service sensitive species

a. Aquatic Wildlife

Regional Forester's Sensitive Species (fish) potentially within the project area include New River shiner (*Notropis scabriceps*) and candy darter (*Etheostoma osburni*). The potential effects "May impact individual,s but are not likely to cause a trend toward federal listing or loss of viability" for both RFSS of fish.

Adverse effects to aquatic biota would be expected to be small and not substantial. Prescribed burning would be conducted in a manner that substantially protects riparian areas, watershed soils, and hydrologic integrity. Earth disturbance from fireline construction would be reduced as a result of the proposed action. The location and erosion control measures of firelines would control most soil loss and sedimentation. Any sedimentation that might enter stream channels may have small, local adverse effects to the aquatic community, primarily in fine sediment deposition within channel substrate and habitats of the small non-perennial streams draining the project area. However, there would be a low potential for adverse sediment effects because of the low risk of generating substantial amounts of sediment and mitigation measures that would be implemented. Dozer-constructed firelines are a potential concern for sedimentation effects to aquatic biota, but those effects would be effectively mitigated through good location and prompt water-barring and revegetation. Potential small and short-term turbidity increases would not adversely affect aquatic biota. Over all, sedimentation effects to aquatic biota would be small, short-term, and not substantial. Adverse effects to aquatic biota from impacts to riparian resource condition are expected to be extremely small. Those potential riparian effects would likely be miniscule and short-term, and would have no substantial impact on the aquatic community.

There would be no aquatic organism passage effects from the proposed action and no substantial stream temperature effects would be expected.

b. Terrestrial Wildlife

Field surveys and a biological assessment were completed. There are no federally listed threatened or endangered species or their designated critical habitat in the project area. However, the entire Forest is potential Indiana bat habitat. The project would be conducted in accordance with the Indiana bat terms and conditions of the programmatic biological opinion; therefore this project has no effect, beyond that which is already disclosed in the Biological Assessment on the Indiana bat dated March 30, 2006 and by

the USFWS in the Biological Opinion of July 7, 2006. Likewise, there would be no effect on other listed or proposed T&E species.

There is potential habitat for several Forest Service sensitive species, including the eastern small-footed bat, Allegheny woodrat, henslow's sparrow, red-headed woodpecker, vesper sparrow, golden-winged warbler, northern metalmark, columbine duskywing, a noctuid moth, cobweb skipper, and the timber rattlesnake. With the exception of the timber rattlesnake, there are no known locations and/or limited habitat, therefore the potential effects "may impact individuals, but would not cause a trend toward listing". The project would not impact other Forest Service sensitive species.

With regard to other wildlife species, fire is a historic part of these ecosystems and is anticipated to have a beneficial effect on wildlife resources. Effects monitoring would be conducted after the initial burns and prior to the next cycle of fire.

c. Botany

Field surveys were conducted for threatened, endangered, sensitive, and non-native invasive plants in various parts of the project area during 2005, 2006, and 2007. No threatened or endangered plants are known to occur in the project area, although some low-potential habitat exists for running buffalo clover (*Trifolium stoloniferum*) and small whorled pogonia (*Isotria medeoloides*). Due to marginal habitat and lack of known occurrences despite extensive surveys, the project would be extremely unlikely to affect these species.

Regional Forester's Sensitive Species (RFSS) known to occur in the project area include rock skullcap (*Scutellaria saxatilis*) and white alumroot (*Heuchera alba*). Potential habitat may exist for other species, although likelihood of occurrence for other species is considered low because none were discovered during field surveys. The likelihood of occurrence document (filed in the project record) evaluates the potential for occurrence for all RFSS.

Although the sensitive species rock skullcap is relatively abundant throughout the project area, the proposed project is not expected to lead to loss of viability or a trend toward federal listing. Numerous rock skullcap occurrences exist in the proposed burn blocks, but many more occurrences exist outside the burn blocks and would not be affected. These unaffected occurrences, together with occurrences in other areas of the Forest, likely are enough to ensure continued viability on the Forest. Within the burn blocks, rock skullcap tends to be concentrated in moist ravines and on rock outcrops and talus. A low-intensity ground fire is not expected to carry through most of these microhabitats. Therefore, even within the burn blocks, most occurrences are expected to persist.

The sensitive species white alumroot also is known to occur at a few locations in the project area. All known occurrences are on rock outcrops that are not expected to carry fire. Therefore, the potential for adverse effects to this species is considered to be low.

2. Floodplains, Wetlands, or Municipal Watersheds

a. Floodplains

There would be no adverse effects to floodplains from prescribed burning. The floodplains would not be altered and they would still function as they did before the burns.

b. Wetlands

Due to the fuel moistures typically found in and around wetlands, any wetlands that may be within or adjacent to the burn areas would not be impacted by the prescribed burning.

c. Municipal Watersheds

There are no municipal water supplies immediately downstream of the prescribed burn areas. It is unlikely that there would be adverse effects to the quality of water in the project area that would diminish its suitability as a source for drinking water. The prescribed burns would have very minor sediment effects to water quality, which likely would not be noticeable downstream of the project area.

3. Congressionally designated areas, such as Wilderness, Wilderness Study Areas, National Recreation Areas, or Wild and Scenic Rivers

a. Wilderness

There are no Congressionally designated wilderness study areas within or near the project area. Laurel Fork North and Laurel Fork South Wilderness Area are north/west of State Highway 250 and State Route 28 respectively. None of the proposed activities would affect the untrammeled, natural, undeveloped character of any nearby wilderness area or affect opportunities for solitude within nearby wilderness areas.

b. Wilderness Study Areas

There are no Congressionally designated wilderness study areas, or national recreational areas within or near the project area. Therefore, there would be no effect to wilderness study areas.

c. National Recreation Areas

There are no Congressionally designated national recreational areas within or near the project area. The Spruce Knob Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area is located north of State Highway 33 and west of State Route 28. Therefore, there would be no effect to National Recreation Areas.

d. Wild and Scenic Rivers

The Wild and Scenic River Study completed by the Monongahela National Forest in 1995 did not identify any eligible segments of any rivers for potential designation as a wild and scenic river within the project area. Therefore, there would be no effect to wild and scenic river segments.

4. Inventoried Roadless Areas

There are no inventoried roadless areas within or near the project area. Little Mountain, the closest area, was considered under the Roadless Area Conservation Rule (RARE II) but not in the 2006 Forest Plan Inventoried Roadless Area review. Little Mountain is located west of State Route 28. Therefore, there would be no effect to inventoried roadless areas.

5. Research Natural Areas

The MNF has no designated Research Natural Areas (RNAs), and four candidate RNAs (Forest Plan, pages III-46, 48, 49, and 63). This project is not within or near any candidate RNAs, and would have no impact on them.

6. American Indian and Alaska Native Religious or Cultural Sites

There are no tribal trust or ceded lands in the proclamation boundary or in West Virginia. There are no federally recognized Indian tribes in West Virginia. Therefore, there would be no impacts to any American Indian or Alaska Native religious or cultural sites as a result of this proposal.

7. Archaeological Sites, or Historic Properties or Areas

This proposal would not result in any effects to any historical or cultural sites. The WV State Historic Preservation Office has concurred.

8. Other Extraordinary Circumstances

No other extraordinary circumstances related to this project were identified.

III. Public Involvement to Date

The Greenbrier Ranger District (RD) of the Monongahela National Forest (MNF) has been working for several years on developing plans for potential projects in the Ramshorn area to help meet desired conditions.

The Ramshorn project has been listed in the Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA) for the MNF since before the July 1, 2006 edition. This information was updated for the April 1, 2008 edition.

On June 26, 2006, the first scoping letter requesting input was sent to about 375 interested parties and adjacent landowners. This scoping letter summarized the purpose and need for action, the proposed action, and described various ways to get additional information and how to provide input. A legal notice about the proposed project was published in *The Pocahontas Times* newspaper the same week.

On April 27, 2007, a second scoping letter requesting input was sent to about 375 interested parties and adjacent landowners. This scoping letter updated the project based on the revised MNF Forest Plan, which was implemented in the fall of 2006. A legal notice about the proposed project was published in *The Pocahontas Times* newspaper the same week.

On June 26, 2007, an open house was held at the National Radio and Astronomy Observatory. Specialists were on hand with maps and information to discuss the project with interested persons and get input. More than 30 people attended.

On March 28, 2008, an update letter was sent to over 400 people describing those projects we had decided to move forward with in the analysis process.

In June, 2006, the original proposal and request for input were posted on the Monongahela National Forest's website at www.fs.fed.us/r9/mnf/ under "Forest Planning". This information was updated in April, 2007.

Approximately 50 individuals and organizations have contacted us about the Ramshorn proposal in the form of letters, e-mails, phone calls, or in-person visits since the scoping process began.

IV. Findings Required By And/Or Related To Other Laws and Regulations

This proposal would comply with all applicable laws and regulations. Some pertinent ones that are not discussed above are summarized below.

Forest Plan Consistency (National Forest Management Act): This Act requires the development of long-range land and resource management plans. The Monongahela National Forest Plan was approved in 2006, as required by this Act. The Act requires all projects and activities to be consistent with the Plan. The Plan has been reviewed in consideration of this project.

Environmental Justice (Executive Order 12898): This Order requires consideration of whether projects would disproportionately impact minority or low-income populations. This proposal complies with this Act. This proposal is not expected to adversely impact minority or low-income populations.

National Environmental Policy Act: This Act requires public involvement and consideration of potential environmental effects. Public involvement is described in

section III above. The entirety of documentation for this proposal, including the project file, supports compliance with this Act.

V. Administrative Review or Appeal Opportunities

A. How to Comment and Timeframe

A recent court order (*Earth Island Institute v. Ruthenbeck*) requires that categorically excluded actions that include prescribed fire provide for public notice and opportunity to comment. Comments will be accepted for a 30-day period following publication in the *Pocahontas Times*, the newspaper of record for this project. The publication date in the *Pocahontas Times* is the exclusive means for calculating the comment period. Do not rely upon dates or timeframe information provided by any other source. Regulations prohibit extending the length of the comment period (36 CFR 215.6).

Postal, hand-delivered, oral, electronic, and facsimile (FAX) comments on the proposal will be accepted. Postal and hand-delivered comments must be submitted to: Cheat Potomac Ranger District, HC 59, Box 240, Petersburg, WV 26847. Oral comments may be submitted by phone to (304) 257-4488, or in person at the Petersburg office. The office hours for those submitting oral or hand-delivered comments are 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., M-F, excluding holidays. Electronic comments must be submitted in a format such as an e-mail message, plain text (.txt), rich text (.rtf), Word (.doc), or Portable Document Format (.pdf), to comments-eastern-monongahela-greenbrier@fs.fed.us. Comments may also be submitted by FAX to (304) 257-2482. Comments received in response to this scoping, including names and addresses of those who comment, will be considered part of the public record on this proposed action and will be available for public inspection.

B. Appeal Eligibility

Only those who provide comments or otherwise express interest in the Ramshorn Prescribed Fire project during the comment period are eligible to appeal the decision under Forest Service regulations (36 CFR 215, as interpreted by the court opinion in *Wilderness Society v. Rey*). It is the responsibility of persons providing comments to submit them by the close of the comment period. For appeal eligibility, each individual or representative from each organization submitting comments must either sign the comments or verify identity upon request.

VI. Implementation Date

The implementation date depends on whether or not any appeals are filed. If no appeals are filed, implementation of the decision may occur on, but not before, 5 business days from the close of the appeal filing period. If appeals are filed, implementation may occur on, but not before, the 15th business day following the date of the last appeal disposition.

VII. Contact Person

Further information about this proposal may be obtained from Kristine Vollmer during normal office hours (weekdays, 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.):

Kristine Vollmer, North Zone NEPA Coordinator
Cheat Potomac Ranger District
HC 59, Box 240
Petersburg, WV 26847

Phone: (304) 257-4488, extension 24

Fax: (304) 257-2482

E-mail: kvollmer@fs.fed.us

VIII. Signature of Responsible Official and Date

Lauren Turner
LAUREN TURNER
Monongahela National Forest
District Ranger – Greenbrier Ranger District
Responsible Official

7/14/2008
Date

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, and 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, 1400 Independence Ave. SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call 202-720-5964 (voice or TDD).

USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.