

# CONTENTS

Preface.....	P - 1
Summary.....	S - 1
<b>Chapter 1. Purpose and Need for Action.....</b>	<b>1 - 1</b>
1.0 Introduction.....	1 - 1
1.1 Proposed Action.....	1 - 1
1.2 Need for the Proposed Action.....	1 - 4
1.3 Objectives of the Proposed Action.....	1 - 13
1.4 Project Background and Development.....	1 - 14
1.5 Decisions That Must Be Made.....	1 - 24
1.6 Applicable Legal and Regulatory Requirements.....	1 - 25
<b>Chapter 2. Alternatives Including the Proposed Action.....</b>	<b>2 - 1</b>
2.0 Introduction.....	2 - 1
2.1 Process Used to Formulate Alternatives.....	2 - 1
2.2 Alternative Designs Criteria.....	2 - 14
2.3 Description of Proposed Alternatives.....	2 - 20
2.4 Mitigation Measures and Monitoring Requirements.....	2 - 35
2.5 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study.....	2 - 45
2.6 Description of Relevant Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions Not Part of the Proposed Action.....	2 - 47
2.7 Summary Comparison of the Activities, the Predicted Achievement of the Project Objectives and the Predicted Environmental Effects of All Alternatives.....	2 - 55
2.8 Identification of the Agency’s Preferred Alternative.....	2 - 84
2.9 Identification of the Environmentally Preferred Alternative.....	2 - 85
<b>Chapter 3. Affected Environment.....</b>	<b>3 - 1</b>
3.0 Introduction.....	3 - 1
3.1 Regional Setting of the Fires of 2000.....	3 - 1
3.2 Project Location.....	3 - 1
3.3 Forest Plan Direction.....	3 - 4
3.4 Geology.....	3 - 13
3.5 Minerals.....	3 - 15
3.6 Climate.....	3 - 20
3.7 Soils.....	3 - 23
3.8 Visual Resources.....	3 - 48
3.9 Heritage Resources.....	3 - 53
3.10 Roadless and Unroaded Resources.....	3 - 58
3.11 Water and Hydrologic Resources.....	3 - 70
3.12 Air Quality.....	3 - 103
3.13 Fire and Fuels.....	3 - 109
3.14 Infrastructure and Improvements.....	3 - 125
3.15 Vegetation and Forest Resources.....	3 - 142
3.16 Sensitive Plants.....	3 - 164
3.17 Noxious and Invasive Plant Species.....	3 - 170
3.18 Wildlife.....	3 - 173
3.19 Fish and Aquatic Resources.....	3 - 201
3.20 Recreation.....	3 - 237
3.21 SocioEconomic Setting.....	3 - 241

<b>Chapter 4. Environmental Consequences.....</b>	<b>4 – 1</b>
4.0 Introduction.....	4 – 1
4.1 Minerals.....	4 – 1
4.2 Soils.....	4 – 3
4.3 Visual Resources.....	4 – 9
4.4 Heritage Resources.....	4 – 16
4.5 Roadless and Unroaded Resources.....	4 – 18
4.6 Water and Hydrologic Resources.....	4 – 30
4.7 Air Quality.....	4 – 74
4.8 Fire and Fuels.....	4 – 77
4.9 Infrastructure and Improvements.....	4 – 85
4.10 Vegetation and Forest Resources.....	4 – 95
4.11 Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Plants.....	4 – 103
4.12 Noxious and Invasive Plant Species.....	4 – 106
4.13 Wildlife.....	4 – 107
4.14 Fish and Aquatic Resources.....	4 – 129
4.15 Recreation.....	4 – 159
4.16 SocioEconomic Setting.....	4 – 161
<b>Chapter 5. List of Preparers.....</b>	<b>5 – 1</b>
<b>Chapter 6. List of Agencies, Organizations, and Persons to Whom Copies of The Statement Are Sent.....</b>	<b>6 - 1</b>

**References**

**Glossary**

**Appendices**

**Appendix A Maps**

**Appendix B Issues Analysis**

**Appendix C Harvest Unit Summary Tables**

**Appendix D Relevant Past, Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions  
Not Part of the Proposed Action**

**Appendix E Best Management Practices**

**Appendix F Bull Trout Matrix of Effects**

**Appendix G Road Treatments by Alternative**

**Appendix H Seeding Guidelines**

**Appendix I Forest Service Response to Public Comments**

**Appendix J Response to Beschta, R.L., et al. 1995.**

**Project File and Supporting Information**

The project file for the Lolo National Forest Post Burn Final Environmental Impact Statement is maintained on the Lolo National Forest. The project file contains background and supporting information collected to produce this Final EIS. Detailed specialist reports, project area descriptions, maps, communication and other logistical information pertinent to the project are kept as a reference. The project file is available for review by the public at the Lolo National Forest, Plains/Thompson Falls Ranger District, 408 Clayton, Plains, Montana.

## List of Figures

### Chapter 1

Figure 1.1.1 Proposed Action.....	1 – 2
Figure 1.3.1 Purposes and Objectives.....	1 – 14
Figure 1.4.1 Burned Area Assessment Priorities.....	1 – 18
Figure 1.4.2 Burned Area Weed Risks.....	1 – 19
Figure 1.4.3 Key Forest Plan Goals.....	1 – 19
Figure 1.4.4 Forest Service Strategic Plan.....	1 – 20
Figure 1.4.5 Public Involvement for Proposed Action.....	1 – 21
Figure 1.4.6 National Fire Plan.....	1 – 22
Figure 1.4.7 Toward Restoration and Recovery.....	1 – 23
Figure 1.4.8 Project Development.....	1 – 24
Figure 1.5.1 Decisions That Must be Made.....	1 – 24
Figure 1.5.2 Decisions Already Made in the Project Area.....	1 – 24

### Chapter 2

Figure 2.1.1 Pre-Scoping Meetings.....	2 – 1
Figure 2.1.2 Notice of Intent.....	2 – 2
Figure 2.1.3 Public Participation Action Plan.....	2 – 2
Figure 2.1.4 Stakeholders, Key Public and Target Audiences.....	2 – 2
Figure 2.1.5 Public Participation Methods.....	2 – 3
Figure 2.1.6 Public Involvement.....	2 – 4
Figure 2.1.7 DEIS Comment Period .....	2 – 4
Figure 2.1.8 Notice of Availability.....	2 – 5
Figure 2.1.9 Beschta et al. (1995) Post Fire Principles .....	2 – 8
Figure 2.1.10 Development of Alternatives.....	2 – 9
Figure 2.1.11 Key Issues.....	2 – 10
Figure 2.1.12 Issue Tracking .....	2 – 10
Figure 2.1.13 Driving Issues.....	2 – 10
Figure 2.1.14 Issues Beyond the Scope.....	2 – 14
Figure 2.2.1 Design Criteria for Forest Plan.....	2 – 15
Figure 2.2.2 Design Criteria for Minerals.....	2 – 15
Figure 2.2.3 Design Criteria for Soils.....	2 – 15
Figure 2.2.4 Design Criteria for Visual Resources.....	2 – 16
Figure 2.2.5 Design Criteria for Heritage Resources.....	2 – 16
Figure 2.2.6 Design Criteria for Inventoried Roadless Areas and Unroaded Areas.....	2 – 16
Figure 2.2.7 Design Criteria for Water Quality and Native Fisheries.....	2 – 16
Figure 2.2.8 Design Criteria for Infrastructure and Improvements.....	2 – 17
Figure 2.2.9 Design Criteria for Vegetation and Forest Resources.....	2 – 18
Figure 2.2.10 Design Criteria for TES Plant Species.....	2 – 18
Figure 2.2.11 Design Criteria for Noxious and Invasive Plant Species.....	2 – 18
Figure 2.2.12 Design Criteria for Wildlife.....	2 – 18
Figure 2.2.13 Design Criteria for Recreation.....	2 – 19
Figure 2.2.14 Design Criteria for Economics.....	2 – 19
Figure 2.3.1 Proposed Alternatives.....	2 – 20
Figure 2.3.2 Alternative #2.....	2 – 21
Figure 2.3.3 Alternative #4.....	2 – 22
Figure 2.3.4 Alternative #5.....	2 – 23
Figure 2.3.5 Timber Sales.....	2 – 25
Figure 2.3.6 Commercial Thinning.....	2 – 30
Figure 2.3.7 Salvage of Insect-Killed Timber.....	2 – 30
Figure 2.3.8 Alternative #2—Road Travel Restrictions.....	2 – 32
Figure 2.3.9 Alternative #4—Road Travel Restrictions.....	2 – 32
Figure 2.3.10 Alternative #5—Road Travel Restrictions.....	2 – 33

Figure 2.3.11 Prescribed Burning..... 2 – 33

Figure 2.3.12 Salvage in Low to Moderate Severity Burns..... 2 – 34

Figure 2.3.13 Salvage in High Severity Burns..... 2 – 34

Figure 2.3.14 Alternative #5—Temporary Roads..... 2 – 35

Figure 2.4.1 Monitoring and Evaluation..... 2 – 40

Figure 2.4.2 Soils Monitoring..... 2 – 42

Figure 2.4.3 Visual Resources Monitoring..... 2 – 42

Figure 2.4.4 Heritage Resources Monitoring..... 2 – 42

Figure 2.4.5 Water and Aquatic Resource Monitoring..... 2 – 42

Figure 2.4.6 Fire, Fuels and Air Quality Monitoring..... 2 – 43

Figure 2.4.7 Infrastructure Monitoring..... 2 – 43

Figure 2.4.8 Vegetation and Forest Resources Monitoring..... 2 – 43

Figure 2.4.9 TES Plants Monitoring..... 2 – 44

Figure 2.4.10 Noxious and Invasive Plant Monitoring..... 2 – 44

Figure 2.4.11 Wildlife Monitoring..... 2 – 44

Figure 2.6.1 Fire line Construction and Rehabilitation..... 2 – 51

Figure 2.6.2 Burn Area Emergency Rehabilitation Treatments..... 2 – 52

Figure 2.6.3 Ongoing Timber Sales..... 2 – 52

**Chapter 3**

Figure 3.2.1 Project Perimeters..... 3 – 2

Figure 3.2.2 Fire Perimeter Acreages..... 3 – 2

Figure 3.2.3 Project Area Boundaries..... 3 – 2

Figure 3.2.4 Analysis Area Boundaries..... 3 – 3

Figure 3.2.5 Land Ownership..... 3 – 4

Figure 3.3.1 Key Forest Plan Goals..... 3 – 4

Figure 3.5.1 Minerals Issues..... 3 – 15

Figure 3.5.2 Congressional Acts and Laws Governing the Minerals Resource..... 3 – 16

Figure 3.5.3 Superior Ranger District, Plans of Operations..... 3 – 18

Figure 3.7.1 Issues Specific to the Soils Resource..... 3 – 26

Figure 3.7.2 Soils-Related Federal and State Regulations..... 3 – 26

Figure 3.7.3 Forest Plan Goals and Standards for Soil..... 3 – 27

Figure 3.7.4 Percent of Project Area by LSI..... 3 – 33

Figure 3.7.5 Ninemile Fire Soil Burn Severities..... 3 – 36

Figure 3.7.6 Alpine Fire Soil Burn Severities..... 3 – 39

Figure 3.7.7 Flat Fire Soil Burn Severities..... 3 – 42

Figure 3.7.8 Landowner Fire Soil Burn Severities..... 3 – 46

Figure 3.8.1 Regulatory Requirements, Guidance and Coordination regarding the Visual Resource..... 3 – 49

Figure 3.8.2 VQOs assigned to Management Areas (MAs) within the Post Burn Project Area..... 3 – 49

Figure 3.8.3 Scenic Integrity Levels..... 3 – 52

Figure 3.9.1 Heritage Resources Issues..... 3 – 54

Figure 3.9.2 Cultural Resources Federal Regulations..... 3 – 54

Figure 3.9.3 Acts Govern Tribal Involvement..... 3 – 55

Figure 3.10.1 Roadless Area Definitions..... 3 – 59

Figure 3.10.2 Unroaded Area Identification..... 3 – 59

Figure 3.10.3 Key Issues Specific to Roadless and Unroaded Resources..... 3 – 60

Figure 3.10.4 Inventoried Roadless Regulations..... 3 – 60

Figure 3.10.5 Inventoried Roadless Areas..... 3 – 62

Figure 3.10.6 Unroaded Areas..... 3 – 66

Figure 3.11.1 Hydrology and Water Resources Issues..... 3 – 71

Figure 3.11.2 Federal Laws Pertaining to Water Resources..... 3 – 71

Figure 3.11.3 Lolo National Forest Plan Direction for Water Resources..... 3 – 72

Figure 3.11.4 Crest Stage Gage Data (2001) from Streams in the Ninemile Creek Watershed... 3 – 88

Figure 3.11.5 Crest Stage Gage Data (2001) from Streams in Flat Creek..... 3 – 88

Figure 3.12.1 Air Quality Issues..... 3 – 104

Figure 3.12.2 Air Quality Regulations..... 3 – 105

Figure 3.13.1 Definitions of Fire and Fuel Terminology ..... 3 – 110

Figure 3.13.2 Fire and Fuels Issues..... 3 – 110

Figure 3.13.3 Fire and Fuels Regulations..... 3 – 111

Figure 3.14.1 Standard Natural Recovery Values (NRV) and Road Closure Levels..... 3 – 128

Figure 3.14.2 Access Management Objectives (AMOs)..... 3 – 129

Figure 3.14.3 Roads Issues..... 3 – 130

Figure 3.14.4 Lolo National Forest Plan Guidelines for Roads..... 3 – 131

Figure 3.14.5 Additional Federal Guidance for Roads..... 3 – 131

Figure 3.14.6 Characteristics of the Mattie V Pit Site..... 3 – 138

Figure 3.15.1 Vegetation Issues..... 3 – 144

Figure 3.15.2 Regulations Pertaining to the Vegetation Resource..... 3 – 145

Figure 3.16.1 Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Plant Issues..... 3 – 167

Figure 3.16.2 Federal Acts and Lolo National Forest Plan Guidance for TES Plants..... 3 – 167

Figure 3.17.1 Noxious and Invasive Plant Issues..... 3 – 170

Figure 3.17.2 Regulations and Guidance for Noxious and Invasive Plants..... 3 – 171

Figure 3.18.1 Wildlife Issues..... 3 – 175

Figure 3.18.2 Wildlife Regulations and Guidance..... 3 – 175

Figure 3.19.1 Road Closure Levels..... 3 – 205

Figure 3.19.2 Fisheries Resource Issues..... 3 – 206

Figure 3.19.3 Federal and State Fisheries Regulations..... 3 – 206

Figure 3.19.4 Forest Plan Fisheries Guidelines..... 3 – 207

Figure 3.19.5a Fish Distribution and Density in the Upper Ninemile Drainage..... 3 – 222

Figure 3.19.5b Fish Distribution and Density in the Upper Ninemile Drainage..... 3 – 222

Figure 3.19.5c Fish Distribution and Density in the Trout Creek Drainage..... 3 – 223

Figure 3.19.5d Fish Distribution and Density in First, Johnson, and Flat Creeks..... 3 – 223

Figure 3.19.6a Maximum and Minimum Daily Water Temperatures for 3 Streams in the  
Ninemile Drainage, 2001..... 3 – 228

Figure 3.19.6b Mean Daily Water Temperature for 3 Streams in the Ninemile Drainage, 2001..... 3 – 228

Figure 3.20.1 Recreation Issues..... 3 – 237

Figure 3.20.2 Lolo National Forest Direction for Recreation..... 3 – 238

Figure 3.20.3 Recreation Opportunities Spectrum..... 3 – 238

Figure 3.21.1 Economics Issues..... 3 – 241

Figure 3.21.2 Lolo National Forest Plan Guidance Pertaining to Economics..... 3 – 242

Figure 3.21.3 Mineral County, MT Employment..... 3 – 247

Figure 3.21.4 Sanders County, MT Employment..... 3 – 248

Figure 3.21.5 Missoula County, MT Employment..... 3 – 248

Figure 3.21.6 Mineral County, MT Real Earnings in 1998 Dollars..... 3 - 249

Figure 3.21.7 Sanders County, MT Real Earnings in 1998 Dollars..... 3 - 249

Figure 3.21.8 Missoula County, MT Real Earnings in 1998 Dollars..... 3 - 250

**Chapter 4**

Figure 4.0.1 Types of Effects..... 4 – 1

Figure 4.2.1 Criteria for Detrimental Soil Condition..... 4 – 3

Figure 4.6.1 Total sediment yields from all sources in First Creek, under all alternatives  
(results from LOLOSED)..... 4 – 34

Figure 4.6.2. Sediment yields from roads in First Creek under all alternatives (results from  
LOLOSED)..... 4 – 36

Figure 4.6.3. Total sediment yields from all sources in Upper Ninemile Creek, under all  
alternatives (results from LOLOSED)..... 4 – 37

Figure 4.6.4. Sediment yields from roads in Upper Ninemile Creek under all alternatives  
(results from LOLOSED)..... 4 – 39

Figure 4.6.5. Total sediment yields from all sources in Big Blue Creek, under all alternatives  
(results from LOLOSED)..... 4 – 40

Figure 4.6.6. Sediment yields from roads in Big Blue Creek under all alternatives (results from  
LOLOSED)..... 4 – 42

Figure 4.6.7. Total sediment yields from all sources in Siegel Creek, under all alternatives (results from LOLOSED)..... 4 – 43

Figure 4.6.8. Sediment yields from roads in Siegel Creek under all alternatives (results from LOLOSED)..... 4 - 45

Figure 4.6.9. Total sediment yields from all sources in Flat Creek, under all alternatives (results from LOLOSED)..... 4 – 46

Figure 4.6.10. Sediment yields from roads in Flat Creek under all alternatives (results from LOLOSED)..... 4 – 48

Figure 4.6.11. Total sediment yields from all sources in Johnson Creek, under all alternatives (results from LOLOSED)..... 4 – 49

Figure 4.6.12. Sediment yields from roads in Johnson Creek under all alternatives (results from LOLOSED)..... 4 – 51

Figure 4.6.13. Total sediment yields from all sources in Idaho Gulch, under all alternatives (results from LOLOSED)..... 4 – 52

Figure 4.6.14. Sediment yields from roads in Idaho Gulch under all alternatives (results from LOLOSED)..... 4 – 54

Figure 4.6.15. Total sediment yields from all sources in Trout Creek, under all alternatives (results from LOLOSED)..... 4 – 55

Figure 4.6.16. Sediment yields from roads in Trout Creek under all alternatives (results from LOLOSED)..... 4 – 57

Figure 4.14.1 Comparison of burn and natural derived sediment yield – Ninemile Creek Drainage..... 4 – 134

Figure 4.14.2 Comparison of burn and natural derived sediment yield – Idaho Gulch Drainage..... 4 – 134

Figure 4.14.3 Comparison of burn and natural derived sediment yield – Johnson Creek Drainage..... 4 – 134

Figure 4.14.4 Road density comparison between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 for watersheds in the Ninemile Drainage..... 4 – 150

Figure 4.14.5 Road density comparison between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 for watersheds in the Trout Creek Drainage ..... 4 – 150

Figure 4.14.6 Road density comparison between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 for watersheds in the Middle Clark Fork Composite Drainage ..... 4 – 151

Figure 4.14.7 Road density within 300 feet of stream channel comparison between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 for all project drainages and watersheds..... 4 – 151

Figure 4.14.8 Comparison of Alternative 1 and 2 stream crossing densities for Ninemile, Trout, and Middle Clark Fork Composite and Cutoff Drainages ..... 4 – 152

Figure 4.14.9 Comparison of Road-derived Sediment Yield by Alternative – Ninemile Creek Drainage..... 4 – 152

Figure 4.14.10 Comparison of Road-derived Sediment Yield by Alternative – Trout Creek Drainage..... 4 – 152

Figure 4.14.11 Comparison of Road-derived Sediment Yield by Alternative – Siegel Creek Drainage..... 4 – 153

Figure 4.14.12 Comparison of Harvest-derived Sediment Yield by Alternative – Ninemile Creek Drainage..... 4 – 154

Figure 4.14.13 Comparison of Harvest-derived Sediment Yield by Alternative – Flat Creek Drainage..... 4 – 155

Figure 4.14.14 Comparison of Harvest-derived Sediment Yield by Alternative – Burnt Fork Creek Watershed, Ninemile Drainage..... 4 – 157

Figure 4.14.15 Comparison of Harvest-derived Sediment Yield by Alternative – Beecher Creek Watershed, Ninemile Drainage..... 4 – 158

Figure 4.14.16 Comparison of sediment yield by source – St. Louis Creek Watershed, Ninemile Drainage..... 4 – 158

## List of Tables

### Chapter 1

Table 1.1.1 Proposed Action Summary Table.....	App A
--	-------

### Chapter 2

Table 2.4.1 Mitigation Measures .....	2 – 36
Table 2.6.1 Past Harvesting on National Forest Lands.....	2 – 47
Table 2.7.1 Comparison of Alternative Activities .....	2 – 56
Table 2.7.2 Comparison of Achieving the Purpose and Need .....	2 – 57
Table 2.7.3 Comparison of Mine Reclamation Activities .....	2 – 61
Table 2.7.4 Comparison of Effects on Soils .....	2 – 62
Table 2.7.5 Comparison of Activities in IRAs .....	2 – 64
Table 2.7.6 Comparison of Effects on Hydrologic, Fisheries and Aquatic Resources.....	2 – 67
Table 2.7.7 Comparison of Effects on Fire, Fuels and Air Quality.....	2 – 70
Table 2.7.8 Alternative Comparison of Road Development, closures and Access and Travel Management.....	2 – 72
Table 2.7.9 Comparison of Effects on Vegetation.....	2 – 75
Table 2.7.10 Comparison of Effects on Weed Spread.....	2 – 77
Table 2.7.11 Comparison of Effects on Wildlife.....	2 – 79
Table 2.7.12 Comparison of Effects on Economic Effects .....	2 – 82

### Chapter 3

Table 3.3.1 Forest Plan Management Area Direction.....	3 – 6
Table 3.6.1 Average Monthly Maximum Temperatures (°F) at Missoula , Superior, Ninemile and Pardee Weather Stations.....	3 – 21
Table 3.6.2 Average Monthly Minimum Temperatures (°F) at Missoula, Superior, Ninemile and Pardee Weather Stations.....	3 – 21
Table 3.6.3 Average Total Precipitation (inches) at Area Weather Stations for Periods of Record.....	3 – 22
Table 3.6.4 Notable 24-hour Precipitation Amounts (inches), September and October 2000 at Ninemile and Pardee weather stations.....	3 – 22
Table 3.9.1 Mining Activities in the Post Burn Project Area.....	3 – 56
Table 3.10.1 Unroaded Areas.....	3 – 67
Table 3.11.1 Area Burned at Moderate to High Soil Burn Severity (Acres and Percent of Watershed) in the Post Burn Project Area by the Fires of 2000.....	3 – 82
Table 3.11.2 Watershed Miles Affected by the 2000 Fires and Fire Suppression Activities.....	3 – 84
Table 3.11.3 Peak Discharge (cfs) at the Ninemile Creek Gaging Station.....	3 – 86
Table 3.11.4 Projected Peak Flow Changes for 2, 5 and 10 Year Storm Events Immediately after Fire (NCRS curve number method).....	3 – 89
Table 3.11.5 ECA (Equivalent Clearcut Area/Acres) as a Percentage of Each Watershed Burned in the 2000 Wildfires and Harvested (Past and Foreseeable Harvest) .....	3 – 90
Table 3.11.6 Water Quality Limited Waterbodies in the Analysis Area, as Listed in the Montana 303(d) Lists in 2000.....	3 – 93
Table 3.11.7 Water Quality Limited Waterbodies in the Analysis Area, as Listed in the Montana 303(d) Lists in 1996.....	3 – 94
Table 3.11.8 Sediment Travel Distances from Forest Road Features in Idaho.....	3 – 96
Table 3.11.9 Miles of Road and Fireline within 300 feet of Perennial and Major Intermittent Stream Channels in the Post Burn Project Area.....	3 – 96
Table 3.11.10 Acres and Percent of Watersheds with Road Densities (including both system roads and jammer roads) of 2 to 5 mi/mi <sup>2</sup> (miles/square mile) and greater than 5 mi/mi <sup>2</sup> (from Moving Windows analysis).....	3 – 99

Table 3.12.1	Smoke Emissions monitored for wildlife and prescribed Fire on the Bitterroot National Forest.....	3 – 108
Table 3.13.1	Number of Fires Smaller than Five Acres Within the Project Area by Decade and VRU.....	3 – 112
Table 3.13.2	Number of Lightning-caused Spring Fires between 1940 and 2000.....	3 – 113
Table 3.13.3	Fire History from Burned Area Assessment Report (USDA Forest Service 2001..	3 – 113
Table 3.13.4	Acres of Fire Severity by Fire.....	3 – 115
Table 3.13.5	Fire Retardant Drop Information.....	3 – 115
Table 3.13.6	Average Fuel Loadings (Tons per Acre) for All Fire Groups (Fischer and Bradley 1987).....	3 – 118
Table 3.13.7	Fuel Loads for Light and Heavy Fuels in VRU 2 (Fire Groups 2 through 6) from Field Verification of Photo Fuel Guides.....	3 – 119
Table 3.13.8	Historical Natural Fire Regimes and Fire Groups.....	3 – 120
Table 3.14.1	LOLOSED Mitigation for Road Closure Levels (FDR = Forest Development Road, HIR = Historic Road).....	3 – 127
Table 3.14.2	Miles of Road within the Project Area by Closure Level and NRV (Natural Recovery Value).....	3 – 129
Table 3.14.3	Roads (of Several Types and Ownerships) Included in Post Burn Analysis Area...	3 – 132
Table 3.14.4	Road Functional Classes and Miles of Each Class within the Project Area.....	3 – 133
Table 3.14.5	Road Densities (mi/mi <sup>2</sup> ) within the Post Burn Analysis Area.....	3 – 134
Table 3.14.6	Miles of Road in the Analysis Area and Project Area Treated by BAER.....	3 – 136
Table 3.14.7	Miles of Road in the Project Area Not Treated by BAER (by Maintenance Level)	3 – 137
Table 3.14.8	Access and Travel Management (ATM) Restrictions on Forest Service Roads in the Post Burn Project Area.....	3 – 139
Table 3.14.9	Forest Service Trails and Travel Restrictions within the Post Burn Project Area...	3 – 141
Table 3.15.1	Douglas-fir Beetle Hazard Rating (Lolo National Forest).....	3 – 143
Table 3.15.2	Relationship of Vegetation Response Units (VRU), Fire Groups and Habitat Type Groups.....	3 – 147
Table 3.15.3	Fire Severity by Vegetation Response Unit (VRU) for the Post Burn Analysis (Lolo National Forest).....	3 – 147
Table 3.15.4	Post Fire Successional Stages for the Post Burn Analysis Lolo National Forest.....	3 – 148
Table 3.15.5	Bark Beetle Caused Tree Mortality (Acres) in Watersheds in the Post Burn Analysis Area Observed During Aerial Detection Flights in Years 1996 through 2000 (Forest Health Protection).....	3 – 154
Table 3.15.6	Summary of Stands at Risk to Bark Beetle (Acres Listed by Wildfire).....	3 – 155
Table 3.15.7	Potential Old Growth Stands (Acres) in Burnt Fork EMA by Wildfire Severity...	3 – 157
Table 3.15.8	Potential Old Growth Stands (Acres) in Upper Ninemile EMA by Wildfire Severity.....	3 – 158
Table 3.15.9	Potential Old Growth Stands (Acres) in Trout Creek EMA by Wildfire Severity...	3 – 158
Table 3.15.10	Summary of Old Growth within the Burnt Fork, Upper Ninemile and Trout Creek EMAs.....	3 – 159
Table 3.15.11	Potential VRU 2 Old Growth Stands (Acres) in Burnt Fork EMA by Wildfire Severity.....	3 – 159
Table 3.15.12	Potential VRU 2 Old Growth Stands (Acres) in Upper Ninemile EMA by Wildfire Severity.....	3 – 160
Table 3.15.13	Potential VRU 2 Old Growth Stands (Acres) in Trout Creek EMA by Wildfire Severity.....	3 – 160
Table 3.15.14	Summary of Old Growth within VRU 2 of the Burnt Fork, Upper Ninemile and Trout Creek EMAs.....	3 – 160
Table 3.15.15	Pre- and Post-Fire Occurrences (acres) of Seral Conifer Forest Types in the Post Burn Analysis Area.....	3 – 161
Table 3.15.16	Potential Reforestation Needs by Wildfire.....	3 – 162
Table 3.15.17	Fire Life Forms of Some Common Understory Plants in the Survivor Component of Northern Rocky Mountain Forests (Stickney, 1991).....	3 – 163
Table 3.16.1	Sensitive Plant Species Survey Priorities for Post-Burn EIS Proposed Activities...	3 – 165
Table 3.16.2	Sensitive Plant Species and Criteria Used to Determine Potential Habitat.....	3 – 168

Table 3.17.1	Weed Presence, Distribution, and Density in Burned Areas within the Post Burn Project Area.....	3 – 172
Table 3.18.1	Federally Listed Species Which May be Present on the Lolo National Forest.....	3 – 177
Table 3.18.2	Wolf Pack Data.....	3 – 177
Table 3.18.3	Winter Range Acreage by Elk Herd Unit.....	3 – 178
Table 3.18.4	Acres of Burn Intensity on Winter Range.....	3 – 179
Table 3.18.5	Acres of Post-Fire Elk security.....	3 – 179
Table 3.18.6	Open Road Density within the Elk Herd Units.....	3 – 179
Table 3.18.7	Fire and Lynx analysis Unit Overlap.....	3 – 181
Table 3.18.8	Losensky’s Historic Vegetation Conditions.....	3 – 181
Table 3.18.9	Percent of Lynx Foraging Habitat by LAU.....	3 – 181
Table 3.18.10	Percent of Lynx Denning Habitat by LAU.....	3 – 182
Table 3.18.11	Burned Acres in each LAU.....	3 – 182
Table 3.18.12	Percent of Unsuitable Lynx Habitat after the Fires.....	3 – 183
Table 3.18.13	Grazing Allotments that Overlap LAUs.....	3 – 183
Table 3.18.14	Open Road Density by LAU.....	3 – 184
Table 3.18.15	Summary of Denning, Foraging and Unsuitable Habitat by LAU.....	3 – 185
Table 3.18.16	Sensitive Species Which May be Present or May Have Suitable Habitat in the Project Area.....	3 – 185
Table 3.18.17	Sensitive Species with No Suitable Habitat in the Project Area.....	3 – 186
Table 3.18.18	Acres of Goshawk Potential Habitat in the Project Area.....	3 – 187
Table 3.18.19	Acres of Potential Black-backed Woodpecker Habitat from the 2000 fires on the Lolo National Forest.....	3 – 188
Table 3.18.20	Wildfire Acreage on the Lolo National Forest for 1997, 1998, and 1999.....	3 – 189
Table 3.18.21	Acres of Fisher Habitat Following the Fires of 2000.....	3 – 190
Table 3.18.22	Wolverine Sightings on the Superior Ranger District.....	3 – 191
Table 3.18.23	Pileated Woodpecker Habitat: Percent of Forest Land in Potential Old Growth by EMA.....	3 – 192
Table 3.18.24	Montana Elk Management Plan Recommendations.....	3 – 193
Table 3.18.25	Elk Herd Units and Fires.....	3 - 193
Table 3.18.26	Hunting Districts and Elk Management Units.....	3 – 193
Table 3.18.27	Elk trend flights—Hunting District 201 Tarkio to St. Regis.....	3 – 193
Table 3.18.28	Elk trend flights—Hunting District 202 Quartz to Cougar Creek.....	3 – 194
Table 3.18.29	Acres of Elk Summer Range.....	3 – 195
Table 3.18.30	Acres and Percent of Elk Security Loss from Fires within the Herd Units.....	3 – 196
Table 3.18.31	Summary of Elk Habitat by Herd Unit.....	3 – 197
Table 3.18.32	Factors Contributing to Fragmentation.....	3 – 199
Table 3.19.1	Drainages, Watersheds and Streams Included in Post Burn EIS Fisheries Analysis	3 – 202
Table 3.19.2	Summary of drainage and watershed features that influence watershed and fisheries condition in the Ninemile, Alpine, Flat, and Landowner Fire analysis areas.....	3 – 214
Table 3.19.3	Fisheries Survey Sites (2001) Within the Ninemile, Alpine, Flat, and Landowner Fires and Past Surveys Used in the Post Burn Analysis of Fish Habitat and Population Condition.....	3 – 218
Table 3.19.4	Mean (Range) Salmonid Densities in Streams in the Ninemile Drainage.....	3 – 219
Table 3.19.5	Fish Habitat Surveys (2001) from Streams in the Ninemile, Landowner, Flat, and Alpine Fires Compared with INFISH RMOs and Lolo National Forest RMOs	3 – 226
 <b>Chapter 4</b>		
Table 4.2.1	Alternative #4 Harvest Units in High burn Severity Soil.....	4 – 7
Table 4.2.2	Alternative #5 Harvest Units in High burn Severity Soil.....	4 – 9
Table 4.5.1	Alternative #4 Vegetation Management within Unroaded Areas.....	4 – 27
Table 4.5.2	Alternative #5 Vegetation Management within Unroaded Areas.....	4 – 28
Table 4.6.1	Effectiveness of Selected Erosion Control Measures (Seyedbagheri, 1996).....	4 – 31
Table 4.6.2	Additional Examples of the Effectiveness of Erosion Control Measures.....	4 – 32

Table 4.6.3 Short-term and Long-term Total Sediment Yield (percent over natural) in First Creek for all Alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 35

Table 4.6.4 Summed Total Modeled Sediment Yield in First Creek for years 2000 through 2015 (percent over natural) for all alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 35

Table 4.6.5 Short-term and Long-term Sediment Yield (Percent over Natural) from Roads in First Creek for All Alternatives, from LOLOSED Results..... 4 – 36

Table 4.6.6 Sum of Modeled Road-derived Sediment Yield in First Creek for years 2000 through 2015 (percent over natural) for all alternatives, from LOLOSED results.... 4 – 36

Table 4.6.7 Short-term and Long-term Total Sediment Yield (percent over natural) in Upper Ninemile Creek for All Alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 38

Table 4.6.8 Summed Total Modeled Sediment Yield in Upper Ninemile Creek for years 2000 through 2015 (percent over natural) for all alternatives, from LOLOSED results.... 4 – 38

Table 4.6.9 Short-term and Long-term Sediment Yield (percent over natural) from Roads in Upper Ninemile Creek for All Alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 39

Table 4.6.10 Sum of Modeled Road-derived Sediment Yield in Upper Ninemile Creek for years 2000 through 2015 (percent over natural) for all alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 40

Table 4.6.11 Short-term and Long-term Total Sediment Yield (percent over natural) in Big Blue Creek for All Alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 41

Table 4.6.12 Summed Total Modeled Sediment Yield in Big Blue Creek for years 2000 through 2015 (percent over natural) for all alternatives, from LOLOSED results... 4 – 41

Table 4.6.13 Short-term and Long-term Sediment Yield (percent over natural) from Roads in Big Blue Creek for All Alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 42

Table 4.6.14 Sum of Modeled Road-derived Sediment Yield in Big Blue Creek for years 2000 through 2015 (percent over natural) for all alternatives, from LOLOSED results... 4 – 42

Table 4.6.15 Short-term and Long-term Total Sediment Yield (percent over natural) in Siegel Creek for All Alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 44

Table 4.6.16 Summed Total Modeled Sediment Yield in Siegel Creek for years 2000 through 2015 (percent over natural) for all alternatives, from LOLOSED results... 4 – 44

Table 4.6.17 Short-term and Long-term Sediment Yield (percent over natural) from Roads in Siegel Creek for All Alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 45

Table 4.6.18 Sum of Modeled Road-derived Sediment Yield in Siegel Creek for years 2000 through 2015 (percent over natural) for all alternatives, from LOLOSED results... 4 – 46

Table 4.6.19 Short-term and Long-term Total Sediment Yield (percent over natural) in Flat Creel for All Alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 47

Table 4.6.20 Summed Total Modeled Sediment Yield in Flat Creek for years 2000 through 2015 (percent over natural) for all alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 47

Table 4.6.21 Short-term and Long-term Sediment Yield (percent over natural) from Roads in Flat Creek for All Alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 48

Table 4.6.22 Sum of Modeled Road-derived Sediment Yield in Flat Creek for years 2000 through 2015 (percent over natural) for all alternatives, from LOLOSED results... 4 – 49

Table 4.6.23 Short-term and Long-term Total Sediment Yield (percent over natural) in Johnson Creek for All Alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 50

Table 4.6.24 Summed Total Modeled Sediment Yield in Johnson Creek for years 2000 through 2015 (percent over natural) for all alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 50

Table 4.6.25 Short-term and Long-term Sediment Yield (percent over natural) from Roads in Johnson Creek for All Alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 51

Table 4.6.26 Sum of Modeled Road-derived Sediment Yield in Johnson Creek for years 2000 through 2015 (percent over natural) for all alternatives, from LOLOSED results 4 – 52

Table 4.6.27 Short-term and Long-term Total Sediment Yield (percent over natural) in Idaho Gulch for All Alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 53

Table 4.6.28 Summed Total Modeled Sediment Yield in Idaho Gulch for years 2000 through 2015 (percent over natural) for all alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 53

Table 4.6.29 Short-term and Long-term Sediment Yield (percent over natural) from Roads in Idaho Gulch for All Alternatives, from LOLOSED results..... 4 – 54

Table 4.6.30	Sum of Modeled Road-derived Sediment Yield in Idaho Gulch for years 2000 through 2015 (percent over natural) for all alternatives, from LOLOSED results...	4 – 54
Table 4.6.31	Short-term and Long-term Total Sediment Yield (percent over natural) in Trout Creek for All Alternatives, from LOLOSED results.....	4 – 56
Table 4.6.32	Summed Total Modeled Sediment Yield in Trout Creek for years 2000 through 2015 (percent over natural) for all alternatives, from LOLOSED results.....	4 – 56
Table 4.6.33	Short-term and Long-term Sediment Yield (percent over natural) from Roads in Trout Creek for All Alternatives, from LOLOSED results.....	4 – 57
Table 4.6.34	Sum of Modeled Road-derived Sediment Yield in Trout Creek for years 2000 through 2015 (percent over natural) for all alternatives, from LOLOSED results...	4 – 57
Table 4.6.35	Miles of road within 300 feet of channels for all alternatives, by watershed.....	4 – 59
Table 4.6.36	Acres of harvest and prescribed burning that may occur within 300 feet of channels, but outside RHCAs.....	4 – 62
Table 4.6.37	Comparison of ECA values for Alternatives 1, 2, 4, and 5.....	4 – 67
Table 4.7.1	Comparison of Estimated Smoke Emissions from 500 Acres by Alternative.....	4 – 76
Table 4.8.1	Fuel Loads Resulting from a Frequent Fire Regime (Every 15 to 30 Years) Compared to Fuel Loads with Little or No Fire Applied for One Stand.....	4 – 78
Table 4.8.2	Cost Comparison of Prescribe Burn and Wildfire (Cost per Acre).....	4 – 78
Table 4.9.1	Alternative Comparison of Road Density (miles/mile <sup>2</sup> ) by Management Area in the Post Burn Project Area.....	4 – 86
Table 4.9.2	Alternative Summary Comparison of Road Work.....	4 – 87
Table 4.9.3	Road and Trail Use Restriction Definitions .....	4 – 88
Table 4.9.4	Road Closure Level Definitions.....	4 – 89
Table 4.9.5	Alternative #2 Proposed Seasonal Restriction and Closure Levels.....	4 – 91
Table 4.9.6	Alternative #2 Proposed Seasonal Road Use Restrictions.....	4 – 92
Table 4.9.7	Alternative #4 Proposed Seasonal Road Use Restriction and Closure Levels.....	4 – 92
Table 4.9.8	Alternative #4: Proposed Seasonal Road Use Restrictions .....	4 – 93
Table 4.9.9	Alternative #5 Proposed Seasonal Road Restriction and Closure Levels.....	4 – 94
Table 4.9.10	Alternative #5: Proposed Seasonal Road Use Restrictions .....	4 – 95
Table 4.9.11	Shapes and Feathers Timber Sale Road Closure Locations.....	4 – 95
Table 4.10.1	Alternative 4 Harvest Activities (acres) by VRU.....	4 – 96
Table 4.10.2	Alternative 5 Harvest Activities (acres) by VRU.....	4 – 96
Table 4.10.3	Acres of Harvest Treatments Proposed by Alternative in Areas that are at High Risk to Bark Beetle Infestations.....	4 – 96
Table 4.10.4	Acres of VRU 2 Treated to Reduce Fuel Loadings by Alternative.....	4 – 98
Table 4.10.5	Acres of Vegetative Treatment within VRU2 for Old Growth Enhancement and Recruitment by Alternative.....	4 – 99
Table 4.13.1	Percent of Elk Security within the Herd Unit by Alternative.....	4 – 109
Table 4.13.2	Open Road Density within the Herd Unit by Alternative (miles/square mile).....	4 – 109
Table 4.13.2a	Losensky’s Historic Vegetative Conditions - Percent of Lodgepole Pine.....	4 – 112
Table 4.13.3	Open Road Density within LAUs by Alternative (mile/square mile).....	4 – 112
Table 4.13.4	Acres and Percent of Lynx Denning Habitat within the LAUs by Alternative.....	4 – 112
Table 4.13.5	Acres and Percent of Unsuitable Lynx Habitat within the LAUs by Alternative....	4 – 113
Table 4.13.5a	Losensky’s Historic Vegetative Conditions - Percent of All Cover Types.....	4 – 116
Table 4.13.5b	Regeneration Acres in the Project Area .....	4 - 116
Table 4.13.6	Acres and Percent of Pileated Woodpecker Habitat in Project Area Treated by Alternative.....	4 – 124
Table 4.13.7	Percent of Elk Security within the Herd Units after Cover Regrowth by Alternative.....	4 – 126
Table 4.14.1	Number of Existing Fish Passage Barriers, Number Proposed for Removal or Replacement under Alternatives 2, 4 and 5, and the Miles of Habitat Made Available to Downstream Fish Population Segments after Removal of Barriers....	4 – 135
Table 4.14.2	The Short- and Long-Term Sediment Yield by Drainage (percent over natural) from Roads for Alternative 1.....	4 – 140
Table 4.14.3	Miles of Road Closure Types by Drainage for Alternatives 2, 4, and 5.....	4 – 144

Table 4.14.4 Modeled Long-term Sediment Yield from Roads (percent over natural) by Drainage and Alternative.....	4 – 145
Table 4.14.5 Long-term Reductions in Road Derived Sediment from LOLOSED modeled data for Alternatives 2, 4, and 5, Compared to Alternative 1 in 2015.....	4 – 146
Table 4.14.6 Road Indicators for Project Drainages for All Alternatives.....	4 – 147
Table 4.16.1 Economic Efficiency Comparison of Alternatives.....	4 – 163
Table 4.16.2 Economic Impacts Comparison of Alternatives.....	4 – 166
Table 4.16.3 Job and Income Impacts by Management Activity.....	4 – 166
Table 4.16.4a Alternative 4 – Sale Detail.....	4 – 167
Table 4.16.4b Alternative 4 – Sale Detail continued.....	4 – 168
Table 4.16.5a Alternative 4 – Sale Detail.....	4 – 168
Table 4.16.5b Alternative 4 – Sale Detail continued.....	4 – 169