Amendment Number 3

Humboldt National Forest
Land and Resource Management Plan

The Humboldt National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) was approved on August 19, 1986. changes affecting the Humboldt National Forest since that time have required periodic amendments to the Forest Plan to keep it current. Amendment Number 1 incorporated the changes resulting from the Nevada Wilderness Protection Act of 1989, which created several wildernesses on the Humboldt National Forest. This Amendment provides clarification in management of two of those wildernesses: Ruby Mountains Wilderness and East Humboldt Wilderness. A decision by the Regional Forester to allow aerial fish stocking in lakes within the wildernesses, where it was an established practice prior to the establishment of wilderness, amended the Forest Plan as follows:

> Page IV-112, Management Direction, Standards and Guidelines for the Ruby Mountains Wilderness Management Area: Add the following text and table of indigenous fish species.

PRACTI CES	MANAGEMENT DIRECTION	STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES
WILDLIFE AND FISH Fish Stocking	Aerial fish stocking of indigenous species by NDOW is allowed at the following lakes: Hidden #1, Hidden #2 Cold #1, Cold #2, Echo, Favre, Liberty, Robinson, Soldier, Overland, Castle, North Furlong, and Lost Lake.	Fish species present at the time the wilderness was created are considered indigenous. Stocking frequency will average from three to five years. Fish will be released during flight with no aircraft landings authorized -

FISH SPECIES INDIGINOUS TO WILDERNESS LAKES, RUBY MOUNTAINS WILDERNESS

Lake	Species	Lake	Species
Hidden #1	bk, rb, ct, gt	Robinson	bk, rb, ct
Hidden #2	bk, rb, ct, gt	Soldier	bk
Cold #1	bk, rb, gt	Overland	bk, rb, ct
Cold #2	bk, rb, gt	Castle	bk, rb
Echo	bk, rb ct, lt	North Furlong	Ct
Favre	bk, rb	Lost	Ct, gt
Liberty	bk, rbm ct lt		

Page lV-118, Management Direction, Standards and Guidelines for the East Humboldt Wilderness Management Area: Add the following text and table under WILDLIFE AND FISH:

Fish Stocking	Aerial fish stocking of indigenous species by NDOW is allowed at the following lakes: Boulder, Greys, Steele, Winchel, and Smith.	Fish species present at the time the wilderness was created are considered indigenous.
		Stocking frequency will average from three to five years.
		Fish will be released during flight with no aircraft landings authorized -

FISH SPECIES lNDIGINOUS TO WILDERNESS LAKES, EAST HUMBOLDT WILDERNESS

Lake	Species	Lake	Species
Boulder	bk, ct	Grays	bk, ct
Steele	bk	Winchel	ct
Smith	ct, gt, ag		

bk-brook trout; rb-rainbow trout; ct-cutthroat trout; gt-golden trout; lt-lake trout; ag-American grayling

AMENDMENT #3

United States	Forest	Region 6	Pacific Northwest Region
Depart merit of	Service	Region I	Northern Region
Agriculture		Region 4	Intermountain Region

File Code: 1920/2600
Route To:
2200/2400/2300/7100
Date: December 4, 2000

Interested Parties

This letter corrects the Inland Native Fish Strategy (INFISH) Environmental Assessment (EA) for:

- Acreage's for priority watersheds
- Total acreage of National Forest System lands and priority watersheds
- Area boundary for INFISH
- Percentage change in priority watersheds by management area categories with these acreage corrections.
- Priority Watershed Map

The acreage's in the INFISH EA are being corrected based on more accurate mapping using Geographic Information System (GB) of the forest and of priority watersheds. This mapping was conducted by the Key and Priority Watershed Task Team, which was formed to address specific commitments made by the Forest Service (FS) to fully implement INFISH and the "Interim strategies for managing anadromous fish-producing watersheds in Eastern Oregon and Washington, Idaho and portions of California" (PACFISH). The Key and Priority Watershed Task Team was comprised of members from the FS and l3ureau of Land Management (BLM) in Oregon, Washington, Idaho and Montana. The Key and Priority Watershed Task Team was one task team founded by the Interagency Implementation Team (ITT) to implement the commitments made by the FS. As a part of their efforts, the Key and Watershed Task Team was to accurately map INFISH priority watersheds.

in starting this effort, the Key and Watershed Task Team identified two sources of information showing priority watersheds. First, after the Decision Notice ibr INFISH, the priority watersheds were listed in an appendix to the Implementation Plan for INFISH. It was determined that the list omitted some watersheds identified by the administrative units during the INFISH process for priority watershed designation, and it included some watersheds that had not been identified during the INFISH process as priority watersheds. Second, the INFISH Environmental Assessment (EA) provided a map of the priority watersheds (figure Il-I), hut it did not list or name the watersheds. The Key and Priority Watershed Task Team used GIS analysis to develop a list of watersheds from the EA map. The GIS analysis of the EA map determined the priority watershed

area to be 7,440,344 acres, not the 5.5 million acres stated in the EA. in addition, the INFISH area boundary was found to he inaccurate; Some Northwest Forest Plan and PACFISH watershed areas were inaccurately located in the INFISH area.

Interested Parties — Correction/Errata for INFISH EA 2

The Key and Priority Watershed Task Team reviewed the priority watershed network in order to summarize and reconcile the errors. The following criteria were used to correct the watershed network: (I) Watersheds that provide habitat for bull trout were added; (2) Watersheds that do not provide habitat for bull trout were deleted; and (3) Priority watersheds identified and located outside the INFISH area were deleted. GIS analysis found a net difference between the INFISH LA priority watershed map and a corrected map of 965,440 acres (total acres previously 7,440,344 versus acres after 8,405,784). This is a 13 percent increase in acres. These new values are the result of accurately mapping the priority watersheds from the INFISH LA map using more specific GIS tools, and correcting the map to insure that those watersheds which were intended to be included or excluded for the conservation of bull trout were properly identified (Attachment I).

Based on the above work of the Key and Priority Watershed Task Team, a corrected priority watershed map has been developed using GIS analysis, and the following corrections/errata are made to the INFISII EA to conform to the corrected map.

INFISH EA

1. Pages 1-4 and 11-7.

in the INFISH EA, the value of 24.9 million acres was given for the total acreage of the National Forest System (NFS) lands within the assessment area. It also states that priority watersheds occupy about 5.5 million acres or 22 percent of the assessment area. After running GIS reports and correcting the maps for priority watersheds, it was determined that the total acreage of NFS lands was approximately 24.8 million acres, and the priority watershed area was 8.4 million acres which comprises 34% of the assessment area.

√ See EA page 1-4
- change 24.9 million acres to 24.8 million acres.

√ See EA page 11-7
- change 5.5 million acres to 8.4 million acres.
- change 24.9 million acres to 24.8 million acres.
- change 22 percent to 34 percent.

2. Page 11-10, figure ll-I

√ See LA page 11-10.
- replace this page with the enclosed figure 11-1.

3. Page 111-3 5.

Table 111-2 in the INFISH LA displayed the percentage of acreage within priority watersheds by Management Area Categories (MACs) under Alternatives B, D, and E.

Interested Parties - Correction/Errata for INFISH EA 3

The following table displays the original and corrected percentages within priority watersheds by MACs.

Category	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Original Percentages in Table 111-2 of the INFISH EA	29	2	28	1	38	2	0	0
Corrected Percentages	26	2	26	0	44	2	0	0

The INFISII EA stated that over 60 percent of the acreage in the INFISH EA is in MACs 1 through 4. These MACs represent the lease amount of management intensity. Category 5 represents the area that will require the most modification (38%). The corrected watersheds comprise 54 percent of the acreage in MACs I thru 4. Category 5 was increased from 38 percent to 44 percent.

Additionally, the INFISH EA identified the total area for priority watersheds to be 5.5 million acres. The corrected acreage is 8.4 million.

√ See LA page 111-35
- change percentages in Table 111-2 with the corrected percentages displayed above.
- change 60% of the acreage is in MACs 1 through 4 to 54%.
- change 5.5 million acres to 8.4 million acres.

in determining whether supplementation or revision of the INFISII EA is needed, we considered the following:

(1) The correction is consistent with the intent an(l effect of the 1995 decision:

a. INFISH was intended to provide programmatic mitigation measures for potential environmental effects that may result from future projects and activities.

b. The intended effect of INFISI-l was to maintain the environmental status quo while long-term management strategies are being developed.

(2) The correction does not substantially alter the estimates of effects projected in the LA:

a. The environmental assessment projected most beneficial effects would be minimal or would not he apparent (luring the interim period (INFISH EA, 111-15).

b.

b. This effect is not altered by correcting the acreage estimate.

c. The EA identified adverse social and economic effects from the selected alternative. These projected effects were considered to be minor or inconsequential since the INFISH strategy is interim. Given the interim nature of the strategy and the minor acreage change resulting from the acreage reconciliation, the effects are expected to be essentially unchanged.

d. Applying the requirements for Priority Watersheds to these watersheds should not have substantially different effects on the affected environment. Priority watershed designation increases the buffer widths for intermittent stream channels from 50 to 100 feet on each side of the stream. However, the actual effects of this change would likely be much less since all watershed additions to the priority watershed network have a federally listed fish species and Endangered Species Act consultations for projects occurring in watersheds with listed fish species would likely result in protections greater than those afforded by the Priority Watershed designation.

We reviewed the needed corrections to the EA, and considered them in relation to the environmental consequences disclosed in the INFISH EA and the purpose and need for INFISH. As a result, we have concluded that these corrections do not constitute significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the selected action or its disclosure to environmental impacts. Consequently, we have determined that no need to supplement or revise the INFISH EA exists.