

Terrence,

In reviewing the documents you sent in response to our FOIA requests (# 2021-FS-R8-05252-F and #2021-FS-R8-05717-F) we were unable to locate several of the items we requested. Could you please either direct us to the specific page number on which the responsive items are located or send us a copy of the missing items? We were unable to identify responsive documents to the following from request #2021-FS-R8-05252-F:

Request #1) We did not locate any comments the IDT team received from within the agency.

Request #2) Pages 3015-3027 contain summaries of IDT team meetings, we would like to confirm that this is the complete extent of records pertaining to the IDT team's identification of key issues and development of alternatives.

Request #3) We did not locate any records related to district personnel's wetland analysis.

Request #4) Did the 'previous decision,' referenced on p. 1-4 of the EA, mean the Forest Plan EIS? Otherwise we were unable to identify any previous decision that discussed Non-Native Invasive Plant Species.

Request #13) We did not locate any data that indicates progress towards desired conditions in previously burned areas.

Request #14) We did not identify any records relating to past events that damaged or destroyed timber resources.

Request #16) We did not find any records supporting the claim that commercial thinning in and around the Chinquapin plot is necessary to achieve desired conditions.

Request #17) Is the Travel Management Process Report, referenced on p. II-9 of the EA, the same as the Transportation Analysis Report on p. 3028 of the FOIA release? If not we were unable to locate the Travel Management Process Report.

Request #19) Although the Forest Service produced many gigabytes of monitoring data we were unable to locate any documents interpreting that monitoring data or agency documents relevant to the project's impacts on TES bats.

Request #20) We did not identify any "design criteria" for Forest Wide Standards that apply to threatened or endangered bats.

Request #29) We did not identify any USGS water quality survey.

Request #30) While we found the WRACE manual and the water sediment data on pp. 4220-23, we were unable to find any other data inputted into the model or modelling results.

Request #31) We did not find any of the following articles cited by the EA: Miller and Liechty (2001); Patric et al. (1984); Davis and Bell (1998); Stednick (1996); Van Lear et al. (1985); Lynch and Corbett (1990).

Request #33) We did not identify any process file containing sediment contribution information.

Request #34) We found neither the Three Knob nor High Mountain EAs.

Request #37) Outside of the Forest Plan EIS we found no records indicating overstocked conditions in the project area, and we found no data underlying the claims about overstocking in the Forest Plan EIS.

Request #39) The Forest Plan EIS contains some records concerning old-growth stands, but that was the only relevant information we were able to find. Are there any other records pertaining to old-growth stands?

Request #40) The Forest Plan EIS contains some discussion of cumulative effects for vegetation management, but that was the only relevant information we were able to find. Are there any other records pertaining to cumulative effects for vegetation management?

Request #42) We were unable to find any records concerning the County Line burn.

Request #43-45) We were unable to find anything related to any SERAs in the released documents. Is this, <https://www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/protecting-forest/integrated-pest-management/pesticide-management/pesticide-risk-assessments.shtml>, the link that's missing on p. III-21?

Request #46) We were unable to identify any maps that were intended to be in the appendix of the EA.

Request #48) We were unable to find any records related to the stands that will be regen harvested on more than 40 acres because of the oak borer and 2009 ice storm.

Request #49) We were unable to find any documents related to conferrals with internal specialists about recreation areas.

Request #50) We were unable to find any records of the bog/pond that the EA asserts may be impacted by activities.

Request #51) We were unable to find a concurrence report from SHPO.

Request #52) We were unable to find a biological opinion or supplemental report for the project area.

Additionally, we were unable to identify responsive documents to the following from request #2021-FS-R8-05717-F:

Request #1) We were unable to find a supplemental information report.

Request #3) Outside of the Forest Plan, we were unable to find any records of measures to protect maternity roosts or new monitoring efforts to identify potential maternity colonies.

We realize that we have the right to administratively appeal the Forest Service's responses to these requests, but we hope to avoid that and obtain the missing responsive records more directly and quickly by simply asking you for them.

Thank you and let me know if you have any questions,

Tom Buchele

Tom Buchele, Co-Director and Clinical Professor | Earthrise Law Center | Lewis & Clark Law School

| <http://earthriselaw.org> |