

# TRAVEL MANAGEMENT RULE

## FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

### Errata Sheet

**August 2014**  
**Revised October 2014**

The Travel Management Rule Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was released in June 2014. This errata sheet documents corrections to the text of the published FEIS. These corrections reflect minor errors and omissions discovered after the release of the FEIS, and as such this document should be reviewed along with the FEIS. Tracked changes are utilized (underlined additions and crossed-out deletions) for some of the changes where it would assist the reader in more easily following the corrections. There are no changes to the project or significant new circumstances or information identified in the Errata Sheet that affect the analysis and conclusion in the Travel Management Rule FEIS.

### CHANGES TO THE TEXT OF THE FEIS

#### Chapter 3, Aquatic Species and Habitat

##### ***Errata #1. Page 227, Table 51.***

The loach minnow and spikedace were listed as threatened species when the Draft EIS came out in 2011. However, in February 2012 both species became listed as endangered species. This change was not noted within Table 51.

**Table 51. Federally listed threatened or endangered species occurring on the Gila National Forest**

Species (Common Name)	Status	Designated Critical Habitat
Loach minnow	<del>Threatened</del> Endangered	Yes
Spikedace	<del>Threatened</del> Endangered	Yes
Gila chub	Endangered	Yes
Chihuahua chub	Threatened	No
Gila trout	Threatened, MIS	No

**Errata #2. Page 243.**

The loach minnow was listed as threatened species when the Draft EIS came out in 2011. However, in February 2012 it became listed as an endangered species. This change was not noted within the heading for loach minnow.

Loach Minnow (~~Threatened~~ Endangered)

**Errata #3. Page 245.**

The spikedace was listed as threatened species when the Draft EIS came out in 2011. However, in February 2012 it became listed as an endangered species. This change was not noted within the heading for spikedace.

Spikedace (~~Threatened~~ Endangered)

**Errata #4. Page 252.**

The loach minnow and spikedace were listed as threatened species when the Draft EIS came out in 2011. However, in February 2012 both species became listed as endangered species. This change was not noted within Table 71.

**Table 71. Gila National Forest threatened, endangered, and designated critical habitat effects determinations**

Species (common name)	Status	Alt. B	Alt. C	Alt. D	Alt. E	Alt. F	Alt. G
Loach minnow	⌘ E with DCH		MALAA	MALAA	MALAA	MALAA	MALAA
Spikedace	⌘ E with DCH		MALAA	MALAA	MALAA	MALAA	MALAA
Gila chub	E with DCH		MANLAA	MANLAA	MANLAA	MANLAA	MANLAA
Chihuahua chub	T		MALAA	MALAA	MALAA	MALAA	MALAA
Gila trout	T		MALAA	MALAA	MALAA	MALAA	MALAA

Key: T=threatened; E=endangered; DCH=designated critical habitat; NE= no effect; MANLAA=may affect, not likely to adversely affect; MALAA=may affect likely to adversely affect

## Chapter 3, Cultural Resources

### Errata #5. Page 420, Table 199.

Table 199 should have included the numbers of analysis acres and acres surveyed to standard for the changes in the route system (Newly Proposed Route Designations) for each alternative. This information is located in Table 5 on page 23 within the Cultural Resources Specialist Report for each Newly Proposed Route designation. While this table was not included within the FEIS, rows 11 and 12 of Table 5 contain information on total numbers of analysis acres and acres surveyed to standard for each alternative. These two rows should have been added to Table 199 in the FEIS for simple comparison between alternatives of the total analysis acres and acres surveyed to standard for changes in the route system (Newly Proposed Route Designations) for each alternative.

**Table 199. Proposed route system changes and number of known sites by alternative**

Sites and Routes	Alt. B	Alt. C	Alt. D	Alt. E	Alt. F	Alt. G
Changes in route system (newly proposed route designations) in miles	N/A	204.52	93.19	11.39	119.62	118.88
Known sites	5,346 Sites (due to motorized cross-country)	49 Sites	27 Sites	6 Sites	33 Sites	34 Sites
Change in number of known sites expressed as a percent (+or-) from Alt. B	N/A	-99.08%	-99.49%	-99.89%	-99.38%	-99.36%
<u>Number of Analysis Acres</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>2458.20</u>	<u>1132.17</u>	<u>145.21</u>	<u>1444.31</u>	<u>1436.48</u>
<u>Number of Acres Surveyed to Standard (Percentage Surveyed)</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>1029.17 (41.87%)</u>	<u>614.93 (54.31%)</u>	<u>32.22 (22.19%)</u>	<u>817.58 (56.61%)</u>	<u>809.43 (56.35%)</u>

### Errata #6, page 423, Table 200.

Table 200 should have included a row the number of Motorized Dispersed Camping Corridor acres surveyed to standard. This row was inadvertently left out when the table was copied from the Cultural Resources Specialist Report into the FEIS. The table appears in the Cultural Resources Specialist Report in its entirety (Table 8, page 27).

**Table 200. Motorized dispersed camping corridor acres available by alternative**

<b>Motorized Dispersed</b>						
<b>Camping Corridor Acres and Sites</b>	<b>Alt. B</b>	<b>Alt. C</b>	<b>Alt. D</b>	<b>Alt. E</b>	<b>Alt. F</b>	<b>Alt. G</b>
Number of acres available	2.44 million	108,180	84,388	0	101,915	94,008
Change in number of acres of motorized dispersed camping corridors expressed as a percent (+ or -) of alternative B		-96%	-97%	-100%	-96%	-96%
Number of known cultural sites	5,346	983	657	0	844	755
Change in number of known cultural sites within motorized dispersed camping corridors expressed as a percent (+ or -) of alternative B		-82%	-88%	-100%	-84%	-86%
<u>Acres Surveyed to Standard</u>	<u>395,483</u>	<u>72,383</u>	<u>60,342</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>69,178</u>	<u>66,546</u>
	(16%)	(67%)	(72%)		(68%)	(71%)

**Chapter 2, Alternatives, Including the Proposed Action**

***Errata #7. Page 34, Table 16.***

Row 3 of Table 16 under the Roads section was incorrectly labeled. The correct label for the displayed values should be “Annual Maintenance” and not “Deferred Maintenance”.

Table 16. Comparison of resources by alternatives

<b>Resource</b>	<b>Alternative B</b>	<b>Alternative C</b>	<b>Alternative D</b>	<b>Alternative E</b>	<b>Alternative F</b>	<b>Alternative G</b>
<b>Roads</b>						
<b>Public safety</b>	Route safety concerns relatively low.	No change.	No change.	No change.	No change.	No change.
<del><b>Deferred maintenance needs (cost)</b></del> <b>Annual maintenance needs (cost)</b>	\$5,169,689	\$5,130,016	\$4,791,394	\$4,616,603	\$4,889,869	\$4,880,903