

**DECISION MEMO**  
**Bear Hole Range Allotment Management Project**

USDA - Forest Service Uinta National Forest  
Heber Ranger District  
Wasatch County, Utah

**DECISION TO BE IMPLEMENTED**

**Description of Decision**

It is my decision to authorize continued livestock grazing on the Bear Hole Allotment consistent with existing management in order to continue to meet or move toward desired resource conditions. My decision incorporates the following elements of the existing livestock grazing management. These practices comply with current direction in the Forest Plan and other applicable laws, regulations and higher level decisions. Project monitoring has determined that current management is meeting or satisfactorily moving toward desired resource conditions (Project record).

The Bear Hole Allotment will continue to be managed under the Uinta National Forest 2003 Land and Resource Management Plan. Two permittees are permitted to graze a total of 244 head of cows with calves on the allotment. The permitted grazing season is from June 11 to October 15. The allotment is divided into three pastures which are grazed using a grazing management system which provides periodic rest for the pastures. The allotments are managed to meet the Uinta National Forest 2003 Land and Resource Management Plan.

The Bear Hole Allotment consists of approximately 5,583 acres of Forest Service System Lands and is located near Currant Creek Reservoir, approximately 21 miles southeast of Heber Utah. Approximately 300 acres of this allotment are designated to be managed to optimize habitat for wildlife by providing security and vegetation diversity as mitigation for wildlife impacts incurred by the construction the Central Utah Project.

**Purpose and Need**

The purpose and need is to continue current grazing management on the Bear Hole Allotment, which has demonstrated to be meeting or satisfactorily moving toward desired conditions, to provide livestock forage to permittees, and continue to implement grazing management direction in the 2003 Uinta National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.

**REASONS FOR CATEGORICALLY EXCLUDING THE DECISION**

**Category of Exclusion**

Livestock grazing decisions may be categorically excluded from documentation in an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment when they are in accordance with P.L. 108-447 Section 339 as follows: "For fiscal years 2005 through 2007, a decision made by the Secretary of Agriculture to authorize grazing on an allotment shall be categorically excluded from documentation in an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) if : (1) the decision continues current grazing management; (2) monitoring indicates that current grazing management is meeting, or satisfactorily moving toward, objectives in the land and resource management plan, as determined by the Secretary; and, (3) the decision is consistent with agency policy concerning extraordinary circumstances. The total number of allotments that may be

categorically excluded under this section may not exceed 900.”

I have concluded that this decision is appropriately categorically excluded from documentation in an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment as it implements current livestock grazing management is shown by monitoring to be meeting or satisfactorily moving toward Forest Plan objectives. There are no effects to extraordinary circumstances (as defined in FSH 1909.15) related to the decision that may result in a significant individual or cumulative effect on the quality of the human environment. My conclusion is based on information presented in this document and the entirety of the project record.

#### **Relationship to Extraordinary Circumstances**

FSH 1909.15, Section 30.3 (1909.15-2004-3) lists the following as resource conditions that should be considered in determining whether extraordinary circumstances warrant further analysis.

#### Federally listed threatened or endangered species, or designated critical habitat, species proposed for Federal listing

The proposed action will have *no effect* on the western yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus occidentalis*) since the project area is a high elevation site which does not contain any large blocks of woodland riparian habitat, and thus is not suitable for this species.

The proposed action *may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect* Canada lynx. The allotment is not part of a Lynx Analysis Unit (LAU), but may function as lynx travel corridor. Lynx could disperse away from livestock grazing activities, and grazing is not expected to threaten any individual lynx. Additionally, livestock grazing is not expected to remove any animals or its primary habitat, high elevation conifer (Project Record: Wildlife Biological Assessment; USFWS Correspondence).

The proposed action will have *no effect* on the Ute ladies'-tresses orchid because there is no habitat for these species in the project area (Project Record: Plants Biological Assessment/Biological Evaluation).

#### Floodplains, wetlands, or municipal watersheds

Executive Order 11988 and 11990 requires federal agencies to avoid adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of wetlands or floodplains. The Bear Hole Allotment has approximately 50 acres of wetlands and waterbodies. The allotment is managed, and will continue to be managed, to meet the Uinta National Forest 2003 Land and Resource Management Plan. (Project record: Fisheries, Range, and Hydrology Reports)

The Fruitland town water sources are located on privately owned lands south of the Bear Hole Allotment in the Mill Hollow drainage. DWSP Zone 4 includes ~28 acres of gentle-sloped meadow and aspen dominated terrain in the extreme southwest corner of the Bear Hole Allotment that extends south of a ridge into Mill Hollow drainage. Overall, less than 5% of the uppermost extent of the protection zone is located within the Project Area (USDA GIS). This portion of the protection zone in the Project Area is at the uppermost margin of the municipal watershed, and is approximately two miles from the drinking water sources. Any pollutants

generated by livestock grazing in the project area would be adequately filtered in the aquifer well before reaching the drinking water sources (Project Record: Hydrology Report).

#### Congressionally Designated Areas

The Bear Hole Allotment does not reside in, and the projects will not have any direct or indirect impacts on any congressionally designated areas such as wilderness, wilderness study areas, or national recreation areas. (Forest Plan, FEIS pg. 3-581-582 & p. 3-592; Forest Plan Management Prescription Map).

#### Inventoried roadless areas

The Bear Hole allotment is within portions of White Ledge (#418034) Inventoried Roadless Area (Forest Plan FEIS, Appendix C). This decision will not affect the characteristics of the inventoried roadless areas and is in compliance with the Roadless Area Conservation Rule (Federal Register 01-12-2001).

#### Research Natural Areas

The Jump-off Point Research Natural Area is located near the Allotment; however, the Allotment does not encompass the RNA and would not affect it. (Forest Plan, FEIS pg. 3-592; Forest Plan Management Prescription Map, MP 2.4).

#### Native American Religious or Cultural Sites, Archaeological Sites, or Historic Properties or Areas

The general affect of continued livestock grazing on heritage sites in the Bear Hole allotment is limited by the low density of sites within the allotments. There are no National Register Eligible sites within the allotment. A *No Historic Properties Affected* determination was made. The State Historic Preservation Office concurred with this determination (Project Record: Heritage Report' SHPO Correspondence).

No known American Indian plant collection or traditional use areas occur within the treatment area, but it is possible that small-scale plant gathering is currently being done. However, most of the plants of interest identified by the Northern Utes in the vegetation communities within the allotment have widespread distributions and relatively good abundance even with current grazing levels. As a result, even if tradition plant gathering was to intensify in this area, access to these plants would continue (Project Record: Heritage Report).

For projects that are categorically excluded, there is no need to repeat a detailed analysis of effects to all resources. In promulgating the categories, the Forest Service has concluded that projects that fit those categories do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. Thus, once the analysis establishes that this project has no extraordinary circumstances and fits into a category, the responsible official can reach the conclusion that there will be no significant effects to the environment without further analysis.

The proposed action will be of limited context and intensity and capable of producing little or no significant environmental effects (40 CFR 1508.4) individually or cumulatively on the quality of the human environment; is within the category granted in by the Consolidated Appropriations Act; and there are no extraordinary circumstances related to the proposed action.

## **PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

This project was listed in the *Winter 2006 Schedule of Proposed Actions*. A scoping letter was sent to interested parties on November 14, 2006 and a request for comments was published in the *Provo Daily Herald* on November 04, 2006. These documents and notices are contained in the project record located at the Heber Ranger District. In response to these efforts, I received two letters regarding this project.

The comments received have been tracked in detail in a separate document in the project record. Comments were identified in categories as: beyond the scope of this decision; not site specific to the project area; addressed by Forest Plan direction; and addressed through consideration of environmental effects of the project. Comments identified as not site specific to the decision or beyond the scope of this decision were dismissed from further consideration. Comments identified as addressed by Forest Plan direction have been noted as part of the decision. Comments identified as addressed through consideration of environmental effects of the project have been noted in making the determination that there are no extraordinary circumstances related to the decision that may result in a significant environmental effect. These issues identified during development of the proposed action and from public response to scoping are addressed in the following section:

**ISSUE:** Questioned whether an Environmental Management System (EMS) had been established and if the proposed action would be in compliance with the Forest Plan

**RESPONSE:** EMS has not been established for the UNF. The requirements of the Planning Rule for EMS establishment apply to developing, amending, and revising land management plans; not to projects (36 CFR 219.2(3) (c)).

As stated in the legal notice and letter to interested publics, the allotments are management to the Uinta NF 2003 LRMP. Decisions would continue to comply with the Forest Plan.

**ISSUE:** Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate Species (TEPCS)/MIS species that did have viable populations and habitat just 10-15 years ago now have been functionally extirpated or have experienced population crashes during Forest Plan implantation. How can it be that you are proposing to authorize the same grazing practices? This is not consistent with National Forest Management Act (NFMA), USDA Department Regulation (FSM and FSH) or the Forest Plan direction to maintain the diversity and population viable of all native species.

**RESPONSE:** The Proposed Action is not expected to adversely affect any threatened, endangered, proposed, or candidate species on the Forest. Monitoring efforts on Uinta National Forest indicate territory occupancy of northern goshawks has not substantively declined since 2001 (2006 Goshawk monitoring report, Provo, UT). Beavers were noted as common and well distributed in the 2006 monitoring report (Provo, UT). Three-toed woodpeckers, a coniferous forest species, are not expected to be impacted by the Proposed Action.

**ISSUE:** Riparian and aquatic habitat is tramped from livestock and vehicle use and is in sub-standard condition.

**RESPONSE:** We have not observed evidence of vehicle use in aquatic habitat within the action area. Habitat surveys conducted within the identified drainages of the action area confirm that aquatic habitat has

been and continues to be influenced by livestock grazing activities. The degree of impact has decreased in recent years, varies with season, and is site specific. Evidence suggests that in a few riparian areas livestock have been allowed to congregate for extended periods of time resulting in decreased habitat suitability for Colorado River cutthroat trout (CRCT). However, these incidents are rare, very localized, and an exception rather than the rule. (Project Record: Fisheries Report) Overall, aquatic habitat in the action area is good and reflects the success of the current grazing management program and confirms the current trend toward meeting or satisfactorily moving towards objectives outlined in the 2003 LRMP.

ISSUE: Lack of native plant diversity and ground cover.

RESPONSE: Trend studies indicate that ground cover is improving and that there is a good diversity of plant species

ISSUE: Aspen understory and shoots are very heavily grazed by apparently trespassing cows and inflated deer/elk populations.

RESPONSE: Browse utilization levels did not appear excessive during field surveys. The action area is considered summer range for deer and elk. Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) data (2005) indicate stable elk populations and declining deer populations for the Wasatch Curreant Creek area. No trespassing cows were reported or documented on the Curreant Creek Allotment this grazing season, it is unknown what this comment is in reference to.

ISSUE: Conifer encroachment in aspen has resulted from overgrazing of aspen shoots.

RESPONSE: Trend studies indicate that aspen is regenerating. Of the 2 trend studies in the analysis area, 1 does not mention any conifer encroachment, and 1 indicates that there is an increase in conifer with in the area.

ISSUE: This proposed action needs to be analyzed in an environmental document. Regardless of whether an environmental document is prepared or not, this is an action implementing the Forest Plan and it is therefore subject to the comment and appeal regulations. As indicated below in the court's order, the 2003 36CFR§215.4(a) that excluded CEs from notice and comment procedures and §215.12(1) that excluded CEs from appeal. Procedures have been severed from the 2003 Forest Service Appeals Reform Act (ARA) regulations because they were illegal.

RESPONSE: This CE constitutes environmental analysis. The referenced Court order was clarified on October 19, 2005 which activities would be subject to notice, comment, and appeal under the 36 CRFR 215 rules. Grazing was not included in the list of activities.

ISSUE: Categorically excluding these allotments is not consistent with section 339 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act because this is planned to be a District Ranger Decision and not a decision made of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture has not determined that the monitoring data gathered would support her determination that current grazing on these allotments is meeting or is satisfactorily modifying toward the objectives in the Forest Plan.

RESPONSE: The Secretary of Agriculture made the decision that some allotments may be categorically excluded provided they meet certain criteria. The site specific decision as to which allotments meet the criteria was delegated to the District Ranger. This decision is consistent with the Consolidated Appropriates Act.

ISSUE: Numerous referenced documents and paragraphs provided out of references were submitted as part of the comment letter. The commenter provided a CD of references from *Welfare Ranching: The*

*Subsidized Destruction of the American West* by Wuerthner & Matteson.

RESPONSE: The interdisciplinary team reviewed the letters in detail. Regarding the references that were not provided in their entirety, it was difficult to review without the context of the reference. The references were not site specific to the project area and many were from papers written about an entirely different vegetation communities or communities that do not exist in the analysis area. The references also refer to wildlife species that do not or never have occurred in the analysis area. The commenter did not state why or how these references were applicable to the Bear Hole Allotment.

The CD documents were general affects that grazing has on various resources; the ID team used site specific data to reach their conclusions.

ISSUE: The Forest must provide the environmental document for public review and comment before a decision is made. "Environmental Document" is defined at 40 CFR§1508.10 to include not just the Environmental Impact Statement, but also the document, "specified in § 1508.9. (environmental assessment)." 40 CFR§.1508, .9 states that the Environmental Assessment, (b) Shall, include brief discussions of the, need for the proposal, of alternatives as required by, section 102(2) (E), of the environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives, and a listing of the agencies and persons consulted."

RESPONSE: The project fits within the category authorized in the Consolidated Appropriations act. Analysis will be documented in a decision memo which is an environmental document. Because this project fits within the category the NEPA regulations cited are not applicable. The Forest will appropriately document the decision in a decision memo, following the Council on Environmental Quality regulation for implementing requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (FSH 1909.15).

The project was sent to the public on November 14, 2006, and a legal notice was published in the *Provo Daily Herald* on November 4, 2006. The project was also listed in the Forest's Schedule of Proposed Actions since Winter of 2006. The public had ample opportunity to provide input regarding the project. Two letters were received and reviewed in detail.

ISSUE: The Forest is required by NFMA and the Forest Plan to ensure the fish and wildlife habitat shall be managed to maintain viable populations of existing native and desired non-native vertebrate species in the planning area. USDA Departmental Regulation 9500-4 provides further direction, expanding the viability requirements.

RESPONSE: A viability analysis was conducted for fish and wildlife species and was included in the FEIS for the 2003 Forest Plan (Appendix F, FEIS, 2003 LRMP FEIS). This viability analysis contained a programmatic assessment of the effects of various activities, including grazing, on the viability of fish and wildlife species from implementation of the Forest Plan. This viability analysis concluded that implementation of the 2003 Forest Plan, including continuation of grazing, would not adversely affect the viability of fish and wildlife on the UNF. The 2003 Forest Plan established five MIS species, and defined monitoring and evaluation requirements for these species (Uinta National Forest 2003 LRMP, Appendix B). In accordance with NFMA, annual monitoring and evaluation has been conducted for these MIS (Project Record: 2005 State of the Forest Report). A capability and suitability analysis for each of these five species has been completed. (Project Record: Suitably/Capability analysis). In addition, the effects of the proposed action on threatened, endangered, and sensitive species have been evaluated and this determined minimal or no effect to these species would occur (Project Record: Biological Assessments and Biological Evaluations). NFMA requirements for evaluating effects on viability and ensuring viability of species have been met.

This regulation also states that habitat goals for wildlife "will be accomplished through Forest planning process in response to targets identified in the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act

(RPA) program and public issues and concerns brought up in the planning process, consistent with available resources.”

“Land and water management activities will integrate fish and wildlife habitat needs with other resources and programs and will, where possible, mitigate habitat losses, consistent with the Forest Plan goals and objectives as developed in the planning process.” This project is consistent with the Forest goals and objectives outlined in the Forest Plan.

ISSUE: Since habitat for mollusks, amphibians and tall forbs are directly impacted by current and proposed grazing levels; the Forest needs to modify the proposed action to address this.

RESPONSE: Grazing effects on amphibian habitat, riparian areas and tall forbs is disclosed in the Wildlife Report and the Grazing Report (project record). Monitoring summarized in the Grazing Report indicates that current grazing management is meeting, or satisfactorily moving toward, objectives in the 2003 Uinta land and resource management plan. Boreal toad is the only sensitive amphibian which may occur in the area of the Proposed Action. No individuals of this species have been detected in this area. The Wildlife Report acknowledges that Boreal toad could be in the project area since they are known to exist around Strawberry Reservoir and concludes that continued livestock grazing “may have a small negative impact on individuals, but is not expected to impact population viability. There isn’t anything in the analysis or project record which indicates that the proposed action needs to be modified based on this issue.

ISSUE: Analysis needs to have a rigorous presentation and analysis of the effects to TES and proposed sensitive flora and fauna. Surveys should be conducted in the project area.

RESPONSE: Effects to TES vertebrate species have been analyzed and are presented in the specialist report. (Project Record: Wildlife Report)

ISSUE: What selected MIS are being used in the analysis and monitoring of the proposed action?

RESPONSE: The MIS species are identified in Appendix B of the Uinta National Forest 2003 Land and Resource Management Plan and discussed in the specialist report. (Project Record: Wildlife Report).

ISSUE: Analyze the effects to migratory birds. The Forest should focus on species listed in the 2002 List of Birds of Conservation Concern and the Partner’s in Flight Priority Species. Activities should be conducted outside critical breeding season for migratory birds, minimize temporary and long-term habitat losses, and mitigate all unavoidable habitat losses.

RESPONSE: The migratory birds analyzed in the Neo-Tropical Migratory Birds (NTMB)/MIS report discuss the 2002 List of Birds of Conservation Concern and the Partner’s in Flight Priority Species (Project record: Neo-Tropical Migratory Birds and Management Indicator Species Report). Potential effects to migratory birds was addressed through consideration of environmental effects of the project

## **FINDINGS REQUIRED BY AND/OR RELATED TO OTHER LAWS AND REGULATIONS**

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 acknowledgment of incomplete or unavailable information, scientific uncertainty, and risk. The best available science was utilized in rendering this decision (Project Record).

My decision will comply with all applicable laws and regulations. I have summarized pertinent ones below.

#### Federal Land Policy and Management Act

This Act allows the granting of easements across National Forest System Lands. The regulations at 36 CFR 251 guide the issuance of permits, leases, and easements under this Act. Permits, leases, and easements are granted across National Forest System lands when the need for such is consistent with planned uses and Forest Service policy and regulations. This decision is consistent with this Act.

#### National Forest Management Act and Forest Plan Consistency

This Act requires the development of long-range land and resource management plans. The Uinta National Forest 2003 Land and Resource Management Plan was approved as required by this Act. The plan provides for guidance for all natural resource management activities. The Act requires all projects and activities are consistent with the plan. The plan has been reviewed in consideration of this project. This allotment lies within the Currant Creek Management Area as identified in the Uinta National Forest 2003 Land and Resource Management Plan. (Forest Plan, pages 5-26 to 37). The management prescriptions within the allotment are 5.1 Forested Ecosystems – Limited Development and 5.2 Forested Ecosystems – Vegetation Management. This decision is responsive to guiding direction contained in the Plan, and is consistent with the standards and guidelines contained in the Plan.

A site-specific analysis of grazing capability and suitability of livestock on the Bear Hole Allotment was completed. Capability and suitability of the land to support grazing is not a limiting factor (Project record: Capability/suitability analysis). A capability/suitability analysis for the Uinta National Forest's Management Indicator Species was completed.

#### National Environmental Policy Act

This Act requires public involvement and consideration of potential environmental effects. The entirety of documentation for this decision supports compliance with this Act.

#### Sensitive Species (Forest Service Manual 2670)

This Manual direction requires analysis of potential impacts to sensitive species, those species for which the Regional Forester has identified population viability is a concern. The USFS Region 4 Sensitive species list published in 2004 was used to determine the potential effects of the proposed action on sensitive terrestrial wildlife species. Potential effects of the proposed action on sensitive species are documented in biological evaluations which are part of the project record.

Of the nine sensitive terrestrial wildlife species, it was determined that the project would have *no impact* on eight of them (Columbia spotted frog (*Rana luteiventris*); Northern goshawk (*Accipiter gentiles*); peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*); flammulated owl (*Otus flammeolus*); American three-toed woodpecker (*Picoides dorsalis*); Spotted bat (*Euderma maculatum*); Townsend's big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii*); fisher (*Martes pennanti*)). Continuation of livestock grazing *may have a small negative impact on individuals but is not expected to impact population viability* of the greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) population (Project Record: Wildlife Report)

Since there is suitable habitat for Garrett bladderpod, Rockcress draba, Barneby woody aster, Wasatch jamesia, Dainty moonwort and Slender moonwort in the project area, and livestock grazing can affect individual plants of each of these species, continued livestock grazing *may impact individuals of each Sensitive species, but is not likely to result in a trend toward federal listing or a loss of viability of any of these species* (Project Record: Plant Biological Assessment /Biological Evaluation).

Continuation of livestock grazing will not result in any additional effects to the Colorado Cutthroat Trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki pleuriticus*) because the conservation measures, standards and guidelines that have been identified to minimize action specific effects are sufficient to protect aquatic resources within the action area. Consequently, it is anticipated that the overall impact of this action will not result in any long-term detrimental effects to existing aquatic resources beyond those that currently exist within the action area. (Project record: Fisheries Report).

#### Clean Water Act

The purpose of this Act is to restore and maintain the integrity of waters. Section 313 of the Clean Water Act requires Federal Agencies to comply with all Federal, State, interstate and local requirements, administrative authority and process and sanctions with respect to the control and abatement of water pollution. Executive Order 12088 also requires the Forest Service to meet the requirements of the Act. The proposed action will comply with the Clean Water Act (Project record: Hydrology Report).

#### Clean Air Act (1977 as amended)

The Clean Air Act defines the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for various sources of pollutants that must be met to protect human health and welfare, including visibility. The entire Uinta National Forest lies within a Class II area of air quality. The project area is not within a non-attainment area. The generalized effects of grazing on air quality are detailed in the FEIS for the Uinta National Forest 2003 Land and Resource Management Plan. Although continuation of livestock grazing can generate dust, the Forest Plan provides for utilization standards that mitigate dust generation. The minimal vehicle use and livestock related impacts from forage consumption and carbon sequestration would not be measurable. Therefore, there would be no impacts to air quality from the proposed action on the project area or within the air shed. This decision is in compliance with the Clean Air Act

#### Environmental Justice (Executive Order 12898)

This Order requires consideration of whether projects would disproportionately impact minority or low-income populations. This decision complies with this Act. Public involvement occurred for this project, the results of which I have considered in this decision-making. Public involvement did not identify any adversely impacted local minority or low-income populations. This decision is not expected to adversely impact minority or low-income populations. Implementation of these proposals is consistent with other Federal, State, and local laws for the protection of the environment.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OR APPEAL OPPORTUNITIES**

Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.12(f) and Earth Island Institute v. Ruthenbeck, No. CIV F-03-386 JKS

(E.D. Cal., October 19, 2005), this decision is not subject to appeal.

This decision is subject to appeal pursuant to 36 CFR 251.82(3). It may only be appealed by those who hold or, in certain instances, those who have applied for a written authorization to occupy and use National Forest System lands, if that authorization would be affected by this decision. Notice of appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeal Reviewing Officer within 45 days of this decision. The notice of appeal should be sent to: Brian Ferebee, Forest Supervisor; Uinta National Forest; 88 West 100 North; Provo, Utah 84601; Fax Number (801) 342-5143. A copy of the notice of appeal must be filed simultaneously with Julie King, Heber District Ranger, 2460 South Highway 40, Heber City, Utah 84032. Appeals must meet the content requirements of 36 CFR 251.90.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE**

This decision will be implemented immediately upon issuance, and may be implemented during the appeal process, unless the Reviewing Officer grants a stay (36 CFR 251.91).

### **CONTACT PERSON**

For further information please contact Jim Percy during normal office hours (weekdays, 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.) at the Heber Ranger District - Uinta National Forest, 2460 South Highway 40 Heber City, UT 84032, or by phone at (435) 654-0470.

### **SIGNATURE AND DATE**

/s/ Julie K. King  
JULIE K. KING  
District Ranger  
Heber Ranger District  
Uinta National Forest

9/24/2007  
Date

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, and marital or familial status (not all prohibited bases apply to all programs). Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's target center at 202-720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-w, Whitten Building, 1400 Independence Ave. SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call 202-720-5964 (voice or TDD).

USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.