

**Draft  
Decision Notice  
and  
Finding of No Significant Impact  
  
La Brea Restoration Project**

USDA Forest Service  
Santa Lucia Ranger District  
Los Padres National Forest  
Santa Barbara County, California

This draft decision notice is made available with the environmental assessment (EA) for the La Brea Restoration Project pursuant to 36 CFR 218.7(b), and documents my proposed decision and rationale for the selection of alternative 1, the proposed action for the La Brea Restoration Project. The EA is incorporated by reference and contains an in-depth discussion of the project area, the purpose and need for action, alternatives considered, and the environmental and social effects and benefits of those alternatives. The EA can be located on the Los Padres National Forest's (Forest) website (<https://www.fs.usda.gov/project/?project=50298>). For the purposes of this document, the Los Padres National Forest Land Management Plan (2005) and Standards and Guidelines, as amended (2014), are referred to as the Forest Plan.

## **Introduction**

The La Brea Restoration Project is needed to address road damage and safety impacts following the 90,000 acre La Brea Fire in 2009 and ensuing floods in 2011. The Forest has maintained a closure to a portion of the area in response to the damage and safety concerns. The primary purpose of this project is to evaluate portions of the La Brea and La Brea Canyon Roads and the Kerry Canyon Trail (also referred to as the Kerry Canyon Motorcycle Trail in this document), and determine whether to reclassify, relocate, reconstruct, or decommission them. The other purpose is to evaluate the 10 recreation sites in the project area (Colson, Barrel Springs, Miranda Pine, Brookshire, Horseshoe Springs, Wagon Flat, and Lazy Campgrounds, and Kerry, Bear and Alejandro primitive camps) for the correct classification, given current conditions and the proposed changes to roads and trails.

The EA documents the analysis of three alternatives to meet this need and the no action alternative. The goal is to restore the area to provide sustainable recreation access to the public, while preserving the natural ecosystem, riparian habitat, and cultural resources.

## **Decision and Reasons for the Decision**

Based upon my review of all alternatives, I have decided to implement alternative 1, the proposed action, as described in the EA with one modification concerning the Kerry Canyon Trail. After reviewing the comments received and the environmental analysis, I have decided to leave the

Kerry Canyon Trail closed to all uses instead of changing its classification from a motorized to non-motorized trail. Decommissioning this trail still meets the project’s purpose and need, and provides better protection of aquatic and hydrological resources, cultural resources, and the safety of forest visitors and employees. Dispersed use is still an option for walking into the area. The Kerry Canyon Motorcycle Trail has been very difficult to use and maintain for the last 30 years. Since the 2009 fire it has been in a closure area and has received no maintenance. It is severely damaged, with washed out areas, downed trees and totally overgrown areas. The same type of restoration and trail maintenance work would be needed to re-open it for motorized or non-motorized use. I believe this change results in a better proposal and decision, and the change will result in minor differences in resource benefits and impacts. All other elements of the proposed action are as described in the EA on pages 6 through 9. The project design features listed in Appendix C of the EA that apply to the proposed action, are also required in my decision.

Under the selected alternative, access to the La Brea Restoration project area will be restored by re-opening to public motorized use 7.2 miles of roads that have been closed since the fire and flooding that occurred in 2009–2011. The project will re-open, but change, 7.4 miles of roads from motorized to non-motorized use. These roads will be managed as non-motorized trails for public recreational use, but will remain on the system as maintenance level (ML) 1 roads for fire suppression and other emergency or administrative access. The 8.3-mile Kerry Canyon Motorcycle Trail will be decommissioned without ground disturbing actions, and removed from the trail system. The project will re-open one developed campground with services, change the classification of one campground from developed to a primitive camp, and decommission two developed campgrounds and three primitive camps. The decommissioned campgrounds would continue to be available for dispersed use. The selected alternative map displays the resulting roads, trails, and camping areas (Attachment 1).

When compared to the other alternatives, the proposed action will provide for sustainable recreation and the lowest impacts on the environment. Motorized and non-motorized public access will be provided in a way that minimizes impacts on the environment, specifically threatened, endangered and sensitive aquatic species; cultural resources; and non-native invasive species introduction and spread. It also is the most economically viable at this point in time. The proposed action satisfies the concern over emergency access, as motorized administrative access would be allowable for emergencies such as fire suppression, search and rescue, etc.

**Table 1. Selected alternative actions**

Road, Trail or Campground	Description of Action	Miles
La Brea Rd. (11N04.3) from Pine Canyon Rd. to Wagon Flat CG	Re-open as a ML2 road	3.7
La Brea Rd. (11N04.3) from Wagon Flat CG to 10N06.1	Re-classify from ML2 to ML1 (closed) and manage as a non-motorized trail	4.7
La Brea Rd. (11N04.3) from Colson Summit to 10N06.1	Re-open as a ML2 road	3.5
Lazy Camp Rd. (11N04B)	Re-classify from ML2 to ML1 (closed) and manage as a non-motorized trail	0.8
La Brea Canyon Rd. (10N06.1) from La Brea Road to Pvt. Property in Sec. 3	Re-classify from ML2 to ML1 (closed) and manage as a non-motorized trail	1.9
Kerry Canyon Motorcycle Trail (30W02)	Decommission this trail (dispersed non-motorized use is allowed)	9.1

Road, Trail or Campground	Description of Action	Miles
TH Parking at Wagon Flat CG	Develop a new trail head and parking area at Wagon Flat campground	N/A
TH Parking at intersection of La Brea Rd. (11N04.3) and La Brea Canyon Rd. (10N06.1)	Develop a new trail head and parking area at this location	N/A
Barrel Springs CG	Re-classify from developed campground to primitive camp	N/A
Wagon Flat CG	Retain this campground as developed, expand it to include 2 additional sites, and replace the toilet	N/A
Colson CG	Keep closed and decommission this campground	N/A
Lazy CG	Decommission this campground (dispersed use is allowed)	N/A
Alejandro Camp	Decommission this campground (dispersed use is allowed)	N/A
Bear Camp	Decommission this campground (dispersed use is allowed)	N/A
Kerry Camp	Decommission this campground (dispersed use is allowed)	N/A

Note. Rd. = Road; CG = Campground; ML = Maintenance Level; NM= Non-motorized; MC = Motorcycle; Pvt. = Private; TH = Trail Head.

As stated in the hydrology section of the EA, the proposed action (alternative 1), would provide the best option for water quality resources as it relates to sediment, because the only road proposed for motorized travel [La Brea Road (National Forest System (NFS) Road 11N04.3) from Pine Canyon Road (NFS Road 11N04.2) to Wagon Flat Campground] would be reopened to provide road prism stability and new engineered stream crossings. I believe this would reduce the risk of road prism failure into the unnamed tributary to the North Fork La Brea Creek. Currently, the road prism has numerous failures from lack of maintenance, and I believe this would continue if the no-action alternative (alternative 2) is implemented.

This was a difficult decision, as I heard the many requests to restore motorized trail and road use from folks who enjoy motorized recreation. I appreciate the offers to assist with trail restoration and maintenance, and recognize the historic use of this area by individuals and families for motorcycle and OHV recreation. Additional rationale for why I am unable to honor the requests at this time is provided under the alternative 3 and 4 descriptions below.

Alternative 1 is consistent with the Los Padres Forest Plan, and meets the requirements under the National Forest Management Act, Endangered Species Act, and National Historic Preservation Act, as disclosed in the specialist reports (project record). It also has no adverse effects on Environmental Justice (project record scoping and consultation).

## Other Alternatives Considered

In addition to the selected alternative, I considered three other alternatives. A comparison of these alternatives can be found in the EA on pages 5 through 15, with a summary table provided on pages 14-15.

## Alternative 2, No Action

Under the no-action alternative, current management plans would continue to guide management of the project area. Access to the La Brea Restoration project area would remain as it has since the fire of 2009, and flooding events of 2011. The temporary closure order for the roads, motorized trails, and recreation sites would become permanent. Any roads and trails that have been closed to motorized use would remain that way. Retaining the closures would be accomplished through travel management reclassification and signage; no dozer or excavation work would be needed. The road templates would remain in place for fire suppression and other administrative access. The roads would be retained as NFS roads managed at ML 1 standards. ML 1 roads are closed to motorized use with a gate or barrier, but can be used as a non-motorized trail. Non-motorized access to the area and dispersed camping would be allowed.

The no-action alternative does not address the purpose and need, because the entire area would remain closed to motorized use, and impacts to the environment that are occurring from no maintenance would continue.

While recreationists could use the area for non-motorized activities, much of the area including campgrounds wouldn't be reasonably accessible and developed campgrounds couldn't be maintained or serviced without motorized access. The purpose and need objectives for restoration of public access and protection of resources would not be met. It is for these reasons I didn't choose this alternative.

## Alternative 3

Alternative 3 was designed in response to public concerns over loss of access and motorized use in the project area. It provided more motorized access and recreation opportunities than the proposed action. The roads and campgrounds re-opened under the proposed action would also be re-opened in alternative 3. Differences between alternative 3 and the proposed action included: The La Brea Road would be retained as an ML 2 road instead of non-motorized trail. The Kerry Canyon Motorcycle Trail would be retained, instead of being converted to a non-motorized trail. The La Brea Canyon Road would be retained as an ML 2 road, and opened seasonally. The Barrel Springs Campground would be restored as a developed site.

I did not choose alternative 3 for several reasons. The anticipated impacts on the environment were unacceptable to me. In addition, the anticipated level of financial and personnel resources that would be needed to implement and maintain such an alternative did not appear feasible or sustainable. As described in the aquatic resources section of the EA (pp. 77–82), impacts to red-legged frog, steelhead trout, and their critical habitat would be greater and more frequent than under the other alternatives. There would be 69 motorized stream crossings and 13 more miles of roads, which, in addition to being sources of impacts to species and habitat, would need to be maintained by personnel and funding that are in short supply. The finding for cultural resources was also more impactful under alternative 3 as compared to the other alternatives. Roads and trails would need to be re-routed around site buffers to avoid significant heritage sites that were impacted by erosion resulting from the fire and subsequent flooding events. Even if all direct effects could be prevented by implementing protection measures, the condition and quality of heritage resources are expected to diminish with increased motorized traffic in the area of potential effect on the Kerry Canyon Motorcycle Trail and the La Brea Road in particular, with an outcome that is likely not consistent with the Forest Plan goals for protecting and managing heritage resources (EA, p. 106-107). Estimated effects to other resources were also greater than under all other alternatives. Alternative 3 would result in the highest risk of noxious weed

infestation, as opening closed roads and trails and maintaining them would result in a larger continuously disturbed area open for weed infestation (EA, p. 101). It would have the greatest potential direct effects on any of the Forest Service sensitive species present in the activity areas. Individual plants could be eliminated from the population or reproduction could be affected negatively (EA, p. 99-100).

The primary reason I did not select alternative 3 is the level of effects to aquatic species and the likelihood that any improvements made to the transportation system to provide for continued motorized use contribute to additional sedimentation as a result of future storm events. As described in the hydrology report, “The most likely prognosis for the North Fork of La Brea Creek is that for the next few decades (if not longer), sediment inputs to the stream will be substantial and bedload materials will move in response to infrequent, high-intensity/long-duration storm events. In other words, large volumes of bedload materials will be moving downstream in response to the very same flood flows that would normally clean out and maintain scour pools. Shallow pools may develop in the lower reaches of the North Fork of La Brea Creek (from approximately Rattlesnake Canyon and downstream) in response to the accumulation of flows from moderate frequency rainfall events. But those pools will be subject to re-deposition during infrequent flood flow events.” (EA, p. 68). These are effects that would occur without any addition of road material for the 74 stream crossings needed in the project area. Alternative 3 would produce the most sediment from roads and trails (EA, p. 70-72). This would not only cause additional impacts to the hydrologic and aquatic systems, but additional costs for future repair and maintenance. This alternative, therefore, is not sustainable from an environmental or financial standpoint.

#### Alternative 4

Alternative 4 was designed in response to public concerns over loss of access and motorized use of the project area, and concerns over damage to sensitive species habitat in La Brea Creek. It provides more motorized access and recreation opportunities than the proposed action, and a different mix of motorized access opportunities than alternative 3. All elements of alternative 4 are the same as the proposed action, except for: a new motorized trail would be constructed on the ridge west of La Brea Creek between La Brea Road 11N04.3 and the Buckhorn Ridge Trail 31W14, and located outside of riparian areas. A Forest Plan amendment would be needed to change the recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS) on either side of this new trail from semi-primitive non-motorized to semi-primitive motorized, and the land use zone (LUZ) from back country non-motorized to back country.

Alternative 4 was an option for restoring motorized recreation while reducing impacts to the environment by offsetting the closure of motorized trails located within riparian areas with construction of a new motorized trail on upland. As analysis of alternative 4 progressed, it became apparent that additional surveys and analysis would be needed for recreation, botany and cultural resources. Taking this action would also require a Forest Plan amendment to change the current ROS and LUZ classifications to allow for a narrow motorized corridor within these areas. A Forest Plan amendment would require additional public notification under 36 CFR 219 and analysis of the suitability criteria. Perhaps this additional analysis will occur in the future when adequate financial and specialist resources are available, but right now, I need to provide for reasonable recreational use of the area balanced with protection of the natural environment, and be in compliance with the Forest Plan.

## Public Involvement and Scoping

As described in the background, the need for this action arose in 2011. A proposal to restore access and recreation opportunity, watershed stability and ecological protection to the North Fork of La Brea Creek area was first listed in the schedule of proposed actions in October 2016. The proposal was provided to the public and other agencies for comment during scoping in April 2017. In addition, as part of the public involvement process, the agency hosted an open house on May 8, 2017. The results of these efforts are documented in the public involvement section of the project record. An additional 30-day comment period was provided for review of the EA in July 2018.

Using the comments from the public, other agencies, and organizations (project record, response to public scoping comments), the interdisciplinary team identified several issues regarding the effects of the proposed action. The main issues included concerns over loss of access and motorized use in the project area; concerns regarding the potential impact to threatened, endangered, and sensitive aquatic species if the roads and trails are repaired and motorized access restored; and concerns about the impact of motorized access on inventoried roadless areas and adjacent wilderness. Internal concerns included the effects of road and trail repairs, campground improvements, and motorized use on cultural resources, and the loss of motorized access for fire suppression and other emergencies. To address these concerns, the Forest Service created the alternatives described above. Project Design Features were developed to prevent or minimize adverse effects (EA Appendix C). Meaningful measures and indicators were identified for each resource analyzed. The results are disclosed in EA chapter 3 for each resource evaluated.

## Finding of No Significant Impact

### Context

For the proposed action and alternatives, the context of the environmental effects is based on the environmental analysis in the environmental assessment.

As shown on the 2018 Los Padres National Forest Motorized Vehicle Use Map (MVUM), the Forest includes approximately 781 miles of roads and 321 miles of motorized trails that are open to the public. The selected alternative reduces those totals by 7.4 miles of road and 9.1 miles of motorized (motorcycle) trail. This equates to a 0.95 percent reduction in roads and 2.8 percent reduction in motorized trails. The amount of roads and trails remaining open on the Forest is 98.5 percent.

On the Santa Lucia Ranger District (District), there are 184 miles of roads and 98 miles of motorized trails that are open to the public. My decision equates to a 4.0 percent reduction in roads and 9.3 percent reduction in motorized trails. The amount remaining open on the District is 94 percent. When considering the public concern over the loss of motorized recreation opportunities resulting from this project, the reduction is not a significant change in terms of context. Given the area affected by the project at both the Forest and District scale, I find that the effects of the project are not significant as disclosed throughout chapter 3 of the EA and at the District and Forest scale.

### Intensity

Intensity is a measure of the severity, extent, or quantity of effects, and is based on information from the effects analysis of this EA and the references in the project record. The effects of this

project have been appropriately and thoroughly considered with an analysis that is responsive to concerns and issues raised by the public. The agency has taken a hard look at the environmental effects using relevant scientific information and knowledge of site-specific conditions gained from field visits. My finding of no significant impact is based on the context of the project and intensity of effects using the 10 factors identified in 40 CFR 1508.27(b).

**1) Impacts may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on the balance the effects will be beneficial.**

My finding of no significant environmental effects is not biased by the beneficial effects of the action. I have considered and disclosed adverse impacts individually to determine significance and did not use beneficial impacts to “balance” out the significance of adverse impacts. As disclosed in the EA, chapter 3, any potential adverse impacts that were identified are minor and of low intensity when the project design features are implemented.

**2) The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety.**

There are no circumstances or conditions associated with my selected action to indicate there would be unusual or substantial risks to public health and safety. The roads, trails, recreational facilities and lands within the project area will continue to be managed and protected. Two of the purposes for the actions proposed are to (1) provide a transportation system that is safe and efficient, and (2) provide recreation facilities that are high-quality, well-maintained, safe, accessible, and consistent with visitor expectations. (EA, p. 3-4). The selected alternative includes actions that will provide for these needs and ensure that we can manage the project area to be sustainable, and that includes safety. Providing for public health and safety has and will continue to be a priority for all lands within the project area.

**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.**

There will be no significant effects on unique features in the area, such as historical or cultural resources, park lands, prime forest lands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

While cultural resources are present within the project area and nearby the roads, trails, and recreational facilities, they would not be adversely affected. As stated in the EA (p. 103) the proposed action appears to have the greatest potential to protect historic properties. Historic properties would be managed through the Forest Service “Standard Protection Measures” of buffering, avoidance, and monitoring (ARPA 2018, Stip. 7.8 (2) (a) (b) Appendix E). The condition and management practices of heritage resources is expected to improve with implementation of the proposed action (EA, p. 104). All required project design features for the protection of cultural resources as listed in the EA, Appendix C for the proposed action would be implemented.

There are no park lands, prime forest lands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas within the project area.

While there are wetlands within the project area watersheds, none of the proposed activities would negatively impact wetlands (EA, p. 73).

**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. While there is opposition to reducing the amount of motorized access, I have concluded that the science behind the effects analysis conducted for each relevant resource is not highly controversial, based on a review of the record that shows a thorough review of relevant scientific information (specialist reports and references folders). I have also taken into account that opposition to the reduction in motorized access has been fully considered through development of alternatives 3 and 4.

**5) The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.**

The possible effects on the human environment are not highly uncertain, nor do they involve unique or unknown risks. The effects analyses discussed in chapter 3 of the EA are based on sound scientific research and previous experience implementing transportation system and recreation projects across the Forest.

**6) The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.**

The action is not likely to establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects because this action is not unusual in and of itself; the scope of this project is very specific in terms of its purpose, location, and timing; and this action does not establish a decision for future actions.

**7) Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.**

I have reviewed the impacts of the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions that were described at the beginning of chapter 3 of the EA (p. 16). Each of the resource sections in chapter 3 of the EA addressed potential cumulative effects. This action does not represent potential significant cumulative impacts when considered in combination with other past or reasonably foreseeable actions.

**8) The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant cultural or historical resources.**

The action will have no significant adverse effect on districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, and will not cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural or historical resources. Historic properties would be managed through the Forest Service “Standard Protection Measures” of buffering, avoidance, and monitoring (ARPA 2018, Stip. 7.8 (2) (a) (b) Appendix E), and the Forest finds that the proposed action of the La Brea Restoration Project would not have adverse effects on heritage resources (EA, p. 105).

**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.**

Many of the proposed activities are covered under programmatic consultation. By implementing the identified mitigation measures and limited operating periods, the selected alternative is not likely to adversely affect the California red-legged frog or its designated critical habitat or steelhead trout or its designated critical habitat. Although limited mortality could occur to western pond turtle, the determination under the selected alternative is “may affect individuals but is not likely to lead to the listing of the species or result in a trend toward Federal listing for the species.” The selected alternative may affect but is not likely to adversely affect the southwestern willow flycatcher and least Bells’ vireo. Although limited mortality could occur to basking two-striped garter snakes under the selected alternative, the determination is “may affect individuals but is not likely to lead to the listing of the species or result in a trend toward Federal listing for the species.” The determination for the California legless lizard is “may affect individuals but is not likely to lead to the listing of the species or result in a trend toward Federal listing for the species” if they were present, because it is possible that limited mortality could occur to burrowing individuals. (EA p. 81-82).

**10) Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.**

The action will not violate Federal, State, and local laws or requirements for the protection of the environment. The action is consistent with the 2005 Forest Plan. This action will not have significant impacts on the transportation system; recreation; inventoried roadless areas; scenery; water quality; wetlands and floodplains; threatened, endangered, proposed, or sensitive species; management indicator species; migratory birds; cultural resources; or climate change (EA, pp. 17–109).

This decision is in compliance with the National Forest Management Act, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the National Historic Preservation act. It is consistent with the Executive Orders for Wetlands (11990), Floodplains (11988), and Environmental Justice (12898). See the Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations section below for additional information and references to the EA.

**Conclusion**

After considering the environmental effects described in the EA and specialist reports, I have determined that alternative 1 will not have significant effects on the quality of the human environment considering the context and intensity of impacts (40 CFR 1508.27). Thus, an environmental impact statement will not be prepared.

**Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations**

*Clean Water Act*

No streams in the project area are listed as impaired under the Clean Water Act (303(d)) (EA, p. 66). Implementation of my draft decision will incorporate project design criteria, as described in Appendix C of the EA, which will protect and maintain water quality conditions. Localized, short-term effects to water quality and stream channel morphology are anticipated. Implementation of Forest Plan standards and guidelines and best management practices are expected to keep water quality at acceptable levels (EA, pp. 71 and 75).

### *Endangered Species Act*

The Forest is consulting with the National Marine Fisheries Service and Fish and Wildlife Service as needed, and appropriate, to comply with consultation requirements under the Endangered Species Act.

### *Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act*

While most are not applicable, the 10 National Standards under the act are being met by the project.

### *National Historic Preservation Act*

The area of potential effect for undertakings is a regulatory process, per the 2018 USFS Pacific Southwest Region (Region 5) Amended Programmatic Agreement with the California State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, (ARPA 2018) Stipulation 7.3). All historic properties with the potential to be affected by the proposed undertaking will be managed through the implementation of approved standard protection measures, per the 2018 Amended USFS Pacific Southwest Region (Region 5) Programmatic Agreement (ARPA 2018 Appendix E). These include buffering, avoidance, and monitoring. No adverse effects to heritage resources will occur (EA, pp. 103–104).

### *Environmental Justice*

Environmental Justice, Executive Order 12898 of February 11, 1994, orders Federal agencies to identify and address any adverse human health and environmental effects of agency programs that disproportionately impact minority and low-income populations. Environmental justice was considered. No disproportionately high adverse human or environmental effects on minorities and/or low-income populations were identified during the analysis or public involvement efforts (notifications, open houses, and comment periods).

### *National Forest Management Act*

This decision to implement the selected alternative as described on page 3 of this decision document is consistent with the intent of the Forest Plan's long-term goals and objectives referenced in the Need for the Proposal summarized in the EA (pp. 2-4). The project was designed in conformance with Forest Plan standards and incorporates appropriate Forest Plan guidelines for restoration of safe and sustainable access and recreational use of the project area (La Brea Restoration EA, Appendix C).

## **Administrative Review and Objection Rights**

This proposed decision is subject to objection pursuant to 36 CFR 218, Subparts A and B. Objections will only be accepted from those who submitted timely project-specific written comments during any designated opportunity for public comment (36 CFR 218.5). Issues raised in objections must be based on previously submitted comments unless based on new information arising after the designated comment periods. Individuals or representatives of an entity submitting comments must sign the comments or verify identity upon request.

Objections must be submitted within 45-days following the publication of the legal notice announcing availability of the EA and draft Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact in the Santa Barbara News-Press, the newspaper of record for this project. The date of this legal notice is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an objection. Those wishing to

object should not rely upon dates or timeframes provided by any other source. It is the objector's responsibility to ensure evidence of timely receipt (36 CFR 218.9).

Objections must be submitted to the reviewing officer: Randy Moore, Regional Forester, USDA Forest Service; Attn: La Brea Restoration Project; 1323 Club Drive, Vallejo, CA 94592. Ph. (707) 562-8737. Objections may be submitted via mail, FAX (707-562-9229), or delivered during business hours (M-F 8:00am to 4:00pm). Comments sent electronically must be in .doc, .pdf, .rtf, or .txt formats and sent to: [objections-pacificsouthwest-regional-office@usda.gov](mailto:objections-pacificsouthwest-regional-office@usda.gov) with the subject: La Brea Restoration Project.

Objections must include (36 CFR 218.8(d)): 1) name, address and telephone; 2) signature or other verification of authorship; 3) identify a single lead objector when applicable; 4) project name, Responsible Official name and title, and name of affected National Forest(s) and/or Ranger District(s); 5) reasons for, and suggested remedies to resolve, your objections; and, 6) description of the connection between your objections and your prior comments. Incorporate documents by reference as per 36 CFR 218.8(b). Names of objectors will be part of the public record subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

### **Implementation Date**

When the objection filing period has ended and responses have been made to any objections by the Reviewing Officer, the Responsible Official may make a final decision on the project. The Reviewing Officer shall issue a written response to any objectors within 45-days following the end of the objection filing period (36 CFR 218.26(b)). If no legitimate objections are filed, a decision can be made on the 5th business day following the close of the filing period (36 CFR 218.12). Implementation may begin immediately after the decision is made

### **Contact**

For further information concerning the La Brea Restoration Project, contact Kyle Kinports, NEPA Coordinator at (805)-961-5710.

Approved by:

---

KEVIN B. ELLIOTT  
Forest Supervisor  
Los Padres National Forest

---

Date

*In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.*

*Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.*

*To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at [http://www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint\\_filing\\_cust.html](http://www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint_filing_cust.html) and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: [program.intake@usda.gov](mailto:program.intake@usda.gov). USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer and lender.*