

Appendix B

Errata for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Item 1: Letters 139 and 161 (see Response to Comments, Appendix D) mentioned that Table 3-20, DSEIS page 3-49, included errors. The corrected table below replaces the version of Table 3-20 that appeared in the DSEIS:

Table 3-20: Existing Coniferous Old Growth Forest (OG) Within the North Lochsa Face Analysis Area

OG Analysis Unit (Area & Id #)	Analysis Unit Area (ac)	Field Verified OG (ac)	Tentatively Identified OG (ac)	Total Old Growth (ac)	Total Old Growth (%)
Upper Hungery Cr (01)	11,300	0	220	220	2
Lower Hungery Cr (02)	11,600	0	170	170	1
Willow Creek (03)	11,700	0	0	0	0
Black Cany'n Face (09)	9,100	0	0	0	0
Lower Fish Creek (10)	11,700	0	260	260	2
Upper Fish Creek (11)	10,200	0	1260	1260	12
West Canyon (12)	10,500	240	2830	3070	29
Canyon/Glade (13)	10,300	2410	470	2880	28
Deadman (14)	11,900	350	1260	1610	14
Bimerick Creek (15)	7,700	90	260	350	5
East Pete King (20)	9,100	330	570	910	10
West Pete King (21)	12,400	290	640	930	7
TOTALS	127,500 ac	3,710	7,940	11,650	9.1 %

Item 2: The Alternative 5 map that appeared in the DSEIS in Appendix A showed offsite pine timber harvest in Bimerick Meadows. Alternative 5 included prescribed burning, but no timber harvest, in roadless areas. A corrected map has been added to Appendix A of the FSEIS.

Item 3: Letter 157 (see Response to Comments, Appendix D) mentioned that page 1-25 of the DSEIS says commercial thinning would retain 70% of the live basal area; page 2-18 of the DSEIS says that commercial thinning would retain up to 67% of the trees in the LTA. The statement on Page 2-18 could be interpreted to mean that no more than 67% of

the live basal area trees will be retained, and that there is the potential to retain less than that.

The DSEIS says on page 1-25 that “approximately” 70% of the live basal area would be retained when commercial thinning. The DSEIS says on page 2-18 that “up to” 67% of the trees on any LTA would be retained. The statement on page 2-18 is correct. Retention levels for commercial thinning would vary by LTA, because commercial thinning is intended to return stand densities to historic levels, and historic stand densities varied by LTA.

Item 4: Page 1-3 of the DSEIS should say “Nez Perce Reservation” rather than “Nez Perce Indian Reservation”.

Item 5: Page 1-24 of the DSEIS should say that the “project area lies within the treaty territory of the Nez Perce Tribe,” rather than “the project area lies within the reservation area of the Nez Perce Tribe”.

Item 6: The mitigation measures described on page 3-72 of the DSEIS should have been included on page 2-10, Activities Common to All Action Alternatives.

Item 7: The document citation for Anderson, H. W., on page M-1 of Appendix M in the DSEIS, should read “Transactions of the American Geophysical Union” rather than “Transmission of the American Geophysical Union.”

Item 8: Unit 101 (a 295-acre precommercial thinning unit) was dropped from Alternative 6 because it is in lynx habitat. However, it is included on the map of Alternative 6 in Appendix A. A corrected map has been added to Appendix A of the FSEIS.

Item 9: The total winter range in available forage shown in Table 3-38 on page 3-99 of the DSEIS should be changed from 39 percent to 9 percent.

Item 10: There is an error in Table 3-35 on page 3-92 of the DSEIS. For Alternative 3A, the elk habitat effectiveness for Gass Creek should be 75%, and for Obia Creek it should be 80%.

Item 11: Table 3-15 on page 3-23 of the DSEIS is confusing because the values in the table are not labeled with a unit of measurement. The numbers in the table are the percentages of the area in each age class. The values in column Alt 1 and Alt 1F are correct.

Item 12: Table 1-2 on page 1-5 of the DSEIS does not include a description of Management Area C6. The *description* for Management Area C6 should say: “This management area consists of the following parcels of currently unroaded land encompassing or adjacent to high value fishery streams:

1. Hungry Creek – Fish Creek – 30,700 acres
2. Cayuse Creek – Toboggan Creek – 59,740 acres

3. Colt Creek – 12,000 acres.

The *goal* for Management Area C6 should say: Protect the soil and water from adverse effects of man’s activities (Forest Plan, Vol. 1, pp III-50).

Item 13: Table 3-59, on page 3-158 of the DSEIS, should say “May Impact” for Western Boreal Toad for Alternatives 2 through 6 instead of “No Impact.” Also, the correct spelling is “Boreal” rather than “Boeral.”

Item 14: Add the following Soils references to Appendix M of the DSEIS:

Clearwater National Forest. 2000. Oracle landslide database: Updated 2000.
Resides on computer system at Supervisor’s Office in Orofino, ID.

Graham, Russell, T.; Harvey, Alan E.; Jurgensen, Martin F.; Jain, Theresa B.; Tonn, Jonalea R.; Page-Dumroese, Deborah S. 1994. Managing coarse woody debris in forests of the Rocky Mountains. Res. Pap. INT-RP-477. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, Ogden, UT. 12p.

USDA Forest Service. 1999. Forest Service Manual 2500. Watershed and Air Management R-1 Supplement 2500-99-1, Effective 11/12/1999.

Item 15: On pages 3-177 through 3-178 of the DSEIS, remove the following paragraph:

“Past actions are included in the description of the existing condition (Chapter Three) and are considered as part of the allowable limit of 15% soil impacts. Present actions include sold, but not completed timber sales (Full Quart, Salt Lick Salvage, and Deadhorse Salvage) and recent wildfires (including year 2000). Reasonably foreseeable actions within the analysis area include South Sheep, Deadly Moose, and prescribed fire projects.”

and replace it with:

“Considered past actions include road building, fire suppression, road decommissioning, landslides, fires, and timber harvest. Present actions include road maintenance, road decommissioning, fire suppression, and salvage timber harvest. Future actions include road maintenance, fire suppression, and salvage timber harvest.”