

APPENDIX O

Changes to the EA following public review and comment

Table of Contents. Page numbers for some subject headings have been changed to reflect minor revisions to the EA described below. Numbering changes begin on page 53.

Chapter 1, p. 6. Errata. Bank Stability is Issue 3, not Issue 2.

Chapter 1, p. 16. Deleted section entitled Framework for Decision, as this is redundant to the following section entitled Decisions to be Made, which is more concise.

Chapter 2, p. 18. Errata. 205 Head Months will be authorized, not 208 Head Months.

Chapter 2. p. 21. Replacement of some of the existing hardwood enclosures with more effective structures was erroneously described as a design criterion/management requirement related to grazing management on p.21 of Chapter 2 of the EA submitted for public comment and has been removed from that section. In actuality, it is a stand-alone independent foreseeable activity that would occur regardless of the alternative. It was not listed as part of either action alternative in Table 2-7 (Comparison of Alternatives), on p 25 of Chapter 2. This modification removes any confusion created by the discrepancy between table and text. Ongoing and future management of the hardwood enclosures is discussed in cumulative effects analyses for several resource areas (e.g. native hardwoods, wildlife).

Chapter 3. p. 53. Text was added to respond to a commenter's request to provide a cost-benefit analysis for dispersed recreation values associated with the Brock allotment.

Chapter 3. p. 54. A section describing current conditions for Cultural and Historic Resources on the allotment was added, in response to a request from a comment on the EA.

Chapter 4, p. 59. Text was added to the Cumulative Effects discussion for Alternative 1 to clarify the discussion is qualitative, and compares those effects relative to effects of the other two alternatives.

Chapter 4, p. 63. Text was added to discussion of hardwood enclosures to clarify reconstruction will modify materials and methods used to improve effectiveness of the structures.

Chapter 4, p. 66. Gray Wolf. Direct and Indirect Effects. Text was added to more clearly describe measures available to the permittee to reduce potential future conflict between livestock and wolves.

Chapter 4., p. 66. Gray Wolf. Cumulative Effects Common to All Alternatives. Upon further review, the cumulative effects discussions for the three alternatives were essentially the same, and the discussions were accordingly condensed into a single narrative.

Chapter 4, p. 67. Gray Wolf. Top paragraph. The word "insignificant" was replaced with the word "non-essential". Although the words are very similar, there may be subtle differences in connotation to some readers and the biologist who performed the analysis preferred the word "non-essential" be used rather than "insignificant" to address that concern.

Chapter 4, p. 68. Table 4-4. Although the EA analysis for Gray Wolf accurately described the species as a Forest Service Region 6 Sensitive species due to recent delisting from the Endangered Species Act in June 2009, the Biological Evaluation Table summarizing effects to Listed and Sensitive Wildlife species was not updated to match the discussion. This error has been corrected.

Chapter 4, p. 76. In response to comments on the EA, a short discussion on cost-benefit analysis for dispersed recreation relative to livestock management in the Brock allotment was added to the Social and Economic Effects section of the EA.

Chapter 4, p. 79. In response to comments on the EA, a short discussion regarding Effects to Cultural and Historic Resources was added in the Social and Economic Effects section of the EA.

Chapter 4, p. 81. Title of this section has been changed from Forest Plan Consistency “Concerns”, to Forest Plan Consistency ‘Review”, as the word “Review” more accurately describes the content and theme of the section.

Chapter 4, p. 80-81. The previous discussion of Forest Plan objectives for bank stability at the allotment scale which are needed to meet the definition of Satisfactory Range (Riparian) Conditions on the allotment and the discussion of PACFISH RMOs at the watershed scale resulted in comments on the EA that identified the need for a clearer explanation of the basis for findings of consistency with the Forest Plan and PACFISH. Those clarifications have been added in this section.

Appendices: An Appendix M was added. It describes Forest range specialists’ informal guidance to permittees on ways to reduce livestock-wolf conflict. This guidance is not specific to the Brock allotment and is not considered mitigation as application is entirely voluntary on the permittees part. An Appendix N was added. It describes the Forest Service’s response to comments on the Environmental Assessment. An Appendix O was added. It describes corrections and additions to the Environmental Assessment.