

**1File Code:** 1570-1

**Date:** December 7, 1999

Mr. Jeff Burgess  
1922 East Orion Street  
Tempe, AZ 85283

Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested  
P 556 954 700

Re: Appeal #00-00-03-0004-A215, Granville Allotment, Clifton Ranger District, Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests

Dear Mr. Burgess:

This is my review decision concerning the appeal you filed regarding the Decision Notice and Finding Of No Significant Impact which authorize grazing and implement the grazing management strategy on the Granville Allotment.

### **BACKGROUND**

District Ranger Frank A. Hayes issued a decision on August 26, 1999, for the Granville Allotment. The decision resulted in the selection of the following alternative and authorization: Granville allotment, Alternative B, which authorizes 200 head of yearling cattle to graze from October 1 to March 30 annually.

The District Ranger is identified as the Responsible Official, whose decision is subject to administrative review under 36 CFR 215 appeal regulations.

Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.16, an attempt was made to seek informal resolution of your appeal. The record indicates that informal resolution was not reached.

My review of this appeal has been conducted pursuant to and in accordance with 36 CFR 215.7. I have thoroughly reviewed the appeal record and the recommendation of the Appeal Reviewing Officer. My review decision incorporates the appeal record.

### **APPEAL REVIEWING OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION**

The Appeal Reviewing Officer recommended that the Responsible Official's decision be affirmed and that your request for relief be denied. The evaluation concluded: (a) decision logic and rationale were generally clearly disclosed; (b) the benefits of the proposal were identified; (c) the proposal and decision were consistent with agency policy, direction and supporting information; (d) public participation and response to comments were adequate; and (e) all of the major issues raised by the appellant were adequately addressed in the project record.

**APPEAL DECISION**

After a detailed review of the records and the Appeal Reviewing Officer's recommendations, I affirm the Responsible Official's decision concerning the Granville allotment, which authorizes grazing and implementation of management actions.

My decision constitutes the final administrative determination of the Department of Agriculture [36 CFR 215.18(c)].

Sincerely,

/s/ James T. Gladen  
JAMES T. GLADEN  
Appeal Deciding Officer  
Deputy Regional Forester, Resources

Enclosure

cc:  
Forest Supervisor, Apache-Sitgreaves NFs  
District Ranger, Clifton RD  
Director of Rangeland Management, R3  
Appeals and Litigation Staff, R3

**REVIEW AND FINDINGS**

of

**Jeff Burgess Appeal #00-00-03-0004-A215**

regarding the

**Granville Allotment Decision**

**ISSUE:** The Granville allotment decision does not comply with the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests Plan to consider the forage needs of local wildlife.

**Contention:** The appellant contends that the decision allocates 100 percent of the available herbaceous forage on full and potential capacity acres to domestic livestock, and that it fails to comply with the 1996 Record of Decision for Amendment of Forest Plans in Arizona and New Mexico, because the maximum allowable forage use level set for the allotment does not include wildlife use. The appellant further contends that by allocating 100 percent of the available herbaceous forage to livestock, the Forest Plan requirement to allow sufficient forage to accommodate wildlife will not be met.

**Response:** The Apache-Sitgreaves Forests Plan contemplates grazing that fulfills the multiple-use sustained yield philosophies that underlie National Forest System management, by requiring continued grazing with increased emphasis on recreation, wildlife, and fishery resources, while maintaining basic soil and water values, and by requiring that the needs of wildlife be considered when establishing livestock grazing capacity (Doc. 130). A review of the record demonstrates that the Interdisciplinary team considered wildlife concerns extensively. Utilization levels ensure sufficient residual vegetation for small animals and birds (Docs. 100; 130), and the continued existence of threatened and endangered species (Docs. 56; 83; 84B; 95A; 98; 98A; 100). Sensitive species and management indicator species were considered in the analysis process as well (Docs. 100; 130).

A review of the record demonstrates that the decision complies with the 1996 Forest Plan amendment which incorporated allowable use guidelines for the purpose of maintaining forage conditions which assures recovery and continued existence of threatened and endangered species. The Interdisciplinary team (IDT) concluded the Forest Plan amendment was appropriate during the growing season under present resource conditions and management objectives. The IDT also concluded it was appropriate to increase the allowable use percentages for dormant season grazing by 10 percent on full and partial capacity acres rated in good and fair condition (Docs. 129; 130).

The analysis of forage production and allowable forage use included estimated herbaceous forage needs for both existing and desired deer populations and permitted livestock. Under the no grazing alternative deer forage needs yearlong are estimated to be only 3 percent of the total herbaceous production on full and partial capacity acres. Under the selected alternative deer and livestock forage needs are estimated to be 35 percent of the total herbaceous production on full

and partial capacity acres , leaving 65 percent to accommodate other wildlife needs and to maintain basic soil and water resources (Docs. 129; 130).

**Finding:** The Responsible Official's decision complies with the requirements of the Forest Plan as amended.

