

**Attachment B
Issue Sorting table**

PROJECT NAME: Pine Fuel Reduction Project:
Compartments 70, 120-122, and 130
DATE: 5/5/2004

COMMENTS/POTENTIAL ISSUES ARE CATEGORIZED ACCORDING TO WHETHER THEY ARE:

- 1) RESOLVED BY FOREST PLAN
- 2) ADDRESSED THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION OF FOREST PLAN S&Gs and BMPs
- 3) ADDRESSED THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT-SPECIFIC DESIGN CRITERIA
- 4) ADDRESSED DURING PROCESS OR ANALYSES ROUTINELY CONDUCTED BY ID TEAM
- 5) ADDRESSED THROUGH SPACIAL LOCATION OF ACTIVITIES DURING ALTERNATIVE DESIGN
- 6) USED TO DRIVE OR PARTIALLY DRIVE AN ALTERNATIVE, or
- 7) BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

Commenter	Affected Resource	Comment/Potential Issue	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Issue
1) Heartwood										
Received 5/3/2004	forest lands	Analysis needs to address all the projects							x	process
(electronic)	forest lands	It is illegal for the Forest Service to break up these projects into individual projects to avoid doing an EIS or EA							x	process
	forest lands	All the issues we raised in our comments on all the other burning projects needs to be addressed							x	process
2) Missouri Forest Alliance										
Received 5/3/2004	forest lands	Analysis needs to address all the projects							x	process
(electronic)	forest lands	It is illegal for the Forest Service to break up these projects into individual projects to avoid doing an EIS or EA							x	process
	forest lands	All the issues we raised in our comments on all the other burning projects needs to be addressed							x	process

NOTES

Both Heartwood and Missouri Forest alliance made exact same comments and signed same letter. and answered questions by public, made info available to adjoining landowners