Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact
Young Mike Sherman Project

U.S. Forest Service
Ozark St-Francis National Forests
Johnson County, Arkansas

Decision

Based on an Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared by an interdisciplinary team of Forest Service specialists, decisions regarding management actions for forest health, watershed improvement, ecosystem restoration, wildlife habitat, and recreation over the next several years have been made for the Young Mike Sherman project.

Appropriate management activities are planned to implement the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests (OSFNFs) 2005 Revised Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) goals, objectives, and desired future condition for the timber, wildlife, and recreation resources within the project area. The management actions designed to meet these objectives address issues and concerns expressed by the public and interdisciplinary team.

The project area of Young Mike Sherman is in Johnson County, Arkansas. Please see the enclosed map for a better description of the project's location where communities, roads and other landmarks can be identified. The project area encompasses approximately 23,680 total acres; 16,407 of National Forest lands and 7,273 acres of private land. The Young Mike Sherman project includes three separate project areas with the following compartments: 345, 373, 372, 378, 374, 375, 376, 377, 353, 354, 358, 364, 359, 401, 400, 338, and 339. The legal description of Young Mike Sherman project area is T11N, R22W Sections: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 19, 20, 21, 28, 29, 30; T11N, R23W Sections: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34; T11N, R24W Sections: 13, 24, 25, 35, 36; T12N, R25W Sections: 23, 24, 25, 26, 35, 36; T11N, R25W Sections: 1, 2, 11, 12, 13; T12N, R24W Sections: 32, 33; T11N, R24W Sections: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 17, 18.

Based on the analysis documented in the EA, it is my decision to implement **Alternative 2** (see attached maps). We took a hard look at environmental consequences of the proposed actions by identifying and analyzing resources that may be potentially affected using best available science. Alternative 2 will have some environmental impacts and may not completely resolve all issues; however, this alternative has the best potential for meeting the purpose and need of this project while minimizing potential environmental consequences. Whenever reasonable and prudent, project modifications, mitigation and protection measures were developed and will be implemented to reduce negative resource impacts and/or resolve issues.

Specifically, the following actions are planned:

Vegetation Management

Regeneration Harvest of Pine and Hardwood (Shelterwood or Seedtree) – up to 1,479 acres

Mature forest stands would be commercially harvested to begin the process of renewal. Much of the overstory would be removed to open the forest floor to new regeneration. Additional site preparation measures would consist of prescribed burning and herbicide/hand tool/mechanized work.

Thinning of Pine and Hardwood Stands – up to 2,300 acres

Thinning would increase growth of immature forest stands, reduce their susceptibility to insects and disease, and improve wildlife habitat. Prescribed burning and mid-story treatments using herbicide and/or hand tools may be utilized to further reduce competition and increase sunlight to developing regeneration.

Shortleaf Pine Restoration – up to 150 acres

This action entails the removal (commercial harvest) of planted, non-native loblolly pine. Shortleaf pine seedlings will then be planted to replace the non-native loblolly pine.. After harvest, site preparation activities will be accomplished using hand tools/herbicide, and mechanical means. Unharvested residual loblolly pine trees could be cut, removed and/or girdled within and adjacent to treatment areas to eliminate seed dispersal. Over time, the shortleaf pine would replace the loblolly returning the stand to a native species.

Pine Heavy Site Preparation – up to 60 acres

This treatment includes a stand that is located within an acquired tract that has previously been cut-over. It is now a thick stand of hardwood brush and saplings where originally it was pine timber. Heavy equipment as well as herbicide and/or hand tools would be utilized to return the stand to shortleaf pine vegetation. Then planting shortleaf pine seedlings could occur.

Hardwood Overstory Removal – up to 80 acres

Three hardwood stands have suffered from a significant wind event that has essentially stripped them of most of their standing over-story. Efforts should be made to restore these stands back to being fully stocked by removing the rest of the trees and planting back to oak. The site preparation measures mentioned above would need to be implemented to help assure stocking levels are attained.

Oak Woodland Management – up to 137 acres

This prescription emphasizes restoration and maintenance of a mosaic of open oak woodland that mimics historical conditions. The purpose is to provide habitat for associated plants and animals, some of which are rare and declining, and to create a setting for recreation that is visually appealing, rich in wildlife and not commonly encountered elsewhere. Where practicable, commercial harvest would be employed to maintain about 45-50 trees per acre. Where it is not practicable, fire, herbicide, and non-commercial thinning would be used to maintain density. Some more accessible areas would be offered as firewood products for local use.

Riparian Hardwood Restoration – up to 90 acres

This action entails the removal (commercial harvest) of off-site pine vegetation in a riparian zone to be replaced by hardwood through natural succession. Unharvested residual loblolly pine trees could be cut, removed and/or girdled within and adjacent to treatment areas to eliminate seed

dispersal. No other after-harvest mechanical and hand tool treatment activities are planned. The hardwood brush and trees presently in the under and mid-story would naturally overtake the site as the pine over-story is removed in two to three stages.

Timber Stand Improvement (TSI) of Pine and Hardwood – up to 630 acres

This treatment would be performed on mostly immature saw-timber-sized trees. The forest stands have a dense mid-story and understory of desirable/undesirable species. Removal of the undesirable species would allow a regeneration harvest to be considered next entry. TSI work of undesirable species would include the use of hand tools, herbicides, mechanical applications, and power saws. Prescribed burning may follow this treatment to further control unwanted competitors of oak and pine.

Pine Pre-Commercial Thinning (PCT) – up to 40 acres

These young stands are overcrowded and need to be thinned out to allow the residual trees to expand and grow. Means to accomplish this would entail hand tools (power saws) and/or herbicides.

Pine & Hardwood Release – up to 110 acres

Young stands of desirable species are being suppressed by competing understory species. Hand tools, herbicide and power saws would be needed to remove the unwanted competition.

Creating/Improving Wildlife Openings – up to 110 acres

This would include 67 new wildlife openings and 43 enlargements of existing wildlife openings. Wildlife openings would be constructed with either the use of a masticator and/or pushing stumps and debris with a dozer. Establishment of herbaceous species would occur using disking, liming, seeding, and fertilization or existing native herbaceous vegetation may suffice for wildlife habitat. Once constructed, these openings would be maintained. Maintenance would consist of the following actions:

Mowing would occur on a 1- to 2-year schedule. Disking, seeding native or non-invasive cool season forage plants, accompanied by application of fertilizer and lime would occur on a 2- to 3-year schedule (as needed).

Application of approved herbicides such as glyphosate, imazapic, imazapyr, triclopyr, or hexazinone would occur on a 2- to 3-year schedule if needed to reduce encroachment of woody species. All Forest-Wide Standards and herbicide labels/precautions would be followed in the use of herbicide.

These openings would disperse concentrations of animal species over a broader area and would meet goals outlined in the Forest Plan. Many animals need these forest openings to fulfill all or some of their habitat requirements during their life cycle. The Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, local volunteers, the National Wild Turkey Federation, and contractors would participate with the USDA Forest Service in wildlife opening maintenance.

Pond Construction – up to 8 new ponds

This would include new construction and reconstruction of 8 ponds approximately ¼ acre each. Some mastication of cut-over acquired land and existing pond banks would occur. . Two existing

ponds would be stocked with forage and sport fish.

Gate Installation – up to 40 gates

Gates would be installed on identified wildlife opening access roads. Roads designated as open to the public would not be closed. Roads which provide access to private developments would not be closed. Gates at wildlife openings improve wildlife habitat by reducing disturbance to wildlife from vehicles and provide better recreational experiences to Forest users by limiting areas to walk-in hunting/wildlife viewing only.

Prescribed Fire – up to 16,407 acres

All Forest Service land within the Young Mike Sherman project (16,407 acres) would potentially receive low-to-moderate intensity prescribed burns to reduce hazardous fuels and wildfire risk, improve wildlife habitat, and for silvicultural purposes. Special attention would be given to all pine stands in which only low-intensity burning would take place in order to promote pine regeneration.

The U.S. Forest Service and the Arkansas Forestry Commission would solicit cooperation with private landowners using the Stevens (state) and Wyden (federal) agreements, which allow the agencies to carry out prescribed fire treatments on private lands surrounded by or adjacent to public lands under federal management. If private land owners do not wish to participate in prescribed fire treatments, their lands would be excluded from the project.

Smoke emission modeling would be completed as part of the project analysis and all information relating to emissions can be found in the project file. All prescribed burning would be conducted in compliance with Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) voluntary smoke management guidelines. Additional information can be found in the project file.

Stream Habitat Improvement – up to 20 miles

Large Woody Debris (LWD) placement would occur in stream channels intended for fish habitat improvement. LWD consists of felling approximately 15-30 trees/mile ranging in size from 10-30 inches dbh and having the felled trees fall into the creek channel. This provides structure for fish, stabilizes banks, reduces velocity of water flow, and helps create pool habitat for fish.

Non-Native Invasive Species

The occurrences of tree of heaven and invasive species would be treated with herbicides under an existing EA and decision notice completed for the main division of the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests (including the Pleasant Hill Ranger District) in 2019.

Roadwork

Reconstruction – up to 3 miles

Some existing roads could be reconstructed within the project area. These roads are situated on somewhat stable templates that display signs of age where spots of erosion are occurring and drainage crossings are crumbling. Reconstruction would help stabilize these roads, reduce erosion and deter sediment from reaching streams.

Decommissioning – up to 20 miles

Some existing roads are no longer needed for management and could be decommissioned within the project area. This entails restoring roads to a more natural state. Activities used to decommission a road would include but are not limited to the following: re-establishing former drainage patterns, stabilizing slopes, restoring vegetation, blocking the entrance to the road, installing water bars (earthen mounds), and removing culverts. Unnamed and unauthorized off-highway vehicle (OHV) trails present in the project area may be closed using debris, rocks, earthen mounds, or gates. A transportation analysis report is part of the project file.

Temporary Roads – up to 5 miles

Some temporary roads would be needed to access timber stands. These roads would be blocked, and then rehabilitated with seeding and/or natural re-vegetation. Temporary roads would not be intended to be included as part of the forest transportation system as they are managed for short-term projects or activities, followed by decommissioning after use.

Access

Adjacent landowners whose property blocks access to Federal land may be contacted by the Forest Service and asked to consider allowing entrance to these otherwise inaccessible areas for forest management and fire protection.

OHV Routes

There will be an additional 3 miles of road designated as an OHV route. The new route will include portions of FS 1524 and FS 4401 for better connectivity between existing routes. The new route is illustrated in the Young Mike Sherman EA in Figure 2.

Site-Specific Design Criteria

Applicable standards and guidelines in the Forest Plan, and the mitigation measures and management requirements of the Best Management Practices (BMPs) Guidelines for Water Quality Protection (Arkansas Forestry Commission 2002) will be applied as appropriate for this project. BMPs will be used to prevent erosion on constructed fire-lines and/or temporary roads. Seeding and installing water bars on these areas will be employed as mitigation for erosion. Burning operations will also follow the guidelines of the Arkansas Forestry Commission's Smoke Management Program (SMP), and be monitored to ensure project design criteria and smoke management activities are properly executed.

Heritage Protection Measure 1: Site Avoidance during Project Implementation

Avoidance of historic properties will require protection from effects resulting from the proposed activities. Mitigation measures include establishing clearly defined site boundaries and buffers around archeological sites where activities might result in an adverse effect and routing those proposed activities away from historic properties. Buffers will be of sufficient size to ensure that site integrity is not compromised.

Heritage Protection Measure 2: Site Protection during Prescribed Burns

1. *Fire-lines*. Historic properties located along existing non-maintained woods roads used as fire control lines will be protected by hand-clearing those sections that cross these sites. Although these roads are generally cleared of combustible debris using a small dozer, those

sections crossing archeological sites will be cleared using leaf blowers and/or leaf rakes. There will be neither removal of soil, nor disturbance below the ground surface, during fire-line preparation. Historic properties and features located along proposed routes of mechanically-constructed fire-lines, where fire-lines do not now exist, will be avoided by routing fire-line construction around historic properties. Sites that lie along previously constructed dozer lines from past burns (where the fire-lines will be used again as fire-lines) will be protected during future burns by hand clearing sections of line that cross the site, rather than re-clearing using heavy equipment. Where these activities will take place outside stands not already surveyed, cultural resource surveys and consultation will be completed prior to project implementation.

2. *Burn Unit Interior*. Combustible elements at historic properties in burn unit interiors will be protected from damage during burns by removing excessive fuels from the feature vicinity and, where applicable, by burning out around the feature prior to igniting the main burn and creating a fuel-free zone. Historic properties containing above ground, non-combustible cultural features and exposed artifacts will be protected by removing fuel concentrations dense enough to significantly alter the characteristics of those cultural resources. For sites that have been previously burned or that do not contain combustible elements or other above-ground features and exposed artifacts, no additional measures are proposed. Past research indicates that prescribed burning is not sufficiently intense to cause adverse effects to these features.

3. *Post-Burn Monitoring*. Post-burn monitoring may be conducted at selected sites to assess actual and indirect effects of the burns on the sites against the expected effects. Arkansas State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) consultation will be carried out with respect to necessary mitigation for any sites that suffer unexpected damage during the burn or from indirect effects following the burn.

Heritage Protection Measure 3: Other Protection Measures
If it is not feasible or desirable to avoid an historic property that may be harmed by a project activity, then the following steps will be taken:

1. In consultation with the Arkansas SHPO, the site(s) will be evaluated against National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) significance criteria (36 CFR 60.4) to determine eligibility for the NRHP. The evaluation may require subsurface site testing;
2. In consultation with the Arkansas SHPO, relevant federally-recognized Tribes, and if required with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), mitigation measures will be developed to minimize the adverse effects on the site, so that a finding of No Adverse Effect results;
3. The agreed-upon mitigation measures will be implemented prior to initiation of activities having the potential to affect the site.

Heritage Protection Measure 4: Discovery of Cultural Resources during Project Implementation

Although cultural resources surveys were designed to locate all NRHP eligible archeological sites and components, these may go undetected for a variety of reasons. Should unrecorded cultural resources be discovered, activities that may be affecting that resource will halt immediately; the resource will be evaluated by an archaeologist, and consultation will be initiated with the SHPO, tribes and nations, and the ACHP, to determine appropriate actions for protecting the resource and mitigating adverse effects. Project activities at that locale will not resume until the resource is adequately protected and until agreed-upon mitigation measures are implemented with SHPO approval.

Decision Rationale

The Proposed Action, Alternative 2, with its site-specific design criteria and associated Forest Plan amendment, was selected because it best addressed the purpose and need in a balanced, cost-effective way, and provides adequate benefits to the public while protecting Forest resources. It was selected over the No Action Alternative because the No Action Alternative would not address the needs of the area, nor move the area toward achieving the desired future conditions in this area outlined in the Forest Plan. The Young Mike Sherman Project EA documents the environmental analysis and conclusions upon which this decision is based.

My reasons for choosing **Alternative 2** were:
Overall, I viewed this proposal as the one best meeting the goals and objectives of the 2005 Forest Plan while still addressing the issues and concerns raised by the public, other agencies, and by the interdisciplinary team. Specifically, the reasons are:

- The effects of past, present, and proposed activities have been carefully analyzed in the EA pp. 19-35. Based on the analysis in the EA, there would be minimal negative direct, indirect and cumulative effects to water quality, soils, vegetation, heritage resources, wildlife, human health, and other resources.

- The proposed action would reach desired future conditions, where as no action would allow for only currrent management activities on a limited scale to continue. Substantive resource management would not be accomplished.

- Prescribed fire will serve to re-introduce fire into a fire-adapted ecosystem, promote oak regeneration in canopy openings created by red oak borer damage/oak decline, promote regeneration in shelterwood and seed-tree harvest areas, maintain pine/hardwood stands in open conditions, increase herbaceous understory species density and diversity, improve habitat conditions for fire-dependent special-status plants, increase soft-mast production, reduce potentially hazardous accumulations of fuels on the forest floor, and improve wildlife habitat conditions. If prescribed burning is not suitable for an area, then mechanical fuel reduction will be applied if sufficient funding is available.

- Alternative 2 will provide a positive effect on the local economy by providing forest products, government revenues, and job opportunities.

Other Alternatives Considered

In addition to Alternative 2, the EA considered the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative would result in no proposed management activities. A comparison between Alternative 2 and the No Action Alternative can be found throughout the analyses in the EA. The analysis used current and desired future conditions as a comparison to determine effects. I have not selected the No Action Alternative because it would not meet the purpose and need for action identified in this project.

Public Involvement

To encourage public participation in the Young Mike Sherman Project EA, a project scoping letter was mailed to all of the landowners within the boundaries of the project area, Native American Tribes and other interested parties explaining the project proposal on March 11, 2019. They were asked to comment on, or involve themselves in, the proposed project, and were informed about the decisions to be made. The project was also published in the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests' Schedule of Proposed Actions and on the Forest Planning website. The project scoping letter resulted in one response from 17 landowners. The project Interdisciplinary Team reviewed the comments received during the scoping period and determined that the issues brought up were adequately addressed through project design or mitigation measures.

All interested parties who responded to our public involvement efforts received a copy of the Draft EA notice for review and comment. The pre-decisional Draft EA was posted on the Ozark St-Francis National Forests' website on December 17, 2019. A legal notice to receive comments was published in Clarksville's *Graphic* newspaper on the same date. Two comments were received during this 30-day period and both individuals came into the office to discuss their concerns and were resolved. Other agencies and people consulted are listed in Chapter 5 of the EA.

Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations

The actions are consistent with the intent of the management goals, objectives, and standards in the 2005 Revised Land and Resource Management Plan for the Ozark St-Francis National Forests. The project was designed in conformance with the 2005 Forest Plan and incoroporates appropriate guidelines and mitigation measures.

It is our finding that the actions of this decision comply with the requirments of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) of 1976, NFMA implementing regulations in 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 219, the National Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for NEPA.

Finding of No Significant Impact

After considering the environmental effects described in the EA, I have determined that Alternative 2will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment considering the context and intensity of impacts (40 CFR 1508.27), and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will not be prepared.

Context means that the significance of an action must be analyzed in several contexts (i.e. local regional, worldwide), and over both short-term and long-term time frames. For site-specific actions, significance usually depends upon the effects in the local context rather than in the world as a whole. This project is limited in scope and duration, and the project was designed to minimize short- and long-term environmental effects through the application of project design criteria.

Intensity

Intensity refers to the severity or degree of impact (40 CFR 1508.27) and is defined by the ten points below:

1. **Impacts may be beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that, on balance, the effects will be beneficial.** Consideration of the intensity of environmental effects is not biased by beneficial effects of the action. Both beneficial and adverse effects have been considered and this action should not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment (EA, pp. 19-35).

2. **The degree to which the proposed action affects public health and safety.** There will be no significant effects on public health and safety. Proper handling and cleanliness of personal protective gear would mitigate human contact. Direct and indirect effects to humans, wildilife, and plants from chemical spills of all herbicides are minimized by following proper mixing and handling procedures, Forest-Wide Standards, and BMPs.

3. **Unique characteristics of the geographic area, such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.** The project will not significantly affect any unique characteristics of the geographic area.

4. **The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.** The effects on the quality of the human environment are not likely to be highly controversial. There is no known credible scientific controversy over the impacts of the Proposed Action (EA, pp. 19-35).

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 actions like the ones proposed in the Young Mike Sherman EA. The analysis shows the effects are not uncertain, and do not involve unique or unknown risks (EA, pp. 19-35).

6. **The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with signifcant effects, or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.** The actions in this decision are not likely to establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects, nor do they represent a decision in principle about a future consideration.

7. **Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.** Cumulatively significant impacts on the environment are not likely. The cumulative effects of the proposed actions have been analyzed with consideration of other similar activities on adjacent lands, in past actions, and in foreseeable future actions (EA, pp. 19-35).

8. **The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed, or eleigible for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.** The actions will not affect any sites listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places, nor cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources. The report prepared for this project was sent to SHPO for concurrence on National Register eligibility and the avoidance of adverse effects to historical properties. Concurrence for the phased approach has been received from Arkansas Historic Preservation Program (AHPP) dated December 30, 2019. Archeological surveys and consultation will occur prior to any ground disturbing activities. The action will not cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources (EA, pp. 29-31).

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 of 1973.** The actions are not likely to adversely affect endangered or threatened plant or animal species, or their critical habitat. The Biological Evaluation (BE) prepared for this project was submitted to the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for review. The concurrence letter from the USFWS was received on November 16, 2017.

10. **Whether the action threatens to violate Federal, State, or local laws or requirements imposed for protection of the environment.** The action will not violate Federal, State, and local laws or requirements for the protection of the environment. Actions are also consistent with the Antiquities Act, Endangered Species Act, Clean Air Act, and the Clean Water Act.

After considering the effects of the actions analyzed, in terms of context and intensity, we have determined that these actions will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement will not be prepared.

Administrative Review (Objection) Opportunities

This decision is subject to objection pursuant to 36 CFR 218.8. Objections must meet requirements stated in 36 CFR 218.8 (d) in order to be considered https://www.fs.fed.us/emc/applit/includes/36CFR218_final_rule_20080917.pdf. A written Notice of Objection must be postmarked or received within 45 days after the date the legal notice of decision is published in Clarksville's *The Graphic* (the Pleasant Hill Ranger District's paper of record). The objection must be filed with: Ozark-St. Francis National Forests, ATTN: Objections Reviewing Officer, 605 West Main St., Russellville, AR 72801, 36 CFR 218.3(a).

Objections may be faxed to (479) 964-7518. Hand-delivered objections must be delivered to the Ozark St.-Francis Supervisor's Office in Russellville within normal business hours of 8:00am to 4:30pm. Objections may also be mailed electronically in a common digital format to ozarkobjection@usda.gov. .

Who may file an objection?

36 CFR 218.5 (a) Individuals and entities as defined in 218.2 who have submitted timely specific written comments regarding a proposed project or activity that is subject to these regulations during any designated opportunity for public comment may file an objection. Opportunity for public comment on an EA includes scoping or any other instance where the responsible official seeks written comments.

Filing an objection

36 CFR 218.8(a) Objections must be filed with the reviewing officer in writing. All objections are available for public inspection during and after the objection process.

(b) Incorporation of documents by reference is not allowed, except for the following list of items that may be referenced by including date, page, and section of the cited document, along with a description of its content and applicability to the objection. All other documents must be included with the objection.

(1) All or any part of a Federal law or regulation.
(2) Forest Service directives and land management plans.
(3) Documents referenced by the Forest Service in the proposed project EA or EIS that is subject to objection.
(4) Comments previously provided to the Forest Service by the objector during public involvment opportunities for the proposed project where written comments were requested by the responsible official.

(c) Issues raised in objections must be based on previously submitted specific written comments regarding the proposed project or activity and attributed to the objector, unless the issue is based on new information that arose after the opportunities for comment. The burden is on the objector to demonstrate compliance with this requirement for objection issues.

(d) At a minimum, an objection must include the following:

(1) Objector's name and address as defined in 218.2, with a telephone number, if available;
(2) Signature or other verification of authorship upon request;
(3) When multiple names are listed on an objection, identification of the lead objector as defined in 218.2. Verification of the identity of the lead objector must be provided upon request or reviewing officer will designate a lead objecteor as provided in 218.5(d);
(4) The name of the proposed project, the name and title of the responsible official, and the Name(s) of the national forest(s) and/or ranger district on which the proposed project will be implemented;

(5) A description of those aspects of the proposed project addressed by the objection, including specific issues related to the proposed project; if applicable, how the objector believes the environmental analysis or draft decision specifically violates law, regulation, or policy; suggested remedies that would resolve the objection; supporting reasons for the reviewing officer to consider; and

(6) A statement that demonstrates the connection between prior specific written comments on the particular proposed project or activiy and the content of the objection, unless the objection concerns an issue that arose after the designated opportunity for comment.

Implementation

Timing of project decision 36 CFR 218.12 (c): When no objection is filed within the objection filing period (see §§218.26 and 218.32):

(1) The reviewing officer must notify the responsible officials.
(2) Approval of the proposed project or activity documented in a ROD in accordance with 40 CFR 1506.10, or in a DN may occur on, but not before, the fifth business day following the end of the objection filing period.

The Final EA and Draft DN/FONSI are available on-line at:
https://www.fs.usda.gov/project/?project=55259.

Contact

Further information about this decision can be obtained from Matt Pfeifler, NEPA Coordinator, Pleasant Hill Ranger District, 2591 Hwy 21 Clarksville, AR.; (479) 754-2864, ext. 2872; fax (479) 754-3017; e-mail: matthew.t.pfeifler@usda.gov.

JASON A. ENGLE
District Ranger

Date

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 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.