

Errata
**Final Environmental Impact Statement for the
Revised Land Management Plan
Francis Marion National Forest**
March 2017

The following statements in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Revised Land Management Plan, Francis Marion National Forest, have been identified as needing to be corrected. After the January 2017 version of the FEIS was released, it was realized these statements were left over from an earlier working version of the Final EIS that had been based on faulty composite ranking score calculations within the Ecological Sustainability Evaluation Tool. These calculations were corrected and the corrected ranking scores are documented in the Ecosystems section of the FEIS and in Appendix E. However, the following statements in the FEIS did not get corrected from that earlier working version.

On pages 184-185, under the Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternatives 2 and 3 for Mesic to Wet Pine Associates:

- In the last paragraph on page 184, delete the sentence – “The ecological sustainability of species in this group was predicted to be fair in both the next 10 and next 50 years in alternative 2, and fair in alternative 3 in both the 10- and 50-year timeframes.”
- At the top of page 185, delete the sentence that states – “The fair ranking was based on connectivity stressors, which are less likely to impact many of the plant species in this group, but could impact amphibians and reptiles.”
- Replace the deleted sentence on page 184 with – “The ecological conditions supporting viable populations for species in this group are consistent with the good to very good composite ecological sustainability scores for wet pine savanna and flatwoods ecosystems in alternatives 2 and 3 at 10- and 50-year intervals (see Figure 3-11, p. 112).”

On page 189, under the Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternatives 2 and 3 for Upland Pine Woodland Associates:

- In the second paragraph of this section, delete the sentence – “The ecological sustainability of the habitat is predicted as fair at both 10- and 50-year intervals in alternatives 2 and 3, given the likelihood of connectivity stressors.”
- In the last paragraph of this section, delete the sentence – “The ecological sustainability of species in this group was predicted to be highest in alternative 2, improving from poor to fair during the next 10 to 50 years, and remain lower at fair in alternative 3, due to the lower relative amount of both upland pine woodlands that will be maintained and restored with prescribed fire in alternative 3, and likelihood of connectivity stressors.”

- Replace the deleted sentence in the second paragraph with – “The ecological conditions supporting viable populations for species in this group are consistent with the good composite ecological sustainability scores in the next 10- and 50-years predicted in alternatives 2 and 3 for upland longleaf pine woodland ecosystems (see Figure 3-10, p. 110).”

On page 196, under the effects of Alternatives 2 and 3 for Wildlife Species Sensitive to Road Mortality:

- Delete the paragraph under Direct and Indirect Effects, and replace that paragraph with the following:

“As a result of the anticipated rate of human population growth in the tri-county area of Berkeley, Charleston, and Dorchester Counties during the next 10 to 50 years, the impacts to species in this group from roads is expected to continue. However, opportunities to minimize road effects to species in this group are included under alternatives 2 and 3 as plan components where ecosystem desired conditions, DCC-SCC-2 (Wildlife Species Sensitive to Road Use Associates) and OBJ-MUB-6 (Comprehensive Roads Planning and Maintenance) would strive to improve ecosystem connectivity. The key indicators associated with OHV trails and unpaved road densities will also be improved in alternatives 2 and 3. As such, the direct and indirect effects of alternatives 2 and 3 are expected to result in decreased road impacts when compared to alternative 1. With the exception of the spotted turtle, all known species in this group occur within and are dependent upon fire-adapted ecosystems. These fire-adapted ecosystems have ecological sustainability scores of good to very good in alternatives 2 and 3 over the next 10 to 50 years. (See Figures 3-10 through 3-13 and 3-15 on pages 110, 112, 116, 120, and 129.)”
- Delete the two paragraphs under Cumulative Effects, and replace those paragraphs with the following:

“Management that contributes to the viability of species in this group would likely be increasingly difficult in the future especially with the anticipated urban growth that is expected in the tri-county area of Berkeley, Charleston and Dorchester Counties during the next 10 to 50 years. Additional impacts from road use will occur from alternatives 1 and 3 with a decreased emphasis on prescribed burning and an increased emphasis on the use of alternative silvicultural practices (such as mastication, grazing, and pesticide application).

Because alternatives 2 and 3 would address road impacts to species in this group, these alternatives would be expected to result in beneficial effects for species in this group, especially with regards to Forest Service roads. For the ecosystems associated with the species in this species group, the key indicator of off-highway vehicle trail density is ranked as very good for all the alternatives except for the upland longleaf pine woodlands ecosystem which is ranked as fair in all the alternatives. The key indicator of unpaved open road density is ranked as good

for alternatives 2 and 3 for the majority of the ecosystems associated with this species group. The exceptions to this are that for the pocosins ecosystem this indicator is ranked as very good in alternatives 2 and 3, for the depressional wetlands and Carolina bays ecosystem this indicator is ranked as fair for alternative 3, and for the upland longleaf pine woodlands ecosystem this indicator is ranked as poor for alternatives 2 and 3 (see FEIS Appendix E, Tables E-20 through E-35, pages 110-125).”

On page 199, under the Cumulative Effects section of Wildlife Snag and Large Diameter Hollow Tree Associates, in the first paragraph on the page:

- Delete the sentences – “Although alternatives 2 and 3 would provide substantially greater habitat for species in this group, the ecological sustainability ranking for this group is expected to decline during the next 10 to 50 years due to cumulative effects outside of the Forest Service’s control. Cumulatively, negative effects would be expected under all alternatives, just less severe under alternatives 2 and 3. This is especially true for alternative 2.”
- Replace the deleted sentences with – “While there may be some declines during the next 10 to 50 years due to cumulative effects outside of the Forest Service’s control, the ecological conditions supporting viable populations for bat species in this group remain within the good to very good composite ecosystem sustainability scores for their associated habitats. (The forested wetlands and pocosin ecosystem sustainability scores were ranked good to very good in alternatives 2 and 3 at 10- to 50-year intervals, see Figure 3-13 on p. 120, Figure 3-32 on p. 178 and Figure 3-33 on p. 179.) In addition, the old growth indicators and associated conditions providing snags and large diameter trees are likely to improve availability of habitat conditions, as well as DC-SCC-9 and G31.”