

**Decision Notice
and
Finding of No Significant Impact
for
Sulphur Lick Run Road Decommissioning
and Relocation EA**

**USDA Forest Service
Marlinton/White Sulphur Springs Ranger District
Monongahela National Forest
Greenbrier County, West Virginia**

The Sulphur Lick Run Road Decommissioning and Relocation project is proposed by the Marlinton/White Sulphur Springs Ranger District to make improvements to several forest roads within the Brushy Mountain Grouse Management Area of the Monongahela National Forest (MNF or Forest). These roads were heavily damaged by storms and flooding in June 2016.

The proposed action is intended to restore safe and sustainable vehicular access within the Brushy Mountain Grouse Management Area for the public, and to identify the minimum road system needed for safe and efficient travel and for administration, utilization, and protection of National Forest System lands. The proposal includes decommissioning a segment of Sulphur Lick Run Road and providing an alternate access route by reconstructing FR 719A and a currently unnamed woods road. The non-system unnamed woods road is a proposed addition to the MNF formal road system and, as such, would need to be brought up to Forest Service standards.

The *Sulphur Lick Run Road Decommissioning and Relocation Environmental Assessment* (EA) documents the analysis of two alternatives to meet this need.

Decision and Reasons for the Decision

Based upon my review of the alternatives and analysis in the *Sulphur Lick Run Road Decommissioning and Relocation EA*, and input from interested parties, I have decided to implement Alternative B as described in the EA. For a detailed discussion of the proposed alternative and the improvements, see chapter 2 of the EA.

My decision authorizes the following activities:

1. Sulphur Lick Run Road, from Pond Lick Road to the North End of the Road Decommissioning. This segment will receive general roadway reconditioning to include grading and “smoothing” of the road surface. This is to address erosion grooves within the roadway that need to be filled.

2. Sulphur Lick Run Road, from the North End of the Road Decommissioning to the Intersection with the Unnamed Woods Road. This section will be decommissioned. The area will be revegetated using a native seed mix and physical barriers will be constructed at each end to prohibit vehicular traffic within this section.
3. Sulphur Lick Run Road, from the Intersection with the Unnamed Woods Road to the Southwestern Terminus of project. This segment will be rehabilitated in-kind to restore the road to pre-storm conditions.

To construct the improvements in Segments 1, 2, and 3, three temporary stream crossings are proposed (unnamed stream, Sulphur Lick Run, and unnamed tributary to Sulphur Lick Run. The temporary stream crossings will likely be comprised of pipe culverts and reshaping of existing fill material.

4. FR 719A, from Pond Lick Road to the North End of the FR 719A Extension. This existing road will be rehabilitated in-kind. Minimal improvements are needed.
5. FR 719A Extension, from the South End of FR 719A to the North End of the Unnamed Woods Road. This road will be rehabilitated primarily by clearing and grubbing and resurfacing. The existing roadway alignment will be followed to minimize cutting into the hillside and/or placing fill material downslope of the road.
6. Unnamed Woods Road from the Eastern End of FR 719A to the Intersection with Sulphur Lick Run Road. The former logging road will be reconstructed to provide a 14-foot wide single travel lane with a 2-foot wide ditch adjacent to the hillside and a 2-foot wide shoulder on the downhill side. The hillside would be excavated and fill material would be placed as needed to widen the existing road and provide 1:1 cut-slopes and between 1:1 and 2:1 fill slopes. Six damaged 18-inch diameter culverts along this segment would be replaced with larger culverts to better convey runoff.

The selected alternative (Alternative B) best meets the purpose and need of the Sulphur Lick Run Road Decommissioning and Relocation project (see chapter 1 of the EA). The selected alternative allows for the restoration of safe and sustainable vehicle access within the Brushy Mountain Grouse Management Area, which includes:

- Access for Forest Service administration and land management activities to create and maintain grouse habitat;
- Access to private lands for management and use of those lands;
- Public access for hunting and other recreational pursuits;
- Access for forest fire protection and suppression; and
- Reflects long-term funding expectations, to ensure that the identified system minimizes adverse environmental impacts associated with road construction, reconstruction, decommissioning, and maintenance.

The activities listed above are consistent with the desired conditions outlined in the 2006 *Monongahela National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan* (updated 2011), also

referred to as the Forest Plan, which provides management direction for the National Forest System lands within the project area.

Other Alternatives Considered

In addition to the selected alternative, I considered one other alternative, Alternative A, No Action. Under Alternative A, no repairs to the observed damage sites would be made and no other activities would be implemented to help meet the purpose and need for action. If this alternative were to be implemented, the damaged road sections on Sulphur Lick Run Road, FR 719 A, and the unnamed woods road would remain in their current condition, with no further repairs, construction, removal, or reconstruction. Sulphur Lick Run Road and FR 719A would no longer be accessible to provide maintenance for the entire road, and access to lands for grouse habitat management, and fire safety management would not be obtainable.

The remaining road prism would exist as it does today, with no obliteration efforts, no culvert removal, no ditch removal, no “pull back” of eroded sections, and no erosion control measures. The road would eventually grow in with vegetation and would be left vulnerable to further or additional erosion issues. Sedimentation of Sulphur Lick Run and other unnamed tributaries would continue.

If no action takes place, sometime in the future, the Forest Service would decide upon a permanent closure point at a location with a turnaround, and the remaining section would be physically blocked. Closure signs would be posted at the beginning of Sulphur Lick Run Road and FR 719A, as well as the turnaround points. This closure would be part of routine road maintenance for public safety and private landowner access, and not associated with this project in terms of leaving the road in its current state. All turnaround points would be located at least 200 feet from streams, ensuring compliance with Forest Plan Guidance.

Alternative A, No Action, would not meet the project’s purpose of maintaining safe motorized transportation vehicular access for forest administration, maintenance, and fire protection, as well as access to private properties within the Brushy Mountain area of the MNF.

Public Involvement and Scoping

As described in the background, the need for this action arose in June 2016. The project was advertised in the *Pocahontas Times* (Newspaper of Record) and the *Register-Herald* on June 20, 2018 to notify the public of the proposed project and allow for public comments. In addition, individuals and stakeholders (including Ruffed Grouse Society and Wild Turkey Federation) were individually contacted based on prior interest in MNF-related projects. No comments or responses were received during the scoping comment period, which ended on July 20, 2018.

The EA was made available to the public and other agencies for comment from October 29, 2018 through November 28, 2018. During this 30-day period, hardcopies of the EA were available for review at the Marlinton/White Sulphur Ranger District offices and the McClintic Public Library. An electronic version of the document was also made available on the project website: <https://flh.fhwa.dot.gov/projects/wv/wverfofs201616/>. One comment was received on the EA. The comment is summarized and included with the errata in Attachment A to this Decision Notice.

Scoping for this project was completed through coordination with resource specialists from the Forest Service and FHWA and outreach to the public and Federal, State, and local stakeholders to aid in the identification of issues regarding the effects of the proposed action and to identify road system opportunities. This scoping process identified three main issues of concern, as described below, which were analyzed in greater detail in the EA.

- **Roads and Access:** Storm damage has rendered the FR 719 road complex unusable and has made this part of the Forest inaccessible by vehicles. The location of Sulphur Lick Run Road adjacent to Sulphur Lick Run makes it vulnerable to future storm damage, (see EA pages 3-16 to 3-18).
- **Soils:** The soils in the project area are generally very shallow, rocky, dry, and acidic, and much of the area is on steep slopes. Past severe weather events have increased erosion of these soils, including roadbeds, (see EA pages 3-18 to 3-21).
- **Protected and Non-native Invasive Species:** Potential habitat for nine Federally-listed plant and animal species exists in the project area, along with four Regional Forester's Sensitive Species (RFSS) plant species. Non-native invasive species abound in the project area, (see EA pages 3-21 to 3-26).

To address these concerns, the Forest Service created the alternatives described above. The main issues of concern were addressed and abated through project design features and alternative development. The EA presents an objective and well-documented analysis of the environmental effects expected to result from implementation of the selected alternative. The analysis shows that the scenario depicted by the selected alternative can effectively restore the project area, while resulting in a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). My conclusion is based on a review of the record that shows an examination of relevant scientific information, a consideration of responsible opposing views, and the acknowledgment of incomplete or unavailable information, scientific uncertainty, and risk.

Finding of No Significant Impact

The following is a summary of the project analysis to determine significance, as defined by Forest Service Handbook 1909.15_05. "Significant" as used in NEPA requires consideration of both context and intensity of the expected project effects.

Context

The context of this project is a complex of Forest Service roads that provide vehicle access in the Brushy Mountain Grouse Management Area. The Brushy Mountain area is in the southwest corner of the Marlinton/White Sulphur Ranger District. The 7,184 acres in the project area include approximately 6,862 acres of Forest Service land and 322 acres of privately-owned land. The project area occupies less than 1 percent of the total area of MNF.

The selected alternative will not pose significant short- or long-term adverse effects, as discussed in each resource section in chapter 3 of the EA. Project design features, as described in chapter 2 of the EA, minimize or avoid adverse impacts to the extent that any impacts are within generally accepted levels. Proposed activities are consistent with standards and guidelines in the Forest Plan, as outlined in pages 1-4 to 1-6 of the EA.

Intensity

The following factors were considered to evaluate intensity.

1) Impacts may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that, on the balance, the effects will be beneficial.

I find that the proposed action can be carried out without significant adverse effects on the natural resources as documented by the EA. Overall, the project will have a long-term beneficial effect on the environment.

2) The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety.

Public health and safety will not be adversely affected by the proposed action. The proposed activities are governed by standard public health and safety guidelines, Forest Service direction, and other applicable laws, regulations, and guidelines. Best management practices (BMPs), which include existing regularly occurring policies, practices, and measures required by law, regulation or policy, will be implemented under Alternative B. BMPs are identified in Appendix C of the EA. On balance, the proposed action will have a beneficial effect on public health and safety by restoring safe and sustainable vehicular access within the Brushy Mountain area.

3) Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

This project will not adversely affect unique characteristics of the geographic area. There are no unique physical characteristics or geographical features within the project area, such as historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas. Therefore, there will be no adverse effects to such resources from the proposed project.

4) The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.

Based on the involvement of forest resource specialists, consultation with Federal, State and local agencies, and the ongoing opportunity for public input during the development of the EA, the effects of the proposed actions on the quality of the human environment is not expected to be controversial.

5) The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

The selected alternative was designed to achieve objectives identified in the Forest Plan. The analysis conducted for the EA demonstrates that the effects of the selected alternative are not uncertain, and do not involve unique or unknown risks. Project design features and resource protection measures will minimize adverse resource effects.

6) The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.

This project does not set a precedent for any future action. Any planning for future projects will consider all relevant scientific, site-specific information available at that time, and an independent environmental analysis of environmental consequences will be conducted.

7) Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.

The cumulative effects of the project in conjunction with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future action in the area were analyzed for roads and access, soils, and protected and non-native invasive species, and found to be relatively minor for all resources. See chapter 3 of the EA.

8) The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant cultural or historical resources.

Surveys were conducted for Native American religious or cultural sites, archaeological sites, and historic properties or areas that may be affected by the project. No archaeological sites were determined to be present within the Area of Potential Effect (APE). One section of FR 719 was determined to be over 50 years old, but it was determined not to meet the criteria for eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. The proposed undertaking will have no effect to historic properties, see page 3-14 of the EA.

9) The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the *Endangered Species Act*.

Under Section 7 of the *Endangered Species Act*, Federal agencies are required to ensure that their actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species or adversely modify a species' critical habitat. In compliance with requirements of the act, the Forest Service has evaluated the project's possible effects on Federally-listed species.

The US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultations (IPaC) website was used to obtain an official species list of Federally-protected species that have the potential to occur in the project area. The IPaC report indicated that five Federally-listed plant species and four Federally-listed animal species had the potential to be present in the project area. Four Regional Forester's Sensitive Species (RFSS) plant species were also identified as having the potential to occur in the project area.

No Federally-listed or RFSS species were identified along the FR 719 complex during the botanical field surveys conducted in September 2017. A RFSS butterfly species, Appalachian grizzled skipper (*Pyrgus wyandot*), that occurs in the project area along FS 719A was later identified through coordination with the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources (WVDNR) in October 2018. (See pages 3-21 through 3-23 in the EA.)

In a letter dated September 5, 2018, USFWS concurred with FHWA's finding that the project is not likely to adversely affect the Indiana bat, and that any take of the northern long-eared bat (NLEB) is exempted under the final 4(d) rule for Federal actions that may affect the NLEB and no conservation measures are required. USFWS also concurred the project is not likely to adversely affect any Federally-listed plant species. Thus, no further consultation under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act is required. (See pages 3-24 and Appendix B.)

The following mitigation measures will be implemented under Alternative B for protected species.

- No tree clearing will be allowed between April 1 and November 15 to avoid impacts to bat species utilizing trees for roosting.
- On FR 719A, disturbance of Canada cinquefoil and other spring blooming plants found on road shoulders and slopes will be avoided to the maximum extent possible to avoid impacts to the Appalachian grizzled skipper. Any fill material used will be acidic, like the native shales. No limestone fill/aggregate will be used and use of lime or fertilizer will be avoided. No insecticide will be applied near the occupied area. Prior to construction activity on FR 719A, construction crews will be briefed on the skipper and made aware of the need to minimize impacts from equipment and traffic to the sides of FR 719A.

BMPs will also be implemented. (See Appendix C for a listing of the BMPs developed to reduce or eliminate potential resource impacts of this project.)

10) Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

The selected alternative is consistent with the Forest Plan and with Federal, State, and local law or requirements essential for the protection of the environment. This alternative will provide the minimum system determined to be needed to meet resource and other management objectives in the Forest Plan, to meet applicable statutory and regulatory requirements, to reflect long-term funding expectations, and to ensure that the identified system minimizes adverse environmental impacts associated with road construction, reconstruction, decommissioning, and maintenance.

Conclusion

After considering the environmental effects described in the EA and specialist reports, I have determined that Alternative B will not have significant effects on the quality of the human environment considering the context and intensity of impacts (40 CFR 1508.27). Thus, an environmental impact statement will not be prepared.

Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations

National Forest Management Act of 1976

This decision to implement Alternative B is consistent with the intent of the Forest Plan's long term goals and objectives listed, as discussed in chapter 1 of the EA. The project was designed in conformance with land and resource management plan standards and incorporates appropriate land and resource management plan guidelines for the Sulphur Lick Run Road decommissioning and relocation project, (*Monongahela National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan*, pages II-54 to II-55).

Other NFMA Requirements - I have determined the selected alternative is consistent with the following provisions of *the National Forest Management Act*:

- 1. Standards of roadway construction:** Roads constructed on National Forest System lands shall be designed to standards appropriate for the intended uses, considering safety, cost of transportation, and impacts on land and resources (16 USC 1608(c)).

Hazardous Materials

The *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976* established a comprehensive program for managing hazardous wastes from the time they are produced until their disposal. The *Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980*, deals with the release (spillage, leaking, dumping, accumulation, etc.), or threat of a release of hazardous substances into the environment. Results from a search of the US Environmental Protection Agency Envirofacts system (<https://www3.epa.gov/enviro/>) determined that there are no known hazardous waste sites within the project's boundaries.

Clean Water Act of 1977

The *Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972*, as amended by the *Clean Water Act*, is a national policy to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters; to enhance the quality of water resources; and to prevent, control, and abate water pollution. For repairs adjacent to Sulphur Lick Run and unnamed tributaries, stabilization of drainages would improve water quality by reducing erosion and sedimentation. Temporary sedimentation may occur during construction; however, BMPs would be implemented to minimize erosion and sedimentation from ground disturbing activities that expose bare soil.

National Wildlife and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968

The *National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act* protects selected rivers, and their immediate environments, which possess outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural or other similar values. The proposed project area is not within or adjacent to a Congressionally-designated wilderness, wilderness study area, wild and scenic rivers or national recreation area.

Clean Air Act of 1977

The *Clean Air Act* regulates multiple air pollutant types, known as criteria pollutants. None of the alternatives under consideration involve a stationary source of air emissions. However, proposed activities would require the use of heavy equipment, such as graders, bulldozers, backhoes, dump trucks, cranes and other diesel- and gasoline-fueled equipment, which would intermittently emit non-stationary source quantities of criteria air pollutants. In addition to tailpipe emissions from heavy equipment, the temporary disturbance of the ground surface during excavation and grading activities could potentially generate fugitive dust.

Adhering to reasonable measures will minimize any fugitive dust emissions. Use of mitigation measures will further reduce the possibility of adverse impacts from fugitive dust emissions. Overall, impacts from fugitive dust emissions will be negligible. Therefore, impacts to air quality from the proposed action will not have a measurable impact on air quality.

Executive Order 12989 – Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898 relating to Environmental Justice requires an assessment of whether minorities or low-income populations will be disproportionately affected by any proposed action. Although minority and low-income groups are present in Greenbrier County, the

proposed action would not have any disproportionate or adverse impacts on minority or low-income populations.

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966

Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act* requires Federal agencies to consider the effect of a project on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in, or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Section 106 also requires Federal agencies to afford the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) a reasonable opportunity to comment. Based on survey results, no archaeological sites were determined to be present within the Area of Potential Effect (APE). One section of FR 719 was determined to be over 50 years old, but it does not meet the criteria for eligibility for the NRHP. The Forest Service determined that the proposed undertaking would have no effect to historic properties and the West Virginia Division of Culture and History, which serves as the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), has concurred.

Department of Transportation (DOT) Act of 1966

Section 4(f) of the *Department of Transportation (DOT) Act* provides for the special consideration of public parks and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites during the transportation development process. The MNF is a multiple-use property and there are no recreational areas located within in the project area.

Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act of 1965

The *Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act* established a funding source to assist Federal, State and local governments to acquire land and water for recreational and conservation needs. The project alternatives would not impact the land acquired for the extension of the Turnpike property. No other LWCF-funded projects in the MNF have been identified.

Road Management Rule and Administrative Policy

On January 12, 2001, the FS adopted the Road Management Rule and Administrative Policy (Roads Policy) requiring that an interdisciplinary science-based roads analysis process be used to inform decision-makers of road system opportunities, needs and priorities that support land and resource management objectives. This travel analysis was conducted in conjunction with the NEPA process for the Sulphur Lick Run Road Decommissioning and Relocation Environmental Assessment. This analysis is considered to be at the appropriate scale and, to the degree practicable, involved a broad spectrum of interested and affected citizens, other state and federal agencies, and tribal governments.

Administrative Review and Objection Rights

This decision is a project level decision, subject to administrative review (commonly called “objections”) pursuant to project-level pre-decisional administrative review process outlined in regulations at 36 CFR Part 218.

The opportunity to object ends 45 days following the date of publication of the legal notice in *Pocahontas Times*, the newspaper of record for Marlinton District Ranger decisions. The publication date of the legal notice in this newspaper is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an objection, and those wishing to object should not rely upon dates or time frame information provided by any other source. It is the objector’s responsibility to ensure timely filing

of a written objection with the reviewing officer pursuant to §218.9. The regulations prohibit extending the time to file an objection. All objections are available for public inspection during and after the objection process.

Forest Service regulations specify that objections will be accepted only from those who have previously submitted specific written comments regarding the proposed project during scoping or other designated opportunity for public comment. Issues raised in objections must be based on issues raised in the previously submitted specific written comments unless the issues are based on new information arising after designated comment opportunities (§218.7(c)(2)(ii)). Incorporation of documents by reference is permitted only as provided in §218.8(b)(2).

At a minimum, objections must include the following (§218.8(d)):

- List the name, address, and if possible a telephone number of the objector;
- Provide a signature or other verification of authorship (a scanned signature for electronic mail may be filed with the objection);
- Identify the lead objector, when multiple names are listed on an objection;
- Provide the name of the project being objected to, the name and title of the responsible official, and name of National Forest(s) and/or ranger district on which the project is located;
- A statement of the issues and/or aspects of the project to which the objection applies;
- If applicable, a statement explaining how the environmental analysis or draft decision specifically violates law, regulation, or policy; suggested remedies to resolve the objection; and supporting reasons for reviewing officer to consider;
- Provide a statement that demonstrates the connection between prior specific written comments and the content of the objection, unless the objection concerns an issue that arose after the designated opportunities for comment.

Written objections, including attachments, must be filed with Objection Reviewing Officer. Objections may be submitted by email to objections-eastern-region@fs.fed.us. They may be mailed to Objections Reviewing Officer, USDA Forest Service, Gaslight Building, Suite 700, 626 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, WI 53202. Hand-delivered objections will also be accepted at this address between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday, exclusive of Federal holidays. Objections may also be submitted by fax to (414) 944-3963, Attn: Objections Reviewing Officer, USDA, Forest Service, Eastern Regional Office.

Objections filed electronically must be submitted in a format such as an email message, plain text (.txt), rich text format (.rft), or Word (.doc, .docx). Please state "MNF Sulphur Lick Run Road Decommissioning and Relocation Project," in the subject line when providing objections electronically, or on the envelope when submitting by mail.

Implementation

Following objection proceedings under 36 CFR 218, implementation of the decision may begin immediately following the publication date of the legal notice of this decision in the Pocahontas Times, the newspaper of record. There will be no further review of this response by any other Forest Service or U.S. Department of Agriculture official as per 36 CFR 218.11(b)(2).

For additional information about how to object, contact Karen Stevens, Forest Planner, (304) 635-4480, karenstevens@fs.fed.us. For additional information about the project or decision please contact Adam Taylor, Assistant ERFO Lead, (304) 799-4334, ajtaylor@fs.fed.us.

Approved by:



Cynthia Sandeno
District Ranger
Marlinton/White Sulphur District
Monongahela National Forest

1/29/19

Date

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at http://www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint_filing_cust.html and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov.

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer and lender.