



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

Idaho Panhandle  
National Forest

Coeur d'Alene River  
Ranger District

P. O. Box 14  
Silverton, ID 83867

2502 East Sherman Avenue  
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814

---

**File Code:** 1950

**Date:** April 22, 2002

Hello –

Enclosed is your copy of the Missouri Heli Bug Environmental Assessment (EA). After printing the document, we found we needed to make a correction. An errata sheet is enclosed describing the correction.

The EA is being provided on compact disk (CD). This format offers a number of very convenient features. For example, the document is book marked so the viewer can easily navigate from one section of the document to another. The viewer can also “zoom” in on maps and other materials, which make them considerably easier to read. I would encourage you to first try the CD format if you have access to a computer. If not, printed copies will be provided to those who request them. If you received a CD but need to have a printed copy, please contact Kerry Arneson at our Fernan Office (208-769-3021).

For the convenience of our interested public and in an effort to conserve paper and reduce publication costs, documents related to this proposal are also available to the public on our Forest's internet web page:

<http://www.fs.fed.us/ipnf/eco/manage/nepa>

Please send written comments to the Coeur d'Alene River Ranger District, Fernan Office, 2502 East Sherman Avenue, Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814. Your comments must be received by May 24, 2002. If you have any questions, please contact Project Team Leader Bob Rehnborg at (208) 664-2318.

Sincerely,

/s/ Joseph P. Stringer

JOSEPH P. STRINGER  
District Ranger

enclosure



## Errata for the Missouri Heli Bug Environmental Assessment

The following statement is made on page 3-38 of the Environmental Assessment (Water Resources section): “Under Alternative 2, WATSED predicts that the green tree harvest to create conditions for regeneration treatments would result in an additional 21 scattered equivalent clearcut acres over the No Action Alternative. Under Alternative 3, this green tree harvest would result in an additional 12 equivalent clearcut acres over the No Action Alternative.” These numbers are inaccurate. They were generated by mistakenly attributing all of the canopy loss to green tree harvest. In reality, a large component of the canopy loss (approximately 40 to 50%) was observed as the result of bark beetle mortality and mortality due to other causal agents.

The correct numbers would be 6 equivalent clearcut acres (ECAs) under Alternative 2, with 3 equivalent clearcut acres under Alternative 3. As a result of this change, the percentage increase in ECAs under Alternative 2 (incorrectly stated later on page 3-38) would then be adjusted to 0.02 percent instead of 0.08 percent above the No-Action Alternative, and the percentage increase in ECAs for Alternative 3 would be adjusted to 0.01 percent instead of 0.05 percent above the No-Action Alternative. These corrections must also be applied to the comparison of effects to Watershed/Fisheries in Chapter 2 (Section 2.7.4 Comparison of Alternatives).

These corrections do not change the conclusion that the cumulative effects resulting from implementation of either of the action alternatives would not be measurable at the tributary or watershed scale for increases in peak flows or sediment over what would occur under the No-Action Alternative, as described in Chapter 3 (Water Resources) and brought forward into Chapter 2 (Comparison of Alternatives).

\* \* \*