



Decision Notice
And
Finding of No Significant Impact
For
Timber Harvest and Associated Activities
Parks Ecological Management Unit
Compartments 328 and 329
Scott County, Arkansas

Responsible Agency:
US Forest Service
Ouachita National Forest
Poteau-Cold Springs Ranger District

Responsible Official:
Richard L. Rosemier, Deputy Forest Supervisor
PO Box 1270
Hot Springs, AR 71902

For Further Information Contact:
Donna S. Reagan
dreagan@fs.fed.us
Cold Springs Ranger District
PO Box 417
Booneville, AR 72927
479-675-3233
December 2011

"The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer."



The ecosystem management activities proposed in the Preferred Alternative are detailed below (acres are approximate).

(TABLE 2.1) Summary of Proposed Action in Parks project area. These are approximate acres only based on field examinations, GIS, and GPS.

TIMBER HARVEST	C328	C329	TOTAL
Commercial Thin pine -- 20 ft. spacing	347	174	521
Commercial Thin – target 60 BA	883	1043	1926
Modified Shelterwood	40	40	80
Total Harvest	1270	1257	2527
PRESCRIBED BURNING			
Multi-purpose(approx. 3-5 year rotation)	1830	2045	3875
SILVICULTURAL TREATMENTS			
Reforestation Site Preparation			
Shortleaf pine shelterwood stands (mechanical scarification, hand tool site prep, burn with option to use herbicides, rip and plant if necessary)	40	40	80
Timber Stand Improvements			
Hand Tool Release	131	158	289
Pre-commercial Thinning	80	30	110
Red-cockaded woodpecker			
Designate recruitment stands and develop them for RCWs	7 stands 70 acres	6 60 ac.	13 130 ac.
WILDLIFE			
Woodland Pond Reconstruction	8	5	13
Woodland Pond Construction	0	3	3
Wildlife Stand Improvements	883	1043	1926
Nest Boxes – in regeneration stands	4	4	8
TRANSPORTATION			
Road construction			2.0
Road reconstruction			5.6
Temporary road construction			11.0
Prehaul maintenance			7.6
OTHER			
Issue firewood and rock permits			Yes
Treatment of non-invasive species			Yes
Landline Maintenance (miles)	3.5	3.25	6.75

This proposed action includes the establishment of 13 recruitment stands and RCW treatments and activities, including use of cavity restrictors, snake and squirrel excluder devices, artificial cavities, single-bird augmentations, multiple-bird group-initiations, brush hogging in cavity tree clusters, removal of southern flying squirrels, population/nest monitoring, and southern pine beetle (SPB) and Ips control efforts.

Nest boxes for other species will also be installed at wildlife ponds.

Permits would be offered to the public for collection of rocks by private individuals within road construction and reconstruction corridors. That is, rocks can be collected within areas of disturbance associated with road construction and reconstruction during the season these roads are open.

This proposal would be conducted in accordance with applicable design criteria found in the Revised Forest Plan and would follow all reasonable and prudent measures and conservation measures as established in biological opinions, biological assessments and species recovery plans for species documented in the biological evaluation for this proposal.



(TABLE 2.2) Description of Road System for the Proposed Action in Parks EMU. These are *approximate* miles based on field examinations, GIS, and GPS. See appendices for Transportation map.

Road Name	Segment	Type of Work	Description
R28A	4	Reconstruction	Reconstruct approx. 0.60 miles from the Scott County Road 20 intersection to a level D standard. Road will be seasonally open after harvest.
R28B	6	Reconstruction	Reconstruct approx. 0.85 mile from the WR3 intersection to the end to a level D standard. This road would be seasonally open after harvest.
R29	9 and 10	Reconstruction	Reconstruct approx. 0.25 mile from the Forest Service Road 884 intersection to a level D standard. This road would be open after harvest.
R29A	11	Reconstruction	Reconstruct approx. 0.80 mile from the Forest Service Road 948 intersection to a level D standard. This road would be seasonally open after harvest.
R29B	12	Reconstruction	Reconstruct approx. 1.10 miles from the Forest Service Road R29A intersection to a level D standard. This road would be seasonally open after harvest.
SC 20	2	Reconstruction	Use a County Road Agreement to have county prepare road bed and Forest Service will rock all or parts of the first 2 miles.
			Total Reconstruction – 5.60 miles.
R28A	4	Prehaul Maintenance	2.32 miles of dozer blading to smooth road bed; clean ditches and maintain drainage structures behind the reconstruction portion. Road would be open after harvest.
R28B	6	Prehaul Maintenance	1.05 miles of dozer blading to smooth road bed; clean ditches and maintain drainage structures on the front portion of this road. Road would be seasonally open after harvest.
R29	8 and 9	Prehaul Maintenance	1.0 mile of dozer blading to smooth road bed; clean ditches and maintain drainage structures. Road would be open after harvest.
R29A	11	Prehaul Maintenance	1.09 mile of dozer blading to smooth road bed; clean ditches and maintain drainage structures. Road would be seasonally open after harvest.
R29B	12	Prehaul Maintenance	0.64 mile of dozer blading to smooth road bed; clean ditches and maintain drainage structures. Road would be seasonally open after harvest.
R29C	13	Prehaul Maintenance	0.84 mile of dozer blading to smooth road bed; clean ditches and maintain drainage structures. Road would be seasonally open after harvest.
R28C	5	Prehaul Maintenance	0.66 mile of dozer blading to smooth road bed; clean ditches and maintain drainage structures. Road would be Closed after harvest.
			Total Prehaul Maintenance – 7.60 miles
R28D	NA	Construction	Construct approx. 1.0 mile to a level D standard. Road will be closed after harvest.
R29D	NA	Construction	Construct approx. 1.0 mile to a level D standard. Road will be closed after harvest.
			Total Construction – 2.0 miles
Temp Roads			11.0 miles – Many of these are old roads that would be opened. A few would be new. All temporary roads would be closed after harvest.
Various		Decks	Approximately 120 decks to be seeded as temporary wildlife openings.

All fish passage culverts replaced will be designed to meet fish passage guidelines.



(TABLE 2.3) 328 Proposed Actions for Parks. All acres are approximations based on field examinations, GIS, and Global Positioning Systems data (GPS); basal areas are projected (target) average residual basal areas.

STD	ACRES	MANAGEMENT		TIMBER HARVESTING		BURNING	SILVICULTURAL TREATMENTS			WILDLIFE							
		Mgt. Area	Description	Commercial Thinning	Even-age		Regeneration Harvests	Prescribed	Reforestation (site prep)	Timber Stand Improvements	Woodland Ponds	WSI	Nest Boxes				
1	79	22B			79												
2	32	22B			32											32	
3	78	22B			78									1			
4	87	22B			87												
5	103	22B			103												
6	75	22B			75									1			75
7	40	22B											40				
8	69	22B			69												69
9	76	22B			76												76
10	61	22B			61									1			61
11	135	22B															
12	50	22B								50							
13	37	22B			37									1			37
14	35	22B			35									1			35
15	40	22B											40				
16	41	22B			41												41
17	63	22B			63												63
18	65	22B			65												65
19	53	22B			53												53
20	41	22B								41							
21	39	22B			39												39
22	48	22B			48												48



(TABLE 2.3) 328 continued - Proposed Actions for Parks. All acres are approximations based on field examinations, GIS, and Global Positioning Systems data (GPS); basal areas are projected (target) average residual basal areas.

STD	ACRES	MANAGEMENT		TIMBER HARVESTING		BURNING	SILVICULTURAL TREATMENTS			WILDLIFE		
		Mgt. Area	Description	Commercial Thinning	Even-age		Prescribed	Reforestation (site prep)	Timber Stand Improvements	Woodland Ponds	WSI	Nest Boxes
23	16	22	Drains			16						
24	47	22	Drains			47						
25	37	22B	Unsuitable			37						
26	23	22B	Unsuitable			23						
27	45	22B		45	Regeneration Harvests	45					45	
28	27	22B		27	Shelter wood Shortleaf Pine	27					27	
29	27	22B		27		27			1		27	
30	29	22	Drains			29						
31	17	22B	Unsuitable			17						
32	12	22B	Unsuitable			12						
33	23	22B	Unsuitable			23						
34	20	22B		20		20		20	20			2
35	20	22B		20		20						
36	20	22B		20		20		20	20	1	20	2
37	37	22	Drains			37						
38	13	22	Drains			13						
39	10	22B	RCW Recruitment*	10		10					10	
40	10	22B	RCW Recruitment*	10		10					10	
41	10	22B	RCW Recruitment*	10		10					10	
42	10	22B	RCW Recruitment*	10		10					10	



(TABLE 2.4) 329 continued - Proposed Actions for Parks. All acres are approximations based on field examinations, GIS, and Global Positioning Systems data (GPS); basal areas are projected (target) average residual basal areas.

STD	ACRES	MANAGEMENT		TIMBER HARVESTING		BURNING	SILVICULTURAL TREATMENTS			WILDLIFE					
		Mgt. Area	Description	Commercial Thinning	Even-age		Regeneration Harvests	Prescribed	Reforestation (site prep)	Timber Stand Improvements	Woodland Ponds	WSI	Nest Boxes		
23	91	22B	Unsuitable				91								
24	114	22B		114			114				1	114			
25	20	22B			20		20		20	20					2
26	47	22B		47			47								
27	38	22	Drains				38								
28	56	22B	Unsuitable				56								
29	20	22B			20		20		20	20					2
30	48	22B		48			48								
31	21	22	Drains				21								
32	48	22	Drains				48								
33	7	22	Drains				7								
34	42	22	Drains				42								
35	108	22	Drains				108								
36	61	22B	Unsuitable				61								
37	6	22	Drains				6								
38	19	22	Drains				19								
39	14	22	Drains				14								
40	7	22	Drains				7								
41	7	22B	Unsuitable				7								
42	22	22B	Unsuitable				22								



Decision

Based on the analysis documented in the EA, it is my decision to implement the Preferred Alternative (Proposed Action) identified above for Parks Ecosystem Management Unit. My decision is based on a review of the record that shows a thorough review of relevant scientific information, a consideration of responsible opposing views, and the acknowledgement of incomplete or unavailable information. See “Relevant Planning Documents”, EA Chapter 1 (p. 13), “Technical Requirements and Forest Plan Mitigations”, EA Chapter 2 (p. 17), and “Literature Cited”, EA Chapter 6 (p. 100).

Reasons for the Decision

The Preferred Alternative (Proposed Action) was chosen over Alternative I (No Action) because the No Action Alternative would not meet the identified purpose and need for this project as stated in the EA beginning on page 6. The Preferred Alternative was chosen over Alternative II (Proposed Action without herbicide use) because it would provide an additional reforestation treatment, if other methods are not successful, to ensure regeneration of seedlings on harvested sites. Herbicide application will move the area toward a pine-bluestem community that is easier to maintain and is also an effective treatment for the control of non-native invasive species. Specifically, the Preferred Alternative would best meet the following project objectives (EA, p. 19):

- Need to restore healthy conditions by thinning the over story, and open the over story to create suitable wildlife habitats by removing unhealthy trees, and reducing stocking.
- Need to increase early seral stage habitat within Parks to meet requirements of the Revised Forest Plan for Management Area 22.
- Need to create a suitable seedbed in the even-age regeneration stands after initial prescribed burning and/or handtools.
- Maintain roads to standard and manage the project area to meet habitat requirements. All management activities would meet Scenic Integrity Objectives (SIO) in Mgt. Area 22.
- Need to reduce the stocking rate in stands, where needed.
- Need to rehabilitate ponds.
- Need to decrease competition for limited nutrients and water among species.
- Need to increase possible nest structures.
- Need to reduce the midstory.
- Need to develop hardwood crowns with WSI stands so that residual hardwood will produce a more reliable hard mast crop.
- Need to reduce the open road density, where feasible in Management Area 22.
- Need to access harvest units and provide a safe road system.
- Need to increase growth rate in these stands and create new age classes.
- Need to create conditions where a wildfire would not become too hot to kill the overstory and a threat to adjacent private properties.
- Need to allow rock permits to be issued, where possible.
- Need to provide sites for firewood areas to allow permitting where possible.
- Need to remove and/or reduce the non native species within the project area and replace with native species
- Need to use adequate protective measure to ensure that these heritage resource sites are protected.
- Need to ensure that driving/sightseeing is enhanced and the roads are safe to drive.
- Need to ensure that management activities meet Revised Forest Plan standards for water quality and follow Arkansas Best Management Practices (BMP's)
- Need to define landlines and maintain landlines
- Need to ensure management of wildfires adheres to safety measures for firefighters and public.



Role of the Interdisciplinary Team and Public Involvement

Public involvement began March 2011. We sent a letter by postal service to the district mailing list with a detailed description of the Proposed Action and a stand map for Parks. A copy was also sent electronically to Mr. Richard Artley. Mr. Artley responded electronically on March 27, 2011. A response was returned to Mr. Artley on April 1, 2011, addressing his concerns. The project was also published in the Ouachita National Forest Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA).

An Environmental Assessment was completed by the interdisciplinary team and a legal notice soliciting public comments was published in the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette, initiating the 30-day notice and comment period on July 11, 2011. Jerry Williams, Ouachita Watch League, comments were received by email during this formal comment period.

Issues Identified

One (1) significant issue was identified during the planning process:

Herbicide Use: No site-specific concerns regarding the use of herbicides were raised during scoping; however the environmental consequences of herbicide use have been raised in the past over similar proposals. Forest policy requires analysis of alternatives to herbicide use.

Alternatives Eliminated From Detailed Study

There were no significant issues or unresolved conflicts to drive the following additional alternatives, but the interdisciplinary team considered the following:

No Burning Alternative

A no burning alternative was considered, but eliminated from detailed study. The Interdisciplinary Team considered the use of prescribed fire necessary to meet objectives set forth in this environmental analysis that would address wildfire hazards and fuels accumulation as well as public health and safety.

No Harvest Alternative

This alternative was considered by the Interdisciplinary Team but eliminated from detailed analysis because the Team felt the No Action Alternative adequately addressed the overall effects of a no harvest alternative.

Alternatives Considered in Detail

Three Alternatives were analyzed in the EA:

1. **Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)** – This alternative is described on pages 5-13 of this document. (Also, see EA, pp. 21-28).
2. **Alternative I (No Action)** - Under the No Action Alternative neither the Proposed Action nor any other action alternative would be implemented. This alternative is required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), and serves as a baseline for comparison of alternatives considered in detail (See EA, p. 29).
3. **Alternative II (Proposed Action without herbicide use)**- This alternative is the same as the Proposed Action except for herbicides are not proposed as an optional silviculture treatment (See



EA, p. 29).

Forest Plan Protective Measures (EA, p. 17)

The Forest-wide Design Criteria for Management Areas 9 and 22 are incorporated by reference into the Proposed Action and are located on the website (as of 09/09) at <http://www.fs.fed.us/r8/ouachita/planning/plan.shtml>.

Project Specific Protective Measures (EA, p. 17)

Soils

Compaction: Soils in both Compartments have areas with compaction hazard ratings that range from slight to severe. Most, however, are in the slight to moderate range. Some of these are on landscapes rated as suitable for timber harvest. Soils with a *moderate-high rating will be treated as having a high rating*. This hazard rating would have a limited equipment-operating season from April to November. Operations during December through March are allowed with the use of methods or equipment that does not cause excessive soil compaction.

There is one suitable stand (Comp. 329 std. 15) with a narrow strip along the road with a severe compaction hazard rating. The rest of stand 15 has a moderate compaction rating. This narrow strip would have a limited equipment-operating season from July to November. Operations during December through June are allowed with the use of methods or equipment that does not cause excessive soil compaction. During these drier periods, extra care would be taken to monitor soil conditions and suspend operations when soils become wet. A map of these soil locations is available in the project file and will be made available to specialists involved in implementing any management activities.

The stands listed below have small portions affected by the seasonal harvest requirements:

- Compartment 328 Stands 1,2,4,5,6,8,9,10,14,16,18,19,21,22,29, and 35
- Compartment 329 Stands 4,5, 11, and 15

Erosion: There were no areas of active erosion identified in this project area during field examinations. All of the soils in Parks are rated as slight to moderate for erosion hazard. There are no areas of soil with erosion hazards of *high or severe* located in the project area on suitable stands where ground disturbing treatments could occur. All ground disturbing activities will be treated while complying with Best Management Practices (BMPs) as established by agency policy and guidelines. A soil map is available in the project file and will be made available to specialists involved in implementing any management activities.

PETS:

Red-cockaded woodpecker: RCW is not known to currently occupy this EMU but it could move in at any time. Seasonal restrictions on activities around active sites will be limited during nesting season.

Herbicide Use



- HU001 – Herbicides will be used only where necessary to achieve the desired condition in the treatment area, and then only when site specific analysis shows no unacceptable negative effects to human or wildlife health or the ecosystem as defined in HU002.
- HU002 – Herbicides will be applied at the lowest rate effective in meeting project objectives and according to guidelines for protecting human and wildlife health. Site-specific risk assessments are required prior to herbicide application and must be calculated using the procedure developed by Syracuse Environmental Research Associates (SERA).
- HU003 – To minimize potential effects of herbicide use, whenever possible, use **individual stem treatments**, directed spraying, and crop tree release.
- HU004 – Herbicides that are not soil-active will be used in preference to soil-active ones when the vegetation management objectives can be met.
- HU006 – Clearly marked buffers will protect streamside zones, private land and public water supplies.
- HU010 – The use of herbicides is **prohibited** in the immediate vicinity of **Proposed, Endangered, or Threatened plants**.
- HU011 – Within a 300-foot buffer from any source waters (public water supply), do not apply herbicide treatments unless a site-specific analysis supports use within the designated buffer to prevent more serious environmental damage than is predicted if pesticides are used.
- HU012 – No herbicide mixing, loading, or cleaning areas will occur within a 300-foot buffer of private land, open water, source waters (public water supply), wells, or other sensitive areas.
- HU018 – A certified pesticide applicator will administer all pesticide application contracts and will supervise any Forest Service personnel involved with the application of pesticides on the Forest.

Monitoring (EA, p. 19)

The Revised Forest Plan lists monitoring activities for the Ouachita National Forest. The Forest's monitoring program is designed to evaluate the environmental effects of actions similar to those proposed in this project, and also serves to assess the effectiveness of treatments. In order to ensure that the appropriate design criteria protecting soil stability, water quality, and other resources are followed, trained contract administrators and inspectors would be on-site during the implementation phase of the project. For those activities that include the use of herbicides, surveillance monitoring to ensure that herbicide label instructions are being followed would be conducted as part of the contract administration. Form R8-FS-2100-1, Herbicide Treatment and Evaluation Record, would be used to monitor work involving herbicides. Stream samples would also be taken to monitor for offsite movement.



Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

I have determined that the proposed actions are not a major federal action, either individually or cumulatively, and will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment based on the EA and from past experience with similar forest management activities. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not necessary. This determination is based upon the following factors:

1. Both beneficial and adverse effects have been considered and this action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment (EA, Chapter 3 Environmental Disclosures).
2. The degree to which public health and safety may be affected is minimal (EA, pp. 88).
3. The project will not affect any unique characteristics of the geographic area (historic or cultural resource, wetlands, and floodplains, etc.). This is based on information gathered through records and site specific field inventories (EA, p.15).
4. Based on public involvement and the analyses conducted in the EA, the effects on the quality of the human environment are not likely to be highly controversial (EA, p.13 and Chapter 3 Environmental Disclosures).
5. The actions do not involve highly uncertain, unique, or unknown environmental risks to the human environment. All actions described have been conducted before, and district staff members have considerable expertise in carrying out these actions (EA, Chapter 3 Environmental Disclosures).
6. The actions in this decision will not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects nor does it represent a decision in principle about a future consideration (EA, Chapter 3 Environmental Disclosures).
7. The cumulative effects of the proposed actions have been analyzed with consideration for past and foreseeable future activities on adjacent public and private land, and no significant cumulative effects would result from implementation (EA, p. 29 and Chapter 3 Environmental Disclosures).
8. The actions will not affect any sites listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places nor will they cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural or historic resources. This is based on site specific cultural resource surveys conducted on the analysis area, preparation of a Cultural Resources Report, and consultation on the proposed project with the Arkansas State Historic Preservation Officer. (EA, p.15).
9. The actions are not likely to significantly affect endangered or threatened plant or animal species or critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act (EA, pp. 71-83 and Biological Evaluation).
10. None of the actions threaten to lead to violation of federal, state, or local laws imposed for the protection of the environment. This will be ensured by carrying out the decision in a way that is consistent with the forest-wide design criteria, management requirements and mitigation measures established in the Revised Forest Plan. For water quality management, State approved Best Management Practices will be used for this project. The project will be monitored to ensure BMPs are implemented. If implementing BMPs on a specific site results in effects significantly



higher than anticipated, because of unforeseen site factors or events, appropriate corrective measures will be considered and implemented. This project will fully comply with State approved BMPs and the Clean Water Act (EA, pp. 44-48).

Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations

I have determined that actions included in this decision are consistent with the Revised Forest Land and Resource Management Plan for the Ouachita National Forest because the Preferred Alternative (Proposed Action) has been planned and will be implemented in accordance with all applicable design criteria of the Revised Forest Plan (EA, p. 19). The actions described in the Preferred Alternative are typical of those projected for implementation in the Revised Land and Resource Management Plan and for which the environmental effects are disclosed in the Final Supplement to the Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). This environmental assessment tiers to the FEIS (EA, p. 17).

Findings under the National Forest Management Act. The Preferred Alternative, which alters vegetation, complies with the requirements of the National Forest Management Act. Under 16 U.S.C. 1604 (g)(3)(E), a Responsible Official may authorize site-specific projects and activities on NFS lands to harvest timber only where:

1. Soil, slope, or other watershed conditions will not be irreversibly damaged (EA pp. 38-43);
2. There is assurance that the lands can be adequately restocked within five years after final regeneration harvest (EA pp. 55-59);
3. Protection is provided for streams, streambanks, shorelines, lakes, wetlands, and other bodies of water 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; and (EA pp. 44-48)
4. The harvesting system to be used is not selected primarily because it will give the greatest dollar return or the greatest unit output of timber (EA pp. 86-87);

A Responsible Official may authorize site-specific projects and activities on NFS lands using clearcutting, seed tree cutting, shelterwood cutting, and other cuts designed to regenerate an even-aged stand of timber as a cutting method only where:

1. Modified shelterwood (80 acres) has been determined to be an appropriate harvest method to meet the objectives and requirements of the Revised Forest Plan for the Ouachita National Forest (EA pp. 10);
2. The interdisciplinary review has been completed and the potential environmental, biological, aesthetic, engineering, and economic impacts have been assessed, as well as the consistency of the even-age harvest with the multiple use of the general area (16 U.S.C. 1604 (g)(3)(F)(ii)) (EA Chapter 3, Environmental Disclosures);
3. Cut blocks, patches, or strips are shaped and blended to the extent practicable with the natural terrain (16 U.S.C. 1604 (g)(3)(F)(iii)) (EA pg. Chapter 3 Visual Resources);
4. These cuts are carried out according to the maximum size limits for areas to be cut in one harvest operation as required by 16 U.S.C. 1604 (g)(3)(F)(iv)). However, projects may be allowed to exceed the established limits after appropriate public notice and review by the responsible Forest Service officer one level above the Forest Service officer who normally would approve the harvest proposal. Furthermore, such limits shall not apply to the size of areas harvested because of



- natural catastrophic conditions such as fire, insect and disease attack, or windstorm (EA pg.10);
5. Timber cuts are carried out in a manner consistent with the protection of soil, watershed, fish, wildlife, recreation, and esthetic resources, and the regeneration of the timber resource (16 U.S.C. 1604 (g)(3)(F)(v)) (EA Chapter 3, Environmental Disclosures);
 6. Under 16 U.S.C. 1604 (m) even-aged stands of trees scheduled for regeneration harvest generally have reached culmination of mean annual increment of growth, unless the purpose of the timber cutting is excepted in the land management plan (EA Chapter 3 Vegetation).

Implementation and Appeal Rights

This decision is **subject to appeal** pursuant to 36 CFR 215.11 by those who commented during the 30-day notice and comment period and have standing. A written appeal, including attachments, must be postmarked or received within 45 days after the date a legal notice of this decision is published in the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette. The Appeal must be sent to USDA, Forest Service, ATTN: Appeals Deciding Officer, 1720 Peachtree Rd, N.W., Suite 811N, Atlanta, Georgia 30309-9102, within 45 days of the date of the legal notice. Appeals may be faxed to (404) 347-5401. Hand-delivered appeals must be received within normal business hours of 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the address listed above. Appeals may also be mailed electronically in a common digital format to: appeals-southern-regional-office@fs.fed.us.

Appeals must meet content requirements of 36 CFR 215.14. If no appeal is received, implementation of this decision may occur on, but not before, five business days from the close of the appeal filing period. If an appeal is received, implementation may not occur for 15 business days following the date of appeal disposition. (36 CFR 215.9).

Contact

For further information on this decision, contact Donna Reagan, Cold Springs Ranger District, P.O. Box 417, Booneville, AR 72927; phone (479) 675-3233.

Responsible Official

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Richard L. Rosemier".

RICHARD L. ROSEMIER, Deputy Forest Supervisor

12/20/11

DATE