

Nedsbar Forest Management Project EA Errata

The following is a list of minor errors we have discovered and associated corrections or clarifications to the environmental assessment (EA) for the Nedsbar Forest Management Project to date. Yellow highlights indicate where corrections have been made.

Table 2-10, page 2-44

The “Number of Trees Over 20 Inches Diameter at Breast Height Harvested” is incorrect in Table 2-10, page 2-44 of the EA. In the preparation of the EA, we inadvertently reported only the estimate of trees over 20 inches DBH for the retention marked stands rather than the total estimate provided by the silviculturist. The “Total” row in the following table is what should have been reported in Table 2-10.

Number of ≥ 20 inch DBH cut trees	Alternative 1	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Cut Mark (tally)	N/A	830	1,325	0
Retention Mark (estimation of cut trees)	N/A	281	501	0
Group Select (unknown at this time)	N/A	Unknown at this time	Unknown at this time	0
Total	N/A	1,111 (without group select information)	1,826 (without group select information)	0

Note: This is a comparison of different measurements, all of which are subject to change because the marking and cruising is not complete. The cut marked units have tree tallies for the diameter classes of trees harvested. The retention marked units have tree tallies for the diameter classes of trees retained, the cut trees have not been measured at this time. This estimation of the number of ≥ 20 inch cut trees is based off comparing the number of ≥ 20 inch trees per acre, expanded to the unit acreage with the amount of ≥ 20 inch retention trees tallied. The number of ≥ 20 inch DBH trees harvested in group selection units have not been measured at this time.

Botanical Resources Project Design Feature, page 2-38

The last PDF under Objective 1 on page 2-38 has been modified to clarify the intent of the PDF:

- Nearly all roads in the project area have, or are adjacent to, known noxious weed populations which have been and will continue to be treated as funding allows but to minimize expansion and spread of these populations, road grading and ditch-pulling will not occur during periods of weed seed production and dissemination, approximately July 15th to September 1st; this period may begin earlier if plants mature sooner upon approval of the Authorized Office in consultation with the botanist.

Table 3-18, page 3-66

Table 3-18 on page 3-66 has been updated to reflect some minor changes in the “Percent Forested Areas Less Than 30% CC [Canopy Cover]” and the “Percent Forested Area Less Than 30% CC within TSZ [Transient Snow Zone].” The changes originate from the interpretation of the Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) boundary lines and the reduced canopy cover associated with the Bald Lick, Lick Stew, and O’Lickety sale units and blowdown. Additionally some of the acres for the units straddled ridges and were split across two 7th field HUCs. The corrected version of Table 3-18 is shown below:

Table 3-18. Percent of Transient Snow Zone (TSZ) with Less than 30 Percent Canopy Cover.

Subwatershed	HUC 7 (drainage)	Percent Forested Area Less Than 30% CC ¹	Percent within TSZ	Percent Forested Area Less Than 30% CC within TSZ ¹
Beaver Creek-Applegate River	UA 0218	3	1	0
	Total	3	1	0
Star Gulch-Applegate River	UA 0360	8	5	12
	UA 0363	6	0	0
Total		7	3	6
Upper Little Applegate River	LA 0127	4	63	1
	LA 0130	1	73	1
	LA 0203	37	14	13
	LA 0206	16	63	5
	LA 0209	4	21	12
	LA 0215	0	13	0
	LA 0218	4	20	6
LA 0221	0	2	0	
Total		10	34	4
Yale Creek	LA 0330	0	2	0
Total		0	2	0
Lower Little Applegate River	LA 0403	7	0	0
	LA 0406	3	11	5
	LA 0409	2	0	0
	LA 0442	7	0	0
	LA 0445	0	0	0
Total		4	2	1
Total - All		5	9	3

¹ CC – Canopy Cover; includes existing disturbance features such as roads and landings. Also includes acreages for units in O’Lickety, Lick Stew, and Bald Lick with less than 30 percent CC post-treatment.

Appendix I, pages I-6 through I-8

The last sentence on page I-6 has a typographical error. It should read as follows:

This list also includes any Category D, E, or F species with known sites located within the **Nedsbar** Project Area.

Table I-2 on page I-7 should have the following corrections:

Table I-2. Survey and Manage Wildlife Species Known or Suspected in the Planning Area

Species	S&M Category	Survey Triggers			Survey Results			Site Management
		Within Range of the Species?	Contains Suitable habitat?	Habitat Disturbing*?	Surveys Required?	Survey Date (M/Y)	Sites Known or Found?	
Vertebrates								
Siskiyou Mountains salamander (<i>Plethodon stormi</i> , north range)	Off ¹	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	Buffers
Great Gray Owl (<i>Strix nebulosa</i>)	A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	2012/2013	TBD	TBD
Red Tree Vole (<i>Arborimus longicaudus</i>)	C	No	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mollusks								
Chase Sideband (<i>Monadenia chaceana</i>)	B ²	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	2011	Yes	Buffers
Oregon Shoulderband (<i>Helminthoglypta hertleini</i>)	B ²	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	2011	No	TBD ⁵
Evening Fieldslug (<i>Deroceras hesperium</i>)	B ²	Yes	Yes	No	No ³	N/A	No	N/A
Crater Lake Tightcoil (<i>Pristiloma arcticum crateris</i>)	A	No	No	No	No ⁴	N/A	N/A	N/A

*"Habitat disturbing" and thereby a trigger for surveys as defined in the 2001 ROD S&Gs (p. 22).

N/A = Not Applicable

¹This species is covered by a Conservation Strategy in the northern part of the species range.

² Equivalent-effort pre-disturbance surveys are required for this species.

³ Suitable habitat for the evening Fieldslug is "associated with wet meadows in forested habitats in a variety of low vegetation, litter and debris; rocks may also be used. Little is known about this species or its habitat. Surveys may be limited to moist surface vegetation and cover objects within 30 m. (98ft.) of perennial wetlands, springs, seeps and riparian areas..." (pg. 41, *Survey Protocol for S&M Terrestrial Mollusk Species v3.0*, 2003). Within the project, suitable habitat is confined to the stream-side areas that are contained within Riparian Reserves in the harvest units. Significant negative affects to the micro-climate of this habitat within the Riparian Reserve will not occur so there is no trigger for surveys. Although, pre-disturbance surveys were conducted in areas outside of the riparian buffers and if this species presence is confirmed, it will receive the appropriate management protection.

⁴ Suitable habitat for the Crater Lake tightcoil is "perennially wet situations in mature conifer forests, among rushes, mosses and other surface vegetation or under rocks and woody debris within 10 meters of open water in wetlands, springs, seeps and riparian areas..." (pg. 43, *Survey Protocol for S&M Terrestrial Mollusk Species v3.0*, 2003). Within the project, suitable habitat is confined to the stream-side areas that are contained within Riparian Reserves in the regeneration harvest units. Significant negative affects to the micro-climate of this habitat within the Riparian Reserve will not occur so there is no trigger for surveys.

⁵ Pre-disturbance surveys were conducted for terrestrial mollusks. Voucher specimens collected from surveys are currently being identified and sent to a regional malacologist for verification. If a Survey and Manage species is confirmed, the site will receive appropriate management protection and removed from the treatment areas.

On page I-8 there is a typographical error in the "Statement of Compliance." It should read as follows:

Statement of Compliance

The Medford District BLM applied the *2001 Record of Decision and Standards and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measure Standards and Guidelines* with 2003 ASR species list to the **Nedsbar Forest Management** Project, completing the pre-disturbance surveys, and management of known sites required by Survey Protocols and Management Recommendations to comply with the 2001 Record of Decision.