



United States Department of Agriculture

Stonewall Vegetation Project FEIS Errata



Forest Service

Helena
National Forest

1

Lincoln
Ranger District

April 2015

These following missing items or edits are errata to be inserted into the Stonewall Vegetation Project FEIS in the listed locations:

1. Abstract, title page, replace the second paragraph, which currently reads:

“Alternative 2 proposes a total of 8,564 acres (about 36 percent of analysis area) of commercial and noncommercial treatments. Harvest treatments (regeneration harvest, intermediate harvest, and precommercial thinning) are proposed on a total of 3,099 acres. Fuels treatments would follow timber removals, including slashing, pile burning, jackpot burning, and underburning. In addition to post-harvest burning, prescribed fire is also proposed within the inventoried roadless areas (IRAs) to promote ecological restoration of a mix of vegetation composition and structure across the landscape. Prescribed fire is proposed on 4,182 acres (about 0.5 percent) within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan Inventoried Roadless Area and on 664 acres (about 3.8 percent) within the Lincoln Gulch Inventoried Roadless Area. Outside of the IRAs, approximately 2.6 miles of road would be built then obliterated immediately following timber removal. Treatments proposed under alternative 2 would reduce elk hiding and thermal cover in both the Beaver Creek and Keep Cool Creek herd units, whereas the amount and distribution of forage would increase. Neither herd unit would meet Forest Plan standard 3 or 4a. This alternative would require a site-specific, nonsignificant forest plan amendment for standards 3 and 4(a) for the reductions in elk hiding cover and thermal cover.”

With the following paragraph (changes in **bold**):

“Alternative 2 proposes a total of 8,564 acres (about 36 percent of analysis area) of commercial and noncommercial treatments. Harvest treatments (regeneration harvest, intermediate harvest, and precommercial thinning) are proposed on a total of 3,099 acres. Fuels treatments would follow timber removals, including slashing, pile burning, jackpot burning, and underburning. In addition to post-harvest burning, prescribed fire is also proposed within the inventoried roadless areas (IRAs) to promote ecological restoration of a mix of vegetation composition and structure across the landscape. Prescribed fire is proposed on 4,182 acres (about 0.5 percent) within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan Inventoried Roadless Area and on 664 acres (about 3.8 percent) within the Lincoln Gulch Inventoried Roadless Area. Outside of the IRAs, approximately 2.6 miles of road would be built then obliterated immediately following timber removal. Treatments proposed under alternative 2 would reduce elk hiding and thermal cover in both the Beaver Creek and Keep Cool Creek herd units, whereas the amount and distribution of forage would increase. Neither herd unit would meet Forest Plan standard 3 or 4a. This alternative would require a site-specific, nonsignificant forest plan amendment for standards 3 and 4(a) for the reductions in elk hiding cover and thermal cover **as well as elk standards for thermal and hiding cover in Management Areas T-2 and T-3.**”

2. Abstract, title page, replace the third paragraph, which currently reads:

“Alternative 3 proposes a total of 6,564 acres (about 27 percent of analysis area) of commercial and noncommercial treatments. Harvest treatments (regeneration harvest, intermediate harvest, and precommercial thinning) are proposed on a total of 2,298 acres. Fuels treatments would follow timber removals, including slashing, pile burning, jackpot burning, and underburning. In addition to post-harvest burning, prescribed fire is proposed within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan Inventoried Roadless Area to promote ecological restoration of a mix of vegetation composition and structure across the landscape. Prescribed fire is proposed on 3,565 acres (about 0.4 percent) within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan Inventoried Roadless Area. The Lincoln Gulch Inventoried Roadless Area would not be treated. Outside of the IRAs, approximately 0.4 mile of road would be built then obliterated immediately following timber removal. Treatments

proposed under alternative 3 would reduce elk hiding and thermal cover in both the Beaver Creek and Keep Cool Creek herd units, whereas the amount and distribution of forage would increase. Neither herd unit would meet Forest Plan standard 3 or 4a. This alternative would require a site-specific, nonsignificant forest plan amendment for standards 3 and 4(a) for the reductions in elk hiding cover and thermal cover.

With the following paragraph (changes in **bold**):

Alternative 3 proposes a total of 6,564 acres (about 27 percent of analysis area) of commercial and noncommercial treatments. Harvest treatments (regeneration harvest, intermediate harvest, and precommercial thinning) are proposed on a total of 2,298 acres. Fuels treatments would follow timber removals, including slashing, pile burning, jackpot burning, and underburning. In addition to post-harvest burning, prescribed fire is proposed within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan Inventoried Roadless Area to promote ecological restoration of a mix of vegetation composition and structure across the landscape. Prescribed fire is proposed on 3,565 acres (about 0.4 percent) within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan Inventoried Roadless Area. The Lincoln Gulch Inventoried Roadless Area would not be treated. Outside of the IRAs, approximately 0.4 mile of road would be built then obliterated immediately following timber removal. Treatments proposed under alternative 3 would reduce elk hiding and thermal cover in both the Beaver Creek and Keep Cool Creek herd units, whereas the amount and distribution of forage would increase. Neither herd unit would meet Forest Plan standard 3 or 4a. This alternative would require a site-specific, nonsignificant forest plan amendment for standards 3 and 4(a) for the reductions in elk hiding cover and thermal cover **as well as elk standards for thermal and hiding cover in Management Areas T-2 and T-3.**"

3. Page ix, replace the second paragraph under the heading "Alternative 2 - The Proposed Action", which currently reads:

"Alternative 2 proposes a total of 8,564 acres of commercial and noncommercial treatments. Harvest treatments (regeneration harvest, intermediate harvest, and precommercial thinning) are proposed on a total of 3,099 acres. Fuels treatments would follow timber removals, including slashing, pile burning, jackpot burning, and underburning. In addition to post-harvest burning, prescribed fire is proposed within the inventoried roadless areas (IRAs) to promote ecological restoration of a mix of vegetation composition and structure across the landscape. Prescribed fire is proposed on 4,182 acres (about 0.5 percent) within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan Inventoried Roadless Area and on 664 acres (about 3.8 percent) within the Lincoln Gulch Inventoried Roadless Area. To help facilitate management, outside these IRAs approximately 2.6 miles of road would be built then obliterated immediately following timber removal."

With the following paragraph (changes in **bold**):

"Alternative 2 proposes a total of 8,564 acres of commercial and noncommercial treatments. Harvest treatments (regeneration harvest, intermediate harvest, and precommercial thinning) are proposed on a total of 3,099 acres. **Proposed regeneration harvest units exceed 40 acres in seven units. All of the units have been severely impacted by recent mountain pine beetle mortality and are exempt from 60-day review and Regional Forester approval as described in FSM 1900-2006-2. (FSM R1 Supplement 2400-2001-2). The Stonewall Vegetation Project EIS 45-day comment period serves to notify the public and is sufficient in documenting the need for the unit size (See also FEIS, Appendix B, page 224).** Fuels treatments would follow timber removals, including slashing, pile burning, jackpot burning, and underburning. In addition to post-harvest burning, prescribed fire is proposed within the inventoried roadless areas

(IRAs) to promote ecological restoration of a mix of vegetation composition and structure across the landscape. Prescribed fire is proposed on 4,182 acres (about 0.5 percent) within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan Inventoried Roadless Area and on 664 acres (about 3.8 percent) within the Lincoln Gulch Inventoried Roadless Area. To help facilitate management, outside these IRAs approximately 2.6 miles of road would be built then obliterated immediately following timber removal.”

4. Page ix, replace the second paragraph under the heading “Alternative 3”, which currently reads:

“Alternative 3 proposes a total of 6,564 acres of commercial and noncommercial treatments. Harvest treatments (regeneration harvest, intermediate harvest, and precommercial thinning) are proposed on a total of 2,298 acres. Fuels treatments would follow timber removals and include slashing, pile burning, jackpot burning, and underburning. In addition to post-harvest burning, prescribed fire is proposed within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan Inventoried Roadless Area to promote ecological restoration of a mix of vegetation composition and structure across the landscape. Prescribed fire is proposed on 3,565 acres (about 0.4 percent) within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan IRA. The Lincoln Gulch IRA would not be treated. To help facilitate management, outside these IRAs approximately 0.4 mile of road would be built then obliterated immediately following timber removal.”

With the following paragraph (changes in bold):

“Alternative 3 proposes a total of 6,564 acres of commercial and noncommercial treatments. Harvest treatments (regeneration harvest, intermediate harvest, and precommercial thinning) are proposed on a total of 2,298 acres. **Proposed regeneration harvest units exceed 40 acres in seven units (Vegetation analysis report, appendix L, project record). All of the units have been severely impacted by recent mountain pine beetle mortality and are exempt from 60-day review and Regional Forester approval as described in FSM 1900-2006-2. (FSM R1 Supplement 2400-2001-2). The Stonewall Vegetation Project EIS 45-day comment period serves to notify the public and is sufficient in documenting the need for the unit size (See also Appendix B, page 230).** Fuels treatments would follow timber removals and include slashing, pile burning, jackpot burning, and underburning. In addition to post-harvest burning, prescribed fire is proposed within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan Inventoried Roadless Area to promote ecological restoration of a mix of vegetation composition and structure across the landscape. Prescribed fire is proposed on 3,565 acres (about 0.4 percent) within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan IRA. The Lincoln Gulch IRA would not be treated. To help facilitate management, outside these IRAs approximately 0.4 mile of road would be built then obliterated immediately following timber removal.”

5. Page XX, “Elk” row in Effects Determination table under “Commonly Hunted Species”, Replace first paragraph in column 3 (“Alternative 2”), which reads:

“Treatments proposed under alternative 2 would reduce elk hiding and thermal cover in both herd units, whereas the amount and distribution of forage would increase. Neither herd unit would meet Forest Plan standard 3 or 4a. This alternative would require a site-specific, non-significant forest plan amendment for standards 3 and 4(a) for the reductions in elk hiding cover and thermal cover.”

With the following paragraph (changes in bold):

“Treatments proposed under alternative 2 would reduce elk hiding and thermal cover in both herd units, whereas the amount and distribution of forage would increase. Neither herd unit would meet Forest Plan standard 3 or 4a. This alternative would require a site-specific, non-significant forest plan amendment for standards 3 and 4(a) for the reductions in elk hiding cover and thermal cover **as well as elk standards for thermal and hiding cover in Management Areas T-2 and T-3.**”

6. Page XX, “Elk” row in Effects Determination table under “Commonly Hunted Species”.
Replace first paragraph in column 4 (“Alternative 3”), which reads:

“Treatments proposed under alternative 3 would reduce elk hiding and thermal cover in both herd units, whereas the amount and distribution of forage would increase. Neither herd unit would meet Forest Plan standard 3 or 4a. This alternative would require a site-specific, non-significant forest plan amendment for standards 3 and 4(a) for the reductions in elk hiding cover and thermal cover.”

With the following paragraph (changes in bold):

“Treatments proposed under alternative 3 would reduce elk hiding and thermal cover in both herd units, whereas the amount and distribution of forage would increase. Neither herd unit would meet Forest Plan standard 3 or 4a. This alternative would require a site-specific, non-significant forest plan amendment for standards 3 and 4(a) for the reductions in elk hiding cover and thermal cover **as well as elk standards for thermal and hiding cover in Management Areas T-2 and T-3.**”

7. Page 4, replace the third paragraph under the heading “Regulatory Framework”, which currently reads:

“**The National Forest Management Act** (NFMA) of 1976 governs vegetation management on national forest lands. Several sections in the act, and its accompanying regulations (USDA Forest Service, 1982), specifically address terms and conditions relevant to the vegetation resource. These include sections on timber suitability and management requirements for vegetative manipulation, including tree regeneration timeframes and opening size limits.”

With the following paragraph (changes in bold):

“**The National Forest Management Act** (NFMA) of 1976 governs vegetation management on national forest lands. Several sections in the act, and its accompanying regulations (USDA Forest Service, 1982), specifically address terms and conditions relevant to the vegetation resource. These include sections on timber suitability and management requirements for vegetative manipulation, including tree regeneration timeframes and opening size limits. **Proposed regeneration harvest units exceed 40 acres in seven units. All of the units have been severely impacted by recent mountain pine beetle mortality and are exempt from 60-day review and Regional Forester approval as described in FSM 1900-2006-2. (FSM R1 Supplement 2400-2001-2). The Stonewall Vegetation Project EIS 45-day comment period serves to notify the public and is sufficient in documenting the need for the unit size (See also Appendix B, pages 224 and 230).**”

8. Page 24, replace the fourth paragraph under the heading “Proposed Action”, which currently reads:

“Implementing the proposed action could include the use of chainsaws, feller-bunchers, and cable logging equipment. Post treatment activities would include underburning, site preparation burning, jackpot burning, hand piling and burning, tree planting, and monitoring of regeneration. In all the areas proposed for burning, the opening size may exceed 40 acres due to the amount of mortality created by the bark beetles and the resulting need for regeneration.”

With the following paragraph (changes in **bold**):

“Implementing the proposed action could include the use of chainsaws, feller-bunchers, and cable logging equipment. Post treatment activities would include underburning, site preparation burning, jackpot burning, hand piling and burning, tree planting, and monitoring of regeneration. In all the areas proposed for burning, the opening size may exceed 40 acres due to the amount of mortality created by the bark beetles and the resulting need for regeneration. **Proposed regeneration harvest units exceed 40 acres in seven units (Vegetation analysis report, appendix L, project record). All of the units have been severely impacted by recent mountain pine beetle mortality and are exempt from 60-day review and Regional Forester approval as described in FSM 1900-2006-2. (FSM R1 Supplement 2400-2001-2). The Stonewall Vegetation Project EIS 45-day comment period serves to notify the public and is sufficient in documenting the need for the unit size.**”

9. Page 29, under the heading “Addressed by Design Features or Evaluated for Comparison“, insert the following paragraph between paragraphs 1 and 2:

“40 Acre Opening Limit: Proposed regeneration harvest units exceed 40 acres in seven units (appendix L). All of the units have been severely impacted by recent mountain pine beetle mortality and are exempt from 60-day review and Regional Forester approval as described in FSM 1900-2006-2. (FSM R1 Supplement 2400-2001-2). The Stonewall Vegetation Project EIS 45-day comment period serves to notify the public and is sufficient in documenting the need for the unit size.”

10. Page 33, replace the second paragraph under the heading “Alternative 2- The Proposed Action”, which currently reads:

“Alternative 2 proposes a total of 8,564 acres of commercial and noncommercial treatments. Harvest treatments (regeneration harvest, intermediate harvest, and precommercial thinning) are proposed on a total of 3,099 acres. Fuels treatments would follow timber removals, including slashing, pile burning, jackpot burning, and underburning. In addition to post-harvest burning, prescribed fire is proposed within the inventoried roadless areas (IRA) to promote ecological restoration of a mix of vegetation composition and structure across the landscape. Prescribed fire is proposed on approximately 4,182 acres (about 0.5 percent) within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan Inventoried Roadless Areas and on 664 acres (about 3.8 percent) within the Lincoln Gulch Inventoried Roadless Areas. To help facilitate management, outside of these IRAs approximately 2.6 miles of road would be built then obliterated immediately following timber removal.”

With the following paragraph (changes in **bold**):

“Alternative 2 proposes a total of 8,564 acres of commercial and noncommercial treatments. Harvest treatments (regeneration harvest, intermediate harvest, and precommercial thinning) are proposed on a total of 3,099 acres. **Proposed regeneration harvest units exceed 40 acres in seven units (Vegetation analysis report, appendix L, project record). All of the units have**

been severely impacted by recent mountain pine beetle mortality and are exempt from 60-day review and Regional Forester approval as described in FSM 1900-2006-2. (FSM R1 Supplement 2400-2001-2). The Stonewall Vegetation Project EIS 45-day comment period serves to notify the public and is sufficient in documenting the need for the unit size.” Fuels treatments would follow timber removals, including slashing, pile burning, jackpot burning, and underburning. In addition to post-harvest burning, prescribed fire is proposed within the inventoried roadless areas (IRA) to promote ecological restoration of a mix of vegetation composition and structure across the landscape. Prescribed fire is proposed on approximately 4,182 acres (about 0.5 percent) within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan Inventoried Roadless Areas and on 664 acres (about 3.8 percent) within the Lincoln Gulch Inventoried Roadless Areas. To help facilitate management, outside of these IRAs approximately 2.6 miles of road would be built then obliterated immediately following timber removal.”

11. Page 39, replace the second paragraph under the heading “Alternative 3”, which currently reads:

“Alternative 3 proposes a total of 6,564 acres of commercial and noncommercial treatments. Harvest treatments (regeneration harvest, intermediate harvest, and precommercial thinning) are proposed on a total of 2,298 acres. Fuels treatments would follow timber removals and include slashing, pile burning, jackpot burning, and underburning. In addition to post-harvest burning, prescribed fire is proposed within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan Inventoried Roadless Areas to promote ecological restoration of a mix of vegetation composition and structure across the landscape. Prescribed fire is proposed on 3,565 acres (about 0.4 percent) within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan Inventoried Roadless Areas. The Lincoln Gulch Inventoried Roadless Areas would not be treated. To help facilitate management, outside the IRAs approximately 0.4 mile of road would be built then obliterated immediately following timber removal.”

With the following paragraph (changes in bold):

“Alternative 3 proposes a total of 6,564 acres of commercial and noncommercial treatments. Harvest treatments (regeneration harvest, intermediate harvest, and precommercial thinning) are proposed on a total of 2,298 acres. **Proposed regeneration harvest units exceed 40 acres in seven units (Vegetation analysis report, appendix L, project record). All of the units have been severely impacted by recent mountain pine beetle mortality and are exempt from 60-day review and Regional Forester approval as described in FSM 1900-2006-2. (FSM R1 Supplement 2400-2001-2). The Stonewall Vegetation Project EIS 45-day comment period serves to notify the public and is sufficient in documenting the need for the unit size (See also FEIS, Appendix B, page 230).** Fuels treatments would follow timber removals and include slashing, pile burning, jackpot burning, and underburning. In addition to post-harvest burning, prescribed fire is proposed within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan Inventoried Roadless Areas to promote ecological restoration of a mix of vegetation composition and structure across the landscape. Prescribed fire is proposed on 3,565 acres (about 0.4 percent) within the Bear Marshall Scapegoat Swan Inventoried Roadless Areas. The Lincoln Gulch Inventoried Roadless Areas would not be treated. To help facilitate management, outside the IRAs approximately 0.4 mile of road would be built then obliterated immediately following timber removal.”

12. Page 76, “Elk” row in Effects Determination table under “Commonly Hunted Species”, Replace first paragraph in column 3 (“Alternative 2”), which reads:

“Treatments proposed under alternative 2 would reduce elk hiding and thermal cover in both herd units, whereas the amount and distribution of forage would increase. Neither herd unit would

meet Forest Plan standard 3 or 4a. This alternative would require a site-specific, non-significant forest plan amendment for standards 3 and 4(a) for the reductions in elk hiding cover and thermal cover.”

With the following paragraph (changes in **bold**):

“Treatments proposed under alternative 2 would reduce elk hiding and thermal cover in both herd units, whereas the amount and distribution of forage would increase. Neither herd unit would meet Forest Plan standard 3 or 4a. This alternative would require a site-specific, non-significant forest plan amendment for standards 3 and 4(a) for the reductions in elk hiding cover and thermal cover **as well as elk standards for thermal and hiding cover in Management Areas T-2 and T-3.**”

13. Page 76, “Elk” row in Effects Determination table under “Commonly Hunted Species”, Replace first paragraph in column 3 (“Alternative 3”), which reads:

“Treatments proposed under alternative 3 would reduce elk hiding and thermal cover in both herd units, whereas the amount and distribution of forage would increase. Neither herd unit would meet Forest Plan standard 3 or 4a. This alternative would require a site-specific, non-significant forest plan amendment for standards 3 and 4(a) for the reductions in elk hiding cover and thermal cover.”

With the following paragraph (changes in **bold**):

“Treatments proposed under alternative 3 would reduce elk hiding and thermal cover in both herd units, whereas the amount and distribution of forage would increase. Neither herd unit would meet Forest Plan standard 3 or 4a. This alternative would require a site-specific, non-significant forest plan amendment for standards 3 and 4(a) for the reductions in elk hiding cover and thermal cover **as well as elk standards for thermal and hiding cover in Management Areas T-2 and T-3.**”

14. Page 695, replace the third paragraph, which currently reads:

“Big game security habitat under the action alternatives would be reduced, causing short-term habitat degradation. If an action alternative is selected, a site-specific forest plan amendment would be required for Forest Plan standards 3 and 4a (FP pgs. II/17-18). The treatments would allow the development of healthy, more vigorous stands that are more sustainable for those habitat values in the long term. These effects are discussed in the Commonly Hunted Species section of this chapter.”

With the following paragraph (changes in **bold**):

“Big game security habitat under the action alternatives would be reduced, causing short-term habitat degradation. If an action alternative is selected, a site-specific forest plan amendment would be required for Forest Plan standards 3 and 4a (FP pgs. II/17-18) **as well as elk standards for thermal and hiding cover in Management Areas T-2 and T-3.** The treatments would allow the development of healthy, more vigorous stands that are more sustainable for those habitat values in the long term. These effects are discussed in the Commonly Hunted Species section of this chapter.”

15. Add Appendix F: Appendix F: “Helena National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan Non-significant, Site-Specific Forest Plan Amendment - Stonewall Vegetation Project” will be added to the appendices.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (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 USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer