



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

Huron-Manistee National Forests

1755 South Mitchell St.
Cadillac, MI 49601
231-775-2421 (voice)
231-775-5551 (fax)
231-775-3183 (TTY)

File Code: 1570-1

Date: June 9, 2004

Mr. David Miehlike
Westside Trail Chairman
Cycle Conservation Club of Michigan
600 Sherman Oaks Ct. #619
Ludington, MI 49431-2936

Re: Appeal of the Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact for the Crystal Valley Project Environmental Assessment, Baldwin-White Cloud Ranger District, Huron-Manistee National Forest, Appeal 04-09-04-0019 A215

Dear Mr. Miehlike:

On April 26, 2004, you filed a notice of appeal pursuant to 36 CFR 215.18. District Ranger Leslie E. Russell signed his Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact on March 8, 2004, choosing Alternative 2 of the Crystal Valley Project. The legal notice for the decision was published on March 10. My decision is based upon the appeal record and the recommendation of the Appeal Reviewing Officer (ARO) White Mountain National Forest, Forest Supervisor Tom Wagner, regarding the disposition of your appeal. The Appeal Reviewing Officer's review focused on the decision documentation developed by the Responsible Official, District Ranger Leslie Russell, and the issues raised in your appeal. The Appeal Reviewing Officer's recommendation is enclosed. This letter constitutes my decision on the appeal and on the specific relief requested.

FOREST ACTION BEING APPEALED

The Crystal Valley Project will implement management activities, including conducting a series of vegetative treatments in an area encompassing approximately 7,470 acres managed under the Huron-Manistee National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.

APPEAL REVIEWING OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Appeal Reviewing Officer found no evidence that the Responsible Official's decision violated law, regulation or policy. He found that the decision responded to comments raised during the analysis process and comment period and adequately assessed the environmental effects of the selected action. In addition, he found that the issues raised in your appeal were addressed, where appropriate, in the decision documentation. Nevertheless, he was concerned about a possible lack of phone conservation documents in the Project Record. Based on his review, the Appeal Reviewing Officer recommended that the decision be affirmed with instructions.



DECISION

After review, I concur with the Appeal Reviewing Officer's analysis and findings regarding your specific appeal issues (e.g., lack of notification of initial scoping, expansion of vegetation treatments in Compartments 142 and 144, maintenance of Brown's Pond, construction of a new waterhole, adoption of Crystal Look Out as a heritage site, excessive road closures, development of a cross-country ski trail, and the Responsible Officials inadequate "Response to Comments"). To avoid repetition, I adopt his rationale as my own and refer you to the enclosed Appeal Reviewing Officer recommendation for further detail.

It is my decision to affirm District Ranger Leslie E. Russell's Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact for the Crystal Valley Project Environmental Assessment, Huron-Manistee National Forest. However, I note the ARO's concern regarding the potential lack of documented phone conversations in the Project Record. Unfortunately, these situations can occur when comments are submitted orally. In the future, I encourage you to submit all your concerns in writing. Nevertheless, I'm directing the Responsible Official to search his files to be sure these documents were not accidentally eliminated when assembling the Record. This review is to be completed within 15 days of this letter. Any new information identified from this review should be addressed according to FSH 1909.15, Section 18.4¹

Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.18(c) this decision constitutes the final administrative determination of the Department of Agriculture.

Sincerely,

/S/ LEANNE M. MARTEN

LEANNE M. MARTEN
Appeal Deciding Officer
Forest Supervisor

Enclosure

cc:

Huron-Manistee NF:
Responsible Official, Leslie E Russell
Christopher J Frederick
White Mtn. NF:
ARO, Tom Wagner
Rob T Fallon
RO, Patricia R Rowell, Joel Strong



File Code: 1570-1
Route To:

Date: June 6, 2004

Subject: Appeal of the Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact for the Crystal Valley Project Environmental Assessment, Baldwin-White Cloud Ranger District, Huron-Manistee National Forest, Appeal 04-09-04-0019 A215 (ARO)

To: Leanne Marten, Appeal Deciding Officer

This letter constitutes my recommendation for the subject appeal filed by David Miehke for the Crystal Valley Project on the Baldwin-White Cloud Ranger District of the Huron-Manistee National Forests. District Ranger Leslie E. Russell signed this Decision Notice on March 8, 2004 and the legal notice of the decision was published on March 10, 2004.

My review was conducted pursuant to 36 CFR 215 – “Notice, Comment, and Appeal Procedures for National Forest System Projects and Activities.” To ensure the analysis and decision are in compliance with applicable laws, regulations, policies and orders, I have reviewed and considered each of the points raised by the Appellant and the decision documentation submitted by the Huron-Manistee National Forests. My recommendation is based upon review of the Project Record and Appeal Record, including but not limited to the scoping letter, public comments, Decision Notice (DN), Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), and Environmental Assessment (EA).

On June 4, 2004, the Responsible Official, Leslie Russell had an Informal Disposition meeting with David Miehke concerning this appeal. The meeting was held at the Baldwin Ranger District, at 1:00 p.m. eastern standard time. The only participants were Mr. Russell and Mr. Miehke. The meeting failed to resolve the issues identified in Mr. Miehke’s appeal of the decision and he did not withdraw his appeal.

Appeal Issues

The Appellant raised nine main issues in his appeal of the Crystal Valley Project Decision. These appeal points will be addressed in the order in which they were presented in the appeal.

Issue 1: *“I did not receive a scoping letter [for this project].”* (NOA, p. 1). *“Net result ... we were not able to submit proposals to be considered in the alternatives.”* (NOA, p. 1).

Mr. Miehke further states:

- *“I did not receive a scoping letter and only become involved by meeting Mr. Frederick on 10/17/04 (sic) to pick up one after noticing the project in the quarterly NEPA update mailed to myself as a friend of the forest.”* (Note: Mr. Frederick is Christopher Frederick,



ID Team Leader for Crystal Valley Project) (NOA, p. 1). *“I asked why myself and CCC got dropped from the mailing list or were not notified since we have a history of involvement with the Baldwin district back into the early 70’s and many of our events were staged out of Whiskey Creek Resort. The MCCCT trail is less than 1 mile from the project EA area.”* (NOA, p.1).

Response: The original scoping period was May 31 to July 1, 2003. A supplemental scoping period, for proposed herbicide treatment of invasive species, occurred between July 23 and August 8, 2003. The formal 30-day comment period on the EA was January 30 to March 1, 2004.

Mr. Miehke is chairman of an organization based in close proximity to the project area, and has an inherent interest in road and trail issues addressed in the project EA. It is not clear from the Project Record why he was not included in the original scoping for this project. The Scoping and Public Involvement section (p. 1-6) of the EA notes the scoping letter was mailed to “approximately 60 landowners, individuals, groups, and agencies who expressed their interest in the project, or whom were identified as possibly having an interest.” It appears that Mr. Miehke and CCC were not on the mailing list, and were not identified by the District as “possibly having an interest”.

According to documents in the Project Record, the Baldwin-White Cloud District first listed the Crystal Valley project in the Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA) in the 2nd Quarter of FY 2003 (1/1/03 to 3/31/03). This was mailed to the public on January 14, 2003, and included the Crystal Valley Project by noting the Roads Analysis was underway, that public involvement was planned to begin April 2003, and a decision was planned for October 2003. Neither Mr. Miehke, nor CCC was on the mailing list for this SOPA. Mr. Miehke does not appear on the SOPA mailing list until the 1st Quarter of FY 2004 (10/1/03 to 12/31/03), which was mailed to the public on September 29, 2003. It appears that Mr. Miehke was not aware of the project until seeing it listed in this SOPA, and that is when he first contacted Mr. Frederick.

The scoping periods for this project ended in July and August. Nevertheless, the District can consider public input as part of the scoping process at any time up to formal notification of the 30-day comment period. The May 31, 2003 scoping letter signed by District Ranger Leslie Russell states, *“It would be most helpful to have comments by July 1, 2003; however, comments will be accepted any time during the planning process.”* (Italics were used in the scoping letter.) Although Mr. Miehke made the effort to contact the Forest Service, the Project Record does not indicate that any specific concerns about the project were received prior to the 30-day comment period (Also see Issue 8).

The District may have overlooked the possible interest of Mr. Miehke and CCC, but Mr. Miehke and CCC bear an equal responsibility for notifying the Forest Service of their interest in such projects by requesting they be included on the appropriate mailing lists. Although Mr. Miehke was not able to comment during the initial scoping phases of the project, he was not denied an opportunity to comment on the project. The Responsible Official did review Mr. Miehke’s concerns during the 30-day official comment period and these were considered in the

final decision for this project. I find the Responsible Official violated no law, regulation or policy.

Issue 2: *“I would like to see compartments 142 and 144 added to the project as in the original project proposal for vegetative treatment.”* (NOA, p. 1). This is needed *“...to promote [a] healthy forest and reduce [the] potential for wildfires.”* (NOA, p. 1). *“...Also since much time and money [is] spent on the EA process, why not do it right the first time even if it takes a little more time.”* (NOA, p. 1).

Response: The Crystal Valley EA notes, on page 2-26, that “Treatment of Compartments 142 and 144” was an “Alternative that was Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis”. The EA states, “In the initial stages of development for this Project, consideration was given to treating stands in Compartments 142 and 144; however, due to time constraints, these two compartments were dropped from consideration. These Compartments are still within the Project Area and are considered in the analysis for other relative actions in this project.”

This appeal point repeats a comment that Mr. Miehke included in his letter submitted during the 30-day comment period. Here he stated, “Not much treatment has been done in this area in quite a few years and I would like to see more area that is due for harvest be harvested or treated to promote the healthy forest and reduce the potential for wildfires.”

Vegetative treatment of stands in Compartments 142 and 144 was dropped from consideration prior to development of the Proposed Action, prior to scoping, and prior to the NEPA process. The Crystal Valley EA does state that including treatment units in these compartments was considered as an alternative, but it was not analyzed in detail because it was not feasible to do so at that time. I find the Responsible Official made no violation in law, regulation or policy.

Issue 3: *“I would like to see Browns Pond maintained instead of removed.”* (NOA, p. 1). This could be *“used as a sediment sand collection pond ... to prevent downstream migration ... or as a flood control structure.”* (NOA, p.1). *“No scientific studies [were] done on pond aquatic life or water temps.”* (NOA, p. 1).

Response: The Crystal Valley EA considers repairing and maintaining the Brown’s Pond Dam and control structure as part of Alternative 3. The direct, indirect and cumulative effects of repairing and maintaining this structure and pond are analyzed in pages 3-14 to 3-19 of the EA. The EA notes that Aquatic MIS are present in the Project Area, but no fish sampling records were found specific to Brown’s Pond. Effects on water temperature, fish passage, and sand bed load are disclosed for all three alternatives. Effects on two MIS, ducks and beaver, are also analyzed in pages 3-39 to 3-50 of the EA. In addition, the Biological Evaluation (BE) (Project Record, II-A) discloses and analyzes potential loss of habitat for the Blanding’s turtle and Eastern box turtle (Regional Foresters Sensitive Species) that could result from removing the dam and control structure. The BE further determines the “proposed alternative should have no impact” on individual turtles or their habitat (BE, pp. 39-42). The BE also discloses and analyzes potential loss of habitat for several “Sensitive Plants Associated with Moist to Wet

Open Areas”, but determines the proposed alternative “may impact individuals but [is] not likely to cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability” (BE, pp. 67-73).

Contrary to Mr. Miehke’s claim, I find repairing and maintaining the Brown’s Pond Dam and control structure was considered as an alternative and fully analyzed in the Crystal Valley EA. Effects on aquatic wildlife and plants, water temperature, and sediment collection were analyzed in the EA and the BE. The dam is not large enough to function as a flood control structure, so it was not necessary to analyze the effects on capacity for flood control.

Issue 4: *“I would like to see the proposed waterhole placed in compartment 142 or 144.”* (NOA, p. 2). *This “would serve wildlife [better] near higher ground.”* (NOA, p. 2). *“Proposed location is more designed for a traffic control structure than to serve wildlife needs.”* (NOA, p.2).

Response: The Huron-Manistee Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) has a Standard and Guideline for Wildlife in MA 2.1 that states, “Upland waterholes should be provided at an average rate of two per square mile if conditions warrant.” (LRMP, page IV-108) The Forest Plan does not have a Standard and Guideline for waterholes in MA 4.3.

Analysis in the EA specific to the waterhole includes a discussion in the effects section on Invasive Species (pp. 3-6 to 3-10) and Soil and Air (pp. 3-20 to 3-27). This part of the analysis also explains the rationale for waterhole development. With regard to the selected location, the EA states (p. 3-9), “The creation of a waterhole is, in part, to keep off-road vehicles from accessing a riparian area.” This has the effect of reducing potential for invasive species. With regard to soil displacement, the EA states (p. 3-24), if a waterhole is constructed as proposed, it will have short-term soil displacement from construction, but long-term stability would be improved “because attractive nuisances through the wetland area (proposed for the waterhole construction site) ... would be removed.” On page 3-26, the EA notes if the waterhole were not constructed as proposed, there would be continued “soil displacement from additional vehicle abuse of the wetland edge.” There is also a brief mention in the MIS section on the effects to ducks of waterhole construction (i.e., may improve habitat) (p. 3-41, Table 3-10).

The EA also notes that an alternative was considered “that proposed the construction of a second water hole in Compartment 143 Stand 18. Upon further analysis, this alternative was dropped due to the relative proximity of the water hole being constructed in Compartment 143 Stand 4 and the existing riparian areas located throughout the Project Area.” No alternative was considered that proposed construction of a waterhole in Compartments 142 or 144, nor did any member of the public, including Mr. Miehke, during the scoping or 30-day comment periods, propose this option. In his February 24, 2004 letter, Mr. Miehke does express concern with the proposed location of the waterhole in the proposed alternative, suggesting, “... repair of Brown’s Pond may meet the need for a water hole instead of digging a new hole in a known wet area.”

The location of a waterhole adjacent to a wetland addresses multiple resource objectives (e.g., off-road travel, invasive species, improved habitat). The selected alternative does not preclude

constructing future waterholes in Compartments 142 and 144. I find no violation of law, regulation or policy.

Issue 5: *“I would like to see the old Crystal LO site recognized as a heritage site and low observation platform constructed with some vegetative treatment...”* (NOA, p. 2). *“Firetowers are part of the forests history....”* (NOA, p.2). *“Visual Quality may be on display....”* (NOA, p.2).

A Heritage resource survey was conducted for the Project Area (Project Record, III-B). This survey did not identify the Crystal Look Out as a heritage site.

Mr. Miehke originally raised a concern for “old fire tower sites” in his letter of February 24, 2004, during the 30-day comment period. This letter states, “I would also like to see old fire tower sites recognized as heritage sites forestwide and possible low platforms constructed with selective cutting to open the view if possible with access for ADA people.” In this letter Mr. Miehke made no specific reference to the Crystal Look Out. This general proposal is beyond the scope of the project (i.e., outside the purpose and need identified in the EA, pp 1-2 to 1-5).

The selected alternative does not propose any activity that would disturb the Crystal Look Out, or result in irretrievable or irreversible loss at this site. Since the selected alternative does not disturb or change the Crystal Look Out, opportunities exists for its inclusion as a heritage site in future proposals. I find the Responsible Official made no violation in law, regulation or policy.

Issue 6: *“I disagree with the decision in this project as to maximum road closures as outlined in alternative #2.”* (NOA, p. 2). *“Closing 37 miles out of a total of 70 miles of roads seems to be a significant impact [within] a roaded natural area”* (NOA, p.2). *“No separate roads analysis was done”* (NOA, p. 2).

Response: A Roads Analysis Report (Project Record, II-B) was prepared for the entire Crystal Valley Analysis Area (Compartments 142, 143, 144, and 145). During development of the Roads Analysis public input was sought and received. The Roads Analysis Report (RAP), which is intended to inform project proposals in the NEPA process, was prepared prior to development of the Proposed Action and initiation of the NEPA process. The RAP was completed in March 2003. The scoping letter was mailed on May 31, 2003.

Proposals in Alternatives 2 and 3 to close roads within the Crystal Valley Project Area are consistent with Forest Plan direction in MAs 2.1 and 4.3. For these MAs, the Forest Plan establishes Standards and Guidelines for a “maximum average of 3 miles of roads per square mile (all three road classes).” (LRMP, pp. IV-110 and IV-161). The Desired Future Condition for both MAs includes a net reduction in roads that is “noticeable because approximately 3 miles are closed for each 1-mile constructed on new locations. This decision closes roads. It does not preclude constructing new roads in the future.

The FONSI asserts that closing 37 miles of roads is not a significant impact on the Crystal Valley Project Area. Item 1 of the FONSI (DN-16) states, “The management of the transportation system in the Project Area will provide a functional, manageable system that combines current County and Forest Service Roads. Some of the road closures will displace those who recreate in the Project Area.” Item 4 of the FONSI (DN-17) states, “Based on the level of response to the proposed project by the public, on past experiences with similar projects, and on the EA, I have determined that there are no highly controversial effects. This does not mean that implementation of the project will be acceptable to all people, because some people will neither agree nor be pleased with the decision.” The effects of retaining the existing road system were analyzed in the Crystal Valley EA for Alternative 1 (EA, pp. 3-3 and 3-4).

I find the RAP for Crystal Valley is comprehensive in its analysis of roads and road issues. It closely follows the agency protocol for roads analysis, as described in the Forest Service Manual and FS-643 (Roads Analysis: “Informing Decisions About Managing the National Forest Transportation System”). The EA considers an alternative that closes fewer miles of roads (Alternative 3 closes 26 miles) (p. 2-27). The EA and FONSI provide rationale for why the closure of 37 miles of roads does not result in significant impacts. I find no violation in law, regulation or policy.

Issue 7: “I disagree with the decision in this project to develop a cross-country ski trail.” (NOA, p. 2). “No consideration was given to the motorized use that is traditional in this area....” “No alternative legal ATV/ORV trail proposals were considered or solicited”. (NOA, p. 2).

Response: The written comments submitted by Mr. Miehke contained in his letter of February 24, 2004, during the 30-day comment period did not propose a motorized trail system as part of the Crystal Valley project. The only record of Mr. Miehke raising this issue is during the appeal period, in his formal letter of appeal, dated April 23, 2004.

The Forest documents their rationale/need for a non-motorized trail system on pages 3-11 to 3-12 of the EA. This ties back to their original purpose and need for the project, specifically, “Manage the transportation system in the Crystal Valley Project Area” (EA, p. 1-3). The EA states,

“Currently, there is an extensive undesignated trail system throughout the Project Area utilizing the classified Forest Service Roads and user-developed roads. The majority of these roads are being used for both motorized and non-motorized recreational activities. As recreational users and population in and around the Project Area increases, it is likely that the use of this undeveloped trail system would also increase. This would allow for an increase in resource damage and further disintegration of the current road system. Development of a trail system would provide user groups (motorized and non-motorized) with portions of the Project Area in which they could safely recreate. The development of a designated trail system in the Project Area would allow for all recreational users of the Project Area to continue to use the area with distinction as to which group would use which part. This would reduce recreational-user conflict on Federal

land throughout the Project Area. Non-motorized recreators would have a trail system that would be exclusively for their use and motorized recreators would have access to the remaining road system left open under this alternative. Motorized users of the area would experience displacement in this portion of the Project Area, due to the development of this trail system; however, open road densities and proximity of other motorized trail systems would serve as alternatives for this Forest-user group.”

According to the Project Record (Section III-G, Recreation), the Oceana Cross Country Ski Association (OCCSA) made a formal proposal for a cross-country ski trail system in the Crystal Valley Project Area as early as December 4, 2002. Page 3-45 of the EA recognizes this proposal as “an opportunity to formalize an existing network of roads and trails that are being used for skiing and hiking and to foster a partnership with a local group interested in the maintenance of the trail system.

Contrary to Mr. Miehike’s allegation, the Project Record documents consideration for continued motorized use. The Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) tallied 7 comments as supporting “management/development of a trail system within the Project Area” (EA, Appendix C-5). At least three of those comments supported management/development of motorized trails (Project Record, Section I-B). Gaye Sorensen stated, “I would like to see many roads closed and 4 wheelers have their own area to play.” Dorothy and Jim Schramm stated, “Focus on shared use of the resource. Hike, cross-country ski and bicycle can use same trails/no horses. Motorized bikes, ATVs, snowmobiles have their own separate trails. No pick up trucks.” Gerald and Bernice Shafer state, “We would like to see a groomed snowmobile trail that might connect with the one at Ruby Creek ...” At least three other comments support limiting or eliminating motorized recreation.

In summary, I find the Responsible Official did consider the concerns of motorized users and used this information in crafting his decision. The fact the selected alternative does not develop a separate motorized trail, as Mr. Miehike would like, is not a violation of law, regulation or policy.

Issue 8: “I believe that some substantive comments were not considered ... in regards to my written response to the EA.” (NOA, p. 2). *“Item 3 was not considered as a whole, but was dismissed as beyond the scope of the document.”* (NOA, p. 2) *“...Phone-in comments were not entered as part of the record.”* (NOA, p.2).

The Forest Service response to Item 3 of Mr. Miehike’s February 24, 2004 comment letter quotes the first line of this item, stating, “Mr. Miehike states that, ‘Reducing the road density to meet standards and guidelines that are outdated and unrealistic is hard for me to understand.’ This is beyond the scope of this document.” The Forest Service response to Mr. Miehike’s opening line of Item 3 is correct in noting that it is beyond the scope of the Crystal Valley EA to modify the road density standards and guidelines in the Forest Plan. Such a modification would require an amendment or revision of the Forest Plan.

Likewise, Mr. Miehle's concerns over a forest-wide program of fire towers as heritage sites is beyond the purpose and need as stated for this project (EA, pp. 1-2 to 1-4) (See Issue 5).

Maintenance and road closures were addressed on a case-by-case basis in the Roads Analysis Report (Project Record, II-B). This was the basis for the proposed roads activities in the project area. The Roads Analysis Report did have public input.

The remainder of Mr. Miehle's comments is general opinion. Mr. Miehle states, "Comments on invasive species ... good luck on this one ... like closing the barn door after the horse is out ... we have a world economy ... now we got a world environment ... when does Darwins theory of evolution come into play?? Closing roads and not managing the forests in response to invasives seems totally unrealistic and a knee jerk response..." Although, the Forest Service may consider these opinions in making the decision, it did not require a direct response.

With regard to Mr. Miehle's concerns about his phone comments, there is no documentation in the project record of any personal meetings or telephone conversations between Mr. Miehle and Mr. Frederick in the Project Record. Mr. Miehle states in his appeal letter that he met with Mr. Frederick on October 17 (2003). Further, he notes in his letter of February 24, 2004 he was submitting his written comments, "in addition to phone comments made to C. Frederick". If these meetings and/or conversations did take place, they should have been part of the Project Record. I'm concerned this information may not be properly documented. It's my recommendation the Responsible Official be directed to search his files to be sure these documents were not accidentally eliminated when assembling the Record. As a result of this search, I recommend the Responsible Official address any new information according to FSH 1909.15, Section 18.4.

Issue 9: "I believe that if this decision does not specifically violate the NEPA process of my public involvement by not being solicited for the motorized user input then it most certainly violates the intent of NEPA and the Forest Plan." (NOA, p. 2).

Response: It's clear from the Project Record the Forest Service did not identify Mr. Miehle or the CCC as "possibly having an interest" in the proposed Crystal Valley Project, and did not solicit comment from him during the scoping process. However, even though Mr. Miehle and CCC were not initially part of the scoping process, they did become aware of the project and did have an opportunity to provide comments during the analysis process (October 2003). Mr. Miehle also had an opportunity to comment during the 30-day comment period. Mr. Miehle's comments were considered by District Ranger, Leslie Russell in making the final decision on this project. My review of Mr. Miehle's appeal issues as detailed above, the EA, and Project Record find no violations of NEPA or the Forest Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

My review was conducted pursuant to and in accordance with 36 CFR 215.19. I reviewed the Project Record, including the comments received during the comment period and how the

Responsible Official considered this information and the Appellants' objections and recommended changes.

Based on my review, I recommend the Responsible Officials decision be affirmed. However, I also recommend that instructions for further action be included in the Deciding Officers decision. Specifically, the Responsible Official should search his files for any documented phone conversations between Mr. Miehke and Christopher Frederick that may have been accidentally eliminated when assembling the Project Record (See Issue 8). Any new information, as a result of this search should be addressed according to FSH 1909.15, Section 18.4.

/s/ Thomas G. Wagner
THOMAS G. WAGNER
Appeal Reviewing Officer
Forest Supervisor

cc:
Huron-Manistee NF:
Responsible Official, Leslie E Russell
Christopher J Frederick
White Mtn. NF, Rob Fallon
RO, Patricia Rowell