

FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

North Lochsa Face Ecosystem Management Project

Lochsa Ranger District
Clearwater National Forest
Idaho County, Idaho

November 2002

Lead Agency: USDA Forest Service

Responsible Official: Larry J. Dawson
Forest Supervisor
Clearwater National Forest
12730 U.S. Highway 12
Orofino, ID 83544

For Further Information, Contact: Cynthia A. Lane
Lochsa District Ranger
Rt. 1, Box 398
Kooskia, ID 83539

Or: Lois Foster
Interdisciplinary Team Leader
Kamiah Ranger Station
208-935-4258

Abstract: This Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) corrects errors in the Draft Supplemental EIS. The Draft Supplemental EIS (January 2002) documented the analysis of eight alternatives, including a "no action" alternative, that were developed for the North Lochsa Face Ecosystem Management Project. The Notice of Intent to prepare this document was published in the Federal Register on August 9, 1996. Guided by the philosophy of ecosystem management, the proposed actions include vegetative and aquatic management activities designed to improve ecological conditions in the North Lochsa Face ecosystem, while incorporating social values associated with this piece of land.

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in its programs on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, religion, sex, disability, political beliefs, and marital or familial status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs). Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact the USDA Office of Communications at (202) 720-5881 (voice) or (202) 720-7808 (TDD). To file a complaint, write the Secretary of Agriculture, USDA, Washington, DC 20250, or call (202) 720-7327 (voice) or (202) 720-1127 (TDD). The USDA is an equal employment opportunity employer.

Table of Contents

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
I. Introduction	FSEIS – 3
II. History of the North Lochsa Face Project	FSEIS – 3
III. Purpose and Need for Action	FSEIS - 4
IV. Alternatives	FSEIS - 5
V. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences	FSEIS - 10

Appendices

Appendix A – Maps

Appendix B – Errata for the Draft Supplemental Environmental
Impact Statement

Appendix C – List of Preparers

Appendix D – Response to Public Comments

Appendix E – List of Agencies, Organizations, and Persons on the
Mailing List for the Final Supplemental Environmental
Impact Statement

Appendix F – Biological Assessment and Biological Evaluation

I. Introduction

This Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS) describes and corrects errors that appeared in the Draft Supplemental EIS (DSEIS, January 2002). Only a brief summary of the history of the North Lochsa Face project, the Purpose and Need for action, the alternatives analyzed in detail, the affected environment, and the environmental consequences are presented here. The corrected maps for the DSEIS are included in Appendix A, and other errata for the DSEIS are included in Appendix B, of this FSEIS.

The DSEIS contains detailed discussions of the issues and alternative development, project area existing conditions, and the potential environmental consequences of the proposed actions. The appendices to this FSEIS contain corrections to some of the information that was presented in the DSEIS. Appendix A includes updated alternative maps; Appendix B includes corrections to the text of the DSEIS; and Alternative D includes a detailed discussion of the IDT's response to public comments, including portions of the analysis that have been updated or revised. Except for the errata that are presented in this FSEIS in the appendices, the DSEIS document contains the complete environmental analysis for the North Lochsa Face Ecosystem Management Project.

II. History of the North Lochsa Face Project

In January 1995, a team of Forest and District specialists started an assessment for the North Lochsa Face Landscape (see vicinity map in Appendix A). The assessment was completed in May 1996. The assessment described the ecological conditions of the North Lochsa Face area, focusing on structure, function and composition of the ecosystems. In addition, the assessment described the social values associated with this piece of land. Opportunities to improve the landscape condition were identified based on the ecological conditions and social considerations.

In August 1996, a Notice of Intent was issued which started the scoping process for the North Lochsa Face environmental analysis. In June 1997 a draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was issued. In June 1999 a Final EIS was issued. Two Records of Decision (ROD), the Recreation and Access Management ROD and the Vegetation and Aquatic Management ROD, were issued in April 2000.

The District Ranger adopted Access Option 3 in the Recreation and Access Management ROD. The Access decision delineated motorized and non-motorized recreational use by major stream drainage, based on social values combined with the suitability/capability of the land to support different recreational experiences. Access Option 3 will maintain trail facilities, relocate and/or reconstruct problem trail stretches, provide road and trail signing and information, develop riding "loop" opportunities, and provide opportunities such as a range of challenging trail bike riding experiences. Friends of the Clearwater, Land and Water Fund of the Rockies, and the Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee appealed this decision. The Regional Forester affirmed the Recreation and Access Management ROD in July 2000. The decision relating to the Recreation and Access

Management is final, and the Regional Forester affirmed that decision; therefore it will not be revisited.

The Forest Supervisor adopted Alternative 3a *modified* in the Vegetation and Aquatic Management ROD. Alternative 3a included the actions described in Final EIS Alternative 3a and additional underburning and prescribed burning in the Fish and Hungery Creek drainages as described in Alternative 3. The Friends of the Earth, Resource Organization on Timber Supply, Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee, and the Land and Water Fund of the Rockies appealed the decision. In July 2000, the Regional Forester *reversed* the decision and directed the Forest Supervisor to prepare a Supplemental EIS that clarified the environmental analyses related to road obliteration effects.

A Draft Supplemental EIS was prepared in response to the Regional Forester's decision to reverse the Vegetation and Aquatic ROD. Therefore, the DSEIS only addressed the decisions to be made regarding vegetation and aquatic management.

The DSEIS was advertised for public comment in January 2002. Almost 200 comment letters were received. The Forest conducted a content analysis of the original comment letters in June 2002, coding and indexing the comment narratives. The original comment letters are available for review in Volumes 6 and 7 of the Project File, and the coded content analysis results are included in the Project File as well (Volume 18, Document 758). The Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) then categorized and summarized the comments, and responded to them in detail. The IDT Response To Comments is included as Appendix D of this FSEIS.

III. Purpose and Need for Action

The Purpose and Need for Action for the North Lochsa Face Ecosystem Management Project is described in detail on pages 1-7 through 1-27 of the DSEIS. The North Lochsa Landscape Assessment evaluated ecological conditions in the Pete King, Rye Patch, Canyon, Apgar, Glade, Deadman, Bimerick, Fish, Hungery, and small, unnamed "face" drainages on the north side of the Lochsa River corridor. The Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) compared existing conditions to a range of historic conditions, and evaluated where there were major differences. The IDT also considered how local communities would be influenced by proposed actions in the North Lochsa Face area. The IDT determined that the following actions were needed to move the North Lochsa Face landscape toward a more sustainable, resilient condition:

- ☞☞ There is a need to improve forest health, reduce wildfire risk, restore ecological processes, and replace patches at historic disturbance levels.
- ☞☞ There is a need to remove off-site pine.
- ☞☞ There is a need to reduce stand densities and favor resilient, early seral species.
- ☞☞ There is a need to control noxious weeds.

There is a need to improve aquatic conditions.

There is a need to provide economic benefits to local communities.

The IDT developed a proposed action that would implement a variety of practices to meet these objectives. A Notice of Intent was advertised in 1996, beginning the scoping process for the North Lochsa Face environmental analysis. The public involvement process has been quite extensive since that time. It is described in detail on page 2-2 of the DSEIS.

The Lochsa Ranger District's scoping and public involvement efforts raised many issues. They are described in detail on pages 2-3 through 2-9 of the DSEIS. To address those issues, the IDT considered a range of alternatives. They are described in detail in the DSEIS on pages 2-9 through 2-38, and are briefly summarized in this FSEIS in the following section.

IV. Alternatives

This section includes a brief discussion of the alternatives that the IDT analyzed in detail. They are described in the DSEIS on Pages 2-9 through 2-23.

Pages 2-10 through 2-12 of the DSEIS describe the management activities that would be common to all of the action alternatives. Those activities include control of noxious weeds, road obliteration, placing roads in long-term maintenance status, sediment trap removal, riparian planting, and a programmatic Forest Plan burning amendment, except that the Forest Plan burning amendment would not be implemented for Alternatives 4 or 4a.

Pages 2-12 through 2-14 of the DSEIS describe monitoring that would occur for all action alternatives. Ongoing monitoring would include annual timber sale implementation monitoring, water temperature monitoring within and downstream from the project area, Pacific dogwood monitoring in the Lochsa Research Natural Area (RNA), reforestation monitoring, sediment delivery from road obliteration, implementation and effectiveness monitoring for prescribed burns, and heritage resource monitoring during and after implementation of management activities.

a. Alternative 1 (No Action)

Alternative 1 is described in the DSEIS on Page 2-15. Alternative 1 is the No Action Alternative.

Ecosystems change on their own even without human influences. Fire is the primary agent of change within the North Lochsa Face ecosystem. The "No Action" Alternative means that management action taken by the Forest Service would be current activities permitted by the Forest Plan and covered under other NEPA documents. Although this alternative provides a baseline for comparing the environmental consequences of the other alternatives to the existing condition (36 CFR 1502.14), it is potentially an appropriate management option that could be selected by the Responsible Official.

No road obliteration, sediment trap removal or riparian planting would occur under the No Action Alternative, as displayed in the Final EIS.

b. Alternative 2

Alternative 2 is described in the DSEIS on Pages 2-15 through 2-19. Alternative 2 was the Proposed Action in the FEIS. It was developed to respond to the Purpose and Need for action. It focuses on commercial thinning, salvaging and underburning to reduce tree densities; reintroducing fire to the ecosystem to improve forest health; and contributing timber products to the economy.

Alternative 2 would implement management activities on approximately 21,885 acres (17 percent of the land in the analysis area). Management actions would include at least five timber sales that would produce a total of about 73 MMBF. Table ROD-3 summarizes the management actions for Alternative 2.

Table ROD-3: Summary of Specific Features for Alternative 2

Action	Acreage
Prescribed Fire	
Mixed Severity Burn	5,485 acres
Underburn	7,045 acres
Timber Harvest	
Regeneration Harvest	2,860 acres
Off-Site Conversion (Clearcut)	2,220 acres
Intermediate Harvest	
Commercial Thin	2,520 acres
Salvage	465 acres
Precommercial Thin	1,290 acres
Roads	
Permanent Road Construction	1.1 miles
Temporary Road Construction – 10 roads	3.7 miles
Reconstruction	13 miles

c. Alternative 3

Alternative 3 is described in the DSEIS on Pages 2-19 through 2-21. Alternative 3 was the Preferred Alternative in the DEIS. It was developed to respond to the issue of road construction. It includes the activities from Alternative 2 that could be accomplished without any permanent or temporary road construction. Alternative 3 includes about 405 acres less of regeneration harvest, and 250 acres less of commercial thinning, than Alternative 2.

Alternative 3 would implement management activities on approximately 21,230 acres (17 percent of the land in the analysis area). Management actions would include at least five timber sales that would produce a total of about 67 MMBF. Table ROD-4 summarizes the management actions for Alternative 3.

Table ROD-4: Summary of Specific Features for Alternative 3

Action	Acreage
Prescribed Fire	
Mixed Severity Burn	5,485 acres
Underburn	7,045 acres
Timber Harvest	
Regeneration Harvest	2,455 acres
Off-Site Conversion (Clearcut)	2,220 acres
Intermediate Harvest	
Commercial Thin	2,270 acres
Salvage	465 acres
Precommercial Thin	1,290 acres
Roads	
Permanent Road Construction	0 miles
Temporary Road Construction	0 miles
Reconstruction	13 miles

d. Alternative 3a

Alternative 3a is described in the DSEIS on Pages 2-22 through 2-24. Alternative 3a was the Preferred Alternative in the FEIS. It was developed to respond to the purpose and need for action, and to respond to the issues of prescribed fire versus commercial timber and transportation planning. Prescribed burning units within Fish and Hungry creeks that would burn trees that have potential commercial value were dropped. Harvest units that would require temporary roads, but not permanent roads, were retained. Alternative 3a would include 160 acres less of regeneration harvest, 4,560 acres less of mixed severity burning, and 410 acres less of underburning, than Alternative 2.

Alternative 3a would implement management activities on approximately 16,755 acres (13 percent of the land in the analysis area). Management actions would include at least five timber sales that would produce a total of about 70 MMBF. Table ROD-5 summarizes the management actions for Alternative 3a.

Table ROD-5: Summary of Specific Features for Alternative 3a

Action	Acreage
Prescribed Fire	
Mixed Severity Burn	925 acres
Underburn	6,635 acres
Timber Harvest	
Regeneration Harvest	2,700 acres
Off-Site Conversion (Clearcut)	2,220 acres
Intermediate Harvest	
Commercial Thin	2,520 acres
Salvage	465 acres
Precommercial Thin	1,290 acres
Roads	
Permanent Road Construction	0 miles
Temporary Road Construction (9 temporary roads)	3.5 miles
Reconstruction	13 miles

e. Alternatives 4 and 4a

Alternatives 4 and 4a are described in the DSEIS on Pages 2-24 through 2-27. Alternative 4 was developed to meet the Purpose and Need for Action while addressing public concerns about activities in the North Lochsa Face Roadless Area. No management activities would occur in the North Lochsa Face Roadless Area, and no permanent road construction would occur. In addition, no prescribed burning would occur in the Lochsa Research Natural Area, and all but one underburning unit would be dropped in the Lochsa Wild and Scenic River Corridor. Alternative 4 would drop the off-site conversion (clearcutting) units in Bimerick Creek, and the mixed severity burning. Alternative 4 would include 755 acres less of regeneration harvest, 215 acres less of commercial thinning, and 6,340 acres less of underburning, than Alternative 2.

Alternative 4a would drop 35 acres of underburning in the Lochsa Wild and Scenic River Corridor. Otherwise it is the same as Alternative 4.

Alternative 4 would implement management activities on approximately 7,220 acres (6 percent of the land in the analysis area). Management actions would include at least five timber sales that would produce a total of about 48 MMBF. Table ROD-6 summarizes the management actions for Alternative 4 and 4a.

Table ROD-6: Summary of Specific Features for Alternative 4

Action	Acreage
Prescribed Fire	
Mixed Severity Burn	0 acres
Underburn	705 acres*
Timber Harvest	
Regeneration Harvest	2,105 acres
Off-Site Conversion (Clearcut)	0 acres
Intermediate Harvest	
Commercial Thin	2,305 acres
Salvage	465 acres
Precommercial Thin	1,290 acres
Roads	
Permanent Road Construction	0 miles
Temporary Road Construction (9 temporary roads)	3.5 miles
Reconstruction	1.5 miles

*Under Alternative 4a, 670 acres would be underburned

f. Alternative 5

Alternative 5 is described in the DSEIS on Pages 2-27 through 2-29. Alternative 5 was developed in response to the issue of activities within the North Lochsa Roadless Area. Only prescribed burning would occur in the North Lochsa Roadless Area, and no permanent or temporary roads would be constructed in roadless areas; 3.5 miles of temporary roads would be constructed in non-roadless areas. Alternative 5 includes

about 2,220 acres less of off-site conversion harvest, 945 acres less of regeneration harvest, and 215 acres less of commercial thinning, than Alternative 2.

Alternative 5 would implement management activities on approximately 18,695 acres (15 percent of the land in the analysis area). Management actions would include at least five timber sales that would produce a total of about 49 MMBF. Table ROD-7 summarizes the management actions for Alternative 3.

Table ROD-7: Summary of Specific Features for Alternative 5

Action	Acreage
Prescribed Fire	
Mixed Severity Burn	5,485 acres
Underburn	7,045 acres
Timber Harvest	
Regeneration Harvest	2,105 acres
Off-Site Conversion (Clearcut)	0 acres
Intermediate Harvest	
Commercial Thin	2,305 acres
Salvage	465 acres
Precommercial Thin	1,290 acres
Roads	
Permanent Road Construction	0 miles
Temporary Road Construction (not in roadless areas)	3.5 miles
Reconstruction	1.5 miles

g. Alternative 6

Alternative 6 is described in the DSEIS on Pages 2-29 through 2-33. Alternative 6 was developed to respond to the issues if harvest in old growth and precommercial thinning in lynx habitat. Alternative 6 includes an additional 170 acres of mixed severity burning and 135 acres of underburning. Alternative 6 includes about 325 acres less of regeneration harvest, 485 acres less of commercial thinning, and 150 acres less of salvage than Alternative 2. Most of the units that were dropped were in old growth. One precommercial thinning unit that was located in lynx habitat was dropped.

Alternative 6 would implement management activities on approximately 21,120 acres (17 percent of the land in the analysis area). Management actions would include at least five timber sales that would produce a total of about 66 MMBF. Table ROD-8 summarizes the management actions for Alternative 6.

Table ROD-8: Summary of Specific Features for Alternative 6

Action	Acreage
Prescribed Fire	
Mixed Severity Burn	5,655 acres
Underburn	7,180 acres
Timber Harvest	
Regeneration Harvest	2,720 acres
Off-Site Conversion (Clearcut)	2,220 acres
Intermediate Harvest	
Commercial Thin	2,035 acres
Salvage	315 acres
Precommercial Thin	995 acres
Roads	
Permanent Road Construction	0 miles
Temporary Road Construction (8 temporary roads)	3.2 miles
Reconstruction	13 miles

V. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

a. Affected Environment

Existing conditions and the potential environmental consequences of proposed management actions are described in detail in the DSEIS in Chapter 3.

The North Lochsa Face analysis area covers approximately 128,000 acres of mostly forested, steep mountains on the Lochsa Ranger District of the Clearwater National Forest (CNF). It lies between Highway 12 and the Lolo Motorway (Forest Road 500) just north of the small communities of Lowell and Syringa, Idaho. Lewiston, Idaho is 95 miles west of the area on Highway 12; the Nez Perce Indian Reservation, headquartered in Lapwai, adjoins the Forest to the west; and Missoula, Montana is 130 miles to the east. The Lochsa River, a designated Wild and Scenic River, runs alongside Highway 12. The project area includes Fish, Pete King, Deadman Creek, Bimerick, Apgar, Glade and Rye Patch Creeks.

The area is relatively isolated and undeveloped. However, U.S. Highway 12, the only highway in central Idaho that connects Washington and Montana, carries a great deal of traffic year-round. It is the primary route for trucks hauling grain, logs and other products from Montana and the northern tier of states, as well as southern Canada, to the shipping port of Lewiston. Recreation traffic on this highway, especially in the summer, can be heavy.

Two small communities, Lowell and Syringa, Idaho lie at the southern tip of the analysis area. Lowell offers places to stay and a restaurant for highway travelers and tourists. Within a 60-mile radius of the analysis area lie the towns of Kooskia, Kamiah, Grangeville, Orofino, Pierce, Weippe, and Stites. All are primarily timber-dependent communities, whose economies are directly affected by National Forest management. The analysis area is within Idaho County, but any activity in the analysis area could also

affect those communities within adjacent Clearwater and Lewis Counties. It is a diverse landscape that offers a variety of experiences for the forest user.

The Lochsa Research Natural Area is located within the project area. The area contains a number of vegetation types that more typically occur in the Cascade Mountains, including Pacific dogwood (*Cornus nuttallii*) and at least 13 other plant species that are rarely found in inland locations. The Lochsa River, a Wild and Scenic River, is located on the eastern boundary of the project area. The area was designated as a Wild and Scenic River because of its scenery, recreation, and fish and wildlife. The Fish and Hungry Creek watersheds were identified as eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers in an amendment to the Clearwater Forest Plan (Amendment #2). A major portion of the North Lochsa Slope Roadless Area #1307 is located within the analysis area. Congress considered portions of this roadless area for wilderness in 1993 and 1994. Portions of the Lolo Trail National Historic Landmark also lie within the project area. This nationally designated historic landmark contains portions of the route used by the Lewis and Clark expedition as they crossed the Rocky Mountains to and from the Pacific Ocean in 1805 and 1806; segments of the trail used by the Nez Perce and U.S. Army during the war of 1877; and a prehistoric route used by native Americans to travel to the plains of Montana for buffalo hunting. Several sites relating to these historic and prehistoric events, among others, are located within this National Historic Landmark, and designation as a National Historic Landmark carries special management and coordination responsibilities. The area contains important sites and resources of traditional interest to the Nez Perce Tribe.

Over half of the project area burned between 1910 and 1934. These fires shape the landscape and vegetative patterns that exist today.

The Endangered gray wolf and Threatened Canada lynx are suspected to occur in the project area. Bald eagles are a winter resident along the Lochsa River. The Threatened bull trout is located throughout the Lochsa River subbasin, with major populations located in the upper Lochsa River drainage. Spring chinook salmon is found in the Lochsa River, and Threatened fall chinook salmon is found in the mainstem of the Clearwater River. Threatened Snake River Basin steelhead is located within the Clearwater River Basin. The project area includes habitat for one of the most famous and most studied elk populations in Idaho. Flammulated owl, northern goshawk, harlequin duck, belted kingfisher, moose, and pileated woodpecker are known to inhabit the project area. The project area also includes several sensitive plant species.

b. Environmental Consequences

In Chapter 3, the DSEIS includes a detailed discussion of the environmental consequences of each alternative. This section of the FSEIS briefly summarizes how strongly each alternative would respond to the purpose and need for action, and the issues that were raised by the public.

The no action alternative, by definition, does not respond to the purpose and need for action. The effects of the no action alternative serve primarily as a baseline for comparing the effects of the action alternatives to existing conditions. All of the action

alternatives respond to the purpose and need for action, although to varying degrees. The greatest differences between the alternatives results from the differences in their responses to the issues that were raised by the public.

Need for Action: There is a need to improve forest health, reduce wildfire risk, restore ecological processes, and replace patches at historic disturbance levels.

Alternatives 2, 3, 3a, 5, and 6 respond most strongly to this need because they would implement timber harvest and prescribed burning on the most acres. Alternatives 4 and 4a would manage vegetation on the fewest acres.

Need for Action: There is a need to remove off-site pine.

Alternatives 2, 3, 3a, and 6 would meet this need by clearcutting off-site pine species found in the Bimerick drainage. Alternatives 4, 4a, and 5 would not include this action.

Need for Action: There is a need to reduce stand densities and favor resilient, early seral species.

Thinning and underburning are the vegetation management activities that would be most effective at reducing stand densities, favoring early seral species as leave trees. Alternatives 2, 3, 3a, 5, and 6 would include the most acres of thinning and underburning. Alternative 4 and 4a would include fewer acres of thinning and underburning.

Need for Action: There is a need to control noxious weeds.

All of the action alternatives would include the management techniques to control noxious weeds that are described on pages 2-10 and 2-11 of the DSEIS.

Need for Action: There is a need to improve aquatic conditions.

All of the action alternatives would include road obliteration, road long-term maintenance, sediment trap removal, and riparian planting as described on pages 2-11 and 2-12 of the DSEIS. All of these actions will contribute to improved aquatic conditions in the North Lochsa Face analysis area.

Need for Action: There is a need to provide economic benefits to local communities.

Based on the number of acres that would be regeneration harvested, clearcut, commercially thinned, or salvaged, Alternatives 2, 3, 3a, and 6 respond most strongly to the need to provide economic benefits for local communities. Alternatives 4, 4a, and 5 would provide fewer economic benefits locally because they would implement timber harvest on fewer acres.

Issue: There should be no active management in the North Lochsa Face analysis area.

The only alternative that addresses this issue is the No Action Alternative. Although taking no action would address this issue, by definition, the No Action Alternative does not meet the purpose and need for action.

Issue: There should be no road construction of any kind.

Alternative 3 would respond to this issue the best of the action alternatives because it would include no road construction of any kind. Alternatives 3a, 4, 4a and 5 would not include permanent system road construction, would not construct roads of any kind in roadless areas, and would construct only 3.5 miles of temporary roads, so they would partially respond to this issue. Alternative 6 is almost the same as 3a, 4, 4a, and 5, except that it would construct only 3.2 miles of temporary roads, so Alternative 6 responds partially to this issue as well. Alternative 2 would not respond to this issue because it would include both permanent and temporary road construction.

Issue: There should be no burning of commercially value timber.

Alternative 3a responds directly to this issue by dropping units in Fish and Hungery creeks that would burn trees that have potential commercial value. Alternatives 4 and 4a also respond to this issue because they would not include these units either. However, the Fish and Hungery burning units would be included in Alternatives 2, 3, 5, and 6.

Issue: There should be no management activities in the Lochsa Research Natural Area.

Alternative 5 partially responds to this issue because it will implement prescribed burns, but not timber harvest, in inventoried roadless areas. Alternatives 2, 3, 3a, and 6 would include both timber harvest and prescribed burning within inventoried roadless areas, the Lochsa Research Natural Area, and the Lochsa Wild and Scenic River Corridor, so they do not respond to this issue. All the action alternatives except for Alternatives 4 and 4a would include these burning units that are within the Lochsa Research Natural Area: Unit 23 (180 acre prescribed burn), Unit 227 (339 out of 387 acres of underburning), Unit 229 (63 acres of underburning), and Unit 230 (84 acres of underburning). Alternatives 4 and 4a would not implement prescribed burns or timber harvest in inventoried roadless areas, and in addition, Alternative 4a would drop a burning unit that is in the Lochsa Wild and Scenic River Corridor.

Issue: There should be no timber harvest in inventoried roadless areas.

Alternatives 4, 4a, and 5 respond to this issue because they would include no timber harvest in roadless areas. Alternative 5 would include prescribed burning in inventoried roadless areas. Alternatives 2, 3, 3a, and 6 would include both timber harvest and prescribed burning in inventoried roadless areas.

Issue: There should be no old growth harvest.

Alternative 6 would not include any timber harvest in old growth. Alternative 2 would harvest the most old growth. Alternatives 3, 3a, 4, 4a, and 5 would harvest some old

growth, but less than Alternative 2. Alternative 5 Modified, the selected action, would not harvest any old growth.

Issue: There should be no effects on lynx habitat

Alternative 6 was developed by the IDT to eliminate all precommercial thinning in lynx habitat; 295 acres of precommercial thinning were dropped from Alternative 6, leaving a total of 995 acres of precommercial thinning. The other action alternatives would include 1,290 acres of precommercial thinning, including 295 acres of precommercial thinning in lynx habitat.

The following table compares the alternatives to each other by the issues they respond to. It also appears in the DSEIS, on page 2-37.

Table FSEIS-1: Comparison of Alternatives by Issues*

Issue	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 3a	Alt 4**	Alt 5	Alt 6
Roadless Area Activities							
Regeneration Harvest	0	450	290	290	0	0	435
Commercial Thin	0	190	190	190	0	0	190
Off-site harvest	0	2,220	2,220	2,220	0	0	2,220
Total Roadless Harvest Acres	0	2,860	2,700	2,700	0	0	2,845
Mixed Severity Burn	0	4,950	4,950	925	0	4,950	5,125
Underburn	0	6,030	6,030	5,755	0	6,030	6,170
Total Roadless Burn Acres		10,980	10,980	6,680	0	10,980	11,295
Permanent Road (Miles)	0	1.1	0	0	0	0	0
Temporary Road (Miles)		.25	0	0	0	0	0
Commercial Harvest vs. Prescribed Fire							
Timber harvest	0	8,065	7,410	7,905	4,875	4,875	7,320
Mixed severity burn	0	5,485	5,485	925	0	5,485	5,655
Underburn	0	7,045	7,045	6,635	705	7,045	7,180
Road construction							
System Road (Miles)	0	1.1	0	0	0	0	0
Temporary Road (Miles)	0	3.7	0	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.2
Old Growth							
Regeneration	0	215	87	166	166	166	0
Commercial Thin	0	464	421	464	464	464	0
Salvage	0	137	137	137	137	137	0
Harvest or Burning Within Lochsa W&S River Corridor							
Regeneration	0	235	235	235	0	0	235
Mixed Severity Fire	0	555	555	680	0	550	690
Underburn	0	130	130	130	35*	130	130
Helicopter landings (each)	0	2	2	2	0	2	2

*In acres (unless otherwise indicated). Acres have been rounded to the nearest 5.

**Under Alternative 4a, no burning would be done in the Lochsa Wild and Scenic River Corridor