

**To:** Dana Backer[dbacker@blm.gov]  
**Cc:** Matthew J Betenson[mbetenso@blm.gov]  
**From:** Staszak, Cynthia  
**Sent:** 2017-11-30T13:15:11-05:00  
**Importance:** Normal  
**Subject:** Fwd: Deer Springs DRAFT DN/FONSI  
**Received:** 2017-11-30T13:16:04-05:00  
20170607 DN FONSI DeerSpringsDRAFT.docx

This is from July.

I don't know if a more finalized Draft EA/DN/FONSI was provided to Amber, since the notice was filed. I do not know if amber started on a Draft Decision Record.....but that is the next step in the process.

***Cindy Staszak  
Monument Manager  
Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument  
669 S. Hwy 89-A  
Kanab, UT 84741  
Office: 435 644-1240  
Cell: 435 691-4340  
Fax: 435 644-1250***

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Hughes, Amber <ahughes@blm.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Jun 30, 2017 at 1:50 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Deer Springs DRAFT DN/FONSI  
**To:** "Green, Jennifer - FS" <jennifergreen@fs.fed.us>  
**Cc:** "Fonger, Leslie -FS" <lesriefonger@fs.fed.us>, "Hancock, Paul -FS" <phancock@fs.fed.us>, Matthew Betenson <mbetenso@blm.gov>, Cynthia Staszak <cstaszak@blm.gov>

Hello,

I was able to provide some feedback for the Draft DN/FONSI attached below. Cindy, our Monument Manager also reviewed the document and appreciated the second to the last paragraph.

When you think you have a more finalized Draft EA/DN/FONSI please share it with me as I'll starting drafting our Decision Record so we can adopt the EA and I'll have Cindy review as well.

I hope you both have a great Fourth of July weekend.  
Thanks,

Amber

**Amber L Hughes**

\*\*\*\*\*

Planning and Environmental Coordinator  
Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument  
Bureau of Land Management

PO Box 225  
Escalante, UT 84726

435 826 5602  
435 826 5650 fax

\*\*\*\*\*

"Between stimulus and response there is a space. In that space is our power to choose our response. In our response lies our growth and freedom" Viktor E Frankl

On Fri, Jun 23, 2017 at 3:46 PM, Green, Jennifer - FS <[jennifergreen@fs.fed.us](mailto:jennifergreen@fs.fed.us)> wrote:

Would a week be sufficient? We are still waiting on the final FWS concurrence, but it should be fine. Other than that, I think we are ready to go out for objections.

thanks

**Jennifer Green**  
**Environmental Coordinator/NEPA Planner**

**Forest Service**

**Dixie National Forest**

**p: 435-865-3729**  
**f: 435-865-3791**  
[jennifergreen@fs.fed.us](mailto:jennifergreen@fs.fed.us)

1789 N Wedgewood Ln  
Cedar City, UT 84720  
[www.fs.fed.us](http://www.fs.fed.us)

Caring for the land and serving people

**From:** Hughes, Amber [mailto:[ahughes@blm.gov](mailto:ahughes@blm.gov)]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 23, 2017 2:47 PM  
**To:** Fonger, Leslie -FS <[lesliefonger@fs.fed.us](mailto:lesliefonger@fs.fed.us)>  
**Cc:** Green, Jennifer - FS <[jennifergreen@fs.fed.us](mailto:jennifergreen@fs.fed.us)>; Hancock, Paul -FS <[phancock@fs.fed.us](mailto:phancock@fs.fed.us)>  
**Subject:** Re: Deer Springs DRAFT DN/FONSI

When do you need feedback on this document by? I'll take a look at later today and share with my managers and request their feedback.

Amber

Amber L Hughes

\*\*\*\*\*

Planning and Environmental Coordinator

Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument

Bureau of Land Management

PO Box 225

Escalante, UT 84726

435 826 5602

435 826 5650 fax

\*\*\*\*\*

"Between stimulus and response there is a space. In that space is our power to choose our response. In our response lies our growth and freedom" Viktor E Frankl

On Thu, Jun 8, 2017 at 10:14 AM, Fonger, Leslie -FS <[lesliefonger@fs.fed.us](mailto:lesliefonger@fs.fed.us)> wrote:

Thanks for picking up on that. I did do a find for lookout. What I have learned now is that find must not search headers/footers unless you are actively editing the header/footer. Always learning something new. Thanks.

Leslie

---

**From:** Green, Jennifer - FS  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 08, 2017 7:16 AM  
**To:** Fonger, Leslie -FS <[lesliefonger@fs.fed.us](mailto:lesliefonger@fs.fed.us)>  
**Subject:** RE: Deer Springs DRAFT DN/FONSI

Thanks for getting this out so quickly. I have found a few grammar type edits. (lookout still in header) always do a control f = find if you are using a template from another project. But looks pretty good. Lets see what Paul and Amber think.

Thank-you!!

---

**From:** Fonger, Leslie -FS  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 07, 2017 4:59 PM  
**To:** Hancock, Paul -FS <[phancock@fs.fed.us](mailto:phancock@fs.fed.us)>; Hughes, Amber <[ahughes@blm.gov](mailto:ahughes@blm.gov)>; Green, Jennifer - FS <[jennifergreen@fs.fed.us](mailto:jennifergreen@fs.fed.us)>  
**Subject:** Deer Springs DRAFT DN/FONSI

Hello All,

Attached is the DRAFT Deer Springs Decision Notice/Finding of No Significant Impact.  
Please review and let me know your comments. Thanks!



**Leslie Fonger**  
**Recreation Specialist**

**Forest Service**

**Dixie National Forest, Powell Ranger District**

p: 435-676-9360  
f: 435-676-9391  
[lesliefonger@fs.fed.us](mailto:lesliefonger@fs.fed.us)

P.O. Box 80  
Panguitch, UT 84759  
[www.fs.fed.us](http://www.fs.fed.us)



**Caring for the land and serving people**

This electronic message contains information generated by the USDA solely for the intended recipients. Any unauthorized interception of this message or the use or disclosure of the information it contains may violate the law and subject the violator to civil or criminal penalties. If you believe you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the email immediately.

## **Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact for the Deer Springs Ranch Fuels Reduction Project**

USDA Forest Service  
Powell Ranger District  
Dixie National Forest  
Kane County, Utah

### *Introduction*

This Decision Notice (DN) documents my decision and rationale for the Deer Springs Ranch Fuels Reduction Project on the Powell Ranger District of the Dixie National Forest. My decision and findings are based on the analysis documented in the Deer Springs Ranch Fuels Reduction Project Environmental Assessment (EA) and its supporting project record, which are incorporated by reference in this document.

The project area consists of approximately 6,247 acres. Approximately 158 acres are under the administration of the Bureau of Land Management. Elevations range from 7,000 ft. to 9,400 ft. and lies within the geological formation known as the Paunsaugunt Plateau. The purpose for this project is to meet or move toward the desired conditions for the Dixie National Forest as established in the Land and Resource Management Plan (1986, as amended) as well as the goals and objectives outlined in the Bureau of Land Management Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument Record of Decision and Approved Monument Management Plan (USDI, 2000). The Forest Service (FS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in 2015 for purposes of project analysis and compliance. The FS is the lead agency and the BLM is a cooperating agency for the Deer Springs Project.

Specifically this project will strive to: (1) reduce fuel loadings, reduce the risk of stand replacing wildfire and create defensible space within the wildland urban interface (WUI), (2) increase vegetative diversity and create and maintain stand conditions that will minimize growth loss and mortality from insects and disease and perpetuate desired forest cover types, and (3) protect existing water resources from degradation and provide new water sources to improve wildlife distribution across habitat. This is proposed to be done through mechanical thinning, prescribed fire and/or herbicide application. These treatments may occur multiple times over several entries as needed to reach the desired conditions.

Lookout Point Mine

### *Project Location*

The Deer Springs Ranch Fuels Reduction Project (project) is within the Powell Ranger District (PRD) of the Dixie National Forest and within the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument (GSENM) of the Bureau of Land Management in Kane County, Utah. The legal description for the project area includes all or part of Township (T) 38 South (S), Range (R) 4 West (W), Section 33; T38S, R4.5W, Sections 34 and 35; T39S, R4W, Sections 3, 5, 10, and 17, 19 (BLM lands are included in Section 9); T39S, R4.5W, Sections 1, 12, 14, 23, and 24; Salt Lake Base and Meridian (SLBM). The nearest community is Alton, which lies about 12 miles to the west of the project area. The GSENM lies in the southwestern portion of the project area and comprises 158 acres of the overall project treatments. Deer Springs Ranch, an 8,000 acre private in holding of approximately 300 home sites lies within the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), directly adjacent to the project area. The fuel loadings in Deer Springs Ranch are high and continuous with those of the project area. Forest Service Road (FSR) 092 roughly bisects the analysis area and Forest Service Road 242 lies within the eastern portion. Several non motorized trails exist throughout the project.

### *Decision and Rationale*

Based upon my review of the EA, comments received from the public and internal input from an interdisciplinary team of Forest Service and BLM Resource Specialists, I have decided to select and implement Alternative 2 The Proposed Action. The Proposed Action includes:

- Forest, woodland and shrubland non commercial thinning and fuels reduction using mechanical equipment on approximately 4,058 acres. This acreage includes Ponderosa Pine and Douglas Fir, Pinyon Pine and Juniper Woodland, and shrubland cover types. This also includes an area of shaded fuel break within the WUI adjacent to Deer Springs Ranch.
- Prescribed fire (pile burning and prescribed fire) on approximately 4,216 Acres. This includes the thinning areas described above and consists of a combination of pile burning and low to moderate intensity prescribed fire.
- Rabbitbrush treatment on approximately 36 acres. This will consist of mowing rabbitbrush followed by a wet mop application of Picloram herbicide. Monitoring and reseeding or replanting would occur.
- Water source protection and development at Gravel Spring and through the installation of two rain catchment apron design guzzlers.

I have selected Alternative 2 the Proposed Action because it best meets the purpose and need for the project and minimizes the potential for adverse environmental impacts of the planned treatments.

## Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact

The Proposed Action reduces the risk of high severity large scale fire in all fuel types within the project area. A high severity fire would have a great negative impact to soils, vegetative diversity, recreation, wildlife and private properties. The Proposed Action also reduces the risk of high severity fire more effectively within the shaded fuel break and provides more options for treatments to reach the purpose and needs of the project. Water source protection and development will also help wildlife and water quality within the project area.

The prescribed rabbitbrush treatment within the Proposed Action would increase plant diversity and forage. Applying the Picloram as proposed will have minimal to no effect on the health and sustainability of the project area or adjacent areas.

### *Other Alternatives Considered*

In addition to the selected alternative, I considered a no action alternative and an additional alternative (alternative 3). The no action alternative provided a basis for comparison with the proposed action and alternative 3. Alternative 3 was developed to address some key issues brought up during scoping and public comment. With the No Action Alternative, the Forest Service would do no vegetative treatments and no water protection or development. The landscape within the project area would continue in its current course. Alternative 3 analyzed proposed treatments similar to the Proposed Action but with more restrictive mechanical vegetative treatments within the Fishhook? Inventoried Roadless Area and no Picloram application.

I also considered two other alternatives which were eliminated from detailed analysis. The Scoped Proposed Action was modified to The Proposed Action after incorporating feedback from the public scoping period. The modification included a clarification regarding acreage intended for treatment and the addition of the 158 acre BLM GSENM parcel to the project. This revised version became Alternative 2 The Proposed Action

The Home Ignition Zone (HIZ) Alternative was developed based on comments received during the public scoping period. This alternative focuses on treatment within the home ignition zone. This alternative is supported by post fire studies, experiments and models which have shown homes ignite due to the condition of the home itself as well as everything around it and up to 200 feet from the foundation. Homes and their surroundings are vulnerable to three potential ignition sources; embers, surface fire and crown fire (NFPA, 2014).

This alternative provides residents within the wildland urban interface information regarding Firewise principles to prepare home and landscapes for wildland fire. This alternative would provide Forest Service personnel to implement fuel reduction projects within the home ignition zone of elderly and handicapped landowners.

Firewise brochures and other information for distribution are available from the following website: [http://firewise.org/wildfire\\_preparedness/teaching\\_tools/brochures\\_and\\_booklets.aspx](http://firewise.org/wildfire_preparedness/teaching_tools/brochures_and_booklets.aspx).



Lookout Point Mine

The HIZ Alternative was not considered in detail for the following reasons:

- The HIZ Alternative failed to meet the purpose and need to reduce surface fuels, thin vegetation, and lessen the risk of stand replacing wildfire on National Forest System Lands.
- Private land management decisions and activities are outside the scope of the purpose and need and the authority of the Responsible Officials.
- Activities suggested through the HIZ alternative are duplicative of existing efforts to assist communities to be Firewise and develop Community Wildfire Protection Plans by the Utah Division of Forest, Fire, and State Lands, the USDI Bureau of Land Management, and the USDA Forest Service.

### *Public Involvement and Scoping*

A Notice of Opportunity to Comment was published in the Dixie National Forest's newspaper of record, *The Spectrum* on Monday, September 21, 2015. The Notice asked for public comment on the proposal within 30 days of the publication date. In addition, the Forest invited public comment and participation by: listing the project in the Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA); posting the scoping packet to the Forest Service project website: (<http://www.fs.usda.gov/project/?project=47244>) and emailing letters to 64 potentially interested persons, city, state, and tribal governments, and other Federal agencies. Three letters were received and 88 comments were extracted from the letters. The interdisciplinary team reviewed all 88 public comments to identify issues for this proposal. Several issues or unresolved conflicts were identified through scoping that indicated a need for additional alternatives. Alternative 3 was developed to meet this need. Also, based on public and internal comments the scoped Proposed Action was refined and clarified.

**Commented [HAL1]:** You might want to add something that states that BLM's interdisciplinary team also reviewed and provided comments. And also, that all relevant and substantive comments were reviewed by both the FS and BLM

The EA was also made available as part of a second scoping period to meet BLM public involvement requirements.

### *Finding of No Significant Impact*

The following is a summary of the project analysis to determine significance, as defined by Forest Service Handbook 1909.15\_05. "Significant" as used in the NEPA requires consideration of both context and intensity of the expected project effects.

#### **Context**

The setting of this project is localized with effects largely confined to the project area. "In the case of site specific actions, significance will usually depend on the effects in the locale rather than in the world as a whole. Both short and long term effects are relevant" (FSH 1909.15, 65.1, Part 02). This project is an area specific action that by itself does not have international, national, region wide, or statewide importance. The resource effects analysis disclosed in the

## Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact

EA reveal that most of the environmental effects of project implementation are confined to the project area.

I realize that while this project is underway there will be impacts to the project area. The project area comprises approximately 6,247 acres in size. In terms of context, this project area and its effects are confined to a small area. It is my determination that the effects of implementing the proposed action will not be significant locally, regionally or nationally.

#### 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 ten factors identified in 40 CFR 1508.27(b).

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

Beneficial and adverse impacts of this decision are addressed in the Environmental Consequences section of the EA (Chapter 3). Consideration of the intensity of environmental effects is not biased by beneficial effects of the action. No significant impacts were identified. No adverse effects could be considered significant even if considered separately from any beneficial effects.

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

This action does not pose a significant effect on public health or safety. The project activities will comply with all state and federal regulations protecting public health and safety.

**3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as the proximity to historical or cultural resources, parklands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.**

The project area has no parklands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers or ecologically critical areas. A cultural resource review and physical survey of the project area was conducted by the Forest Archaeologist. No historical, archaeological or other heritage resources were detected in the project area.

My decision will not create significant effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area such as the proximity to historical or cultural resources, parklands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

Lookout Point Mine

**4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.**

The effects of the proposed action on the quality of the human environment are not likely to be highly controversial. No highly controversial or significant issues related to the human environment were identified during scoping efforts or during the analysis process (EA, Chapter 3).

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

Possible effects to the human environment that are uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks are minimal or non-existent based on a review of the project analysis that employed scientifically accepted analytical techniques, available information and best professional experience and judgement to estimate the effects to the human environment. The effects associated with the proposed Action are recognized, familiar and predictable.

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

The Proposed Action is site specific and similar to past actions approved elsewhere on National Forest System lands, and will not set a precedence for future actions or represent a decision in principle about future considerations.

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

The cumulative effects of past and present actions, combined with the current proposal, and the reasonably foreseeable future actions for each resource are discussed in the analysis and disclosure of effects in the EA (Chapter 3) and the specialist reports. The Proposed Action will not have significant impacts when considered in combination with other past or reasonably foreseeable future actions.

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

Cultural resource surveys have been conducted following protocols approved by the State Historic Preservation Office. Native American tribes have been contacted and have expressed no concerns about the proposed activities. No cultural or historic resources will be impacted. The Proposed Action will comply with the National Historic Preservation Act. The Utah State Historic Preservation Office concurrence letter found that no historic properties were found within the project area and there would be no effect. Concurrence by the Utah State Historic Preservation Office was received in February of 2017.

## Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact

**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.**

The Dixie National Forest biological assessment determined that the proposed Deer Springs Ranch Fuels Reduction project as described would have No Affect on any of the listed threatened, endangered or proposed species, or their habitat, and would not likely affect these species or their persistence on the Powell Ranger District, or on the Dixie National Forest. (see BA in the project record).

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

The action is consistent with the Dixie National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan as amended (USDA 1986). The action will not violate Federal or applicable State and local laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

**Conclusion**

After considering the environmental effects described in the EA and specialist reports, I have determined that approving The Proposed Action of the Deer Springs Ranch Fuels Reduction Project 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***

**National Forest Management Act (NFMA).** The project was designed in conformance with land and resource management plan standards and incorporates appropriate land and resource management plan guidelines.

**National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).** NEPA directs the Forest Service (and other federal agencies) to conduct environmental analyses to assess the nature and importance of the physical, biological, social, and economic effects of a proposed action and its reasonable alternatives. Public notification and involvement are a key part of environmental analysis. Conclusions are reached about the significance of the effects on the human environment. This analysis is compliant with NEPA.

**Clean Water Act.** The Clean Water Act requires each state to implement its own water quality standards. The State of Utah's Water Quality Anti degradation Policy requires maintenance of water quality to protect existing in stream Beneficial Uses on streams designated as Category 1 High Quality Waters. All surface waters geographically located within the outer boundaries of the Dixie National Forest, whether on private or public lands, are designated as High Quality Waters (Category 1). This means they will be maintained at existing high quality.

## Lookout Point Mine

New point sources will not be allowed, and non point sources will be controlled to the extent feasible through implementation of best management practices (BMPs) or regulatory programs (Utah Administrative Code 2013). The State of Utah and the Forest Service have agreed through a 1993 Memorandum of Understanding to use Forest Plan standards and guidelines and the Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 2509.22 Soil and Water Conservation Practices (SWCPs) as the BMPs (USDA Forest Service 1993). The use of SWCPs as the BMPs meets the water quality protection elements of the Utah Nonpoint Source Management Plan. The Proposed Action will not measurably degrade the water quality of waters anywhere within the project area.

**Executive Order 11990.** This order requires the Forest Service to take action to minimize destruction, loss, or degradation of wetlands and to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands. In compliance with this order, Forest Service direction requires that an analysis be completed to determine whether adverse impacts will result. The Proposed Action will not destroy, degrade, or result in the loss of any wetlands within the project area.

**Executive Order 11988.** This order requires the Forest Service to provide leadership and to take action to (1) minimize adverse impacts associated with occupancy and modification of floodplains and reduce risks of flood loss, (2) minimize impacts of floods on human safety, health, and welfare, and (3) restore and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by floodplains. In compliance with this order, the Forest Service requires an analysis be completed to determine the significance of proposed actions in terms of impacts to floodplains. There is no proposal to permanently occupy or modify any unmodified floodplains within the project area. Adherence to the above design criteria is expected to be in compliance with Executive Order 11988.

**Executive Order 13653.** Preparing the United States for the impacts of Climate Change (2013). Executive Order 13653 outlines Federal agency responsibilities in the areas of supporting climate resilient investment; managing lands and waters for climate preparedness and resilience; providing information, data and tools for climate change preparedness and resilience; and planning.

**Endangered Species Act.** The Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 1544) as amended, directs federal agencies to utilize their authorities in furtherance of the purposes of the Act by carrying out programs for the conservation of listed species. The Act also requires federal agencies to insure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by them is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat.

**Executive Order 13186.** Executive Order 13186 directs federal agencies to protect migratory birds by integrating bird conservation principles, measures, and practices into agency activities and by avoiding or minimizing, to the extent practical, adverse impacts on migratory bird resources when conducting agency actions. This order directs agencies to further comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, and other

## Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact

pertinent statutes. This analysis is compliant with the National Memorandum of Understanding between the USDA Forest Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to promote the conservation of migratory birds (USDA 2008). In addition, the Dixie National Forest is compliant with the letter of understanding to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Utah Field Office (USDA 2007) concerning compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Executive Order 13186.

### *Science Used*

I am confident that the analysis of this project was conducted using the highest quality information. My conclusion is based on a review of the record that shows my staff conducted a thorough review of relevant scientific information, considered responsible opposing views, and acknowledged incomplete or unavailable information, scientific uncertainty, and risk. Please refer to the specialist reports in the project record for specific discussions of the science and methods used for analysis and for literature reviewed and referenced.

### *Pre-Decisional Opportunity to Object*

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 project specific written comments during scoping or other designated comment period for this project. Issues raised in objections must be based on previously submitted comments unless based on new information arising after the designated comment period(s).

Written objections, including any attachments, must be filed (regular mail, fax, email, hand delivery, or express delivery) with the Reviewing Officer at: Objection Reviewing Officer, Intermountain Region USFS, 324 25th Street, Ogden, Utah 84401; or fax to 801 625 5277; or by email to: objections.intermtn.regional.office@fs.fed.us within 45 days following the publication date of this legal notice in *The Spectrum*, newspaper of record. 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.

The office business hours for those submitting hand delivered objections are 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays. Electronic objections must be submitted in a format such as an email message, pdf, plain text (.txt), rich text format (rtf), and Word (.doc or .docx). Please add "Deer Springs Ranch Fuels Reduction Objection" in the Subject line.). It is the responsibility of Objectors to ensure their objection is received in a timely manner (§ 218.9).

Objections must include the following content as required by 36 CFR 218.8(d): 1) name, address and telephone; 2) signature or other verification of authorship; 3) identification of 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

Lookout Point Mine

your objections and your prior comments. Documents should be incorporated by reference only as provided for at 36 CFR 218.8(b).

### *Implementation/Objection Review and Final Decision*

If no objections are filed within the 45 day time period, the Final Decision Notice (DN) will be signed indicating approval of the project, and the project may be implemented 5 business days following the end of the objection filing period. If an objection is filed, then a resolution meeting with the objector(s) will be completed within another 30 day period which follows the objection filing period, which at the option of the objection reviewing officer, may be extended up to another 30 day time period, if needed.

Once responses to the objections are completed and recorded in writing, the Reviewing Officer will make recommendations as to the Environmental Assessment and FONSI, and Final DN for signature/approval. A project which has undergone the objection review process may be implemented immediately after the signing of the Final DN. Implementation is defined as actually performance the mining actions described in this notice.

In either case, according to regulations (36 CFR 218), no legal notice is required once a Final Decision is signed. However, the Forest Service may send out a letter or news release to notify any interested parties of the availability of the final decision document(s).

The BLM also has the option to do a separate decision and appeal process regarding BLM administered lands within the project area.

For further information concerning the Deer Springs Ranch Fuels Reduction Project, contact Leslie Fonger, 435 676 9360, or [lesliefonger@fs.fed.us](mailto:lesliefonger@fs.fed.us) during normal business hours.

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul Hancock  
Powell District Ranger  
Dixie National Forest

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact

### **Literature Cited**

**USDA. 1986.** Land and Resource Management Plan for the Dixie National Forest. Cedar City, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Dixie National Forest.

**USDA. 2007.** Letter of understanding between the U.S. Forest Service, Dixie National Forest, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Utah Field office, regarding the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Executive Order 13186. Cedar City, UT: USDA Forest Service, Dixie National Forest.

**USDA. 2008.** Memorandum of understanding between the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to promote the conservation of migratory birds. Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service.

USDI Bureau of Land Management. 2000. Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument Management Plan. Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument, UT.



