FEIS Errata

This document corrects erroneous information published in the Bitterroot National Forest Burned Area Recovery Final Environmental Impact Statement and Summary.

FEIS Abstract (Cover Sheet)

Alternative D should say 59,639 acres, Alternative E should say 19,831 acres and Alternative G should say 9414 acres.

FEIS Summary

Page S-2, under current fuel conditions, 1st paragraph, last sentence; "Current fuel load estimates have been made for…

Total Employment number for Alternative F in Table S-18 on pg. S-29 should be 4,097.

FEIS Chapter 2

In the mitigation measures to preserve and protect fisheries habitat on pages 2-26 and 2-27 (FEIS Volume 1), and the Mitigation/Monitoring Plan (FEIS Volume 2, Appendix C-12), the RHCA buffer widths for Alternatives E, F, and G should be:

- within 300 feet of fish-bearing streams
- within 200 feet of permanently flowing streams that do not have fish
- within 200 feet of intermittent streams
- within 150 feet of ponds, lakes, or wetlands > 1 acre
- within 100 feet of ponds, lakes, or wetlands < 1 acre
- within 100 feet of landslide prone areas

On page 2-17 of the FEIS, the RHCA buffer table should be corrected to read:

Class	INFISH	Alt E
Perennial, fish bearing	300	300
Perennial, non-fish	150	200
Intermittent – priority watersheds	100	200
Intermittent – non-priority watersheds	50	200
Ponds, lakes, or wetlands > 1 acre	150	150
Ponds, lakes, or wetlands < 1 acre	100	100
Landslide prone areas	100	100

Page 2-29; mitigation "provide wildlife habitat." Replace first sentence with " Some islands of live trees occur within fuel reduction activity units burned at high or moderate severity."

Page 2-30; fifth mitigation measure under "Meet Visual Quality Objectives" should read, "The skyline portions of units 5, 49, 59…".

Page 2-47; Watershed modeling numbers summarized in Chapter 2 (Table 2-18) was changed to reflect correction listed under Chapter 3 below. Table 2-18 shows 6th level HUCs containing MTDEQ 1996 and 2000 303(d) stream segments and estimated net (ton/yr) and change in sediment from existing, by alternative. Percentage change from existing is listed in parentheses. (PF-Watershed-41, Table 6).

Table 2-18– 303(d) Stream Segments and Estimated Net Change in Sediment (ton/yr), Revised

HUC	Stream	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E	Alt F	Alt G
1005	Upper Blodgett	0.0	- 0.4 (0.0%)	- 0.4 (0.0%)	- 0.4 (0.0%)	- 0.3 (0.0%)	- 0.4 (0.0%)	- 0.4 (0.0%)
1101	Lower Blodgett, Sheafman, Mill	0.0	23.0 (2.0%)	- 3.1 (0.0%)	22.2 (2.0%)	18.3 (1.3%)	32.3 (2.0%)	- 3.2 (0.0%)
0801	Rye	0.0	367.8 (0.3%)	-60.0 (0.0%)	430.5 (3.0%)	129.0 (1.0%)	348.6 (2.0%)	-70.0 (-1.0%)
0901	S. Fk. Skalkaho, Weasel	0.0	96.4 (3.0%)	-14.2 (0.0%)	120.1 (4.0%)	-7.5 (0.0%)	92.8 (3.0%)	-19.6 (-1.0%)
0902	Daly, Falls	0.0	-1.7 (0.0%)	-1.7 (0.0%)	-1.7 (0.0%)	0.0 (0.0%)	-4.3 (-1.0%)	-1.8 (0.0%)
0903	Middle Skalkaho	0.0	11.9 (1.0%)	0.0 (0.0%)	15.1 (1.0%)	0.7 (0.0%)	8.9 (1.0%)	0.0 (0.0%)
0701	S. Fk. Sleeping Child	0.0	31.5 (2.0%)	-1.6 (0.0%)	31.5 (2.0%)	-1.5 (0.0%)	26.7 (2.0%)	-0.1 (0.0%)
0702	Switchback, Divide (N. Fk.)	0.0	7.9 (1.0%)	-5.1 (-1.0%)	7.9 (1.0%)	-2.9 (0.0%)	7.0 (1.0%)	-3.9 (0.0%)
0703	Middle Sleeping Child, Two Bear	0.0	77.6 (1.0%)	-14.7 (0.0%)	77.6 (1.0%)	-0.1 (0.0%)	90.6 (1.0%)	-15.0 (1.0%)
0704	L. Sleeping Child, S. Fk. L. Sleeping Child, Rogers Gulch		310.0 (7.0%)	-7.2 (0.0%)	310.8 (0.0%)	149.8 (4.0%)	216.0 (5.0%)	-9.5 (0.0%)
0401	Moose		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0403	Martin *	0.0	-0.8 (-1.0%)	-0.8 (0.0%)	-0.8 (-1.0%)	-0.8 (-1.0%)	-0.8 (-1.0%)	0.0
0404	Meadow *	0.0	7.1 (0.0%)	-10.0 (0.0%)	7.1 (0.0%)	-7.2 (0.0%)	5.0 (0.0%)	-30.3 (-1.0%)
0503	Reimel *	0.0	7.7 (0.0%)	-15.9 (-1.0%)	5.5 (0.0%)	-6.0 (0.0%)	0.5 (0.0%)	-30.3 (-2.0%)
0506	Lower E. Fk., Medicine Tree, Maynard, Laird, Gilbert	0.0	599.7 (4.0%)	-40.2 (0.0%)	599.9 (4.0%)	427.6 (3.0%)	523.0 (3.0%)	-57.4 (0.0%)
0102	Deer *	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0103	Hughes	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0104	Overwhich	0.0	31.9 (1.0%)	0.0 (0.0%)	26.9 (1.0%)	0.0 (0.0%)	50.3 (1.0%)	-3.2 (0.0%)
0305	Lower West Fork	0.0	17.8 (1.0%)	-0.1 (0.0%)	17.8 (1.0%)	5.4 (0.0%)	12.4 (1.0%)	-5.7 (0.0%)
	Net sediment change from existing	0.0	1,587	-173	1,670	816	1,415	-249
	Mean percentage change from existing	0.0	1.0	0.00	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.00

* - Stream from 1996 303(d) list proposed for de-listing under 2000 303(d) list. Current MTDEQ position requires display of both 1996 and 2000 lists.

Page 2-57; Total Employment number for Alternative F in Table 2-29 should be 4,097.

Page 2-57; Table 2-28 Summary Table of Effects on Unroaded Lands should have columns B, D, and F replaced with the following corrected columns:

Table 2-28--Revised

Skalkaho Rye	**B**	**D**	**F**
Miles of Temp Road Construction	0	2.6	2.6
Total Harvest Treatment	6113	6334	6104
Rx Fire/Manual Treatment	2377	2377	1035
East Fork			
Miles of Temp Road Construction	0	0.5	0.8
Total Harvest Treatment	10,797	11,012	8683
Rx Fire/Manual Treatment	241	241	95
West Fork			
Miles of Temp Road Construction	0	0.9	0
Total Harvest Treatment	4834	4834	2647
Rx Fire/Manual Treatment	226	226	172
Total			
Miles of Temp Road Construction	0	3.9	3.4
Total Harvest Treatment	21,744	22,180	17,434
Rx Fire/Manual Treatment	2844	2844	1302

FEIS Chapter 3

Page 3-11; add “Forested Plant Communities” to “Watershed and Geology and Soils” where referenced.

Page 3-176; Watershed Report, Table 3-40 is not named correctly. The title should be, “West Fork Estimated Decrease in Sediment Yield from Watershed Improvement Work”. Deer Creek HUC, that has no activities proposed was not included in Table 3-40 of the FEIS, the information on Deer Creek is included below.

Additional modeling was completed between the FEIS and the Record of Decision. This is because it was discovered that the wider stream buffers identified by the IDT and listed in the mitigation table on page 2-26 and 27 of the FEIS were not entered in the sediment yield calculations for proposed hillslope activities for the appropriate alternatives. As these were an important addition to Alternatives E and F, additional modeling was completed to incorporate the additional desired mitigation in the effects analysis and estimation of sediment yields.

Table 3-40 - West Fork Estimated Decrease in Sediment Yield from Proposed Harvest Activities

	Alt A	**Alt B**	**Alt C and E**	**Alt D**	**Alt F**	**Alt G**
Watershed Name	Change from Existing %					
Deer, 0102	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hughes, 0103 **	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overwhich, 0104 **	0	0	0	0	0	8
Blue Joint, 0105	0	6	6	6	6	22
Slate, 0106	0	42	42	31	42	89
Coal,West, 0107 **	0	14	12	12	13	25
Beavertail, 0301 **	0	0	0	0	0	0
Piquett, 0303	0	31	31	31	26	77
Baker, 0305 **	0	0	0	0	0	10

When the wider buffers were applied, only 13 of the 35 watershed analyzed were affected by the wider buffers. This was due to the fact that the units were located outside the area of the buffer-they were already located beyond the distance of the wider buffer from the stream. The wider buffer did reduce sediment yields in13 watersheds but not to a large extent in many of the watersheds. The reduction in sediment yields ranged from 1-23% in the watersheds where wider stream buffers made a difference. Below are updated tables that would replace those found in the FEIS that are made obsolete by the application of wider INFISH buffers. (PF-Watershed-60)

In these tables, as well as those in the FEIS, all sediment yield and water yield estimates predicted to result from the proposed activities are displayed as though all activities occurred in one year. In reality, this is not likely. It is likely that activities would be implemented over a period of 1-3 years, at the time of analysis it was not known which units or

watershed improvements would be implemented during which year and so it was analyzed as a worst case scenario in an effort to be conservative.

Following each table is a listing of the watersheds where sediment yield estimates were affected by application of the wider INFISH buffers.

Blodgett Geographic Area

Alternative E and F columns would be replaced in Table 3-26, page 3-92, in the FEIS to reflect the accurate buffer width. Shaded areas reflect where changes in sediment yield resulted.

All figures are in tons/year.

Watershed Name	Alternative E	Alternative F
Blodgett Geographic Area		
Canyon, 1004	0	0
Blodgett, 1005	0	0
Lower Blodgett, 1007	0	0
Mill-Fred Burr, 1101	20.1	32.3

FEIS, Chapter 3, Include the following in the discussion on Alternatives E and F on page 3-91:

Mill-Fred Burr (1101): The differences in sediment yield estimates with wider buffers are very small (0.01 ton for Alternative F, and less than that for Alternative E) and would make no difference in stream channel conditions or water quality during implementation. There would be no significant changes to the cumulative effects analysis with a reduction of sediment yield of this size.

Skalkaho Rye Geographic Area

Alternative E and F columns would be replaced in Table 3-30,page 3-119, in the FEIS to reflect the accurate buffer width. Shaded areas reflect where changes in sediment yield estimates occurred.

All figures are in tons/year

Watershed Name	**Alternative E**	**Alternative F**
Skalkaho Rye Geographic Area		
Upper Sleeping Child, 0701	**0**	**26.8**
Divide, 0702	**0**	**9.2**
Middle Sleeping Child, 0703	**5.3**	**104.4**
Little Sleeping Child, 0704	155.7	224.6
Lower Sleeping Child, 0705	0.1	65.3
Rye, 0801	159.1	408.1
Upper Bitterroot, 0805	66.6	93.8
Upper Skalkaho, 0901	1.3	107.0
Daly, 0902	0	0
Middle Skalkaho 0903	.8	8.9
Lower Skalkaho, 0904	0.5	0.5

FEIS, Chapter 3: Include the following in the discussion on Alternatives E and F on page 3-110:

Little Sleeping Child (0704): Alternative E wider buffers decrease estimated sediment yields by 32.6 tons. The wider buffer would decrease the amount of sediment that could cross RHCA's and enter streams. In Alternative F the wider buffer makes little difference in sediment yield estimates (0.2 tons) because of the location of units mostly outside the area that would be affected by the wider buffer. There would be no changes to the cumulative effects discussion in the FEIS.

FEIS, Chapter 3: Include the following in the discussion on Alternatives E and F on page 3-114 and 115:

Lower Sleeping Child (0705): The differences in sediment yield estimates with wider buffers are very small (less than 0.1 ton for Alternative E) and would make no difference in stream channel conditions or water quality during implementation. There would be no changes to the cumulative effects discussion in the FEIS.

FEIS, Chapter 3: Include the following in the discussion on Alternatives E and F on page 3-107:

Rye Creek (0801): Alternative E wider buffers decrease estimated sediment yields by 37.8 tons. The wider buffer would decrease the amount of sediment that could cross RHCA's and enter streams. In Alternative F, the difference in sediment

yield estimates in minor (0.7 tons) because of unit placement on the ground. The cumulative effects discussion in the FEIS would not be changed as a result of the changes in estimated sediment yields.

FEIS, Chapter 3: Include the following in the discussion on Alternatives E and F on page 3-109:

Upper Bitterroot (0805): Wider buffers in Alternative E and F decreases estimated sediment yields by 7.2 tons for Alternative E and 6.5 tons for Alternative F. This would provide added protection for the small subwatersheds within the HUC. The cumulative effects discussion in the FEIS would not be changed as a result of the changes in estimated sediment yields.

FEIS, Chapter 3: Include the following in the discussion on Alternatives E and F on page 3-116:

Upper Skalkaho (0901): In Alternative E, the difference between application of wider buffers is minor (0.2 tons) because of unit placement on the ground. In Alternative F, there is no change in sediment yield estimates because of unit location in respect to streams. The cumulative effects discussion in the FEIS would not be changed as a result of the changes in estimated sediment yields.

East Fork Geographic Area

Alternative E and F columns would be replaced in Table 3-34 in the FEIS to reflect the accurate buffer width. Shaded areas reflect where changes in sediment yield estimates occurred.

All figures are in tons/year

East Fork Geographic Area	Alternative E	Alternative F
Moose, 0401	0	0
Upper East Fork, 0402	0	0
Martin, 0403	1387.4	0
Meadow, 0404	0	15.0
Bertie Lord, 0405	0	0
Tolan, 0501	0	70.7
Camp, 0502	51.6	70.2
Middle East Fork, 0503	0.8	18.9
Cameron, 0504	75.1	91.8
Warm Springs, 0505	29.8	37.9
Lower East Fork, 0506	446.9	564.6

FEIS, Chapter 3: Include the following in the discussion on Alternatives E and F on page 3-142 and 143:

Tolan (0501): The application of the wider buffers in Tolan Creek would result in a small decrease (8.6 tons) in sediment yield in Alternative F; there would be no changes to Alternative E. Reduction in sediment contributed to streams would be of benefit to the stream channel conditions beyond that afforded by Alternatives B or D. The small difference in estimated sediment yield increases would not alter the cumulative effects discussion in the FEIS.

FEIS, Chapter 3: Include the following in the discussion on Alternatives E and F on page 3-143 and 144:

Camp (0502): In Alternatives E and F slightly less sediment (estimated at 16.3 tons for E and 13.2 tons for F) could cross the wider buffer and combined with the watershed improvements, stream channel conditions would improve at a quicker rate because of less additional sediment contributed. The cumulative effects discussion in the FEIS would not be changed as a result of the changes in estimated sediment yields.

FEIS, Chapter 3: Include the following in the discussion on Alternatives E and F on page 3-145:

Middle East Fork (0503): Estimation of sediment yield increases with the application of wider buffers in the HUC is minor (0.3 tons for Alternative E, 0.1 tons for Alternative F) because of actual placement of the unit on the ground. The cumulative effects discussion in the FEIS would not be changed as a result of the changes in estimated sediment yields.

FEIS, Chapter 3: Include the following in the discussion on Alternatives E and F on page 3-146:

Cameron (0504): Location of units on the ground in Cameron Creek is affected by the wider buffer application in both Alternatives E and F. For Alternative E, wider buffers result in a reduction of sediment yields of 24.6 tons for Alternative F 27.1 tons. Alternative E is estimated to produce the least amount of sediment of the action alternatives. Alterative F would reduce risk of sediment input to streams beyond that for Alternatives B or D because with the wider buffers, less sediment could cross this filter area and enter streams. In the cumulative effects discussion (page 3-160) of the FEIS,

Alternative F would be more similar to Alternative E than to Alternatives B or D because the estimated increases are similar in scale.

FEIS, Chapter 3: Include the following in the discussion on Alternatives E and F on page 3-147 and 148:

Warm Springs (0505): Application of wider buffers results in slightly lower sediment yield estimates for both Alternative E and F, the difference is minor. The cumulative effects discussion in the FEIS would not be changed as a result of the changes in estimated sediment yields.

FEIS, Chapter 3: Include the following in the discussion on Alternatives E and F on page 3-149:

Lower East Fork: (0506): The application of wider buffers in Alternative E results in lower estimated sediment yields by 60.8 tons of sediment. In Alternative F, the reduction is estimated to be 33.5 tons, this would be considerably less than with Alternatives B. A reduction of this amount would reduce risk of channel changes in the subwatersheds of the HUC. FEIS, page 3-162, cumulative effects of Alternative F: Combined with cumulative activities, the lower sediment yields associated with the wider stream buffers would reduce the risk of stream channel changes in the HUC. In Medicine Tree, Laird, and Robbins Gulch, a level of risk to channel changes would remain.

West Fork Geographic Area

Alternative E and F columns would be replaced in Table 3-39 in the FEIS to reflect the accurate buffer width. Shaded areas reflect where changes in sediment yield estimates occurred.

All figures are in tons/year

Watershed Name	Alternative E	Alternative F
West Fork Geographic Area		
Deer Creek, 0102	0	0
Hughes Creek, 0103	0	0
Overwhich Creek, 0104	0	50.3
Blue Joint Creek, 0105	0	22.8
Slate Creek, 0106	0	0
Coal, West Creek, 0107	0	9.4
Beavertail, 0301	0	0
Piquett, 0303	0	0
Baker, 0305	5.5	12.4

FEIS, Chapter 3: Include the following in the discussion on Alternatives E and F on page 3-168:

Baker, Lower West Fork Interfluve (0305): Changes in sediment yield estimates from the application of wider buffers are minimal (less than 2 tons for Alternatives E and F). This small change would not alter the discussion located on page 168 of the FEIS nor the cumulative effects discussion.

Page 3-208; Table 3-59 – Alternative F Combined Ground-Based and Skyline Treatments

Geographic Area	Acres of Proposed Treatment	Acres of Reentry Area	Amount Re-entered
Blodgett	187	21	1.1%
Skalkaho Rye	4854	60	1.2%
East Fork	4232	96	2.3%
West Fork	65	1	1.5%
Total	9338	178	1.9%

Page 3-208 below table should read “The relatively small amount of area proposed for re-entry (0.1 to 2%)…

Page 3-338; Forested Plant Communities report, reference to “USDA Forest Service, 1982” should be “36 CFR 219”.

Page 3-350; third paragraph …Montana on the Bitterroot NF where pre-1990 fires… should be pre-1900.

Pages 3-464, 464, and 473; Noxious Weed report, reference cited as “USDA Forest Service, 1995c” should be “USDA Forest Service, 1996”.

Page 3-471; Noxious Weed report, reference cited as “USDA Forest Service, 1994” should be “USDA Forest Service, 1994b”.

Pages 3-485 and 3-518; Wildlife report, reference cited as “USDA Forest Service, 1987” should be “USDA Forest Service, 1987(c)”.

Page 3-640; Unroaded Table 3-163 Column F should be replaced with the following column:

Table 3-163, Revised

Alternative	F
Yarding System	
Helicopter	4158
Skyline	446
Tractor	1424
Tractor Line Machine	76
Total	**6104**
Rx Fire/Manual Treatment	1035

Page 3-643; Unroaded Table 3-165 Column F should be replaced with the following column:

Table 3-163, Revised

Alternative	F
Yarding System	
Helicopter	6945
Skyline	979
Tractor	613
Tractor Line Machine	146
Total	8683
Rx Fire/Manual Treatment	95

Page 3-654; Unroaded Table 3-167 Column F should be replaced with the following column:

Table 3-163, Revised

Alternative	F
Yarding System	
Helicopter	2514
Skyline	122
Tractor	11
Tractor Line Machine	0
Total	2647
Rx Fire/Manual Treatment	172

FEIS Chapter 4 – Response To Comments

Response to Comment 427: (p4-111); Replace with "Refer to FEIS Chapter 3, Watershed and Fisheries reports."

Literature Cited (Volume 1)

FEIS Page #	Citation	Change
1-8; 3-349	Covington et al. 1994	Covington and Moore 1994
1-6	DeBanget et al. 1998	DeBano et al. 1998
1-6	Heary et al. 1999	Neary et al.
1-6	Luisa 1984	Lucia 1983
1-6	Tri-Data 1993	Tri-Data 1996
1-7	Byram 1959	Byram 1954
1-7	Ryan and Noste 1983	Ryan and Noste 1985 (incorrectly cited in Lit. Cited p l-16)
1-7	Pollet 1999	Pollet and Omi 1999
1-8	Quigley and Arbelbide 1997	Quigley et al. 1997
1-8	INFISH 1995	USDA 1995f
1-13	Bitterroot BAER Reports 2000	USDA FS 2000 c,d,i,j,m,n
1-19	Harvey et al. 1981a and 1981b	These documents were cited in the Bitterroot Forest Plan, USDA 1987c.

FEIS Page #	Citation	Change
1-19	Harvey 1982	These documents were cited in the Bitterroot Forest Plan, USDA 1987c
2-11	Luce 1977	Luce 1997
2-24	Rescission Bill HR-1944, 1995	Document is in Project File Range-12. Added to Lit. Cited
3 (intro)	Arno 1977	Arno 1976
*********	FIRE AND FUELS	**********
3-19	Barrett and Arno 1983	Barrett and Arno 1982
3-22	Hodgson 1994	Added to Lit. Cited
*********	AIR QUALITY	**********
3-64	Hammer 1995	USDA 1995
"	Hammer 1996	USDA 1996
"	Hammer 1998	USDA 1998
3-67	Ottmar and Hessburg 1996	Ottmar et al. 1996
*********	WATERSHED	**********
3-70,71,231	Decker 1991	Decker et al. 1991
3-71	Decker et al. 1998	PF,Watershed-33 and PF, Watershed-34
3-72	WFPB 1997	PF, Watershed-41
"	Callahan 1999a and b	PF, Watershed-41
3-74,138	Farnes 2000a and b	Farnes 2000
3-93	RMRS 2000	Citation error, removed from text.
3-106,124	Lolo NF Monitoring Report 1999	PF, Watershed-43
3-107,108	Logan 1991	Logan and Clinch 1991
3-139,142	McBride 1994	McBride et al. 1994
3-140	WATSED 1991	USDA. 1991c
3-178	DeBano 1975	DeBano et al. 1998
3-194	DeBano 1988	Debano et al. 1998
*********	GEOLOGY AND SOILS	**********
3-196,197	Brown and Reinhardt 2001	Brown et al. 2001
*********	FISHERIES	**********
3-216,231,242	MFWP 1993 and 2001	Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, 1992 and 2001.
3-216,220,235, 254,286,318	Robinson and Minshall 1993	Minshall and Robinson 1993
3-217,224	Beschta and Taylor 1988	Beschta and Taylor 1998
3-217,218,228	Lee et al. 1997	Quigley and Arbelbide 1997
3-236,239	DNRC Blodgett Salvage EA 2001	PF, RFPI-62
*********	FORESTED VEGETATION	**********
3-340	Hann et al. 1997	As Cited in Quigley and Arbelbide 1997
3-340	Schoonmaker and Foster 1991	As Cited in Landres, et al 1999
3-341	Bradley 1987	Fischer and Bradley 1987
3-346	Baker 1992	Baker 1993 Added to Lit. Cited
3-346	Arno 1993	Arno et al. 1993 Added to Lit. Cited
3-348,357	Arno 1995	Arno et al. 1995
3-352	Furniss and others 1979	Furniss et al. 1979 Added to Lit. Cited
3-353	Furniss 1979	Furniss et al. 1979
3-353	Inland Native Fish Strategy	USDA 1995f
3-353	Agee 1987	Agee 1998
3-354	Graham 1993	Graham 1994
3-354	Klock 1979	Klock and Grier 1979
3-355	USDA, 1997 Silvicultural Practices Handbook	USDA, 1999i.
3-355	USDA, 1997 Reforestation Handbook	USDA, 1994d.
3-361	Oliver 1996	Oliver and Larson 1996

FEIS Page #	Citation	Change
3-362	Burns 1990	Burns and Honkala 1990
3-362	Ferguson 1991	Ferguson and Carlson 1991
3-362	Fischer 1987	Fischer and Bradley 1987
3-367,379,390	Arno 1997	Arno et al. 1997
3-364,365	Brown 2001	Brown et al. 2001
3-384	Stettler 1993	Stettler 1986
*********	WILDLIFE	**********
4-489,490,498	Brown and Reinhardt 2001	Brown et al. 2001
"	Thomas et al. 1990	Thomas et al. 1989
"	Harris 1984	As cited in USDA 1991b
3-527	Lotan et al. 1983	Lotan and Perry 1983
3-542	Ruediger 2000	Ruediger et al. 2000
3-545	Hansen et al. 1995	Hickman et al. 1999
3-548	Caton 1996	As cited in Hitchcox 1996
3-552	Hanna 1941	As cited in Reynolds and Linkhart 1992
"	Bull and Anderson 1978	As cited in Reynolds and Linkhart 1992
"	Canning et al. 1978	As cited in Reynolds and Linkhart 1992
"	Hasenyager et al. 1979	As cited in Reynolds and Linkhart 1992
"	Cannings 1982	As cited in Reynolds and Linkhart 1992
"	Bloom 1983	As cited in Reynolds and Linkhart 1992
"	Reynolds and Linkhart 1984	As cited in Reynolds and Linkhart 1992
"	Fix 1986	As cited in Reynolds and Linkhart 1992
"	Gogans 1985	As cited in Reynolds and Linkhart 1992
"	Haward 1986	Hayward 1986 As cited in Reynolds and Linkhart 1992
"	McCallum and Ghelback 1988	As cited in Reynolds and Linkhart 1992

The following documents were cited in the text of the FEIS but were not listed in the Literature Cited Section.

Alexander, M.E., B.J. Stocks, B.M. Wotton, M.D. Flannigan, J.B. Todd, B.W. Butler, R.A. Lanoville. The International Crown Fire Modelling Experiment: An Overview and Progress Report. *Available at:* http://www.nofc.forestry.ca/fire/frn/nwt/papers/icfme-ams-paper.htm

Bailey, R.G., Avers, P.E., King, T., and McNab, W.H. 1994. Ecoregions and Subregions of the United States. Map scale 1:7,500,000. USDA Forest Service

Baker, W.L. 1993. Spatially heterogeneous multi-scale response of landscapes to fire suppression. Oikos 66: 66-71.

Barbour, R. W. and W.H. Davis. 1969. Bats of America. The University Press of Kentucky. Lexington, KY.

Barrett, S.W. 1991. Fire history and fire regime types in the Clark Fork River corridor. Contracted Research Report for the Superior Ranger District, Lolo National Forest, Superior, MT

Bate, L. J., E. O. Garton and M. J. Wisdom. 1999. Estimating Snag and Large Tree Densities and Distributions on a Landscape for Wildlife Management. USDA Forest Service. PNW-GTR-425

Beissinger, S. R., M.I. Westphal. 1998. On the Use of Demographic Models of Population Viability in Endangered Species Management. Journal of Wildlife Management 62(3): 821-841.

Decker, G., R. Hammer, M. Beck and M. Mais. 1993. Bitterroot Watershed Evaluation Process-Review Draft. USDA Forest Service, Bitterroot National Forest. Hamilton, MT

Forman, R.T.T. 1998. Land mosaics: The ecology of landscapes and regions. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge CB2 1RP, United Kingdom. pp 63-65.

Furniss, M. M., M. D. McGregor, M. W. Foiles, A. D. Partridge. Chronology and Characteristics of a Douglas-Fir Beetle Outbreak in Northern Idaho. USDA Forest Service. GTR-INT-59.

Graham, R. T. 1994. Silviculture, Fire and Ecosystem Management. Journal of Sustainable Forestry 2(3/4): 339-351.

Harris, R. B. 1999. Abundance and Characteristics of Snags in Western Montana Forests. USDA Forest Service. RMRS-GTR-31.

Hartwell, M. G., P. Alaback, S. F. Arno. 2000. Comparing Historic and Modern Forests on the Bitterroot Front. *In* USDA Forest Service Proceedings RMRS-P-17.D187

Hodgson, R. W. 1995. Strategies for and Barriers to Public Adoption of Fire Safe Behavior. USDA Forest Service Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-158.

Hunter, Jr. M. L. 1990. Wildlife, Forests and Forestry. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ. pp129-138

McNab, W.H., and P.E. Avers, compilers. 1994. Ecological Subregions of the United States: Section Descriptions. Administrative Publication WO-WSA-5. Washington, D.C. USDA Forest Service.

Miller, Eric. 2000. Notes and Observations on the 2000 Boundary Fire.

Morgan, P., G.H. Aplet, H.B. Haufler, H.C. Humphries, M.M. Moore, W.D. Wilson. 1994. Historical Range of Variability: A Useful Tool for Evaluating Ecosystem Change. Journal of Sustainable Forestry 2:211-220.

Noss, R. F. 1983. A Regional Landscape Approach to Maintain Diversity. *In BioScience Vol. 33 No. 11.* pp 700-706.

Noss, R. F. 1987. Corridors in Real Landscapes: A Reply to Simberloff and Cox. *In Conservation Biology Vol. 1, No. 2.* pp 159-164.

Pfister, R.D., B.L. Kovalchik, S. F. Arno, R.C. Presby. 1997. Forest Habitat Types of Montana. USDA Forest Service Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station General Technical Report INT-34. Ogden, UT.

Pyne, Stephen J. 1982. Fire in America - A Cultural History of Wildland and Rural Fire. Princeton University Press. Princeton, NJ.

Sirucek, D. 1999. Comparison of Eroded Soil Material from a Culvert Removal Site Versus a Culvert Failure.

Thomas, J. W., E. D. Forsman, J. B. Lint, E. C. Meslow, B. R. Noon, J. Verner. 1990. A Conservation Strategy for the Northern Spotted Owl. Interagency Scientific Committee to Address the Conservation of the Northern Spotted Owl. Portland, OR.

USDA, Forest Service, USDI Bureau of Land Management. 2000. Appendix 12: Requirements for Snags and Downed Wood. pp. 12-1 to 12-14. Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project. Supplemental Draft EIS.

USDA, Forest Service. 1983. Northern Regional Guide.

USDA, Forest Service. 1993c. Forest Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Report. Bitterroot National Forest, Hamilton, MT

USDA, Forest Service. 1994c. Forest Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Report. Bitterroot National Forest, Hamilton, MT

USDA, Forest Service. 1994d. Reforestation Handbook. FSH 2409.26b.

USDA, Forest Service. 1995j. Forest Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Report. Bitterroot National Forest, Hamilton, MT

USDA, Forest Service. 1996d. Forest Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Report. Bitterroot National Forest, Hamilton, MT

USDA, Forest Service. 1998c. Northern Region Overview Summary. 44 pp.

USDA, Forest Service. 1999h. Forest Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Report. Bitterroot National Forest, Hamilton, MT

USDA, Forest Service. 1999i. Silvicultural Practices Handbook. FSH 2409.17

USDA, Forest Service. 2001h. Bitterroot National Forest 2001 Fire Management Plan: Appendix K-11 to the Bitterroot National Forest Plan.

FEIS Appendix B

Alternative B

Page B-15, Unit 330 should be helicopter, not TLM

Alternative F

Page B-84, Unit 373 – a flammulated owl unit – listed as intermediate harvest – change to salvage only

Page B-74 and B-77, Units 79 and 167 should be manual/rx fire, instead of salvage or salv/regen

Page B-79, Units 197, 199 –change prescription to “plant only” in Alt F (not salvage)

Appendix C

Flam mitigation – should read same as Chapter 2 (drop unit 366 and add snag language and change dates).