

**DECISION NOTICE
AND
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)
USDA Forest Service**

Dry Restoration Project

**Okanogan – Wenatchee National Forest
Naches Ranger District
Yakima, WA**

HISTORY OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The Dry Restoration Project is the second of two projects planned within the 11,769 acre Dry Ridge Potential Landscape Treatment Area (PLTA). The analysis for the first project, Nelli Restoration, was completed in 2012 and the final decision notice was signed on June 28, 2013. Analyzing the entire PLTA allows the Forest Service to achieve the larger landscape perspective and better address cumulative effects to resources. The Dry Restoration Project proposes specific treatments within the Dry Ridge PLTA. Landmarks within the project area include Nile Creek, Rattlesnake Creek, Orr Creek, Dry Creek, and the Nile Mill Site. The overall location is west of Naches, Washington in Township 16 North, Range 14 East, Sections 10 through 15, 23 through 29, and 32 through 36; Township 16 North, Range 15 East, Sections 18, 19, 30, and 31, and; Township 15 North, Range 14 East, Sections 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, and 12. The project area borders 5.5 miles of state and private land in the Nile Valley. Forest Roads providing access to the project area include 1600, 1601, 1603, 1611, 1631, and their associated collector and spur roads. The area is a popular among horsemen, hunters, and snowmobilers.

This decision incorporates the completed Dry Restoration Environmental Assessment (EA) by reference. The EA documents the development of the proposed action and discloses known environmental impacts. The EA is available at <http://go.usa.gov/Nnmd>.

PURPOSE AND NEED

Based on Forest Service management direction and guidance (EA page I-3-7) and the Ecosystem Management Decision Support (EMDS) analysis, the desired future condition of the Dry Restoration Project area is one in which:

- Key components of the composition, structure, and pattern of forest vegetation are within an average of the natural and future range of variability.
- Forest vegetation is resilient to insect, disease, and uncharacteristic fire.
- Appropriate proportions of structural components on the landscape are restored or protected

- Forest composition, structure, function, and pattern are appropriate to the forest type and within the natural range of variability.
- Protection of life, property, critical infrastructure, and resources can be achieved within normal risk inherent to wildland firefighting in a light fuel loading, dry forest type.
- Riparian Reserves are maintained or restored to provide aquatic habitat and passage for aquatic and terrestrial organisms including ponds, marshes and wetlands.

The purpose and need for the Dry Restoration Project was derived from the comparison of the existing condition (EA page I-8-10) with the desired future condition consistent with national and local guidance. The Purpose and Need is to reduce fuels and restore stands on the landscape to provide resiliency to uncharacteristic wildfire, insects, and disease, enhance and protect white-headed woodpecker, flammulated owl, and northern spotted owl habitat, improve the stability and function of the coarse woody debris-depleted Dry Creek stream channel, and to provide forest products (EA pages I-10-11).

DECISION AND RATIONALE

This Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) documents my decision regarding the implementation of the Dry Restoration Project. I have decided to implement the Refined Proposed Action as presented in the Final Dry Restoration EA. Management actions were designed to accomplish the purpose and need for the project area. The Refined Proposed Action includes:

- Commercial harvest on 548 acres in dry forest stands. These stands are composed of Douglas fir, ponderosa pine, grand fir, and western larch trees. Commercial harvest will remove merchantable size material (greater than seven inches in diameter). Within the proposed 548 acres, 304 acres will use ground-based logging systems such as tractor, rubber-tired skidder, log forwarder, etc. The remaining 244 acres are located on steeper ground and will utilize skyline logging systems to yard timber to landings.
- 200 acres available for commercial or personal firewood cutting. These identified acres for firewood collection will include seven inch or greater green material in areas in need of thinning.
- Stream course stabilization within approximately two miles of the Dry creek channel. The stabilization treatment will consist of supplementing approximately 200 small and medium size trees (<15 inches diameter breast height (dbh)) into the bankfull channel and floodplain of Dry creek. The placement would occur from the National Forest boundary to the Forest Service Road 1631 stream crossing.

Connected actions that are directly associated with the Refined Proposed Action include:

- Constructing approximately three miles of temporary road to facilitate timber harvest operations. All project related temporary roads will be returned to their original closed state after the project is fully implemented. For the exact location of temporary roads see the EA located at <http://go.usa.gov/Nnmd>.

- Installation of erosion control structures, vegetation and grass seeding in areas vulnerable to erosion (e.g. skid road and landings).
- Ripping of compacted soil on skid roads and landings in the proposed timber harvest areas to reduce soil compaction and to prepare seedbeds for vegetative planting.
- Reconstructing roads to clean ditches and culverts as well as basic road maintenance activities. The Refined Proposed action does not propose any changes to the status of system roads.
- Piling and burning of activity fuels, known as wood and slash, left on site after commercial harvest and firewood removal.

OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

No Action

The Dry Restoration Project EA includes a No Action alternative, as per 36 CFR Part 220, Section 220.7 (b)(2)(ii). The No Action Alternative considers effects to the project area if no management action were taken. I did not choose the No Action Alternative because the existing condition would continue into the future and it would not meet this project's purpose and need. No Action would result in not increasing the resiliency of the landscape, allowing it to become increasingly susceptible to uncharacteristic wildlife, insects, and disease. With the project area remaining at high risk for large-scale high severity fires, there would be the risk of losing habitat for species like the white headed woodpecker, flammulated owl, and the northern spotted owl. Taking no action would also mean the aquatic habitat and coarse woody debris condition would remain the same or continue to degrade in the Dry Creek stream channel. The stability of Dry Creek would not be improved. Taking no action would mean no forest products would be made available.

The Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) considered all comments made during project scoping (see Chapter IV of EA for more information) and comment periods and where applicable adjusted the Original Proposed Action to resolve those concerns. Adjustments were minor and included additional protection of riparian reserves, more specific information on road management within the project area, and an increase in the availability of commercially viable timber. These adjustments continue to allow the project to meet Wenatchee Forest Plan and Northwest Forest Plan standards and guidelines.

The Refined Proposed Action design criteria and Best Management Practices were selected to optimize vegetation restoration, while still minimizing potential impacts to other resources. A comprehensive and interdisciplinary project design allowed the IDT to eliminate unresolved conflicts within the project area. As this project is prepared under Forest Service Manual and Forest Service Handbook direction National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations and there are no unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources, no additional alternatives were fully developed. The range of alternatives presented, including No Action, addresses all topics raised during scoping and comment periods.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND SCOPING

As mentioned in Chapter I of the EA, the Dry Restoration project is a continuation of the landscape analysis in the Dry Ridge PLTA. The IDT for the landscape analysis was initiated in February of 2011. Scoping for the first project in the Dry Ridge PLTA, Nelli, began in February of 2012 (more information on page I-22 of the Nelli EA). The Nelli Restoration Project was completed and signed June 28, 2013. That same summer, IDT members began internal scoping and field reconnaissance for the second project in the analysis area, Dry Restoration.

A government-to-government consultation letter for the Dry Restoration Project was sent to Harry Smiskin, Chairman, Yakama Nation and other Yakama Nation contacts on February 4, 2014. The project proposal was then mailed to 575 individuals on the Naches mailing list (including hard copy letters and emails) February 6, 2014. The project proposal letter sent mailed out also outlined the start of the official comment period and the proposed timeline under the new 36 CFR 218 regulations. The project proposal can be found in its entirety at <http://go.usa.gov/Nnmd>. Additional public outreach included publishing available information in the Forest Service Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA), presentations at multiple (2013-2014) Trails and Wilderness Interest Group Meetings (TWIG), and making information available in the Naches Ranger District foyer.

The Dry Restoration Project had two comment periods. The first official 30-day comment period began on February 12, 2014 after being announced in both the Wenatchee World and the Yakima Herald Republic legal notice section. The second comment period began on April 24, 2014 and lasted for 15 days.

During the comment periods, the Naches Ranger District received comments and interest from 12 individuals and agencies. Topics included recreational and trail impacts, commercial harvest related impacts, road status within the project area, Forest Service communication with the public, economic impacts of the project, target landscape objectives, reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfire, impacts in the firewood cutting unit, protection of tribal resources, and the protection of riparian resources. A detailed response and analysis of all comments received is available at <http://go.usa.gov/Nnmd>.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

My responsibility as the Line Officer with authority to make this decision is to review the EA and determine whether the proposed action may have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. In compliance with 40 CFR 1508.13 and 1508.25, the following findings support my determination that there will not be a significant effect on the human environment and an environmental impact statement will, therefore, not be prepared.

SIGNIFICANCE

From 40 CFR 1508.27:

"Significantly" as used in NEPA requires considerations of both context and intensity:

(a) Context. This means that the significance of an action must be analyzed in several contexts such as society as a whole (human, national), the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality. Significance varies with the setting of the proposed action. For instance, in the case of a site-specific action, significance would usually depend upon the effects in the locale rather than in the world as a whole. Both short- and long-term effects are relevant.

(b) Intensity. This refers to the severity of impact. Responsible officials must bear in mind that more than one agency may make decisions about partial aspects of a major action.

Context

This project is a site-specific action that by itself does not have international, national, region-wide, or statewide importance. The discussion of the significance criteria that follows applies to the intended action and is within the context of local importance in the area associated with the Dry Ridge Potential Landscape Treatment Area (PLTA).

Intensity

The following discussion is organized around the 10 Significance Criteria described in NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1508.27).

1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the effect will be beneficial. A thorough effects analysis (direct, indirect, and cumulative) is available in Chapter III of the EA, and in the Biological Assessment. The beneficial effects of the action as disclosed in Chapter III do not bias my finding of no significant environmental effects, nor do beneficial effects mask adverse effects.
2. The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety. The proposed actions will not have adverse effects to public safety (EA III-82). Impacts of prescribed burning will be minimized through smoke regulations and avoidance. The Naches Ranger District works closely with the Washington State Department of Natural Resources and Yakima Regional Clean Air Agency to minimize impacts of smoke from prescribed fire. Additional incidental dust from project implementation including commercial trucks and road maintenance is negligible to public health. With project design, this project is in compliance with the Washington State, State Implementation Plan and the Clean Air Act (EA III-83).
3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers,

ecologically critical areas, critical habitat, Inventoried Roadless Areas, or Potential Wilderness Areas. There will be no significant effects on the unique characteristics of the area. No Inventoried Roadless Areas, Potential Wilderness Areas, park lands, prime farmlands or prime forest lands are found in the project area (EA, page III-86-87). No Wild and Scenic Rivers occur within the Dry project area. This project complies with regulations of Wild and Scenic Rivers and will have no impact on designated Wild and Scenic Rivers. (EA, page III-87).

Project design criteria and mitigations address and minimize possible effects to the scenic character. Long term cumulative effects to the visual resource would not be measurable as the Dry Ridge landscape would be returned to more natural appearing conditions and would be consistent with the Wenatchee Forest Plan Visual Quality Objective of modification (EA III-82).

Historic resources will be protected with standard cultural mitigations. Impacts to cultural and heritages resources are entirely covered by the Nelli Restoration Project. Dry Restoration Project will have no additional impacts on cultural resources and is in compliance of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). NHPA Section 106 consultation for the Dry project was completed in accordance with the terms of the programmatic agreement regarding management of cultural resources on Washington State National Forests (1997). For more information, reference the Nelli EA pages III-183-185.

4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial. The nature of potential effects on the human environment from the Refined Proposed Action is well established and is not likely to be highly controversial. The Forest Service has used best available science and monitoring data from other similar projects in guiding the effects of this project. The Forest Service also conducted far reaching scoping on this project, received no indication of controversy and resolved issues in the Refined Proposed Action (EA, page IV-1).
5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. The Forest Service has considerable experience with this type of action. The effects analysis (EA Chapter III), current science, and monitoring show the predicted results of these treatments are highly likely and there is little, if any, uncertainty regarding their outcome. Effects do not involve unique or unknown risk. After a review of scientific literature, including articles cited in comments received, there is no science indicating different effects than described in the EA on the quality to the environment. Refer to Forest Service Response to Comments located at <http://go.usa.gov/Nnmd>.
6. The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration. My decision to implement the actions included in the Refined Proposed Action does not establish a precedent for future actions with significant

effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration. I have made this decision based on the overall consistency of the proposed activities with the Amended Wenatchee Forest Plan standards and guidelines. The decisions made and analysis completed is site and temporal specific. The purpose and need are only relevant to the specific affected environment.

7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance exists if it is reasonable to anticipate a cumulatively significant impact on the environment. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into small component parts. The effects of implementing the actions included in the Refined Proposed Action will not be significant, individually or cumulatively, when considered with the effects of other past and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Actions in the Refined Proposed Action along with past, current and reasonably foreseeable actions that could impact the project area are routine Forest Service activities. The impacts of the project were reviewed holistically to ensure effects were not significant when actions were combined. For more information on the cumulative effects of each resource, see Chapter III of the EA.
8. The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources. I have determined that the actions described in the Refined Proposed Action do not adversely affect or cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources. Impacts to cultural and heritages resources are entirely covered by the Nelli Restoration Project. For more information, reference the Nelli EA pages III-183-185. No new actions that would impact cultural resources were proposed under the Dry Restoration Project.

This project is consistent with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). No cultural resource concerns or issues were identified in the government-to-government consultation process. NHPA Section 106 consultation for the Dry project was completed in accordance with the terms of the programmatic agreement regarding management of cultural resources on Washington State National Forests (1997). Specific measures were identified for all known eligible or potentially eligible properties to ensure their protection and/or consideration with regard to proposed restoration activities. It was determined the project would have “no effect” on cultural resources provided these measures are fully implemented (Beidl 2012: Report 2012061708010).

9. The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act. A Biological Assessment of threatened and endangered wildlife and aquatic species was completed and concluded the following for the implementation of the Refined Proposed Action:

- a. Fisheries: Proposed activities for the Refined Proposed Action "**May Affect, but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect**" Middle Columbia River steelhead and Columbia River bull trout. The project "**May Affect, but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect**" MCR steelhead and Columbia River bull trout Designated Critical Habitat. Essential Fish Habitat for Chinook and coho salmon will not be adversely affected.

Commercial tree harvest and associated temporary road construction would cause no effect to Management Indicator Species habitat in the project area. Hauling of logs on system roads may cause negligible, short term effects to management indicator species habitat from increased sediment delivery to habitat. Large wood supplementation to Dry Creek would indirectly benefit management indicator species habitat by restoring approximately 2.0 miles of occupied habitat.

Effects of the Refine Proposed Action considered cumulatively with other restoration projects in the area will reduce watershed road densities, drainage networks, and improve floodplain function and fish habitat in these watersheds (EA III-27).

- b. Wildlife species: The Refined Proposed Action "**May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect**" Designated Critical Habitat for the Northern spotted owl, and "**May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect**" the northern spotted owl, and gray wolf. It has been determined that this project will have "**No Effect**" on the grizzly bear, Canada lynx, marbled murrelet, and Pacific fisher "**Not Likely to Jeopardize the Continued Existence**" of the North American wolverine (EA III-36).

The Dry Ridge PLTA does not occur within the documented range for the marbled murrelet and is located outside of the Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone. Although the project area exists within approximately 2,339 acres of the Rattlesnake LAU (Lynx Analysis Unit) it does not occur within mapped potential lynx habitat. Habitat for the fisher exists within the project area, however populations in Washington are thought to be extirpated, or contain only remnant scattered individuals (Hayes and Lewis 2006). No risk factors for fisher exist in the project area since this species is highly unlikely to occur. This project will not affect species that do not occur and habitat that is not present within or adjacent to the project area.

The project will have "no impact" on sensitive species that do not occur or where habitat does not exist within the project area (see Table III-7 on page III-38 of the EA). Although habitat and sightings have occurred within the Dry Ridge PLTA, a no risk factor was concluded for the shiny tightcoil, western gray squirrel, pallid bat, bald eagle, and peregrine falcon as these species are highly unlikely to occur within the Dry project area. None of these species have been documented within the Dry project area

and nesting habitat for the bald eagle and American peregrine falcon does not exist within the Dry Ridge PLTA.

- c. The Dry Restoration Project will have no impact on listed threatened, endangered, or sensitive plant species within the project area. All effects to threatened, endangered, sensitive, or survey and manage species (Northwest Forest Plan) were previously analyzed in the Nelli Restoration Project. None of these species were found in the project area (Nelli Decision Notice, DN-12)

The Naches Ranger District received a letter of concurrence on the Biological Assessment for the Aquatic and Wildlife species from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on August 7, 2014. Concurrence for the Dry Restoration Project from National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) for Fisheries was received on August 26, 2014. Both documents are available at <http://go.usa.gov/Nnmd>.

10. Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment. The actions described in the Refined Proposed Action do not threaten any violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment. State, local, and federal laws were reviewed in the analysis of the Dry Restoration project and no inconsistencies were found. More information can be found on page III-86 of the EA. Other required findings of applicable laws can be found below on page DN-10.

I find that implementing the Refined Proposed Action does not constitute a major federal action that will significantly affect the quality of the human environment in either context or intensity. I have made this determination after considering both positive and negative effects, as well as direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of this action.

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 that the severity of these impacts is not significant based on the above analysis of the significance factors.

I base my conclusion on a review of the record that shows a thorough review of relevant scientific information, a consideration of responsible opposing views, and the acknowledgment that there is not incomplete or unavailable information, scientific uncertainty, or risk associated with the Refined Proposed Action. My basis includes the effects analysis contained in the EA in Chapter III, public comment, and consultation with interested environmental groups and government agencies (EA, Chapter IV and comment analysis).

FINDINGS REQUIRED BY OTHER LAWS

Wenatchee National Land and Resource Management Plan as Amended by the Northwest Forest Plan (Amended Forest Plan)

This decision is consistent with the Wenatchee National Land and Resource Management Plan's (as amended) goals and objectives. Project design is in conformance with Amended Forest Plan Forest-wide Management Area standards and guidelines. Chapter III of the EA shows adherence to these land allocations in the Hydrology, Fisheries, Silviculture, Wildlife, and Recreation effects analyses.

No management activities are planned in Administratively Withdrawn or Congressionally Withdrawn Areas. This project is consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy (ACS) objectives. The project will maintain all nine objectives of the ACS at the project and 5th field watershed levels (EA, pages III-36). The project may involve some short term negative impacts but this will be offset by long term riparian area improvements.

This project has no impact on timber or other Forest resources and is consistent with the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) of 1976. This project does not propose any commitments of resources that are irretrievable or irreversible.

This project is consistent with the 2001 Record of Decision and Standards and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage Protection buffer, and other Mitigation Measures Standards and Guidelines (EA Chapter III).

This project is consistent with the 2005 Pacific Northwest Record of Decision for Invasive Plant Management (EA page III-40). All applicable prevention and treatment standards and guidelines from that document have been incorporated into the design criteria for the Dry Restoration Project.

Roadless Area Conservation Rule

No management activities are proposed within or adjacent to any Inventoried Roadless Area.

Endangered Species Act

This project has been designed to promote the conservation of ESA-species, see FONSI element nine above.

Magnuson – Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA)

This project is consistent with the MSA. Within the Rattlesnake Creek-Naches River sub-basin (HUC 10) the Naches River, Rattlesnake Creek and all tributaries are considered Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for Chinook and coho salmon, under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Essential Fish Habitat for Chinook and coho salmon includes all streams, lakes, ponds, wetlands, tributaries and other water bodies currently viable, and most of the habitat historically accessible to Chinook and coho salmon. Spring Chinook salmon are widespread in the Naches River and its larger tributaries. No adverse effects to EFH are expected to occur under the Refined Proposed Action.

Clean Air Act (CAA)

This project is compliant with the CAA. See FONSI element two above.

Clean Water Act

Integrated project design criteria and BMP implementation will ensure that water quality standards and the anti-degradation policy (Chapter 173-201A WAC) are expected to be met with the Refined Proposed Action. The Refined Proposed Action is not expected to substantially alter the water quality (EA III-27). Full implementation of BMPs has been shown to be an effective method in preventing and controlling nonpoint source water pollution (Rashin, 2006), (USDA Forest Service, 2000). Monitoring would be conducted during the project in order to validate implementation and effectiveness of BMP's and assure compliance with the Clean Water Act, State water quality regulations and forest plan standards.

National Historic Preservation Act, Alaska Native Religious Sites, and Cultural Sites

The Forest Service program for compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act includes locating, inventorying, and nominating all cultural sites that may be directly or indirectly affected by scheduled activities. Since 1978, at least thirty-one archeological surveys have identified over forty eligible and potentially eligible cultural properties in the project planning area, and identified and assessed their protection needs. In consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) it has been determined that the undertaking would affect no properties listed on or eligible to the National Register (letter concurring with "No Effect" received from SHPO on June 13, 2012. Refer also to Nelli EA pages III-183 through III-185).

Floodplain Management (E.O. 11988), Protection of Wetlands (E.O. 11990), municipal watersheds

The project design criteria and implementation of mitigation measures for Riparian Reserves will ensure compliance with EO 11988 Floodplain Management (11988, 1977), and EO 11990 Wetland Protection (11990, 1977). Proposed unit boundaries have been located to avoid floodplains and wetlands. Vegetation and fuels management prescriptions were developed which will not affect stream shading or ground cover levels within riparian floodplain or wetland areas. These actions will provide protection and reduce the risk of detrimental effects to riparian areas and wetlands (EA III-27).

Recreational Fishing (E.O. 12962)

Recreational fishing is an identified use in the analysis area. This project would not result in any appreciable reduction in the fish population numbers or otherwise negatively affect the fishing opportunity. This project is consistent with this Order.

Environmental Justice (E.O. 12898)

The Refined Proposed Action is consistent with Executive Order 12898. This project will not have any disparate effects on minority populations or low-income populations. This project is site specific and will not have human health effects on any group.

Potential or Unusual Expenditures of Energy

This project has no potential or unusual expenditures of energy. All proposed activities are actions which the Forest Service routinely takes. This project does not involve energy production or storage.

Conflicts with Plans, Policies, or Other Jurisdictions

The IDT has cooperated with State and other local agencies to the fullest extent possible to reduce duplication between NEPA and State and local requirements. State, local, and federal laws were reviewed and this project has no inconsistencies with approved State or local plan and laws.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND OBJECTION OPPORTUNITIES

On March 27, 2013, a final rule revising 36 CFR Part 218 was published in the Federal Register Volume 78, No. 59. The new rule replaces the previous appeal rules defined in 36 CFR 215, and expands the use of the pre-decisional objection process. The new rule provides the public an opportunity to comment and express concerns on projects before decisions are made, rather than after.

The Dry Restoration project is a non-HFRA project that was subject to subparts A and B of 36CFR 218 regulations. This Decision was subject to administrative review (objection) pursuant to 36 CFR Part 218. No objections to the Dry Restoration Project were filed.

IMPLEMENTATION OF DECISION

This project is likely to be implemented in 2015. Implementation of the decision may occur immediately.

INFORMATION CONTACT PERSON

For additional information concerning this decision, contact Dave Lucas, 10237 Highway 12, Naches, WA, 98937, at 509-653-1458.



KELLY LAWRENCE
District Ranger
Naches Ranger District
Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest



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, or marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.