

Record of Decision
(2nd Record of Decision)

Prairie Project
(Lower Rapid Creek Area)
Environmental Impact Statement

USDA Forest Service
Mystic Ranger District, Black Hills National Forest
Pennington County, South Dakota

Introduction

This (second) Record of Decision (ROD) regarding the Prairie Project EIS is related specifically to a proposal to conduct forest thinning and hazard fuel reduction on about 150 acres in and around the Forest Service administrative site called Pactola Work Center (PWC). The site is located near Highway 44 about 2 miles northwest of Johnson Siding and 11 miles northwest of Rapid City, South Dakota (see attached vicinity map).

Background

The Black Hills National Forest, Mystic Ranger District is currently implementing resource management actions within the Prairie Project Area per the Prairie Project ROD approved and dated October 31, 2003. These actions are guided by the Black Hills National Forest Revised Land and Resource Management Plan; the Phase II Amendment; the first Prairie Project ROD; and supported by national policy and initiatives such as the National Fire Plan, the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan agreed to by the Western Governor's Association and others, the President's Healthy Forest Initiative, and the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003.

The Prairie Project Area covers a total of about 29,000 acres of National Forest System land and about 6,300 acres of interspersed private land within the lower Rapid Creek watershed directly west of Rapid City, South Dakota. Resource management actions associated with the Prairie Project analysis and Record of Decision apply to National Forest System (NFS) lands only and do not include private lands.

The (first) Prairie Project Record of Decision dated October 31, 2003 provided for implementation of a large number of treatment actions to address the 'purpose and need for action' (see Prairie EIS, Chapter 1, p. 8). A total of about 8,550 acres of commercial fuels and vegetative treatment was authorized by that ROD. Much of this treatment has already been completed or is currently ongoing. About 8,250 acres of non-commercial fuels and vegetation

treatment is taking place or planned as provided by the ROD. Over 4,200 acres of prescribed burning is approved and being prepared for. Much of the completed commercial thinning and fuels reduction treatment is visible along Highway 44 west of Rapid City. These management actions are making a significant contribution to lowering hazardous fuels and reducing the potential for severe crown fire in this wildland-urban interface area.

This document is a second Record of Decision (ROD) based on the analysis in the Prairie Project Final Environmental Impact Statement. This second ROD is focused specifically on forest thinning and fuels reduction treatments prescribed for stands totaling about 150 acres within and surrounding Pactola Work Center (PWC). PWC is located near Highway 44 about 2 miles northwest of Johnson Siding and 11 miles northwest of Rapid City, South Dakota (see attached project area map).

The forested stands comprising the 150 acres were proposed for forest thinning treatment and fully analyzed under Alternative C in the Prairie Project EIS. The decision to treat these acres was deferred in the ROD of October 31, 2003 until interim management direction for goshawk, under the Forest Plan Phase I Amendment, would be supported or replaced with new direction from the Phase II Amendment. The Phase II Amendment Record of Decision has since been made (October 2005) and is being implemented. Revised Phase II Amendment direction permits treatment of these sites as guided by the appropriate goshawk management direction.

This second ROD for the Prairie Project incorporates by reference the October 31, 2003 ROD and EIS, including the public involvement/collaboration, issue identification/resolution, alternative analysis and disclosure of environmental consequences. A more detailed account of the background and reason for the project, including the purpose and need is provided in these documents.

Project Summary

A brief overview of the issues and alternatives analyzed in the Prairie Project EIS is presented below to give the reader a better understanding of the context of the decision disclosed in the October 31, 2003 ROD. A more detailed description of the project can be found in Chapters 1 and 2 of the Prairie Project EIS.

Issues

The Prairie EIS (see DEIS, pgs. 14-19 and Table 2-1, pg 44) and October 31, 2003 ROD (pg 3) discuss the five (5) prevailing or key issues. These issues include:

Fuel and Fire Hazard Reduction. Wildfire hazard, the need to reduce fuels, and the potential for catastrophic wildfire are currently of foremost concern with the public and the agency in this area. This issue is the major focus of the Prairie Project. The importance of addressing this issue is magnified by the fact that the project area is located in a wildland urban interface setting that contains several at-risk communities (ARCs). Furthermore, this entire project area lies within a heavily forested ponderosa pine fire-adapted ecosystem.

Prescribed Fire. Prescribed fire can be an effective tool to reduce fuels and enhance wildlife habitat. The public generally supports the use of prescribed burning, but some have concerns about the threat of an escaped fire and smoke, especially within this populated wildland-urban interface area.

Travel and Recreation Use. This issue is largely focused on recreational opportunities for motorized on and off-road travel and use. The issue has a wider divergence of strongly held opinion than any of the other key issues.

Wildlife Habitat. In general, there is public support for wildlife habitat even though most of the public did not list this as a key concern. This issue generally relates to providing for big game (deer and elk) winter range forage and security needs within Management Area 5.4, protecting and expanding hardwoods, eliminating pine encroachment from meadows, protecting late successional (older trees) habitat, and providing for a variety of habitats and associated species.

Socio-economic Concerns. The project area lies within the wildland-urban interface and contains five at-risk communities. The many people who live within and adjacent to the project area strongly value its forested setting and the experiences and lifestyle associated with this environment. People are concerned about property values and their health and safety as related to the potential threat of catastrophic large-scale wildfire in this area. There was a remarkable expression of urgency and expectation by local residents and groups during the public involvement period. The public clearly felt that the agency should act quickly and do something significant and effective to safeguard their well-being and the surrounding resource amenities from the potential impacts of large-scale severe wildfire.

Alternatives Considered

In making the original decision, four alternatives were considered. A detailed comparative discussion of these alternatives is presented in Chapter 2 of the Prairie Project DEIS. This second ROD relates to implementing forest thinning and fuels reduction on about 150 acres of forest that was initially proposed for treatment and subsequently deferred from treatment per the Responsible Officials decision (ref. October 31, 2003 ROD, Alternative C--Modified). As discussed, the original ROD deferred treatment of this area around the Pactola Work Center administrative site until further direction, relative to goshawk management, was provided by the Phase II Amendment. With the approval of the Phase II Amendment to the Forest Plan, treatment can take place in accordance with the applicable Phase II direction.

Decision

This Record of Decision documents my decision and rationale with respect to treating the 150 acre forested area discussed above. The Prairie Project purpose and need provides the focus and scope for the proposed action and alternatives as related to Forest and National level policy and direction (DEIS, Chapter 1). Given this purpose and need, I have reviewed the original Record of Decision relative to treatment of this area within and around Pactola Work Center (Alternative C--Modified), the issues identified during the public involvement process, the alternatives, and the environmental consequences of implementing the actions proposed and alternatives disclosed in the EIS.

Furthermore, I have carefully considered the substantial number of public comments received on the EIS. These comments were invaluable to me in weighing management options. Public feedback, the analysis disclosed in the EIS, information contained in the project record, and management direction and policy considerations contributed collectively to my evaluation and determination regarding implementation of this action. And finally I have reviewed the additional analysis and documentation relative to treating this area as originally proposed and documented in the EIS, subject to the new direction regarding goshawk management provided by the Forest Plan Phase II Amendment. Based on this review, **I have decided to treat this area of about 150 acres, within and around Pactola Work Center, as set forth in Alternative C of the Prairie Project EIS.**

Treatment of this area has been analyzed and documented in the Prairie Project EIS. Subsequent analysis and findings relative to the effect of the new Phase II direction has been documented in the project record. The effects of treatment as originally proposed, and now subject to Phase II management direction, is minor in scope, and falls within the range of alternatives analyzed and associated effects disclosed in the EIS and subsequent analysis. I believe the information contained in the analysis is sufficient to understand the effects of implementing proposed treatment on this area within and around the Pactola Work Center administrative site.

Vegetation treatment planned is characterized by thinning the forest commercially and non-commercially as well as removing hazardous fuels. Forest thinning will focus on thinning from below (thinning the smaller trees) and retaining larger sized trees on the landscape. Non-commercial thinning and fuels removal is also planned on this area to meet fuels reduction objectives near the Pactola Work Center administrative site and the adjacent private land.

Rationale for Selected Action

As discussed earlier in this document, the original decision deferred vegetation treatment on this area (@ 150 acres) in response to northern goshawk habitat management standards and guidelines applicable at the time (Phase I Amendment). Deferral of treatment precluded the need to amend the Forest Plan at that time regarding treatment of this area (see discussion in the DEIS, under Alternative C, page 28). Phase I Amendment direction has now been replaced with the Phase II Amendment to the Forest Plan. The ROD for the Phase II Amendment was signed on October 31, 2005. The original Black Hills Supplement #2600-2001-1, providing direction to assume presence, and identify and analyze goshawk post fledgling areas (PFA)s in areas not known to be occupied by goshawk, has been superseded by BH-2600-2005-1. The former supplement is no longer in effect.

The Phase II Amendment to the Forest Plan now provides direction, in terms of protective measures (standards), for historically active and active northern goshawk nest areas (see Standards 3108 and 3111, LRMP Phase II Amendment, p II-35). Further field survey and analysis indicates that there are no known historically active or currently active goshawk nest areas in this project area. Therefore, vegetation treatments proposed in the Pactola Work Center Project are consistent with the current Forest Plan Phase II Amendment direction for northern goshawk.

Other applicable direction provided by the FP Phase II Amendment specifies that management areas (MAs) should be managed to provide a distribution of structural stages (SS) in a variety of sizes and shapes. It further specifies the SS objectives for each MA. The MA for the Pactola Work Center project area is MA 5.1—Resource Production Emphasis. The applicable objective in this case would be Objective 5.1-204 (see LRMP Phase II Amendment, p. III-67). Table 1 displays the changes to Forest-wide SS resulting from actions proposed in the PWC project.

Table 1. Comparison of changes in Forest-wide SS resulting from the actions proposed.

MA 5.1	Objective	Existing *		Proposal	
		Acres	%	Acres	%
SS	%				
1	5%	61938	13%	61938	13%
2	5%	10324	2%	10324	2%
3A	10%	18833	4%	18833	4%
3B	15%	27966	6%	27918	6%
3C	5%	12934	3%	12934	3%
4A	25%	172401	36%	172529	36%
4B	25%	126491	27%	126411	27%
4C	5%	44721	9%	44721	9%
5	5%	442	0%	442	0%
Total	100%	476050	100%	476050	100%

Review of Table 1 indicates change in SS is limited to a shift in acreage from SS 3B and 4B to the SS 4A after treatment. The change in SS 4A is a 0.07% increase. From a Forest-wide perspective, SS changes in this MA are minimal and not significant enough to move any of the structure stages a whole percentage point.

I recognize that this treatment results in a slight trend away from SS objectives as described. Nevertheless, I find it reasonable, in this case, to thin and open these dense stands. This is because there is a need to be responsive to the desired conditions embodied in FP Phase II, Goal 10 relative to reducing the fuels hazard and lowering the potential for severe crown fire within and around the PWC.

Objective 5.1-204 also specifies that 10% of SS 4 ponderosa pine acreage in the MA will have an average tree size of “very large” where the average size pine is greater than 16 inches DBH. Table 2 displays the changes to the Forest-wide ponderosa pine size class of very large resulting from actions proposed in the PWC project.

Table 2. Comparison of changes in Forest-wide ponderosa pine size class of very large resulting from the actions proposed.

MA 5.1	SS4 with a tree size of very large (V)			
	Existing		Proposal	
Objective	acres	% of SS4	acres	% of SS4
10%	40635	12%	40730	12%

Review of Table 2 shows an increase in acres with average tree size larger than 16 inches DBH. On a Forest-wide basis this addition of 95 acres represents a negligible increase of about .02%.

So there is essentially no change to the existing 12%--remaining 2% above the Forest-wide objective of 10%. Of note is that the proposed treatment does not reduce acres of very large trees. In fact, because treatments thin smaller trees, while emphasizing leaving the larger trees, an increase in average diameter of the stands of remaining trees is realized. There are fewer trees in the thinned forest, but they are on the average larger, and because they are thinned the potential for crown fire spread is reduced. I find this a compelling result that maintains Forest Plan structural stage large tree objectives while responding to the Prairie Project purpose and need--focused on fuel hazard reduction and minimizing potential for large severe wildfire in this wildland-urban interface setting.

My decision to treat this area contributes to meeting the purpose and need for action, as determined by management direction and conditions on the ground; and it responds very well to the issues and public comments. As stated in the DEIS, there is a need to reduce the potential for large-scale intense wildfire and to reduce fuel loads. Recent events have dramatically demonstrated the need to reduce the potential for catastrophic wildfire within this area. The past several years have witnessed a series of wildfires within the Black Hills. These have been intense, fast moving fires that raced for miles through the tree crowns and, in places, consumed all the vegetation and some structures along its path. Residents have been evacuated, firefighters and the public placed at risk, natural resources have been negatively impacted, and substantial economic loss resulted due to these fires.

Treating this area in and around Pactola Work Center administrative site as originally planned, in accordance with the direction provided by the Forest Plan Phase II Amendment, responds well to the purpose and need originally set forth for the Prairie Project. This treatment is compatible with the landscape approach to fuel and fire hazard reduction characteristic of the Prairie Project: aggressively thinning pine trees and removing biomass; maintaining and expanding hardwoods and meadows; and use of prescribed burning to reduce fuels and improve wildlife habitat.

The National Fire Plan with its associated strategies and agreements directs Federal agencies to reduce fuels and associated fire hazards within the wildland-urban interface, at-risk communities, and other areas on public lands (see pages 6 and 7 in the DEIS). The Black Hills in general, and the Project Area in particular, is within a fire-adapted ponderosa pine ecosystem. Fire suppression and some management practices over the past century have changed vegetation patterns and created an explosive fire hazard condition around the Project Area. Treating this area, as part of the landscape level effort to reduce fuels, responds well to National direction in reducing the potential for large-scale crown fires.

Public Involvement

Scoping comments on the proposed action, potential concerns, and opportunities for managing the Prairie Project Area were solicited from adjacent property owners, tribal representatives, other members of the public, other public agencies, organizations and Forest Service specialists. The public was afforded the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS as well as appeal the initial ROD. See the EIS and first ROD for more detailed discussion on public involvement and collaboration.

The Environmentally Preferred Alternative(s)

Disclosure of one or more environmentally preferable alternatives is required [Section 101 NEPA; 40 CFR 1505.2(b)]. See the original ROD for more detailed discussion on the environmentally preferred alternative.

Mitigation

Mitigation measures and design criteria describe features and actions applied in the project analysis during the design of the proposed action and alternatives to reduce effects (see (D)EIS Chapter 2, pg. 32 and Appendix B). They include any requirements such as BMP's, standards and guidelines, and standard operating procedures that are incorporated into (made part of) the action design. Both design criteria and mitigation measures, applicable to the selected action, have been developed and recommended by resource specialists on the ID Team. I find the mitigation actions to be appropriate and characterized by a successful history of being effective. Design criteria and mitigation measures will be applied to on-the-ground project design, layout, and implementation including project contracts and/or permits and are incorporated into this Record of Decision.

Monitoring

The monitoring activities described in Appendix C of the DEIS will be implemented as appropriate. Activities and their effects, including effectiveness of design criteria and any needed mitigation measures, will be monitored during and following project completion. This decision makes no changes to the referenced monitoring activities.

Legal Requirements, Regulation, and Policy

Decision actions must comply with all legal requirements and policy. The Action described herein is consistent with the following legal requirements.

Federal Laws

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended: All surveyed and inventoried cultural sites considered eligible or potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places will be buffered and/or avoided during resource management activities. New sites discovered during operations will be protected. Any identified Traditional Cultural Properties and sacred areas will be protected. Reference is made to the consultation with the South Dakota State Historical Preservation Officer (SHPO) under State Laws section below.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 1969: NEPA establishes the format and content requirements of environmental analysis and documentation. The process of preparing the Prairie Project EIS and ROD was completed in accordance with NEPA.

The Endangered Species Act, 1973: A Biological Assessment and Biological Evaluation (BABE) has been prepared to document possible effects of any activities on endangered,

threatened, proposed or sensitive species in the Prairie Project Area. A determination was made that planned activities will have “No Effect” on the bald eagle and therefore no formal consultation with the USFWS is required. The USFWS concurred via informal consultation with this determination. The bald eagle was recently delisted. The existing effects analysis satisfies the current requirements. There is no new information on habitat use in the project area.

The Clean Air Act Amendments, 1977: Planned activities will be implemented to meet the National Ambient Air Quality standards through avoidance of practices that degrade air quality below health and visibility standards.

The Clean Water Act, 1982: Planned activities will meet and conform to the Clean Water Act as amended in 1982. This act establishes a non-degradation policy for all federally proposed projects. Actions are not likely to degrade water quality below standards set by the State of South Dakota. This will be accomplished through planning, application, and monitoring of Best Management Practices and other mitigation measures and design criteria for project activities.

Consistency with the Land and Resource Management Plan

The NFMA law (16 U.S.C. 1604(i)) requires me to ensure that permits, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other activities carried out on the Black Hills National Forest are consistent with the Forest Plan. My decision is consistent with this direction in that:

- Planned activities will contribute to Forest Plan goals and objectives (FEIS, Chapter 1).
- I have reviewed the BHNF FY 2006 Monitoring and Evaluation Report and Region 2 MIS guidance for projects. The effects of planned activities on management indicator species are consistent with the Forest Plan.
- Planned activities are consistent with management area direction
- Planned activities comply with Forest Plan standards.

Consistency with the National Forest Management Act

The 1982 planning rule has been superseded and is no longer in effect, and a recent court ruling has enjoined the Forest Service from implementing the 2005 planning rule.

The scope of analysis for a Forest Plan’s management indicator species is determined by the Forest Plan’s management direction, specifically, its standards and guidelines (Chapter II) and monitoring direction (Chapter IV). The Black Hills National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) contains no obligation to conduct project-specific monitoring or surveying for MIS. Phase II ROD, pp. 8, 20; Forest Plan as Amended, pg. I-11, Objective 238. The Forest Plan establishes monitoring and evaluation requirements that do not require population monitoring for MIS, but rather employ habitat capability relationships. Phase II ROD, pp. 20; Forest Plan as Amended, pg. I-11, Objective 238. Effects of the proposed project to species designated as MIS by the Forest Plan, as amended by the Phase II Amendment, have been considered. Due to the scale of the proposed project in relation to habitats available across the Forest, there will be no effect on Forest-wide habitat trends for any MIS species. The project

would therefore not influence achievement of Objective 238 (*maintain or enhance habitat for management indicator species*).

My decision to implement this action is consistent with the requirements in the Forest Plan as documented in the 1st Prairie Project ROD (pp. 21-22) and this document.

My decision also is based upon consideration of the best available science. I have reviewed the record which shows a thorough review of relevant scientific information; a consideration of responsible opposing views; and the acknowledgement of incomplete or unavailable information, scientific uncertainty and risk. Specifically, the record shows that extensive literature citations have been reviewed and considered by resource specialists in preparation of the EIS as evidenced by the literature cited sections in the specialist reports. In addition, the record shows that all literature cited by the public during the comment period has been reviewed and considered by resource specialists on the Prairie Project IDT.

The NFMA directs the Secretary of Agriculture to establish certain resource management guidelines included in the agency directives system. I find that the activities in this project decision comply with the NFMA law, as follows:

- Irreversible resource damage will not occur. The project will not cause irreversible resource damage, such as to soil productivity or watershed condition. (FEIS, Chapter 3).
- Adequate restocking is assured.
- No clearcutting is proposed.
- No timber harvesting will occur on lands not suited for timber production. No harvest will occur for timber production purposes on lands classified as unsuitable for timber harvest. (See Silviculture report in project file.)
- No created openings will be larger than 40 acres.
- Culmination of Mean Annual Increment (CMAI) requirements are met.

State Laws

South Dakota State Best Management Practices (BMPs): Site-specific BMPs have been designed to protect beneficial uses. See DEIS, Appendix B: Design Criteria and Mitigation Measures.

Consultation with the South Dakota State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO): The SHPO has been consulted concerning the proposed activities in the Prairie Project Area. The SHPO concurred with our determination of “No Historic Properties Affected” in a letter dated December 18, 2002. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) will be consulted about measures to protect significant archeological sites from adverse affects, should any be identified. No new heritage resources have been discovered in the project area since that concurrence was received.

Other Policy or Guiding Documentation

Forest Plan Direction

The 1997 Black Hills National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) supported by its Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), is the Forest programmatic document required by the rules implementing the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Act of 1974 (RPA), as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (NFMA). The Forest Plan was amended by the Phase II Forest Plan Amendment Record of Decision made in October 2005, and became effective March 2, 2006. This amendment provides revised and new Standards and Guidelines focused on: protecting communities, property, and forest values by reducing severe insect and fire hazards; conserving viable plant and animal species and habitats for the long term supported by the best available science; designating research natural areas; and providing for the continuing viability of the existing forest products industry in the Black Hills area.

Effects of the proposed project to species of local concern (FSM R2-BH-2600-2005-1, effective Nov. 7, 2005) have been considered. Due to the small scale of the proposed project in relation to habitats available across the Forest, species of local concern are likely to persist because the proposed project is consistent with Forest Plan direction for species of local concern habitats, and therefore Objective 221 (*conserve or enhance habitat for ... species of local concern*).

The Region 2 sensitive species list was revised effective June 4, 2007. Included in that revision was the addition of the Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep (*Ovis canadensis canadensis*). This species was addressed in the Prairie FEIS, although at the time the bighorn sheep was not considered a Region 2 sensitive species. The Pactola Work Center project “may adversely impact individuals, but is not likely to result in a loss of viability in the Planning Area, nor cause a trend toward federal listing.” There were no other plant or animal species added to the revised Region 2 sensitive species list.

Upon review of this action, I find the selected action to be consistent with the changes provided by the LRMP Phase II Amendment. In particular, the effects to MIS, SOLC, and Sensitive Species (including goshawk) are consistent with the LRMP as amended by the Phase II Amendment.

This decision to implement treatment on this area is consistent with the intent of the Forest Plan's long-term goals and objectives (DEIS, pages 5-10). This action also responds to and is consistent with the multiple National level initiatives and policy (DEIS page 6) regarding reduction of fuels and fire hazard in areas like the Prairie Project Area.

Implementation

Implementation of treatment activities will occur under the authority of this Record of Decision, subject to the appropriate appeal and implementation procedures cited below. Acreages and locations are approximate and may vary slightly during implementation depending on site specific conditions.

Pursuant to regulations at 36 CFR 215.9(a), when no appeal is filed within the 45-day time period, implementation of the decision may begin on, but not before, the 5th business day following the close of the appeal-filing period. When an appeal is filed, implementation may occur on, but not before, the 15th business day following the date of appeal disposition (36 CFR 215.9(b)).

Administrative Review or Appeal Opportunities

This decision is subject to appeal pursuant to 36 CFR Part 215 (June 2003). A written appeal must be submitted within 45 days following the publication date of the legal notice of this decision in the Rapid City Journal, Rapid City, South Dakota. It is the responsibility of the appellant to ensure their appeal is received in a timely manner. The publication date of the legal notice of the decision in the newspaper of record is the *exclusive* means for calculating the time to file an appeal. Appellants should not rely on date or time-frame information provided by any other source.

Paper appeals must be submitted to:

USDA, Forest Service, Region 2
Attn: Appeal Deciding Officer
740 Simms St
Golden, Colorado 80401

Electronic appeals must be submitted to: appeals-rocky-mountain-regional-office@fs.fed.us

In electronic appeals, the subject line should contain the name of the project being appealed. An automated response will confirm your electronic appeal has been received. Electronic appeals must be readable in MS Word, Rich Text Format (RTF) or PDF formats..

It is the appellant's responsibility to provide sufficient project- or activity-specific evidence and rationale, focusing on the decision, to show why my decision should be reversed. The appeal must be filed with the Appeal Deciding Officer in writing. At a minimum, the appeal must meet the content requirements of 36 CFR 215.14, and include the following information:

- The appellant's name and address, with a telephone number, if available;
- A signature, or other verification of authorship upon request (a scanned signature for electronic mail may be filed with the appeal);
- When multiple names are listed on an appeal, identification of the lead appellant and verification of the identity of the lead appellant upon request;
- The name of the project or activity for which the decision was made, the name and title of the Responsible Official, and the date of the decision;
- The regulation under which the appeal is being filed, when there is an option to appeal under either 36 CFR 215 or 36 CFR 251, subpart C;
- Any specific change(s) in the decision that the appellant seeks and rationale for those changes;
- Any portion(s) of the decision with which the appellant disagrees, and explanation for the disagreement;
- Why the appellant believes the Responsible Official's decision failed to consider the comments; and
- How the appellant believes the decision specifically violates law, regulation, or policy.

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this decision or the Forest Service appeal process, contact Robert J. Thompson, District Ranger, Mystic Ranger District, 8221 South Highway 16, Rapid City, SD 57702 or Ed Fischer, Environmental Coordinator, Black Hills National Forest, 1019 North 5th Street, Custer, SD 57730.

/s/ Dennis L. Jaeger, for

September 12, 2007

CRAIG BOBZIEN
Forest Supervisor
Black Hills National Forest
USDA Forest Service

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, DC 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.