

From: Munson, James
To: [FS-comments-pacificsouthwest-stanislaus](#)
Cc: [Martinez, Beth H -FS](#)
Subject: OSV
Date: Friday, October 5, 2018 10:55:27 AM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)
[StanislausNFOver-SnowVehicleUseDesignation_DEIS_EPACommentLtr.pdf](#)

Please find attached EPA's comment LTR on the Stanislaus National Forest Over-Snow Vehicle Use Designation Project.

Hard copy to follow...



James M. Munson, CFM

Environmental Protection Specialist

Enforcement Division, NEPA Section

U.S. EPA, Region IX

[75 Hawthorne Street](#) ENF- 4-2

[San Francisco, Ca 94105](#)

[\(415\) 972-3852](#), Fax: [\(415\) 947-8026](#)



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Jason Kuiken, Forest Supervisor
Stanislaus National Forest
19777 Greenley Road
Sonora, CA 95370

OCT 05 2018

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Stanislaus National Forest Over-Snow Vehicle Use Designation Project, Stanislaus National Forest. (CEQ# 20180190)


Dear Mr. Kuiken:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed the DEIS for the Stanislaus National Forest Over-Snow Vehicle Use Designation Project pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and our NEPA review authority under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

The DEIS identifies actions to manage over-snow vehicle use on the Stanislaus National Forest to implement Subpart C of the Travel Management Rule. The DEIS also identifies snow trails for grooming, and includes measures to promote safe, responsible use of the project area while balancing recreational use with environmental protection. EPA has rated the DEIS and Preferred Alternatives 5 as Lack of Objections (LO; see enclosed "Summary of EPA Rating Definitions"). Please include all of the best management practices, such as those incorporated into the water quality management and monitoring components of the project design, into the Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this DEIS. When the FEIS and ROD are released, please send one electronic copy to the address above (mail code: ENF-4-2). If you have any questions, please contact me at (415) 972-3521, or have your staff contact James Munson, the lead reviewer for this project. Mr. Munson can be reached at (415) 972-3852 or Munson.James@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

for 
Kathleen Martyn Goforth, Manager
Environmental Review Section

Enclosure: Summary of EPA Rating Definitions
cc via email: Beth Martinez, United States Forest Service

SUMMARY OF EPA RATING DEFINITIONS*

This rating system was developed as a means to summarize the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) level of concern with a proposed action. The ratings are a combination of alphabetical categories for evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposal and numerical categories for evaluation of the adequacy of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF THE ACTION

“LO” (Lack of Objections)

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

“EC” (Environmental Concerns)

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

“EO” (Environmental Objections)

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

“EU” (Environmentally Unsatisfactory)

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

ADEQUACY OF THE IMPACT STATEMENT

Category “1” (Adequate)

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category “2” (Insufficient Information)

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

Category “3” (Inadequate)

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

*From EPA Manual 1640, Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment.