

McCaslin DEIS
Errata

1. Map 4 of Alternative 3 included a number of even-aged harvests that are included as part of Alternative 2. A corrected map showing the correct Alternative 3 activities for that area now replaces the earlier erroneous version.
2. The existing estimated ruffed grouse population shown in Table 3.7-1 (p. 51, DEIS) is incorrect. The figure given (337) is the estimated number of drumming males per 100 acres. The corrected estimated ruffed grouse population is 2,016 birds. See the response to Comment 7F (EIS Appendix I) for further explanation.
3. Golden-winged warbler (GWWA) population estimates in Tables 4.7.1b and 2.5-7 for Alternative 2 of the DEIS were miscalculated. The corrected estimated population is 293 birds, which would be a decline of 9 birds from the existing condition. This recalculation also affects data in Table 4.7b. The corrected GWWA estimated population decline in Alternative 2 is 3.1 %. Alternative 2 would result in the 3rd highest estimated population compared to the other alternatives.
4. McCaslin DEIS Appendix D contained an incomplete statement on page 38 which resulted in confusion to at least one respondent. In the DEIS, the statement reads, “1,770 acres of potential cerulean warbler habitat was identified within the MPA by GIS habitat analysis”.
This statement is now corrected to read as follows:
“1,770 acres of potential cerulean warbler habitat **that had proposed harvest treatments** was identified within the MPA by GIS habitat analysis”.
5. Section 4.14 of the McCaslin DEIS concluded that Alternatives 2 and 4 would limit Forest Plan Revision options by creating 260 and 585 acres of temporary openings, respectively. At the time the McCaslin DEIS was being prepared, a Proposed Land and Resource Management Plan for the Chequamegon-Nicolet was not available. Early assumptions in the McCaslin DEIS were made which were since found to be incorrect.

Since the McCaslin DEIS was issued, a Proposed Chequamegon-Nicolet NF Land and Resource Management Plan and DEIS (4/11/03) was released. A review of Management Areas 2A, 2B, and 2C in the Proposed Plan (pp. 3-7 through 3-10) show that neither level of additional openings would result in any apparent conflict with Management Area goals, standards or guidelines proposed in the Forest Plan revision effort. Management Area goals under revision MA’s 2A, 2B and 2C allow for, and desire, some management of early seral habitats. All three MA’s allow for small amounts of temporary openings up to 40 acres in size (see response to Comment 10 C, Appendix I).

McCaslin DEIS section 4.14 conclusions are now changed to read:
 Based upon comparison of effects of McCaslin proposed and alternative actions, there would be no inconsistency or apparent conflict with Alternatives being considered in the effort to refine the 1986 Forest Plans (see McCaslin Project File Section BB).

6. The following text has been added to Section 1.6 – Public Involvement:

“On November 1, 2002, a letter was sent to all of those people who had previously commented on or otherwise showed interest in the McCaslin Project. The letter asked each recipient which format of the McCaslin Draft Environmental Impact Statement they would prefer.

On February 21, 2003, a copy of the DEIS, a summary of the DEIS, or a web address where it could be found was mailed to approximately 113 parties for comment. A Notice of Availability of an EIS was published in the Federal Register on March 7, 2003. Also published on March 7 was a legal notice in the Rhinelander Daily News.

In response to the DEIS, 12 responses were received during the 45-day comment period. Summaries of these comments and responses to those comments are attached to this document.

Modifications were made to the DEIS as a result of some of the public comments and this Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) is the result of these changes.”

7. Appendix I – Responses to Comments on the DEIS has been added to the EIS.
8. Portions of Tables 2.5-3 and 2.5-4 were corrected to read as follows:

Table 2.5-2: Desired Future Conditions, Existing Conditions, and outcomes for MA 1.1/1.2: Mixed forests with a large aspen component (4638 acres)

Vegetative Type	Lakewood Portion (values in percentages)						
	DFC	Existing	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5
Hardwoods	13	12.4	12.4	14.8	12.4	10.0	13.2
White Birch	8	7.8	7.8	4.7	7.8	6.9	6.0
Aspen	63	48.3	48.3	49.1	48.3	52.2	49.4
Vegetative Type	Laona Portion (values in percentages)						
	DFC	Existing	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5
White Spruce	1	18.4	18.4	18.4	18.4	15.0	18.4
Hardwoods	37	27.7	27.7	27.7	29.8	24.5	37.2
Aspen	52	48.6	48.6	48.6	46.4	55.2	39.1

Table 2.5-3: Desired Future Conditions, Existing Conditions, and outcomes for MA 3.1/3.2: Even-aged hardwood forests managed for large sawtimber (13,945 acres)

Vegetative Type	Lakewood Portion (values in percentages)						
	DFC	Existing	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5
Hardwoods	32	29.4	29.4	31.6	30.2	25.6	30.6
White Birch	4	3.0	3.0	1.7	3.0	2.7	2.7
Aspen	28	49.4	49.4	49.1	48.6	54.1	49.2

Vegetative Type	Laona Portion (values in percentages)						
	DFC	Existing	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5
White Spruce	2	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	3.4	2.1
Hardwoods	53	66.0	66.0	66.2	67.2	61.5	68.7
Aspen	29	23.6	23.6	23.4	22.4	26.8	20.9

Table 2.5-4: Desired Future Conditions, Existing Conditions, and outcomes for MA 4.1/4.2: Upland softwood forest managed for pulpwood and sawtimber (2,954 acres)

Vegetative Type	Laona Portion (values in percentages)						
	DFC	Existing	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5
White Spruce	8	33.4	33.4	33.4	33.4	28.6	33.4
Hardwoods	23	21.9	21.9	21.9	22.9	15.5	22.9
Aspen	20	32.6	32.6	32.6	31.6	43.8	31.6