

Appendix F

Freds Fire Reforestation Project

Public Comments

The Notice of Availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was published in the Federal Register September 11, 2009 (Vol. 74, No. 175) and copies of the DEIS/project summary mailed to 43 individuals, organizations, tribes, and government agencies. The comment period ended on October 26, 2009. 19 individuals responded during the comment period and are listed below. Two comments were received from federal, State, and local agencies, and elected officials and are listed below.

Commenters

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Patricia Sanderson Port,
Regional Environmental Officer | United States Department of the
Interior |
| 2. Kathleen M. Goforth,
Manager, Environmental Review Office | United States Environmental
Protection Agency |
| 3. Steve Brink | California Forestry Association |
| 4. Foresthill High School | California Forestry Challenge |
| 5. Napa New Tech High School | California Forestry Challenge |
| 6. Napa New Tech High School | California Forestry Challenge |
| 7. Franklin High School | California Forestry Challenge |
| 8. Sacramento New Tech High School | California Forestry Challenge |
| 9. Sacramento New Tech High School | California Forestry Challenge |
| 10. Livermore High School | California Forestry Challenge |
| 11. Rio Linda High School | California Forestry Challenge |
| 12. Grant High School | California Forestry Challenge |
| 13. Grant High School | California Forestry Challenge |
| 14. Upper Lake High School | California Forestry Challenge |
| 15. Lincoln High School | California Forestry Challenge |
| 16. Delta High School | California Forestry Challenge |
| 17. Shenandoah High School | California Forestry Challenge |
| 18. Elk Grove High School | California Forestry Challenge |
| 19. Argonaut High School | California Forestry Challenge |

20. Mike Vedder

California Forestry Challenge

21. Tessa Levine

California Forestry Challenge



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
Pacific Southwest Region
1111 Jackson Street, Suite 520
Oakland, California 94607

IN REPLY REFER TO:
ER09/970

Electronically Filed

23 October 2009

Robert Carroll
4260 Eight Mile Road
Camino, CA 95709

Subject: Review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Freds Fire Restoration, Eldorado National Forest, Placerville Ranger District, El Dorado County, California

Dear Mr. Carroll:

The Department of the Interior has received and reviewed the subject document and has no comments to offer.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Patricia Sanderson Port". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent initial "P".

Patricia Sanderson Port
Regional Environmental Officer

cc:
Director, OEPC
FWS, Region VIII



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION IX

75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

OCT 26 2009

Ramiro Villalvazo
Forest Supervisor
Eldorado National Forest
100 Forni Road
Placerville, CA 95667

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) Freds Fire Reforestation, El Dorado County, CA (CEQ# 20090313)

Dear Mr. Villalvazo,

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the above-referenced document pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and our NEPA review authority under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

The proposed action would take place on 3,320 acres in the Eldorado National Forest. The preferred alternative (Alternative 1) proposes to reestablish a forested landscape, control or eradicate invasive plant species using herbicides, reduce fuel, and restore spotted owl travel corridors.

Based on our review, we have rated the DEIS as Environmental Concerns - Insufficient

SUMMARY OF EPA RATING DEFINITIONS*

This rating system was developed as a means to summarize the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) level of concern with a proposed action. The ratings are a combination of alphabetical categories for evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposal and numerical categories for evaluation of the adequacy of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF THE ACTION

"LO" (Lack of Objections)

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

"EC" (Environmental Concerns)

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

"EO" (Environmental Objections)

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

"EU" (Environmentally Unsatisfactory)

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

ADEQUACY OF THE IMPACT STATEMENT

"Category 1" (Adequate)

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

"Category 2" (Insufficient Information)

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analysed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be

**EPA DETAILED COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(DEIS) FOR FREDS FIRE REFORESTATION, EL DORADO COUNTY, CA, OCTOBER 26, 2009**

State the EPA Registration Number of any products anticipated to be used for the project. Forest Service proposes to apply several types of herbicide, which include glyphosate, triclopyr, hexazinone, clopyralid and chlorosulfuron, to competing vegetation on approximately 3,200 acres within the Freds Fire area to hasten the development of a structurally diverse conifer forest.

Recommendation:

The FEIS should state the EPA Registration Number of any products anticipated to be used for the project. The pesticides used must be registered with EPA and the California Department of Pesticide Regulation and used according to the label directions and Federal and