

Ruby Copper Errata (Wildlife)

p. 2-19 – Road 2509-UG (0.15 miles) will not be decommissioned (access to gravel pit). Also wrong on map on p. 2-22.

p. 2-19 – Road 2527-FDR should also have 0.55 miles in “Storage” column.

p. 2-21 – Road 2529-UB should also have 0.87 miles in “Storage” column.

p. 2-28 – Fisher (Alternative 3) should say: “Reduction of 30% suitable denning habitat. Longer-term (70-80 years) change to moderate quality subdrainage status.”

p. 4-45 – A minor change in calculated road miles gives the final data for Table 4-10:

	Existing miles/density {miles/(mi/mi <sup>2</sup> )}	Mission Brush {miles}	Northern Prairie {miles}	Ruby Copper {miles}	Final miles/density {miles/(mi/mi <sup>2</sup> )}
<u>During Implementation</u>					
Open roads	101.1 (2.4)	-	-	-	No change*
Total roads	111.4 (2.6)	+0.55	+0.75	+2.6	115.3 (2.7)
<u>After Implementation</u>					
Open roads	101.1 (2.4)	-5.4	-0.6	-6.0	89.1 (2.1)
Total roads	111.4 (2.6)	-5.4	-0.6	-8.7	96.8 (2.3)

Road densities rounded to nearest 0.1 mi/mi<sup>2</sup> remain unchanged.

p. 4-45 – Last sentence of “Conclusion” paragraph should read: “As a result, Alternatives 2 and 4 are unlikely to cause adverse impacts to grizzly bears or their habitat. However, under Alternative 3 continuous disturbance (helicopter logging) over several seasons along a ridge system that forms the western boundary of the Cabinet-Yaak Recovery Zone (units CS08, CS09 and CS17) could potentially have adverse effects on grizzly bears that may be present.”

p. 4-69 – Paragraph 3 is edited for clarity as follows: “This alternative proposes even-aged regeneration harvest (approximately 89 acres) and group selection harvest (approximately 73 acres) of mature forest in general goshawk habitat. As a result, the 89 acres of even-aged harvest would initially be converted to the “open” structural stage, and would progress to the “seed/sapling” stage once reforestation is confirmed (usually within 5 years of harvest). Group selection harvest units would retain sufficient canopy cover to remain in the “mature” size class, although small openings (groups) may cover up to ½ of the area of these stands (an additional ~1%). Commercial thin/sanitation salvage would leave a contiguous overstory canopy in affected stands, and these stands would remain in the “mature” size class.”

Literature Cited – add the following references:

Bush, R. and R. Lundburg. 2008. Wildlife habitat estimates for the Region 1 conservation assessment. Region 1 Vegetation Classification, Inventory, and Analysis Report. 22 pp.

McCallum D.A. and F.R. Gehlbach. 1988. Nest site preferences of flammulated owls in western New Mexico. Condor 90:653-661.

Pilliod, D.S., E.L. Bull, J.L. Hayes, and B.C. Wales. 2006. Wildlife and invertebrate response to fuel reduction treatments in dry coniferous forests of the Western United States: a synthesis. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-173. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 34 p.

Reynolds, R.T., R.T. Graham and D.A. Boyce, Jr. 2008. Northern Goshawk Habitat: an Intersection of Science, Management, and Conservation. J. Wildl. Manage. 72(4):1047-1055.

Samson, F. 2006b. Habitat Estimates For Maintaining Viable Populations of the Northern Goshawk, Black-backed Woodpecker, Flammulated Owl, Pileated Woodpecker, American Marten, and Fisher. Unpublished report on file, Northern Region, Missoula, Montana. 24 pp.

Servheen C., J.S. Waller and P. Sandstrom. 2001. Identification and management of linkage zones for grizzly bears between the large blocks of public land in the Northern Rocky Mountains. *in*: Proceedings of the 2001 International Conference on Ecology and Transportation. C.L. Irwin, P. Garrett, and K.P. McDermott.(eds.). Center for Transportation and the Environment, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC: pp. 161-179.

Smallwood, K. S. 1999. Scale domains of abundance amongst species of mammalian Carnivora. Environmental Management 26: 102-111. *cited in* Samson (2006b).

p. A-11 – add this statement under “*Rationale for No Further Analysis*”: “On July 18, 2008, the U.S. Federal District Court in Missoula, Montana, issued an order immediately reinstating Endangered Species Act protections for wolves in the northern Rocky Mountains. In September 2008, the Service requested the court vacate and remand the final delisting rule back to the Service. The court granted the Service's request on October 13, 2008. It was determined that the Ruby Copper project would have *no effect* on gray wolf.”

p. B-1 – “Determination of Effects” for grizzly bear should be “May effect, not likely to adversely affect.”