

Decision Notice
& Finding of No Significant Impact
Grazing Authorization and Allotment Management Plans
HQ, Campini and Blacktail Allotments

USDA Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
Sierra Vista Ranger District,
Cochise and Santa Cruz Counties, Arizona

Background

This decision covers the authorization of grazing and selected improvements for the HQ, Campini and Blacktail Allotments on the Sierra Vista Ranger District in Cochise and Santa Cruz Counties, Arizona. The allotments include lands designated as Management Areas 4 and 7 in the Coronado National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan).

The purpose and need for the proposed action arose for the following reasons:

- The allotments currently lack sufficient environmental analysis to comply with the Rescission Act (*P.L. 104-19, 1995*).
- There is a need to incorporate additional flexibility into the management of the allotments in order to allow the Forest Service and individual grazing permit holders to be able to adapt management to changing resource conditions or management objectives.
- There is a need for change from current management on some of the allotments in order to maintain or move toward desired conditions. Specifically:
 - Additional waters and fences are needed to improve distribution.
 - Permitted use on some allotments exceeds what is considered sustainable. Forest Plan direction to balance permitted use with capacity is not being met.

In addition, historic activities on the HQ allotment have created head cuts that are impacting soil condition and require stabilization. The headcuts are decades old and their origin is unknown. They do not appear to be related to or exacerbated by current livestock management, but because of their size, may require intervention in order to prevent further soil loss.

The authorization of grazing and of management practices on allotments were analyzed in the HQ, Campini and Blacktail Range Allotment Environmental Assessment (EA) in compliance with the Rescission Act of 1995 (*P.L. 104-19*) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The EA describes the anticipated effects of the proposed action and two alternatives (No Action/No Grazing and Continue Current Management). It also describes specific mitigation and monitoring requirements that will be implemented as part of the proposed action. The EA is available at the Sierra Vista Ranger District, the Coronado National Forest Supervisor's Office and on the Forest website at www.fs.fed.us/r3/coronado/.

Decision and Reasons for the Selection

Based upon my review of all alternatives, I have decided to approve the grazing management strategy described under *Alternative 3* of the EA. The selected alternative best meets the purpose and need and achieves desired conditions (EA pp. 4-5) in the following ways.

1. The alternative is consistent with the management emphasis and direction for Management Areas 4 and 7 of the Coronado Forest Plan.
2. The alternative best achieves Forest Service Policy (FSM 2202) and the mission of the Coronado National Forest Plan (Forest Plan p. 9) to manage for multiple use and sustained yield and to contribute to a viable rural economy.
3. It will provide for sufficient growing season rest and light to moderate utilization that will promote continued improvement in upland vegetation and soil condition.
4. The permitted numbers are conservative and reflect the range of variability that affects capacity on the allotments, consistent with Forest Plan direction.
5. The alternative provides for the repair of infrastructure to improve livestock distribution, which will increase vegetative cover and litter accumulation and protect soils. Proposed improvements will improve livestock distribution on all three allotments and will provide a mechanism to increase pasture rest and management flexibility.
6. The alternative will reduce disturbance at a spring on the Blacktail allotment, thereby protecting riparian resources while providing additional reliable sources of water in uplands.
7. The alternative provides a mechanism to arrest active erosion cuts on the HQ allotment, thereby contributing to overall soil stability.
8. The alternative provides a basis for sharing responsibility for successful implementation of this decision with the permittees. It will provide an adaptive management framework that will allow the Forest and grazing permittees to adapt management to changing resource conditions.

The selected action will authorize grazing within the following defined limits for the duration, intensity, frequency and timing of grazing.

Duration and timing of grazing. Use on the HQ, Campini and Blacktail allotments will be authorized year-round using rotational grazing. Periodic growing season rest or deferment will be used to provide for grazed plant recovery. The sequence and timing of pasture moves will be based on monitoring of range readiness, ecological condition, and utilization.

Frequency and intensity of grazing. Forage utilization will be managed at a level corresponding to light to moderate intensity (30-45% annual utilization of key forage species in key areas) in order to provide for grazed plant recovery, increased herbage production and retention of herbaceous litter to protect soils.

Grazing authorizations (Table 1) will be accomplished through the issuance of new 10-year term grazing permits in accordance with Forest Service policy (FSH 2209.13). New allotment management plans (AMPs) will be developed for each allotment and will become part of Part 3 of any grazing permits issued under the proposed action. The AMPs would incorporate an adaptive management strategy described on page 14 of the EA. Using adaptive management, if monitoring indicates that desired conditions are not being achieved, the Forest Service and permittee(s) will cooperate to modify management practices. Changes could include administrative decisions such as the specific number of livestock authorized annually, specific dates for grazing, class of animal or modifications in pasture rotations or grazing systems, but

such changes will not exceed the limits for timing, intensity, duration and frequency defined above for the proposed action and analyzed in the EA.

Table 1. Proposed Grazing Management and Authorization

Allotment	Grazing System	Animal Unit Months Permitted	Change from Current Management
HQ	2 pasture deferred rest rotation	317-586 AUM (20-37 cow/calf yearlong) • Term permit - 9-26 CYL • Private permit - 9 CYL • Private permit - 2 horses YL	Change from 444 AUM.
Campini	5 pasture deferred rest rotation	1584-2376 AUM (100-150 cow/calf yearlong) • Term Permit – 92-142 CYL • Private Permit – 8 CYL	Change from 3406 AUM. One new pasture.
Blacktail	5 pasture deferred rest rotation	1272-1742 AUM (80-110 cow/calf yearlong) • Term Permit – 55-85 CYL • Private Permit – 22 CYL • Private Permit – 3 horses YL	Change from 2059 AUM.

Proposed improvements for each allotment are shown in Table 2. Not all of the projects shown would be implemented immediately; funding constraints may require the projects to be completed over a period of years, or monitoring may indicate that the projects are no longer necessary. In the absence of completed developments to promote proper distribution and/or intensive management, actual use on the allotments may be less than the maximums shown in column 3 of Table 1.

Table 3. Proposed Range Improvements

Allotment	Proposed Action	Purpose/Objective
HQ	Develop upland waters in the two primary pastures by piping water from an existing well.	The allotment is reliant on dirt tanks, which requires the permittee to haul water in some years. Permanent waters would improve distribution and reduce overuse of some areas.
Campini	Cross fence the large Mesa pasture to create 2 pastures. Construct a water lot around George Tank to water both pastures.	An additional pasture would increase deferment time for all pastures and create 3 pastures of approximately equal capacity. This would reduce the duration of grazing in any given pasture, promote plant vigor and increase management flexibility.
Campini	Realign the fence separating Heifer and Lower pastures.	This would increase capacity and improve distribution in the Heifer pasture by allowing the use of forage that is not used by cattle in Lower pasture and reducing grazing intensity in other areas.
Blacktail	Fence an existing spring in Sundown Canyon and pipe water to a nearby location.	This would protect aquatic and riparian resources at the spring site and provide reliable water for livestock.

This decision also authorizes the placement of erosion control structures in five active head cuts on the HQ allotment (PR# 6). This activity would require the placement of approximately 190 cubic yards of rock, held in place with woven wire fencing, within the active cuts in order to stabilize soils and would involve the temporary disturbance of less than 5 acres.

No other new improvements are authorized; however, existing structural range improvements will be repaired or reconstructed to the degree necessary to maintain or achieve management objectives and desired conditions for each allotment.

Mitigation: To mitigate resource impacts, the following measures will be implemented. These measures have been used on previous projects and are considered effective at reducing environmental impacts. They are consistent with applicable Forest Plan standards and guidelines, Best Management Practices and the terms and conditions and conservation measures of existing biological opinions. Implementation of the mitigation measures, in combination with project design criteria, should preclude the occurrence of potentially significant environmental impacts.

Soil, Water and Vegetation – the objective is to mitigate effects of livestock grazing management and to assure that management is responsive to changing resource conditions. The objective will be accomplished through the use of Best Management Practices (FSH 2509.22, PR# 40 Attachment C) and adaptive management. Practices include, but are not limited to the following.

- Utilization of key upland herbaceous forage species in key areas will be managed to achieve the goal of light to moderate grazing as a pasture average. The objective is to protect plant vigor, provide herbaceous residue for soil protection and to increase herbage producing ability of forage plants. A utilization guideline of 45% use of key species in key areas will be used to achieve this objective.
- The Forest and permittees will jointly prepare annual operating plans that consider current conditions and management goals. Periodic field checks including stock counts, range readiness and utilization monitoring will be used to identify needed management adjustments. The objective is to assure achievement of resource and management objectives.
- Necessary techniques will be used to achieve proper distribution or lessen the impact on sensitive areas. Practices include herding, salting and controlling access to waters. Salt will be placed on good feed, one quarter to one half mile from waters and salting locations will be moved annually. No hay or bulk feed will be placed on Forest lands.

Wildlife and Plants – the objective is to mitigate impacts to wildlife and sensitive plants from livestock grazing and from disturbance associated with construction of range facilities.

- All new or reconstructed water developments will include wildlife access and escape ramps.
- All new fencing will be built to Forest Plan standards (Forest Plan, p. 35) to provide for wildlife passage through the fence. At a minimum, this will be a 4-strand fence with smooth bottom wire 16 inches off of the ground and a total height of 42 inches or less.
- All proposed range facilities will be surveyed for threatened, endangered or sensitive species prior to any ground-disturbing activities. Facilities will be designed and constructed to have no adverse effect on listed species.
- Range construction projects will be designed to avoid the destruction of agaves. If impacts to agaves are unavoidable, the Forest will insure that no more than 1% of agaves within 800 meters of a project are impacted.
- Within areas meeting the definition of high quality Mearns' quail habitat, herbaceous vegetation will be managed to maintain a minimum of 6 inches of herbaceous stubble height, which is generally interpreted as less than 45% utilization of key herbaceous

species (PR# 19). The objective is to provide herbaceous vegetation as cover for quail and other wildlife.

- Stockpond maintenance activities will be conducted in compliance with the Forest's stockpond management and maintenance guidelines for the Sonoran Tiger Salamander and the Chiricahua leopard frog (PR# 29, 39) in order to reduce effects to these species as a result of stockpond maintenance activities. The objective is to maintain occupied habitats for the species

Heritage Resources – the objective is to protect heritage resources (historic and prehistoric sites) from impacts caused by range construction projects or livestock concentration.

- All proposed range facilities will be surveyed for heritage resources prior to any ground-disturbing activities. Facilities will be built or modified to avoid impacts to sites. If unrecorded sites are discovered during the course of project implementation, activities will cease and the forest Archeologist will be notified.
- Range facilities, if needed, will be located so as to avoid concentrations of livestock on identified heritage resource sites.
- No salting will occur within or adjacent to identified heritage sites.

Monitoring: The objective of monitoring is to determine whether management is being properly implemented and whether the actions are effective at achieving or moving toward desired conditions.

Effectiveness monitoring includes measurements to track condition and trend of upland and riparian vegetation, soil, and watersheds. Monitoring will be done following procedures described in the Interagency Technical Reference¹ and the Region 3 Rangeland Analysis and Training Guide.² These data will be interpreted to determine whether management is achieving desired resource conditions, whether changes in resource condition are related to management, and to determine whether modifications in management are necessary. Effectiveness monitoring will occur at a minimum of five-year intervals, or more frequently if considered necessary.

Implementation monitoring will occur yearly and will include such things as inspection reports, forage utilization measurements in key areas, livestock counts and facilities inspections. Utilization measurements are made following procedures found in the Interagency Technical Reference³ and with consideration of the Principles of Obtaining and Interpreting Utilization Data on Southwest Rangelands (PR# 32).

¹ Sampling Vegetation Attributes, Interagency Technical Reference. 1996. Cooperative Extension Service, USDA Forest Service and Natural Resources Conservation Service, and USDI Bureau of Land Management.

² Rangeland Analysis and Management Training Guide. 1997. USDA Forest Service, Southwestern Region.

³ Utilization Studies and Residual Measurements. Interagency Technical Reference. 1996. Cooperative Extension Service, USDA Forest Service and Natural Resources Conservation Service, and USDI Bureau of Land Management. Revised 1999.

Utilization will be monitored on key forage species, which are native perennial grasses that are palatable to livestock. At a minimum monitoring will include use in key areas⁴, but may include monitoring outside of key areas. The Sierra Vista District Range Staff Officer and the permittees will be responsible for monitoring livestock grazing utilization. Over time, changes in resource conditions or management may result in changes in livestock use patterns. As livestock use patterns change, new key areas may be established and existing key areas may be modified or abandoned in cooperation with the permittee(s).

Permittees will be encouraged to participate in monitoring activities. Records of livestock numbers, movement dates and shipping records will be kept by the permittees and will be provided to the District Range Staff annually.

Public Involvement.

The proposal has been listed in the Forest's Schedule of Proposed Actions continuously since September 2004. On October 29, 2004, a Forest interdisciplinary team met to develop proposed actions and to identify preliminary issues, concerns and measures to carry forward into the analysis. The proposal was provided to the public and other agencies for comment during scoping on February 3, 2005 (PR# 12). Four comment letters were received in response to scoping (PR#s 13-16). Using the comments from the public and other agencies, the interdisciplinary team developed a list of issues and concerns to address.

In February 2006, a draft of this EA was provided to parties who had expressed interest through scoping (PR# 44). The public was also notified of the opportunity to comment through a legal notice published in the *Sierra Vista Herald/Bisbee Daily Review* on February 3, 2006 (PR# 46). Two responses were received during the 30-day comment period that ended on March 6, 2006 (PR# 48, 49). I considered these comments in making my decision (PR# 50) and they have been addressed as appropriate in the analysis.

Other Alternatives Considered

In addition to the selected alternative, I considered two other alternatives, summarized below. A comparison of these alternatives is summarized in Table 5 of the EA and is the basis of Chapter 3 of the EA.

Alternative 1: No Action (No Grazing). Under this alternative, grazing would not be authorized and use of the allotment by domestic livestock would be discontinued. The permittee would be given one year from the date of the decision to remove livestock from the allotment. Existing structural improvements would remain in place but would not be maintained. Improvements contributing to resource protection or enhancement, such as water developments important for wildlife, would be maintained where feasible using other program funds. Periodic inspection of structural improvements would be used to determine whether maintenance or removal is needed. Removal or maintenance of improvements would be authorized by a separate decision. Where

⁴ A key area is a portion of rangeland selected because of its location, use or grazing value as a monitoring location for grazing use, range condition and trend. Key areas are usually ¼ to 1 mile from water, located on productive soils on level to intermediate slopes where prescribed use will occur first. They are 5 acres or more in size. Properly selected key areas will reflect the overall acceptability of current management.

possible, maintenance of allotment boundary fences would be reassigned to adjacent permittees with the understanding that livestock are to be kept off of the allotment.

While this alternative would meet the natural resource objectives defined for the allotments, it would not be consistent with Forest Service Policy (FSM 2202.1) and the Forest Plan Mission (Forest Plan p. 9) to manage for multiple use and sustained yield and to contribute to a viable rural economy.

Alternative 2: Continue Current Management. Livestock grazing would continue on all allotments as currently permitted. New permits would be issued for the classes and numbers of livestock currently allowed. Authorized use would continue to be controlled through annual operating instructions (AOI). Existing fences, water developments and other range improvements would be maintained, but no new infrastructure would be proposed or developed. Erosion control structures described under the proposed action would be authorized, since the need for this action would remain regardless of the presence of livestock. Allotment management plans would include mitigation and monitoring features described under the proposed action.

This alternative does not provide for the construction of needed fences and waters to achieve improved livestock distribution and would make it more difficult to achieve desired resource conditions across the landscape. In addition, this alternative does not achieve the objective of balancing permitted use with capacity on the allotments, nor does it provide for management flexibility to allow management to adapt to changing conditions.

Finding of No Significant Impact

After considering the context and intensity of the environmental effects described in the EA, I have determined that these actions will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment (40 CFR 1508.27). Thus, an environmental impact statement will not be prepared. I base my finding on the following:

Context: The action is a site-specific action that by itself does not have international, national, region wide or statewide importance. The discussion of significance criteria that follows applies to the intended action as is within the context of local importance in the area associated with the Sierra Vista Ranger District.

Intensity: The following discussion is organized around the Ten Significance Criteria described in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations at 40 CFR 1508.27.

1. Both *beneficial and adverse impacts* were considered in the analysis (EA, Chapter 3, pp. 16-34). New improvements associated with the grazing authorizations involve the placement or realignment of pasture fences, placement of short fences around water sources and the extension of above-ground pipelines from an existing well to new water facilities. Construction of these improvements will result in minor, short term disturbance, but will benefit resources over the long term as a result of improved livestock distribution and protection of a spring. Adverse effects have been reduced or eliminated through project design and mitigation measures (EA pp. 11-12). Growing season rest and light to moderate utilization are predicted to result in long-term rangeland improvement (EA p. 26). The erosion control structures authorized by this decision will have short term impacts associated with soil disturbance and construction noise, but will serve to stabilize soils over the long term. The EA and project record contain complete discussions of the anticipated effects (EA pages 16-34 and PR#s 26, 28, 31, 38, 40).
2. No significant *effects on public health and safety* were identified. The installation of erosion control structures would involve the use of heavy equipment and large trucks, but hazards would be limited to workers at the job site who are trained in the use of the equipment and would not create health or safety concerns for the public at large. No vegetation manipulation is proposed, so there would be no safety concerns, such as smoke or heavy traffic, related to these types of activities. The scope of the grazing authorization is limited to the authorization of managed livestock grazing and the installation and maintenance of livestock watering facilities. These actions are not expected to present significant hazards to workers or the public.
3. There are no known *unique characteristics* associated with the allotments. Therefore, the project will not adversely affect parks, prime farm lands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or other resources considered to have unique characteristics (EA pp. 28-31).
4. The effects on the quality of the human environment are not likely to be *highly controversial*. The environmental analysis process has documented expected environmental effects from my decision. These effects have been disclosed in Chapter 3 of the EA and the selected action has been designed and mitigated to address the various issues raised. The analysis represents the judgement and expertise of resource management professionals who have applied their knowledge to similar projects and

resources in the past. The management practices proposed are commonly-used resource management practices described in agency directives, prescribed in the Forest Plan and used by other land management agencies. While some members of the public are opposed to public lands livestock grazing, this action is not highly controversial within the context of the National Environmental Policy Act.

5. The effects analysis (EA pp. 16-34) shows the effects are not uncertain, and do not involve *unique or unknown risk*. The Forest Service has considerable experience with the types of activities to be implemented. The effects described in the EA are based on the judgement of experienced resource management professionals using the best available information.
6. The decision to reissue grazing permits for the HQ, Campini and Blacktail Allotments does not establish a *precedent for future actions* with significant effects. Future actions will be evaluated through the NEPA process and will stand on their own as to environmental effects and project feasibility (EA p. 14).
7. The *cumulative impacts* of the action on soils, vegetation and terrestrial and aquatic wildlife resources were considered and disclosed in the EA in Chapter 3, pp. 33-34. The direct and indirect effects of the proposal are expected to be minor in the short term beneficial or neutral over the long term. None of the effects are considered significant for reasons described herein. No past or future actions have been identified that will combine with the effects of the proposed action to cause cumulatively significant effects.
8. 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*, because none are identified within the project area. The action will also not cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources (EA pp. 30-31, PR# 38).
9. Formal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) was completed both as part of the Forest-wide reinitiation of consultation on ongoing and long-term grazing on the Coronado National Forest in 2002 (PR# 27) and at the project level for all of the allotments considered in the Analysis (EA pp. 16-20, PR#s 26, 27, 34). The conclusions of these consultations document that the effects of the proposed action are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of threatened, endangered or proposed species. The project level biological assessment (PR# 26) and supporting information in the project record (PR#s 8, 9, 10, 11, 22, 23, 24, 25, 33, 40) further document that environmental baseline resource conditions that may affect listed species are stable or improving. Based on this, and updated species survey information (PR# 20), the Forest requested that the USFWS extend the term of the existing (2002) consultation through 2016 to correspond to the term of the grazing authorizations. The USFWS concurred with these findings (PR# 34) and agreed to extend the term of the consultation. Terms and conditions to avoid take are being implemented through the Forest's Chiricahua leopard frog and Sonora tiger salamander management guidelines (PR# 29, 35). No terms and conditions have been issued for the lesser long-nosed bat.

10. This selected alternative is in full compliance with all federal, state and local law requirements imposed for environmental protection (EA pp. 28-31). The action is consistent with the Coronado National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.

Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations

National Forest Management Act. The Coronado Land and Resource Management Plan was adopted on August 4, 1986 and has been amended several times. Forest Service planning regulations state that projects implemented after the LMP is in place must be "consistent with the plan" (36 CFR 219.10 (e)). The HQ, Campini and Blacktail allotments are located in LMP Management Areas 4 and 7 (EA p. 4 and Figure 4). The LMP identifies Management Areas 4 and 7 as suitable for grazing. The term permit grazing authorization for the allotments is fully consistent with the long-term goals and objectives listed on pages 9-11 of the Coronado LMP, as well as the standards and guidelines for Management Areas 4 and 7. The light to moderate utilization and growing season rest prescribed, in combination with prescribed mitigation features will meet the LMP goals for range, wildlife, soil, water and riparian resources. There are no identified effects to management indicator species or sensitive species that would affect their Forest-wide populations or long-term viability (EA, pp. 16-24, PR#s 28, 31). Other NFMA consistency findings relate to the management of suitable timberlands. The project area does not contain any suitable timberlands; therefore, the other NFMA consistency requirements do not apply.

Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act. The selected alternative will not impair land productivity (EA pp. 24-30) and is therefore consistent with this law.

Endangered Species Act. Formal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was completed both as part of the Forest-wide consultation on ongoing and long-term grazing on the Coronado National Forest and at the project level for all of the allotments considered in the analysis (PR#s 26, 27, 34). The conclusions of these consultations (paragraph 9, above) document that the effects of the proposed action are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of threatened, endangered or proposed species.

National Historic Preservation Act. A Heritage Resource Investigation was completed with a finding of no adverse effect on cultural resources (PR# 38).

Executive Order 13186 (Migratory Birds). There are no identified effects on migratory birds, Birds of Conservation Concern and Important Bird Areas (EA, page 24).

Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice). This decision does not impose disproportionately high adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low-income populations (EA p. 33-34).

Implementation Date

This project will be implemented no sooner than five business days following the close of the appeal filing period established in the notice of decision published in the *Sierra Vista Herald/Bisbee Daily Review*. If an appeal is filed, implementation will not occur sooner than 15 calendar days following a final decision on the appeal. Implementation means actually issuing the new permit or accomplishing any ground disturbing actions. Field preparation work needed to implement this decision may proceed immediately.

Administrative Review or Appeal Opportunities

This decision is subject to appeal in accordance with 36 CFR 215 by individuals or organizations that submitted substantive comments during the comment period that ended March 6, 2006. A notice of appeal must be in writing and clearly state that it is a Notice of Appeal being filed in pursuant to 36 CFR 215. Appeals must be filed (regular mail, email, fax, hand-delivery, or express delivery) with the Appeals Deciding Officer and should be submitted to: Appeals Deciding Officer, Jeanine Derby, Forest Supervisor, Coronado National Forest, 300 West Congress, Tucson, AZ 85701, fax: (520) 388-8305, email: appeals-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us (.doc, .rtf or .txt formats only). If hand-delivered, the appeal must be received at the above address during business hours (Monday-Friday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm), excluding holidays.

Appeals, including attachments, must be filed in writing, consistent with 36 CFR 215.14 within 45 days of the date of legal notice of this decision in the *Sierra Vista Herald/Bisbee Daily Review*. This publication date is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an appeal. Those wishing to appeal this decision should not rely on dates or timeframes provided by any other source.

Relative to issuance of the term grazing permits, permittees may choose to appeal under the regulations listed at 36 CFR 251, Subpart C. The permittee must select which administrative review regulation (36 CFR 215 or 251) he will opt to use, because he cannot use both for the same appealed decision. An appeal by the permittee under the 36 CFR 251 regulations must be filed simultaneously with the Coronado National Forest Supervisor Jeanine Derby (address above) and the Sierra Vista District Ranger, Stephen L. Gunzel, 5990 S. Hwy 92, Hereford, AZ 85615 within 45 days of the date of publication of legal notice in the *Sierra Vista Herald/Bisbee Daily Review*.

Contact Information

For additional information concerning this decision or the Forest Service appeal process, contact Stephen L. Gunzel, Sierra Vista District Ranger or Bill Edwards, Sierra Vista District Range Staff Officer at (520) 378-0311, or Rick Gerhart, Analysis Team Leader, (520) 388-8374.

/s/Stephen L. Gunzel

4/20/06

Stephen L. Gunzel
District Ranger
Sierra Vista Ranger District

Date