

APPENDIX A

CONSULTATION AND SCOPING

Consultation and Scoping List

Public participation played a major role in the planning process and development of this environmental assessment. Scoping letters were mailed to the following list of agencies, interested groups and individuals. The Forest received 17 comment letters as a result of our initial scoping, from which issues and concerns were identified and alternatives were developed.

Bill Hill, USDI Bureau of Land Management
Honorable Thomas Daschle
Honorable Tim Johnson
Honorable John Thune
Honorable Craig Thomas
Honorable Barbara Cubin
Honorable Mike Enzi
Governor Bill Janklow
South Dakota Game, Fish & Parks
South Dakota Department of Transportation
South Dakota Department of Water and Natural Resources
South Dakota Department of Forestry
South Dakota Division of Forestry
South Dakota Association of Professional Archeologists
South Dakota Stock Growers Association
Custer Highway Department
Custer County Commissioners
Pennington County Commissioners
Meade County Commissioners
Lawrence County Commissioners
Fall River County Commissioners
Crook County Commissioners
Weston County Commissioners
Custer Conservation Officer
Pennington County Planning Department
Weston County Natural Resources
Weston County Weed and Pest
Brian Brademeyer
Sam Clauson, South Dakota Chapter of the Sierra Club
Sara Jane Johnson, Native Ecosystems Council
Prairie Hills Audubon Society

Jeremy Nichols, Biodiversity Conservation Alliance
Andrea Lococo, Fund For Animals
Michael Mueller, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
Randy Gaskins, National Wild Turkey Federation
William King, Wind River Multiple Use Advocates
Mark Winland, National Wildlife Federation
Gary Richards, Richards, Hood, Brady and Nies
Dennis Brown, Newberg Lumber Company
Gene Norman, Pope & Talbot, INC.
Jim Hoxie, Pope & Talbot, INC.
Bob Linde, R. E. Linde Sawmills, INC.
Jerry Knapp, Neiman Sawmill, INC.
Conrad Rupert, Rushmore Forest Products
Donnie Quaschnick, Black Hills Timbermans Association
Steve Flanderka, Neiman Sawmill, INC
Tom Troxel, Black Hills Forest Resource Association
Tim Nevadomski, Black Hills 4-Wheelers
Brad Riggen, Black Hills 4-Wheelers
Mari Sheldon, Black Hills 4-Wheelers
Dan Hutt, Black Hills Electric Cooperative
George Kruse, Pacer Corporation
Ron Dahlinger, Black Hills Power & Light
Madonna Thunderhawk, Black Hills Protection Committee
Rick Bryant, Wyoming Association of Professional Archeologists
Upton Branch Library
Jim Magagna, Wyoming Stock Growers Association
Frank Petera, Wyoming Department of Game and Fish
Bill Kohlbrand, Wyoming Department of Forestry
Greg Anderson, Wyoming Department of Game and Fish
Don Christianson, Wyoming Department of Agriculture
Julie Hamilton, Wyoming Land Office

Fanny Project Area

DRAFT Environmental Assessment

John Keck, Wyoming State Historical Preservation Officer
Michael Massie, Wyoming Association of Historians
Stanley Dempsey, Environmental Strategies
Bob Kloss, California State University
Anthony Addison, Sr., Northern Arapaho Business Council
Madonna Archembeau, Tribal Chairwoman, Yankton Sioux Tribe
Jolene Arrow, Historic Preservation Committee, Yankton Sioux Tribe
Mr. Gail Baker, Three Affiliated Tribes
Joe Big Medicine, Jr., Southern Cheyenne Tribe
Gregg Bourland, Tribal Chairman, Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe
Gilbert Brady, Cultural Commission, Northern Cheyenne Tribe
Mr. Francis Brown, Medicine Wheel Coalition
Reginald Cedar Face, Pine Ridge Indian Health Service, Oglala Sioux Tribe
Delphine Clair, Eastern Shoshone Tribe
Elgin Crows Breast, Three Affiliated Tribes
Victor Douville, Sinte Gleska University
Sicangu Treaty Council, Rosebud Sioux Tribe
Terry Gray, CRM/NAGPRA Coordinator, Rosebud Sioux Tribe
Andrew Grey, Tribal Chairman, Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe
Tex Hall, Tribal Chairman, Three Affiliated Tribes
Johnson Holy Rock, Fifth Members Office, Oglala Sioux Tribe
Bryce In The Woods, Tribal Council, Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe
Michael Jandreau, Tribal Chairman, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe
Scott Jones, Cultural Resource Officer, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe
William Kindle, President, Rosebud Sioux Tribe
Sebastian Lebeau, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Cheyenne River
Sioux Tribe
Philip Longie, Tribal Chairman, Spirit Lake Sioux Tribe
Tim Mentz, Sr., Preservation Officer, Standing Rock Sioux Tribe
Charles Murphy, Tribal Chairman, Standing Rock Sioux Tribe
William Pedro, Southern Arapaho NAGPRA, Southern Arapaho Tribe
Robert Tabor, Tribal Chairman, Cheyenne/Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma
Bobby Peters, Natural Resource Office, Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe
Michael Peters, Tribal Secretary, Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe
Ivan Posey, Tribal Chairman, Eastern Shoshone Tribe
Elaine Quiver, Grey Eagle Society

Alvin Slow Bear, Rural Water Office Oglala Sioux Tribe
Roger Trudell, Tribal Chairman, Santee Tribal Office
Haman Wise, Eastern Shoshone Tribe
James White, NAGPRA Coordinator, Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska
Tom Ranfranz, Tribal Chairman, Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe
Geri Small, President, Northern Cheyenne Tribe
Raymond Uses The Knife, Wolakota Committee Chairman, Cheyenne
River Sioux Tribe
John Woodenlegs, Vice President, Northern Cheyenne Tribe
Fremont Fallis, Tribal Council, Rosebud Sioux Tribe
Roxanne Sazue, Tribal Chairperson, Crow Creek Sioux Tribe
John Steele, Tribal Chairman, Oglala Sioux Tribe
Harvey White Woman, Fifth Members Office, Oglala Sioux Tribe
Howard Brown, Economic Development Office, Northern Arapaho Tribe
Carla Boucher
Nancy Hilding
Marie Jordon
Don Sautner
Tom Stock
Susan Schimmer
Tom Morgan
Richard Peterson
Darlene Sears
Carl Hanson
David Lamb
Larry Sarauer
John Gausman
Russell Davis
Tracy Hunt
Rory & Wanda Brown
Mike Morrison
Harold & Dana Tysdal
Harold & Jana Sallee
Dennis & Jean Patton
Jim Pitts
Dan Baker

Comments, Issues and How They Were Addressed

The following table contains a summary of comments received during scoping and how they were addressed during the Fanny Environmental Assessment (EA) Process. Each letter was assigned a number, and each comment within that letter was assigned an alphabetic letter since some comment letters may have more than one issue or concern to address. Issues identified from each letter were used by the IDT to develop alternatives within the scope of the project and Forest Plan. By reviewing Chapter 2 in the EA, commentors can see how the alternatives address the issues. The response column provides a brief explanation as to how the issue was addressed, or where in the document a discussion of the issue can be found. The issue column broadly identifies the issue or concern. In some cases the issue and/or response column is blank. This indicates that the comment was providing information, making a request for information, or providing statements that did not require a response.

Scoping Comment Summary and Responses				
#	Name of Commenter	Comment Summary	Issue	Response
1a	Davis	Continue with your proposed plan as soon as possible.		Thank you for your input on this project.
2a	M. Morrison	Please send better maps.		Mailed Mr. Morrison bigger maps that are easier to read and identify proposed activities more clearly.
3a	Sallee	“You are on the right track”...”You have some good ideas”.		Thank you for your input on this project.
4a	Crook County Board of Commissioners	No comment at this time.		No response needed.
5a	Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe	No cultural concerns at this time for this project.	Heritage Resources	Thank you for your input on this project.
6a	G. Morrison	Specific comments regarding roads: FDR 376.2M – this road accesses Corral Spring and would like to keep open to spring.	Travel Management	This road would remain open under Alternatives 1 and 2. Under Alternative 3, this road would be gated for administrative use.
6b	G. Morrison	FDR 280.2A & U280.02 are parallel roads. Recommend closing 280.2A because of erosion and making U280.02 a system road that stays open.	Travel Management	Under Alternative 1, these roads would remain as they currently are. Under both Alternatives 2 and 3, FDR 280.2A would remain open,

**Fanny Project Area
DRAFT Environmental Assessment**

				and U280025 would be closed.
6c	G. Morrison	FDR 280.2X accesses Yellow Butte; uses this road frequently to check fence and would like to keep open.	Travel Management	This road would remain open under Alternatives 1 and 2, but would be gated for administrative access under Alternative 3.
7a	County of Weston	Oppose any action that would limit access to public lands.	Travel Management	Roads and Travel Management are discussed in the EA, Chapter 3.
7b	County of Weston	Oppose any action that does not include timber management.	Timber Management	Timber management is discussed in the EA, Chapter 3.
7c	County of Weston	Would like the Forest Service to use avenues available to prevent forest fires, and beetle infestations.	Forest Health	Forest health, including prevention of forest fires and beetle infestations are discussed in the EA, Chapter 3.
8a	Pope & Talbot	Agrees with both commercial and non-commercial timber harvest.	Timber Management	Timber harvests are discussed in the EA, Chapter 3.
8b	Pope & Talbot	Commercial harvesting should be limited in pine encroachment areas – not usually economical and timber is low quality.	Timber Management/ Economics	Timber harvests and economics are discussed in the EA, Chapter 3.
8c	Pope & Talbot	Prescribed burning is a valuable tool that can be used for wildlife habitat improvement and can reduce fuel hazards. The proposed 300-acre prescribed burn is a modest proposal.	Fire/Fuels	Fire and fuels management is discussed in the EA, Chapter 3.
8d	Pope & Talbot	Road costs should be kept to a minimum. No need for a lot of surface gravel placement; these roads have had logging traffic in the past with little or no damage.	Roads / Economics	Travel management and associated costs are discussed in the EA, Chapter 3.
8e	Pope & Talbot	Caution should be taken not to close too many roads, especially from a fire suppression standpoint.	Travel Management	Travel management and effects of road closures on fire suppression are discussed in the EA, Chapter 3.
9a	Black Hills Forest Resource Association	We are encouraged to see a proactive management strategy. Agree that wildlife habitat, water yield, forest health and timber resources will all benefit from increased	Timber Management	Thank you for your input on this project.

**Fanny Project Area
DRAFT Environmental Assessment**

		diversity.		
9b	Black Hills Forest Resource Association	Concerned with the proposed closure of 55-miles of roads. No mention in proposed action whether or no the District has completed its Roads Analysis Process.	Travel Management	Travel management is discussed in the EA, Chapter 3. The Roads Analysis Process has been completed and is available for review.
10a	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	Concerned over the significant adverse effects of excessive timber harvest and associated activities on the BHNF and Hell Canyon District.	Timber Management	Timber harvest and effects to other resources are discussed in the EA, Chapter 3.
10b	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	It is imperative that the Forest Service make protecting and restoring biodiversity on the BHNF a priority in order to offset the damages done from over a century of unbalanced management.	Cumulative Effects	Cumulative effects are discussed in Chapter 3.
10c	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	We request that the agency complete a full environmental impact statement to analyze the Fanny Timber Sale.	NEPA Process	The proposal contained in the Fanny project is not one that normally requires an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), nor would it be categorically excluded (40 CFR 1501.4) and therefore, this Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared. If the Decision Maker determines that an EIS is not warranted, a Finding of No Significant Impact will be prepared and made available to the public.
10d	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS is necessary due to cumulative effects of past actions, including reductions in late successional habitat, degradation of streams, excessive livestock grazing, declines in native fish and wildlife species,	Cumulative Effects	A discussion of cumulative effects by resource is contained in Chapter 3 of the EA.

**Fanny Project Area
DRAFT Environmental Assessment**

		and the overall conversion of the BHNF from a healthy, alive and functioning ecosystem to a well-manicured tree farm.		
10e	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	For cumulative effects of the Fanny Timber Sale, the agency must fully disclose all timber sales and related activities, all livestock grazing and related activities, all mining activities and any and all off-road vehicle use.	Cumulative Effects	Cumulative effects analysis is discussed by resource in Chapter 3.
10f	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS must fully analyze and assess the effects to the northern goshawks and their habitat.	Wildlife	Northern goshawks are discussed in the wildlife section in Chapter 3 of the EA, and in Appendix D in the BA/BE.
10g	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS must fully analyze and assess the effects to snail species of concern.	Wildlife	Discussion of snail species of concern can be found in the wildlife section, Chapter 3, in the EA and in Appendix D in the BA/BE.
10h	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS must fully analyze and assess the effects to late successional forest habitat and snags to assess the effects to sensitive woodpecker species.	Wildlife	Late successional habitat and snags are discussed in the wildlife section in Chapter 3 of the EA. Sensitive woodpecker species are also discussed in the wildlife section, Chapter 3 of the EA, and in Appendix D in the BA/BE.
10i	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS must fully analyze and assess the effects to other R2 sensitive species, T/E species, and all candidate species (including the yellow-billed cuckoo).	Wildlife	Discussion of R2 sensitive species, T/E species and any candidate species in discussed in the wildlife section of the EA, and in Appendix D in the BA/BE.
10j	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS must fully analyze and assess the effects to species listed as threatened or endangered by the States of South Dakota	Wildlife	Species listed as threatened or endangered by the State of SD are discussed in the wildlife section of

**Fanny Project Area
DRAFT Environmental Assessment**

		and Wyoming and their habitat.		the EA, and in the BA/BE in Appendix D. Analysis of threatened or endangered species in Wyoming is outside the scope of this analysis, since the Fanny Project Area falls entirely within the state of South Dakota.
10k	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS must fully analyze and assess the effects to the northern flying squirrel.	Wildlife	The northern flying squirrel is discussed in the wildlife section of the EA.
10l	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS must fully analyze and assess the effects to the black bear and its habitat.	Wildlife	The status of the black bear was addressed in the Phase I analysis (Phase I Amendment to the 1997 Forest Plan, 118-119). The black bear was removed from the MIS list due to lack of evidence of black bear populations existing on the Forest.
10m	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS must fully analyze and assess the effects to native fish species.	Wildlife	There is no fisheries habitat within the Fanny project area. Sensitive fish species are discussed in Appendix D in the BA/BE.
10n	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS must fully analyze and assess the effects to all MIS and their habitat that may exist within the Fanny Timber Sale area.	Wildlife	MIS species are discussed in the wildlife section of the EA.
10o	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS must fully analyze and assess the effects to water quality both within the Fanny Timber Sale area and downstream from the Fanny area.	Water Quality	Water quality and downstream effects are discussed in the soils and water section of the EA.
10p	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS must fully disclose the existence and extent of all riparian areas within the Fanny Timber Sale area and fully analyze effects to these areas.	Riparian Areas	Riparian areas are discussed in the wildlife section to some extent, and the soils and water section of the EA.

**Fanny Project Area
DRAFT Environmental Assessment**

10q	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS must fully disclose the location and extent of all historic meadows in the Fanny area so that reviewers can understand the extent of pine encroachment, and disclose acres desired to be meadows compared with acres created by the Fanny Timber Sale.	Meadows	Meadows are discussed in the wildlife section to some extent under vegetative habitat, and in the soils and water section of the EA.
10r	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS must fully analyze and assess the effects to late successional habitat, including all potential late successional habitat.	Wildlife	Late successional habitat is discussed in the wildlife section of the EA.
10s	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS must fully disclose the existence of all roads, ways, two-tracks, illegally created routes, off-road routes, ATV trails, and any other pathway that facilitates the transportation and movement of motorized vehicles, and analyze and assess the impacts any travel management plan to the environment.	Travel Management	Roads and travel management is discussed in the Transportation Management section of the EA. Transportation management maps for each alternative can be found in Appendix G. The Roads Analysis Process for the Fanny project area is also available for review.
10t	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS is necessary to fully analyze a range of alternatives that must include an alternative that does not provide commercial timber.	Range of Alternatives	Discussion of the range of alternatives, alternatives considered, and alternatives considered but dropped from detailed analysis can be found in Chapter 2 of the EA. The No Action Alternative does not propose any commercial timber harvests.
10u	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS is necessary to fully analyze a range of alternatives that must include an alternative that decommissions the maximum amount of roads and ways possible within the project area.	Range of Alternatives	Alternative 3 proposes to close the most miles of roads. Some access must be maintained in the project area for private land access and fire suppression. See discussion of alternatives in Chapter 2.
10v	Biodiversity Associates and	An EIS is necessary to fully analyze a range	Range of	This alternative is discussed in

**Fanny Project Area
DRAFT Environmental Assessment**

	Brian Brademeyer	of alternatives that must include an alternative that proposes only prescribed burning.	Alternatives	Chapter 2 of the EA.
10w	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	An EIS is necessary to fully analyze a range of alternatives that must include an alternative that proposes to designate all management area prescription (MAP) 5.1 within the project area as MAP 4.1. This alternative proposes a non-significant forest plan amendment and will enhance wildlife.	Range of Alternatives	This alternative is discussed in Chapter 2 of the EA.
10x	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	If the Forest Service chooses not to analyze the aforementioned alternatives, the agency must provide discussion to support their elimination.	Range of Alternatives	Discussion of the alternatives can be found in Chapter 2 of the EA.
10y	Biodiversity Associates and Brian Brademeyer	We also remind the agency that if any alternative is eliminated from analysis on the basis that it does not meet the purpose and need to “produce timber” or “provide commercial timber”, the agency is unreasonably restricting the range of alternatives through an unreasonably narrow purpose and need. If the purpose and need entails several objectives (e.g., wildlife habitat enhancement, improve forest health, etc.), then the agency must analyze all alternatives that meet at least one of the objectives.	Range of Alternatives	Discussion of the alternatives can be found in Chapter 2 of the EA.
11a	Office of Federal Land Policy	Concerned with road closures and effects to access roads within Wyoming.	Travel Management	Travel management is discussed in the EA, and in the Roads Analysis Process for the Fanny Project Area.
12a	Wyoming Game and Fish Department	We have no terrestrial or aquatic concerns.	Wildlife	Thank you for your input for this project.
13a	Wyoming Department of	Provided the Black Hills National Forest	Heritage Resource	Management of Heritage

**Fanny Project Area
DRAFT Environmental Assessment**

	State Parks & Cultural Resources	follows the procedures established in the regulations (Section 106), we have no objection to the project.	Protection	Resources and compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Advisory Council regulations 36 CFR Part 800 is discussed in the Heritage Resource section of the EA.
14a	Wyoming State Engineer's Office	No comment regarding this project.		No response needed.
15a	Wyoming Office of State Lands and Investments	Our office feels that this project will have no measurable affect to Wyoming state lands.		No response needed.
16a	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	In order to meet FP direction, 20% of the planning area should provide forage for wildlife. The scoping letter indicated that grass cover type and SS1 consisted of only 12% and 11% respectively. We support meadow enhancements, and recommend you include patch clearcuts in the alternatives.	Wildlife	Forage and Forest Plan direction for providing forage is discussed on in Chapter 3, wildlife section, in the EA. Meadows account for about 14% of the project area, or 3,260 acres. SS 1 in the forested portion of the project area accounts for about 8% of the project area, or about 1,940 acres. The meadow restoration and pine encroachment treatments will improve existing meadows and provide additional forage in forested areas.
16b	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	The District needs to outline a vegetation management plan to increase shrubs and stimulate browse production for wildlife. This includes woody species enhancement, protection and monitoring. Please address this as well as aspen release treatments.	Wildlife / Vegetation Diversity	Discussion of shrub species and aspen treatments can be found in Chapter 3, wildlife section of the EA.
16c	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	HABCAP underestimates forage and browse, and overestimates thermal cover needs. We realize Phase II will re-evaluate	Wildlife / HABCAP	The HABCAP model, its' function and limitations, is discussed in the wildlife section of the EA, Chapter

**Fanny Project Area
DRAFT Environmental Assessment**

		this model glitch, but wildlife biologists' professional judgment should be used to evaluate the driving force of FP goals for wildlife-not a flawed model. Timber harvesting and prescribed burning are primary management tools used to stimulate browse and improve habitat.		3. Results of this model give the Decision Maker a means for comparing alternatives, and are not intended to be exact. The Biologist also considers other factors that the model does not, including shrub species and professional judgment.
16d	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	Please disclose inventory and review of each SS and cover type (map and data) and distribution in the project area.	Wildlife	Structural stage and cover type is discussed in Chapter 3, wildlife section, in the EA.
16e	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	Please include vegetation treatments in the alternatives that would increase forage and browse, and provide security and screening along roads.	Wildlife	Discussions of forage and browse production are in Chapter 3, wildlife section, in the EA.
16f	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	What are historical conditions and why are most of the late successional stages slated for overstory removal or shelterwood harvest in MA 5.4?	Wildlife	Late successional stage conditions are discussed in the wildlife section, Chapter 3, of the EA.
16g	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	Concerned with timber harvest on steep topography, especially along Roby and Boles Canyons. What is the District's vegetation management plans for canyon areas and steep hillsides? Please address in alternatives.	Timber Management	There are areas with steep slopes (> 35%) proposed for commercial timber harvest. It may be possible to utilize cable logging on these sites; however, this has not yet been determined. During layout, these areas will be re-evaluated for logability.
16h	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	Ground reconnaissance revealed excellent wildlife cover and multi-storied stands in Sections 28 and 33 south of county line, and sufficient cover along roads 117.4C and 117.4F. We believe there is no need to perform pre-commercial thinning and POL	Wildlife	Hiding requirements and a discussion of how this project meets FP standard 3203 can be found in the wildlife section of Chapter 3. The ID Team did consider your request and

**Fanny Project Area
DRAFT Environmental Assessment**

		cuts here.		dropped three of these sites from treatment (pre-commercial thinning) in Alternative 3.
16i	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	We would prefer late successional stands be left as is, with non-commercial thinning below on south facing slopes to increase understory production.	Wildlife	Within MA 5.4, all old growth stands and SS 4C stands will be left un-treated. Non-commercial treatments are proposed within some of these sites.
16j	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	Why is the majority of pre-commercial thinning taking place in MA 5.1? Are there few large overstory trees remaining in 5.1 of the project area?	Timber Management	Pre-commercial thinning is proposed within those stands that are silviculturally ready for that type of treatment. Within MA 5.4, some of the pre-commercial thinning will be accomplished using variable density thinning, which varies the spacing of leave trees.
16k	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	Please indicate by map and table what structural stages have been deferred in the Project Area.		A discussion of vegetative diversity including structural stages can be found in the wildlife section, Chapter 3, in the EA. Appendix F displays a summary of activities by alternative, and includes structural stages, and those stands that are deferred for treatment this entry.
16l	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	We recommend the District consider variable density thinning and some multi-storied stands in the project area to break-up typical monoculture pine stands.	Timber Management	Variable density thinning (pre-commercial) is proposed for some stands in MA 5.4.
16m	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	Please disclose (in EA) alternative consideration for mountain lion, which is a BHNF MIS and SD State Threatened	Wildlife	Discussion of the mountain lion can be found in the wildlife section, Chapter 3, in the EA.

**Fanny Project Area
DRAFT Environmental Assessment**

		species.		
16n	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	The 1972 Stateline Area Plan mentions northern flying squirrel and several woodpecker species. Please address in the EA alternatives.	Wildlife	Both of these species are discussed in Chapter 3, wildlife section, in the EA.
16o	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	Please disclose how various alternatives will enhance wildlife habitat and forage for mule deer.	Wildlife	Mule deer and its' habitat is discussed in Chapter 3, wildlife section, in the EA.
16p	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	Please discuss importance of both early and late successional structural stages to bird species and provide alternative that will provide necessary habitat requirements.	Wildlife	Both early and late successional stages, as well as bird species and their habitat requirements are discussed in Chapter 3, wildlife section, in the EA.
16q	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	What are the livestock grazing mitigation plans (pre-and post-burn) for all prescribed burns? Why is the only proposed prescribed burn adjacent to private land (Sec. 15), what is the purpose of this burn and what time of the year will it occur? Evaluate opportunities for prescribed burns elsewhere in the project area such as the south unit, which includes mostly grasslands and meadows.	Fire/fuels	Standard 4107 in the Forest Plan states that prescribed burned areas will be deferred from livestock grazing for at least a portion of the following growing season. Prescribed burning in other areas was discussed extensively by the IDT, and included burning in meadows, grasslands and shrublands. Burning within these areas was deferred this entry for various reasons including economics, objectives likely would not be met, and other treatments would better meet objectives.
16r	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	We are generally not in favor of water developments for big game when monies could be better spent on increasing and protecting forage and browse or improving non-game habitat. We do favor water	Wildlife	Wildlife/water developments are discussed in the EA.

**Fanny Project Area
DRAFT Environmental Assessment**

		developments that remove watering livestock from wet areas and hardwoods.		
16s	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	If livestock grazing and AMP's are outside the scope of timber sale projects, why are KV funds available for livestock grazing infrastructure?	Grazing	AMP environmental assessments (EA) develop and analyze the grazing strategy for a given allotment. These assessments also identify any infrastructure needs. Some of those needs may be included in the Fanny Project Area EA. Currently, the AMP environmental assessments for the two allotments within the Fanny project area are scheduled for completion in FY 2010.
16t	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	We applaud the coordination of pine encroachment treatments and road closures when they best serve wildlife needs and provide goals of MA5.4.	Wildlife	Thank you for your input for this project.
16u	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	Will all pine be removed from aspen release treatment areas? We also request that all pine be removed from draws containing box elder and chokecherry, and other hardwood inclusions such as the small aspen clone on FDR 376.2F. We recommend a minimum 2-chain buffer around hardwood and shrub stands.	Vegetative Diversity	All pine will be removed from aspen clones where they are proposed for treatment. These treatments are discussed in Chapter 2 and 3 of the EA. A 100-foot buffer is proposed around these clones.
16v	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	Please disclose in effects analysis what site conditions should be for juniper and mountain mahogany. These are critical for wintering wildlife and there are opportunities to increase these species in distribution and abundance.	Vegetative Diversity	Vegetative diversity, including shrub species, and their values to wildlife are discussed in Chapter 3 of the EA.
16w	SD Department of Game,	On the Draft Alternative Treatment map,		Special cuts were made up a

**Fanny Project Area
DRAFT Environmental Assessment**

	Fish and Parks	what are the “special cuts”?		variety of treatments; including burning and removal of pine in shrub and hardwood cover types. Most of these treatments were dropped from the alternatives due to a variety of reasons, including economics and failure to achieve objectives.
16x	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	Please provide in the alternatives a detailed analysis of current and proposed road densities in addition to number of miles of various road treatments.	Travel Management	Travel management and proposed changes by alternative is discussed in the EA in the Transportation Management section of Chapter 3.
16y	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	We recommend an off-road motorized closure area be developed. Please provide an alternative that includes off-road restrictions and closure.	Travel Management	An area closure is proposed in Alternative 3. For a more detailed discussion, please refer to Chapter 3 in the EA.
16z	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	We support road closures that achieve a road density of 1 mi./sq. mi. or less, and suggest closure of the following roads: U280026, FDR 117.4F, 117.4E, 376.21, 668.1B, and Roby Canyon area west to the Stateline.	Travel Management	Travel management and proposed road closures are discussed in the Transportation Management section in Chapter 3 of the EA.
16aa	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	Request that FDR 264.1A, 264.1B, 264.1C, 264.1D and 264.1E be closed or at minimum be closed seasonally.	Travel Management	Travel management and proposed road closures are discussed in the Transportation Management section, Chapter 3, in the EA. In all alternatives, these roads are either seasonally closed, or closed year around.
16bb	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	In sections 30 and 31 there appear to be delineated roads not indicated as FS classified or unclassified. Are these old roadbeds that have been previously closed?	Travel Management	The roads that you refer to are part of the original coverage, prior to field review. Field review has determined that some of these roads are no longer in existence, or

**Fanny Project Area
DRAFT Environmental Assessment**

				are in a different location.
16cc	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	What are the proposed KV wildlife plans other than possibility of water developments? There needs to be shrub and browse improvements in this area especially along canyon lands – please consider this as a KV project rather than a wildlife guzzler.	Wildlife	Proposed wildlife post sale projects include road closures, hardwood release (aspen), non-commercial thinning (variable density), snag creation, as well as water/spring development improvements.
16dd	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	Does spruce occur in the project area and if so, please delineate on a map and in a table. Will spruce be removed in vegetation treatments?	Vegetative Diversity	Spruce is not a major component of the Fanny project area, but could occur in very small amounts in the northern portions of the project area. Any spruce found in the project area during the implementations phase, would be left on site.
16ee	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	How will springs, seasonally wet meadows and streams (including intermittent streams and pools in canyon lands) be protected? Major canyons have had considerable ash and material run-off and deposition in the last two years. Please consider cumulative impacts to these areas due to vegetation treatments in this project area.	Water Quality	Water quality, springs and meadows are discussed in the wildlife section, and the soils and water section, Chapter 3, in the EA. Cumulative effects are also discussed in Chapter 3 of the EA by resource.
16ff	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	Will this project be impacted by Phase II Decision?		No. The Fanny decision is expected in May 2003, and the Phase II decision is not scheduled until sometime later.
16gg	SD Department of Game, Fish and Parks	We propose you include an alternative that meets or exceeds MA5.4 goals; and alternative that significantly addresses early and late successional stages that are more desirable and beneficial to wildlife than in-between pole-sized ponderosa pine with an	Wildlife / Range of Alternatives	A discussion of alternatives considered can be found in Chapter 2 of the EA. Goals of MA 5.4 are incorporated into all of the alternatives, but to differing degrees for various components.

**Fanny Project Area
DRAFT Environmental Assessment**

		average 80 BA.		For example, Alternative 3 closes more roads than Alternatives 1 or 2, and Alternatives 1 and 3 leave more cover for wildlife. All alternatives leave adequate browse and forage habitat, and provides for late successional stage habitat.
17a	Native Ecosystems Council	Concerned with the BHNF failure to reasonably analyze logging and roading impacts to wildlife.	Wildlife	Impacts to wildlife from logging and roads are discussed in Chapter 3 of the EA in the wildlife section.
17b	Native Ecosystems Council	Concerned with the ongoing failure of the agency to conduct and develop habitat and wildlife inventories, conservation strategies, and monitoring to determine viability of wildlife species.	Wildlife	Wildlife and habitat inventories and surveys are discussed in the EA. Monitoring is also discussed in the EA. Conservation strategies – please refer to response for 17f.
17c	Native Ecosystems Council	Please define where old growth habitat is located, how it has been validated, where replacement old growth occurs, where connections exist between these patches, and show monitoring data that demonstrates these old growth patches will ensure species viability.	Wildlife	Old growth is discussed in the EA, and a map of old growth locations can be found in Appendix G.
17d	Native Ecosystems Council	Please provide inventory for snags and course woody debris by structural stage.	Wildlife	Snags and course woody debris are discussed in the EA.
17e	Native Ecosystems Council	Please define the current population and habitat trends for management indicator and sensitive wildlife species in the project area, based on past and current monitoring activities by the Forest.	Wildlife	Existing information for population and habitat trends for MIS and sensitive species is discussed in the BA/BE in Appendix D. Please refer to the 2001 BHNF Monitoring Report for information concerning Forest wide monitoring activities.
17f	Native Ecosystems Council	Please define the conservation strategies that	Wildlife	The Forest Plan, as amended,

**Fanny Project Area
DRAFT Environmental Assessment**

		are going to be implemented in the project area for all management indicator and sensitive wildlife and plant species.		includes revised standards and guidelines for habitat management of MIS and sensitive species. The Phase II analysis is in process and will re-evaluate standards and guidelines for these species. The Fanny EA will follow direction established under Phase I, which is based on expert interviews (Expert Interview Summary for the BHNF LRMP Amendment), and intended to protect these species.
17g	Native Ecosystems Council	Please define where key habitat areas currently exist in the project area for MIS and sensitive species.	Wildlife	Wildlife habitat for MIS and sensitive species is discussed in the wildlife section of Chapter 3 in the EA, and in the BE/BA contained in Appendix D.
17h	Native Ecosystems Council	Please define where key habitats for MIS and sensitive species will be provided for local viability in the project area over the planning period.	Wildlife	Wildlife habitat for MIS and sensitive species is discussed in the wildlife section of Chapter 3 in the EA, and in the BE/BA contained in Appendix D. Viability is a Forest Planning issue that is outside the scope of the Fanny EA.
17i	Native Ecosystems Council	Please evaluate how timber management goals and wildlife goals will both be achieved in the project area. This analysis should include all monitoring data obtained on previous impacts of logging on sensitive and MIS on the Forest.	Wildlife / Timber Management	Goals and Objectives for Timber and Wildlife are identified in the Forest Plan. Analysis of how the Fanny project area achieves these goals and objectives is discussed in the EA. Monitoring of previous timber sales is referenced in the Monitoring section of Chapter 2 in the EA, as well as in the BHNF

**Fanny Project Area
DRAFT Environmental Assessment**

				2001 Monitoring Report.
17j	Native Ecosystems Council	Define the monitoring results that demonstrate that past and ongoing management of MIS and sensitive species is adequate to maintain local and landscape viability.	Wildlife	Monitoring is discussed in Chapter 2 of the EA, and in the BHNF 2001 Monitoring Report. Viability is a Forest Planning issue that is outside the scope of the Fanny EA.
17k	Native Ecosystems Council	Define how timber and wildlife management practices elsewhere on the Forest are being coordinated with this particular program to ensure landscape viability of MIS and sensitive species.	Wildlife / Timber Management	Timber and wildlife management practices elsewhere on the Forest follow the same Forest Plan Direction. Analysis and discussion of MIS and sensitive species at the Forest level can be found in the Forest Plan EIS and Phase I Amendment EA. Viability is a Forest Planning issue that is outside the scope of the Fanny EA.
17l	Native Ecosystems Council	Please provide a complete inventory of thermal cover, hiding cover, and forest interior habitat for the project area, and show how these habitat features will change with implementation of this project.	Wildlife	Thermal and hiding cover is discussed in the EA. A complete inventory of these areas is located in the Project File. Changes to these areas by alternative are also discussed in the EA.
17m	Native Ecosystems Council	Please provide a complete inventory of all roads in the project area, and evaluate roading impacts on all wildlife using validated research.	Wildlife / Travel Management	Roads inventory data tables are included as part of the Roads Analysis Process, which is located in the project file. A discussion of roading impacts to wildlife can be found in the wildlife section of Chapter 3 in the EA.