

COLORADO ROADLESS RULEMAKING

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

ERRATA SHEET

JULY 21, 2008

This errata sheet makes corrections to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). These corrections are relatively minor and do not alter the conclusions made in the EIS regarding the environmental consequences of each alternative.

Erratum # 1

In the Analysis Framework section, the following statement on pg. 70 should not have been included and will be deleted from the EIS.

~~In addition, projections for alternative 2 include the activities that would likely occur in the in the substantially altered acres and ski area acres included in IRAs and not included in CRAs, for comparison purposes.~~

Additionally in the Analysis Framework section, tables 14 and 15 (page 74) display the projections of potential future road construction miles that might occur in roadless areas under each alternative. The projected road building miles for alternative 2 were over-estimated for alternative 2. Those projections inadvertently included some potential road building in Colorado roadless areas under alternative 2 that would be needed to support forest health treatments in areas not covered by a Community Wildfire Protection Plan or not in a Wildland Urban Interface. Alternative 2, like alternative 1, does not allow road construction or reconstruction in roadless areas for that purpose. Thus, the estimate for alternative 2 showing 5.9 miles per year of road construction or reconstruction for fuels or forest health purposes would be projected to be closer to 3 to 4 miles per year instead (table 15). This would reduce the total projection of annual average road building miles for alternative 2 by 2 to 3 miles, or from approximately 21 miles to 18 to 19 miles.

Erratum #2

The following edits will be made to pages 47, 49, and 60 to correct language regarding circumstances where road building is allowed in roadless areas under alternative 2. Strikethrough = deletion and *italics* = addition.

~~In the North Fork coal mining area, roads constructed pursuant to rights granted under a coal lease for the purposes of methane removal from underground mines may be used by an oil and gas lessee for the purposes of collecting and transporting coal mine methane if applicable (pp. 47, 49).~~

Road construction or reconstruction in CRAs is allowed for coal-related *activities*. *Those same coal roads may subsequently be utilized for methane gas capture in the North Fork coal mining area where authorized under a gas lease (p. 60).*

Erratum #3

On page 85, last paragraph, the third sentence should read:

In addition, the risk of a large-scale high-intensity wildfire in a roadless area resulting in water quality impacts on a municipal water supply assessment area in a roadless area would be ~~increased~~ *decreased* under alternative 2 compared to alternative 1.

Erratum #4

In Appendix A, Table A-2, Inventoried Roadless Area Names and Acres (pages A-4 to A-11), the last 61 inventoried roadless areas (IRAs) are missing. The updated Appendix A that includes those IRAs is posted on the web site at: <http://roadless.fs.fed.us/colorado.shtml>, and available by mail upon request.

Erratum #5

In Appendix B, some roadless area acres shown in tables B-3 to B-6 are incorrect. In addition, the introductions to tables B-3 to B-7 have been corrected. The updated Appendix B is posted on the web site at: <http://roadless.fs.fed.us/colorado.shtml> , and available by mail upon request.

Erratum #6

The following notice was inadvertently left off the title page.

Send any comments, including for this errata, via mail, email or fax:

Mail: Colorado Roadless Rule/EIS
P.O. Box 162909
Sacramento, CA 95816-2909

Email: COComments@fsroadless.org

Fax: 916-456-6724

Comments must be received by the deadlines posted in the Federal Register Notice for the Rule and the DEIS respectively.

Reviewers should provide the Forest Service with their comments during the review period of the draft environmental impact statement. This will enable the Forest Service to analyze and respond to the comments at one time and to use information acquired in the preparation of the final environmental impact statement, thus avoiding undue delay in the decisionmaking process. Reviewers have an obligation to structure their participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process so that it is meaningful and alerts the agency to the reviewers' position and contentions. Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978).

Environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft stage may be waived if not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement. City of Angoon v. Hodel (9th Circuit, 1986) and Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris, 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be specific and should address the adequacy of the statement and the merits of the alternatives discussed (40 CFR 1503.3).