Errata Sheet for the ICBEMP Supplemental Draft EIS

(as of April 21, 2000; updated May 23, 2000)

The following errors in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project have been discovered. This page will be updated if any additional errors are found. Updates will be indicated with the date in the first column.

Volume 1 - Supplemental Draft EIS

Chapter 2, page 7 — First column header should be "Hierarchy **Term**"

Chapter 3, page 83 — Rationale for B-S51, second sentence should read: Examples include: species listed under the Endangered Species Act, Forest Service and BLM sensitive species lists, species ranked as **G1-G3** or nonvascular plants ranked as **S1-S3** by the network of State Natural Heritage programs, broad-scale species listed in Volume 1, Table 1 of Wisdom et al. (in press), species listed in Table 2 in Croft et al. (in press), and plant communities ranked **G1-G3** by the network of State Natural Heritage programs.

Chapter 4, page 52: (added 5/23/00) — The legend on Map 4-6 should read:

Very Low/ Low to High
Moderate to High
Very Low/ Low to Moderate
High to **Very Low/** Low
High to Moderate
Moderate to Low **/Very Low**

Chapter 4, page 196: — The last two paragraphs in the second column should read:

Changes in livestock grazing management are more likely to cause localized improvements and to trend livestock grazing effects toward historical vegetation and soil conditions on sites that have not crossed a threshold (within the state-and-transition model of vegetation succession [see Chapter 2]) to a more degraded state, than on sites that have crossed a threshold (Archer and Smeins 1991; Johnson and Kingery 1999). Examples of degraded steady states are: (1) western juniper-dominated sites that used to but no longer support a well-distributed and diverse a shrub and herb understory, show soil loss in the A horizon and would experience less frequent and more intense fire compared to historical; and (2) exotic annual grass-dominated sites that lack perennial shrubs, forbs, and grasses; lack biological crusts; and would experience more frequent fire compared to historical. On these degraded sites that have crossed a successional threshold, restoration activities (in the form of prescribed burning, tree thinning, herbicide treatments, rehabilitation seedings, and other intensive practices) are necessary to reverse the degraded condition and reverse the successional momentum. Changes in livestock grazing management alone would not likely do the job. Even if intensive restoration activities are applied on sites that have crossed a threshold, historical vegetation and soil conditions would be predicted to reestablish slowly or not at all, attributable to ecological, technical, and financial restraints (Tausch 1998; Johnson and Kingery 1999). Intensive restoration activities can prevent further degradation by establishing some perennial plant species, reducing the dominance of exotic undesirable plants, lessening fire risk, and promoting conditions favorable for biological crust development.

On sites that have not crossed a threshold, some can be determined to be functioning and others can be determined to be functioning "at risk," based on physical (such as soil) and biological (such as biological crusts or plant cover) indicators of rangeland health (USDI/BLM 1999). Those that are functioning "at risk" are at risk of crossing a

successional threshold to a degraded state. In both kinds of sites, localized improvements discussed previously would be likely if changes are made to livestock grazing management. If livestock grazing is determined to be a factor that had caused the site to be functioning at risk, then changes made to livestock grazing manage ment would help prevent these sites from crossing a threshold. This depends on being able to prevent exotic undesirable plants (such as noxious weeds) from invading or increasing, which would negate the benefits accrued to the changes in livestock grazing management.

Chapter 5, page 5	Information for Cliff Walker should read: Cliff Walker, Tribal Liaison. B.S. Business Management, Marylhurst College; B.S. Forest Management, Grays Harbor Community College; U.S. Army (3 years), Private Industry (10 years), Forest Service (8 years), Bureau of Indian Affairs (13 years). Experience includes Forest management, tribal government staff assistant, supervisory forester-regional sale prep, assistant forest manager, sale prep officer, forest development officer, sale prep and timber sale administration forester, and check scaler.
Chapter 5, page 5	Information for Cheryle Zwang should read: Cheryle Zwang, Tribal Liaison. B.S. English and Communications, Montana State University; Working on Masters in Public Administration BSU; Forest Service (12 years), Bureau of Land Management (2 years). Experience includes public affairs specialist, legislative affairs, tribal relations, tribal government liaison, member of Blackfeet Tribe, land use planning, content analysis, training/education specialist.

Volume 2 - Supplemental Draft EIS Appendices

Table of Contents page iv	Appendix 8a is attached (delete the word “Unattached”)
Appendix 6, page 6-2	Column 2, paragraph 4, last sentence should read “These plants are referenced in **Objective B-O47**.” Column 2, paragraph 5, first sentence should read “Table 8 is a list of vascular plants that are ranked by the Natural Heritage Projects as G1-G3 and non-vascular plants ranked as S1-S3 (see **Standard B-S51**).