

APPENDIX N—CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

The following past, present, and reasonably foreseeable programmatic actions have affected or could affect the various resources in Idaho Roadless Areas. There is additional discussion of cumulative effects within the various resource area sections of chapter 3 of the EIS.

Existing Forest Plans, As Amended

Existing plans form the baseline of effects. The effects of these plans have previously been determined and disclosed in appropriate National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents.

Past Programmatic Amendments and Federal Policies That Affect Units In the Planning Area

Past programmatic actions either amended existing plans, or added or changed higher-level policy that affected existing plans. Policy decisions have been incorporated into the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Both amendments and policy decisions are discussed here, either because they changed management direction or because they affected many existing plans and may be relevant to the future management of Idaho Roadless Areas.

Past Amendments

PACFISH and INFISH

The 1994 Interim Strategies for Managing Anadromous Fish-producing Watersheds in Eastern Oregon and Washington, Idaho and Portions of California (PACFISH) (USDA Forest Service and USDI BLM 1995) and the 1995 Inland Native Fish Strategies (INFISH) (USDA Forest Service 1995) amended plans by establishing management requirements within riparian habitat conservation areas that apply to all Forest Service units within Idaho. PACFISH and INFISH generally require retention of vegetation near streams and wetlands.

PACFISH and INFISH requirements apply to all riparian habitat conservation areas, regardless of whether they contain Idaho Roadless Areas. Since any project that occurs in an Idaho Roadless Area will follow PACFISH/INFISH requirements, the effects of PACFISH and INFISH are the same under all four alternatives.

PACFISH and INFISH provide measures to mitigate the impacts of road building and/or tree cutting near riparian areas to acceptable levels. Given the PACFISH and INFISH requirements at the project level, the Existing Plans alternative poses a low risk to riparian and aquatic habitats. The 2001 Roadless Rule, the Proposed Idaho Roadless Rule (Proposed Rule), and the Modified Idaho Roadless Rule (Modified Rule) would further reduce impacts on riparian and aquatic habitats through their various prohibitions on road building and tree cutting in Idaho Roadless Areas. In the context of the State of Idaho as a whole, these roadless area alternatives would result in additional riparian habitat being protected. These additional protections vary by alternative, commensurate with the projected levels of activities described in tables 3-2 and 3-3.

Forest Plan Amendments For Grizzly Bear Habitat Conservation For the Greater Yellowstone Area National Forests

A record of decision was issued in April 2006 that amended six forest plans on six Greater Yellowstone Area national forests (Beaverhead-Deerlodge, Bridge-Teton, Caribou-Targhee, Custer, Gallatin, and Shoshone). The Caribou-Targhee is the only national forest in Idaho that was amended by this decision. The amendment incorporates habitat standards and other relevant provisions in the Final Conservation Strategy for the Grizzly Bear in the Greater Yellowstone Area (USDA Forest Service 2006c).

The purpose and need for this amendment was to ensure conservation of habitat to sustain the recovered grizzly bear population, update the management and monitoring of grizzly bear habitat, provide consistency among Greater Yellowstone area national forests in managing grizzly bear habitat, and ensure the adequacy of regulatory mechanisms for grizzly bear habitat protection upon delisting as identified in the Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan. This amendment would apply to all activities implemented on the Caribou-Targhee National Forest pursuant to any of the alternatives.

The grizzly bear conservation strategy (USDA Forest Service 2006c, 2006d):

- Would continue to provide for input into the planning process for all roads and new construction;
- Recommends minimum road and site construction specifications and construction times;
- Recommends that roads, trails, drill sites, and landing zones be located to avoid habitat;
- Recommends that new roads that are not compatible with area management objectives and are no longer needed be restricted or decommissioned;
- Keeps developed recreation at existing levels; and
- May limit size and number of individual fuel-reduction projects requiring new motorized access inside the primary conservation area.

The Forest Service will continue to follow the provisions of the grizzly bear conservation strategy, regardless of which of the four alternatives is implemented. The Idaho Roadless Rule therefore has no effect on these requirements.

The grizzly bear conservation strategy ensures that projects on the Caribou-Targhee National Forest are conducted in a way that safeguards grizzly bear habitat. Given these requirements at the project level, the Existing Plans alternative poses a low risk to grizzly bear habitat. The 2001 Roadless Rule, the Proposed Rule, and the Modified Rule would further reduce impacts on grizzly bear habitat through their various prohibitions on road building, tree cutting, and mining in Idaho Roadless Areas. These additional protections will likely vary according to the projected levels of activities described in tables 3-2 and 3-3, and in section 3.5, Minerals and Energy Resources, in chapter 3 of this EIS.

Northern Rockies Lynx Management Direction

A record of decision was issued in March 2007 that provides direction contributing to conservation and recovery of Canada lynx in the Northern Rockies ecosystem (USDA Forest Service 20071). The direction applies to mapped lynx habitat on NFS land presently occupied by

Canada lynx as defined by the Amended Lynx Conservation Agreement between the Forest Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS).

The purpose and need for this direction was to incorporate into land management plans management direction that conserves and promotes recovery of Canada lynx, by reducing or eliminating adverse effects from land management activities on National Forest System (NFS) lands, while preserving the overall multiple-use direction in existing plans. This amendment applies to all activities implemented on the Idaho Panhandle, Kootenai, Clearwater, Nez Perce, and Salmon-Challis National Forests, and the Targhee portion of the Caribou-Targhee National Forest, if they are in occupied lynx habitat. The amendment provides additional protections to lynx and indirectly to other fish and wildlife species.

The Forest Service will continue to follow Northern Rockies lynx management direction, regardless of which of the four alternatives is implemented. The Idaho Roadless Rule therefore has no effect on these requirements.

The lynx management direction ensures that projects are conducted in a way that safeguards lynx habitat. Given these requirements at the project level, the Existing Plans alternative poses a low risk to lynx habitat. The 2001 Roadless Rule, the Proposed Rule and the Modified Rule would further reduce impacts on lynx habitat through their various prohibitions on road building, tree cutting, and mining in Idaho Roadless Areas. These additional protections will likely vary commensurate with the projected levels of activities described in table 3-2, table 3-3, and section 3.5, Minerals and Energy Resources, in chapter 3.

Past Policy Decisions

2008 Planning Rule

On March 22, 2008, the Forest Service published a new planning rule (USDA Forest Service 2008t [73 FR 21468]). This rule is considered to be procedural and does not cause national forests and grasslands to make decisions contrary to other national rules such as the 2001 Roadless Rule. However, the 2001 Roadless Rule and any future State-specific rules will have an indirect effect on forest plan revision efforts under the 2008 planning rule because they would pre-restrict certain types of actions on those lands affected by the rule. Agency line officers would not change those restrictions during the land management plan revision process. Conversely, during individual forest plan development in Idaho, it is anticipated that forest supervisors and regional foresters would consider plan alternatives that would, in the long term, more closely mirror the goals established under the Idaho Roadless Rule. This alignment would not increase or decrease acreage but would better match the types of activities allowed and any restrictions to those activities. It is not anticipated that all lands affected by the rule would conform during forest planning, for a variety of reasons that include wildlife management issues, recreational demands, fiscal concerns, and congressional action. This would also be true if other State-specific rules are promulgated under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA).

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA define a cumulative effect as “the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions” (40 CFR § 1508.7).

For cumulative impacts to accrue there must first be an impact from the action under review that can then be added to the impacts of other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions. Neither the 2008 planning rule nor any of the alternative planning rules (2000, 2005 planning rules) dictate how administrative units of the National Forest System are to be managed. These alternative rules establish administrative procedures. The Agency does not expect that any of these rules would affect the mix of uses on any or all units of the National Forest System. Consequently, there are no direct or indirect effects to be added to any past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions.

Because the 2008 planning rule and any of the alternative planning rules are procedural, the Agency also considered the possibility of synergies between these rules and other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable changes to Agency procedures. The Agency considered possible interactions with a foreseeable proposal to move Agency NEPA procedures into regulation, the Agency's recent categorical exclusion for land management planning, and the legal uncertainties surrounding 2001 Roadless Rule and Idaho Roadless Rule. These considerations did not indicate a concern as to cumulative impacts of the above rules, regulations, and agency procedures.

Forest Service NEPA Procedures

On July 24, 2008, the Agency issued a procedural rule to guide its implementation of the NEPA (USDA Forest Service 2008d). While the new rule includes some changes, most of the Agency's NEPA procedures were moved to regulation unchanged. No cumulative effects are expected from these actions because these are intended to be procedural requirements that do not cause effects on the human environment.

The Roads Policy

This 2001 policy incorporated at 36 CFR 212 provides the Forest Service direction about its transportation system. The roads policy gives managers a scientific analysis process to inform their decision-making. It directs the Agency to maintain a safe, environmentally sound road network that is responsive to public needs and affordable to manage but that calls for unneeded roads to be decommissioned.

The roads policy generally has no effects because it is an analysis process. It is likely to result in improved habitat for wildlife, plant, and aquatic species and lead to fewer roads in the future. For cumulative impacts to accrue there must first be an impact from the action under review that can be added to the impacts of other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions. Because the roads policy merely establishes an analysis process and does not dictate the mix of uses on the ground, it has no direct or indirect effects that will interact with the Idaho Roadless Rule. Therefore there are no cumulative effects from the Idaho Roadless Rule and the roads policy.

The National Travel Management Final Rule

In November 2005, the Forest Service published a new travel management rule governing motor vehicle use on national forests and grasslands (USDA Forest Service 2005b). Under the final rule, each national forest or ranger district will designate those roads, trails, and areas open to motor vehicle use by class of vehicle and, if appropriate, by time of year. As designation is completed on a national forest or ranger district, motor vehicle use off the designated system

will be prohibited. Designated routes and areas will be identified on a motor vehicle use map. Motor vehicle use outside of designated routes and areas will be provided for fire, military, emergency, and law enforcement purposes, and for use under Forest Service permit. Valid existing rights are honored. The rule also maintains the status quo for snowmobile use, as determined in individual forest plans.

The travel management rule will:

- Likely have no effect on fire management, forest management, grazing, transportation systems, mineral and energy development, winter recreation, or land acquisition because it does not affect permits or valid existing rights;
- Likely lead to fewer roads in the future;
- Likely affect the amount and type of roads open to public use.

Travel management decisions are made under separate travel planning processes and are ongoing for all Idaho National Forests. The Idaho Roadless Rule specifically maintains the status quo in this arena and defers to the travel management process. As stated in section 3.4 in chapter 3 of this EIS, none of the alternatives would have a measurable impact on access to NFS lands or on rural highway access when considered on a State or national scale because: (1) they do not include access decisions and (2) new road construction is projected to be minimal in the foreseeable future.

National Fire Plan

The National Fire Plan (NFP) was developed in August 2000, following a landmark wildland fire season, with the intent of actively responding to severe wildland fires and their impacts on communities while ensuring sufficient firefighting capacity and safety for the future. The NFP addresses five key points: firefighting, rehabilitation, hazardous fuels reduction, community assistance, and accountability (USDA Forest Service and USDI 2000).

The NFP established an intensive, long-term hazardous fuels reduction program in response to the risks posed by heavy fuels loads – the result of decades of fire suppression activities; sustained drought; and increasing insect, disease, and invasive plant infestations. Hazardous fuels treatments are accomplished using a variety of tools, including prescribed fire, wildland fire use, mechanical thinning, timber harvest, herbicides, grazing, or combinations of these and other methods. Treatments are being increasingly focused in the expanding wildland-urban interface (WUI) areas.

Various sections of chapter 3 of this EIS, particularly sections 3.2 (Vegetation and Forest Health) and 3.3 (Fuels Management), discuss the interaction of the four Idaho Roadless Rule alternatives with the National Fire Plan. A discussion of cumulative effects can be found there as well.

10-Year Comprehensive Strategy and the Idaho Statewide Implementation Strategy

The 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy of 2001 takes a collaborative approach to reducing wildland fire risks to communities and the environment for the Forest Service, while also setting goals for wildland fire policy (USDA Forest Service 2001c). In 2006 the State of Idaho adopted the Idaho Statewide Implementation Strategy as an expansion and update of the 10-year Comprehensive Strategy.

The National Fire Plan, the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy, and the Idaho Statewide Implementation Strategy all share goals to:

- Improve fire prevention and suppression;
- Promote community assistance;
- Restore fire-adapted ecosystems (post-fire restoration); and
- Reduce hazardous fuels.

The effects of the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy and its interaction with the Idaho Roadless Rule are essentially the same those as under the National Fire Plan. Sections 3.2 (Vegetation and Forest Health) and 3.3 (Fuels Management) discuss the impacts of these policies.

The Development of a Collaborative Fuel Treatment Program

The 2003 multiparty memorandum of understanding (MOU) describes criteria for selecting Forest Service fuel treatment projects and defines high-priority areas as the WUI and forest condition classes 2 and 3 outside the WUI (USDA Forest Service et al. 2003).

These documents do not prescribe specific outcomes; they are not programmatic decisions; they merely identify actions that should be taken to respond to the NFP.

In response to the NFP, an Idaho Statewide Implementation Strategy for the National Fire Plan was developed (Idaho Department of Lands 2002). A Statewide Working Group was created to assist counties in implementing the NFP (IDWG 2007). This organization was also used to develop community wildfire protection plans under the auspices of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act. Community wildfire protection plans designate WUI areas around communities where priority fuel treatments are subsequently identified (IDL 2007).

The effects of the Collaborative Fuel Treatment Program and its interaction with the Idaho Roadless Rule are essentially the same those as under the National Fire Plan. Sections 3.2 (Vegetation and Forest Health) and 3.3 (Fuels Management) discuss the impacts of these policies.

Healthy Forests Initiative

In August 2002, the President issued Healthy Forests: An Initiative for Wildfire Prevention and Stronger Communities. The intent of the initiative is to better protect people and natural resources by lowering the procedural and process hurdles that impede the reduction of hazardous fuels on public land. The initiative includes:

- Improving procedures for developing and implementing fuels treatment and forest restoration projects in priority forests and rangelands;
- Reducing the number of overlapping environmental reviews by combining project analyses and establishing a process for concurrent project clearance by Federal agencies;
- Developing guidance for weighing the short-term risk against the long-term benefits of fuel treatment and restoration projects;
- Developing guidance to ensure consistent NEPA procedures for fuel treatment activities and restoration activities.

One outcome of the Healthy Forests Initiative was the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (HFRA).

Various sections of chapter 3 of this EIS, particularly sections 3.2 (Vegetation and Forest Health) and 3.3 (Fuels Management), discuss the interaction of the four Idaho Roadless Rule alternatives with the Healthy Forests Initiative. A discussion of cumulative effects can be found there as well.

Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-148, HFRA)

The Healthy Forests Restoration Act, approved by Congress in December 2003, applies to the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The act contains a variety of provisions to expedite hazardous-fuel reduction and forest-restoration projects on specific types of Federal land that are at risk of a wildland fire or insect and disease epidemics. The act helps rural communities, States, Tribes, and landowners restore healthy forest and rangeland conditions, on State, tribal, and private lands.

Even though they do not specify outcomes, the direction set forth in these documents (the NFP and HFRA) was considered in the effects analysis. The analysis evaluates the relative ability to treat hazardous fuels primarily within the WUI and municipal watersheds. The prohibitions and permissions for road construction/ reconstruction and timber cutting, sale, or removal influence the ability to treat hazardous fuels.

Timber cutting and associated road-building projections portrayed in the EIS reflect activities anticipated to be implemented within Idaho Roadless Areas in response to the NFP, Healthy Forests Initiative, and HFRA. Various sections of chapter 3 of the EIS, particularly sections 3.2 (Vegetation and Forest Health) and 3.3 (Fuels Management), discuss the interaction of the four Idaho Roadless Rule alternatives with the HFRA. A discussion of cumulative effects can be found there as well.

Woody Biomass Utilization Strategy

This 2008 strategy describes how Forest Service programs can better coordinate to improve the use of woody biomass in tandem with forest management activities on both Federal and private lands. Although the focus is on the use of woody biomass, the primary broader objective is sustaining healthy and resilient forests that will survive an environment of natural disturbances and threats including climate change. One of four goals of the strategy is facilitating a reliable and predictable supply of biomass. The strategy does not prescribe any specific outcomes.

Each of the roadless rule alternatives would result in a different level of biomass being available for use from Idaho Roadless Areas, commensurate with the levels of tree harvest predicted in table 3.2. However, the amount of biomass expected to come from Idaho Roadless Areas would be a very small portion of the total woody biomass supply in Idaho. As such, the goals of the woody biomass utilization strategy would be unaffected by the outcome of the Idaho Rule.

Energy Implementation Plan

The 2001 Forest Service Energy Implementation Plan was written to implement elements of Executive Order 13212, Actions to Expedite Energy Related Projects, also called the National Energy Plan (USDA Forest Service 2001b). The National Energy Plan encourages agencies to "...expedite their review of permits and or take other actions necessary to accelerate the

completion of such projects, while maintaining safety, public health, and environmental protections...”

No priority areas were identified in Idaho. The Energy Implementation Plan does not prescribe any specific outcome and is not a programmatic decision. It merely identifies actions that should be taken to respond to the National Energy Plan.

Even though it does not specify outcomes, the direction set forth was considered in the effects analysis in chapter 3 of this EIS. The National Energy Plan would have few effects on resources in roadless areas because the potential for energy development is low. Idaho was allocated none of the undiscovered oil resources, and 1 percent of the undiscovered gas resources, in the 2003 U.S. Geological Services assessment of undiscovered oil and gas resources within the Wyoming Thrust province.

Energy Policy Act of 2005

Recognizing the fundamental importance of the delivery of energy supplies to the Nation’s economic well-being, Congress passed section 368 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require certain Federal agencies to designate energy corridors on Federal lands in 11 western States, including Idaho, and to coordinate with each other to create a cooperative, efficient process for applicants to apply for rights-of-way in such corridors. Congress stated in section 368 that the agencies should incorporate the designated corridors into their respective land use or resource management plans. Congress also directed the agencies to conduct environmental reviews that are required to designate corridors and add the designated corridors to the plans.

As directed by Congress in section 368 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, the Forest Service is participating in preparing a programmatic EIS to designate energy corridors on land it administers for oil, gas, and hydrogen pipelines and electricity transmission and distribution facilities in 11 contiguous western States and to incorporate these designations into affected agency land use plans (USDE et al. 2005). Energy corridors not addressed in the programmatic analysis would be subject to a separate environmental analysis.

None of the Idaho corridors being addressed in the programmatic EIS would affect Idaho Roadless Areas; therefore, no effects on roadless areas due to these designated energy corridors are anticipated.

There are two primary energy resources in Idaho – one is oil and gas, which is in limited supply as discussed above; the other is geothermal. Partly as an outgrowth of the Energy Policy Act, there is renewed interest in Idaho’s geothermal resources. The BLM and Forest Service have initiated a national programmatic EIS for geothermal development to assist in geothermal leasing and permitting on BLM public lands and NFS lands. A notice of availability of the draft programmatic EIS was published in the *Federal Register*, 73 FR 33802, on June 13, 2008 (USDI BLM and USDA Forest Service 2008). When completed, the EIS will help the Forest Service decide whether or not to allow BLM to lease lands with medium to high geothermal potential, including the lands contained in the Boise and the Salmon-Challis applications (USDI BLM 2008). None of the Idaho forests have a current leasing decision for geothermal resources (USDI BLM and USDA Forest Service 2007a and 2008).

Potential development of energy resources in Idaho Roadless Areas was considered in the EIS, to the degree information was available. This discussion can be found in section 3.5 of chapter 3.

Forest Service Open Space Conservation Strategy

The Forest Service announced its Open Space Conservation Strategy on December 6, 2007. This strategy establishes goals and priority actions to conserve open space across private and public land and underscores the importance of the conservation of open space to the mission of the Forest Service (USDA Forest Service 2007o).

Each day 6,000 acres of open space are lost in the United States as more people choose to live at the urban fringe and in scenic, rural areas. Between 1982 and 2001, approximately 34 million acres of open space (an area the size of Illinois) were developed. Considering forestlands specifically, more than 10 million acres were converted to houses, buildings, lawns, and pavement between 1982 and 1997, and another 26 million acres of forests are projected to be developed by 2030 (USDA 2007o).

Development of open space affects the Agency's ability to manage national forests and grasslands, as well as the ability to help private landowners and communities manage their land to maintain private and public benefits and ecosystem services. At stake is the ability of private and public forests and rangelands to provide clean water, scenic beauty, biodiversity, outdoor recreation, and natural resource based jobs, forest products, and carbon sequestration.

The Open Space Conservation Strategy establishes four priority actions for the Forest Service, which can be broken down into 13 supporting actions:

- Convene partners to identify and protect priority open space.
 - Conduct a rapid science-based assessment of open space change to inform priorities.
 - Convene partners and stakeholders to identify regional priority lands.
 - Protect regional priority lands through partnerships and mechanisms such as land acquisition and conservation easements.
- Promote national policies and markets to help private landowners conserve open space.
 - Identify where changes in tax and other Federal policies could provide economic incentives and remove barriers for open space conservation.
 - Support the development of emerging ecosystem service markets to encourage private investments in open space conservation.
 - Encourage natural-resource-based industries to provide economic incentives for landowners to retain working lands.
 - Support recreation and tourism uses to generate revenue for landowners and communities from open space lands.
 - Provide and encourage landowner assistance and incentives to help keep working lands working.
- Provide resources and tools to help communities expand and connect open space.
 - Provide urban forestry assistance to communities to enhance and restore open space within cities, suburbs and towns.

- Develop tools to help communities strategically connect open spaces to build a functioning green infrastructure.
- Participate in community growth planning to reduce ecological impacts and wildfire risks.
 - Support and participate in local, regional, and transportation planning to conserve open space and retain ecosystem benefits.
 - Work with communities to plan for and reduce wildfire risks.

All four of the alternatives considered for the Idaho Roadless Rule are consistent with the actions identified in the Open Space Conservation Strategy. The management approaches of the alternatives include different combinations of active and passive land management. Under all the alternatives, however, Idaho Roadless Areas would remain open spaces, contributing to the Open Space Conservation Strategy established by the Forest Service.

Recreation Facility Master Planning

Agency leadership is concerned about the continued erosion of the capacity of national forest recreation sites to meet the needs of the recreating public.

- Recreation site deferred maintenance estimates have reached \$346 million; and
- In fiscal year (FY) 2004, national forests' existing, Forest Service-owned recreation sites had an inventoried capacity to provide 342 million people at one time (PAOT) days; however, in FY04, fewer than 84 million PAOT days (25 percent) were funded to be managed to quality standard.

Many of the facilities were built 30–50 years ago and have reached the end of their useful life without significant deferred maintenance investment. Other facilities receive little or no use and no longer serve the demand that existed in years past. The fundamental premise of the recreation program of work nationwide is to create an inventory that is sustainable and flexible enough to be annually adapted to any changes in demand, available resources, and opportunities.

Through the recreation site–facility master planning process (USDA Forest Service 2007p) the overall goal of the Forest Service recreation site program is to:

- Focus resources on the most appropriate recreation opportunities to meet changing public desires and demands;
- Maintain or enhance visitor satisfaction with the sites and services provided;
- Meet quality health and safety standards at all developed recreation sites ;
- Be financially sustainable;
- Be environmentally sound; and
- Maintain community sustainability.

Under each of the four alternatives, decisions on the use of recreation sites and resources would still be made under either the forest travel management plan or through other forest-level decision making processes. Since the Idaho Roadless Rule will have no effect on Recreation

Facility Master Planning, there is no interaction between the two sets of regulations, and no cumulative effects to consider.

The Idaho Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (2005)

The Idaho Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (IDFG 2005) provides a foundation for sustaining Idaho's fish and wildlife and the habitats on which they depend. The strategy provides general directions for wildlife conservation and a stimulus to engage partners in conservation of Idaho's wildlife resources. In addition, there are several species-specific recovery plans and conservation strategies for species occurring in Idaho, such as the Idaho Bull Trout Plan (Batt 1996). The importance of this strategy and the role of non-Federal land in wildlife conservation is discussed in the cumulative effects portion of section 3.9 Terrestrial Animal Habitat and Species.

Non-Native Invasive Species

Non-native invasive species are a problem throughout Idaho. Several current State and Federal activities and authorities address some invasive species, their prevention, and control – namely, the Idaho Invasive Plan 2005 [IDA 2005] and the National Strategy and Implementation Plan for Invasive Species Management [USDA Forest Service 2004a]). Of particular concern is that the presence or spread of invasive species could potentially limit the effectiveness of habitat improvements or efforts to recover species. Roads often provide vectors for spread of invasive species. In general, areas with fewer roads have a lower risk of having invasive species populations established. The Idaho and national invasive plans provide guidance to reduce and/or limit the spread of noxious weeds. Overall, these guiding documents would beneficially affect ecological processes, wildlife, fisheries, and roadless characteristics by identifying actions to reduce or limit the spread of noxious weeds.

The Roads Policy and Travel Management Policy can provide information on what roads are needed and unneeded, and which roads would remain open or closed. As noted in section 3.4, Road Construction/Reconstruction, roads are being decommissioned more than they are being constructed; therefore cumulatively there are fewer roads on the landscape. The trend toward road decommissioning is expected under each of the four alternatives, as is continued emphasis on noxious weed management and prevention. Since these trends will continue regardless of which alternative is selected, there would be few cumulative effects from the Idaho Roadless Rule on non-native invasive species.

Executive Order 13443: Facilitation of Hunting Heritage and Wildlife Conservation

In part Executive Order 13443 directs the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior to facilitate the expansion and enhancement of hunting opportunities and the management of game species and their habitats by evaluating the effect of Agency actions on trends in hunting participation and, where appropriate, to address declining trends and implement actions that expand and enhance hunting opportunities for the public. The analysis evaluates the potential effect on wildlife and hunting and shows that the alternatives would not affect the ability to expand or enhance hunting opportunities on NFS lands in Idaho.

Reasonably Foreseeable Policy or Programmatic Decisions

Forest Plan Amendments For Access Management In the Selkirk and Cabinet/Yaak Grizzly Bear Recovery Zones

In March 2004, the Kootenai, Idaho Panhandle, and Lolo National Forests amended their plans to change existing plan objectives, standards, and guidelines about motorized access in the Selkirk and Cabinet-Yaak Grizzly Bear Recovery Zones (USDA Forest Service 2004g). The preferred alternative, alternative E, set road densities and core areas for each bear management unit (BMU) reflecting the unique features of each BMU. The grizzly bear access management amendment:

- Could improve habitat for wildlife, plant and aquatic species;
- May increase fire risk lands where access is restricted;
- Could reduce timber harvest;
- Could reduce areas available for precommercial thinning;
- May change recreational user experiences, especially where vegetation grows back in restricted roads; and
- Would not affect mineral and energy development, grazing or land acquisition.

On December 13, 2006, Judge Donald Malloy, United States District Court for the District of Montana, set aside this EIS and ROD and remanded the matter to the Forest Service for preparation of a new environmental analysis. A supplemental EIS is being prepared, with a final decision anticipated in 2009.

The Forest Service would follow the provisions of the final decision on bear recovery zones regardless of which alternative is adopted. Additionally, all four alternatives for the Idaho Roadless Rule defer to the travel management process for decisions on the motorized use of roads, so any effects of bear recovery zones would be felt in the travel management process. The effects of the bear recovery zones would be the same under all four alternatives. Cumulatively, when the amendment is completed it would provide additional protection of the grizzly bear in the Selkirk and Cabinet-Yaak ecosystems in Idaho Roadless Areas.

Snake River Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Plan

NOAA Fisheries, in partnership with Idaho's Office of Species Conservation, is beginning to draft Idaho's portion of the Snake River Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Plan. This plan is scheduled to be completed in 2008. Important salmon and steelhead habitats existing in Idaho Roadless Areas are analyzed in section 3.8, Aquatic Species, in this EIS.

Potential For Other State-specific Roadless Area Regulations

In November 2006, Colorado Governor Bill Owens submitted a petition to the Secretary of Agriculture for State-specific direction for the conservation and management of 4.4 million roadless acres within the State of Colorado. In April 2007, Colorado Governor Bill Ritter amended the petition. The Agency is proceeding with promulgation of a Colorado State-specific rule with the State as a cooperating agency. A notice of intent for the supporting environmental impact statement was published in the Federal Register on December 26, 2007. The 60-day

comment period closed February 25, and a proposed rule and accompanying draft environmental impact statement are expected to be published in summer 2008.

The Agency considered possible interactions among the Idaho Roadless Rule, the potential Colorado Roadless Rule, and the legal uncertainties surrounding 2001 Roadless Rule. The Idaho Rule and the Colorado Rule are not connected actions. They will not affect each other; however, they will each incrementally affect the national roadless area picture. Additionally, if the 2001 Roadless Rule is again enjoined by the courts, the existence of two State-specific roadless rules may encourage other States to submit petitions for State-specific roadless area management rules.

The 2001 Roadless Rule has been subject to ten lawsuits and has been alternately enjoined and reinstated. In part to respond to the lawsuits and the continued public concern for roadless areas, the Department published in 2005 the State Petitions for Inventoried Roadless Area Management Rule (70 FR 25654). As part of this rule, the Roadless Area Conservation National Advisory Committee was established to make recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture on State petitions and provide a national perspective on roadless area management. The States of California, Idaho, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia filed petitions under the State Petition Rule. The North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia petitions were essentially the same as the 2001 Roadless Rule. California sought a “no net loss” policy for inventoried roadless lands. New Mexico wanted the 2001 Roadless Rule plus the inclusion of the 101,000 acres of the Valle Vidal¹. The District Court for the Northern District of California enjoined the State Petition Rule on September 20, 2006, and reinstated the 2001 Roadless Rule. Since then these States have not sought to file a petition under the authority of the APA (5 U.S.C. §553(e)) and 7 CFR 1.28.

Prior to the September 2006 injunction, the States of Arizona, Illinois, Oregon, Wisconsin, and Washington announced they intended to submit a petition under the State Petition Rule. They have not indicated if they will pursue a petition under the APA. The State of Utah announced it would file a petition under the APA, but in January 2007 announced the effort was tabled. The States of West Virginia and Wyoming have announced they did not intend to file a petition under the State Petition Rule.

The 2001 Roadless Rule continues to face legal uncertainty. The remaining active lawsuit was heard by Judge Clarence A. Brimmer of the Wyoming District Court on October 19, 2007, and his decision is pending. If the 2001 Roadless Rule is again enjoined by court action and the injunction on the 2005 State Petition Rule continues, the pre-2001 Roadless Rule status would be in effect for inventoried roadless areas. Individual land management plans for national forests and grasslands would dictate the management of individual inventoried roadless areas covered by their plan. Approximately 34 million acres would not have prohibitions for road construction.

Around 40 national forests have undergone revision since the 2001 Roadless Rule and have new inventories for potential wilderness evaluation and recommendation. Some forests have decreased the number of acres for consideration by removing areas where roads are now present (part of the 2.8 million acres identified in the 2001 Roadless Rule), while others have

¹ Since the submission of the New Mexico petition, the Valle Vidal Protection Act of 2006 was enacted, establishing congressional direction for this land.

increased the size of their inventories because of changed conditions. Another 40 national forests are currently in the process of revising their plans.

If the management of roadless areas is once again returned to individual land management plans, it is reasonably foreseeable that other State petitions would be submitted requesting protections from road construction and timber harvesting for these areas through rulemaking. The Agency does not plan to reinitiate a nation-wide rule because of the contentious and litigious nature of such an approach as shown in the cases of 2001 Roadless Rule. The Agency expects it would continue to pursue rulemaking at the State level, where there is demonstrated interest by governors. The Agency believes this approach best meets a balanced approach between local and national interests.

Based on the previously submitted State petitions, the Agency estimates there would be less than a 6 percent decrease in the 49.2 million acres² currently protected by the 2001 Roadless Rule over the next 15 years (approximately 3 million acres). This estimate assumes future petitions would request withdrawal of the 2.8 million acres identified in the 2001 Roadless Rule as having some level of activity that affected some of its roadless characteristics as well as other special areas like ski area expansions and specialized mineral and energy resource areas.³ These decreases will most likely be in western forests. From forest planning efforts since the 2001 Roadless Rule, the Agency has seen individual forests with increases in inventoried roadless areas. Subsequent petitions may ask for protection of these areas which are currently outside the protection of the 2001 Roadless Rule.⁴

The Agency anticipates that future proposed project activities in an individual roadless area that may affect roadless characteristics through road construction, timber harvesting, and other development activities would still see intense public scrutiny, administrative appeals, and in some cases, legal challenge. However, the Agency believes that changes to individual IRAs would be incrementally small, changing a portion of the area and not the entire area, and would be infrequent.

Other Reasonably Foreseeable Actions

Danskin Land Exchange

The Forest Service is proposing to convey Federal lands that are not within Idaho Roadless Areas and is proposing to acquire some non-Federal lands that are within or adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas (USDA Forest Service 2006e). This could potentially increase the amount of roadless lands in Idaho.

² The 2001 Roadless Rule now applies to 49.2 million acres instead of the original 58.5 because of the 2003 government settlement with Alaska, which led to an exemption for the 9.3 million roadless acres of the Tongass National Forest.

³ The Agency is mindful that in the 22 years between RARE II and RACR, project activities occurred at a level where 2.8 million acres of the 58.5 million acres (less than 5 percent) in inventoried roadless areas may have had some their roadless characteristics affected.

⁴ In New Hampshire and Maine, the 2005 White Mountain National Forest Plan proposes an increase of inventoried roadless acres. New Mexico's request for inclusion of the Valle Vidal is another example of a State petition requesting an increase. The proposed Colorado roadless rule may include more than 300,000 acres of new roadless designation.

Grandmother Mountain Land Exchange

On October 16, 2007, Forest Supervisor Ranota McNair of the Idaho Panhandle National Forests approved the Grandmother Mountain land exchange (USDA Forest Service 2007q). The Forest Service would convey 1,325.38 acres of Federal land for 2,394.38 acres of non-Federal land. About 80 acres of non-Federal land would be acquired within the Pinchot Roadless Area and 1,279 acres of non-Federal land would be acquired within the Grandmother Mountain land exchange. This decision is reflected in the Idaho Roadless Area maps, because these lands are shown as Federal lands; therefore, this decision has been considered in this EIS.

Summary of Cumulative Effects

This section discusses the “synergistic interaction of different effects” disclosed under each resource section as they qualitatively relate to each other with a look beyond the specific policies and programmatic decisions described above. A similar analysis of cumulative effects was provided in the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation EIS, in the cumulative effects section of chapter 3. Much of the discussion in the 2001 EIS is still applicable to the cumulative effects of the Idaho Roadless Rule.

Key points that emerged from the 2001 Roadless Rule analysis included the increasing threats to biodiversity and open space due to population growth and continued development on the fringes of NFS land. In addition, more people are coming to appreciate national forests for their inherent “naturalness” rather than for the commodities they provide. The result is that roadless areas are expected to play an even greater role in the conservation of biodiversity, and that role will increasingly be recognized by the public.

The 2001 Rule analysis also concluded that the reductions in timber harvest and mineral production predicted from the rule would have little impact on these economic sectors on a national or regional scale. However, there could be localized impacts that significantly affect specific communities.

Similar themes emerged from the Idaho Roadless Rule EIS. Idaho Roadless Areas will continue to provide key wildlife habitat. Because of development on private land, biodiversity is expected to be at increased risk regardless of which Idaho Roadless Rule alternative is selected. The value of Idaho Roadless Areas for wildlife habitat is only likely to increase over time. Their value is even higher because of their role in providing large contiguous habitat blocks across other Federal, State, and private lands. As stated in section 3.9 of this EIS, the 2001 Roadless Rule, the Proposed Rule, and the Modified Rule alternatives are all expected to be beneficial to biological diversity. The Existing Plans alternative may or may not be sufficient to provide for biological diversity.

As with the 2001 Roadless Rule, many of the impacts of the Idaho Roadless Rule will not be felt on a national or regional scale, but the increased management flexibility offered by Existing Plans and the Proposed and Modified Rule alternatives could have an impact on a more local scale. There are currently an estimated 1.44 million acres of Idaho Roadless Areas at risk of insect and disease mortality, and 418,900 acres are in high priority WUI acres (fire regimes I, II, and III, and condition classes 2 and 3). The magnitude of these threats could increase further because of the potential effects of climate change on fire frequency and severity and forest insect and disease occurrence. While the increased flexibility under the Existing Plans and Modified and Proposed Rule alternatives are unlikely to affect the climate change or forest health impacts

on a broad scale, they could provide opportunities to treat high priority areas on a local scale that are currently not available under the 2001 Roadless Rule.

Management Direction for Idaho Roadless Areas that Overlap with Other States

There are ten National Forests with roadless areas that are adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas. The purpose of this section is twofold: first, to examine the compatibility of proposed management direction on Idaho Roadless Areas that extend beyond Idaho into another State; and second, to consider the cumulative effects of proposed management direction on areas that overlap with another State. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 of this EIS. Site specific evaluations of cumulative effects would also be conducted with the appropriate level of NEPA and applicable regulations.

Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest

There are six Idaho Roadless Areas adjacent to the Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest: Anderson Mountain, Garfield Mountain, Goat Mountain, Italian Peak, Mount Jefferson, and West Big Hole Roadless Areas. Tables N-1a and N-1b describe the existing and proposed plan management area permissions and prohibitions for the three activities (timber cutting, road construction, and mineral activities) that are analyzed for effects in this EIS.

Table N-1a. Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest (Montana) existing plan management prescriptions adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas.

Rx #	Description	Equivalent theme	Timber cutting	Roads construction	Minerals leasing
1	Nonforest noncommercial forest	Backcountry	Salvage and firewood removal permitted – other harvest not scheduled	Generally not permissible for surface management	Leasing and surface occupancy permitted
8	Dispersed recreation with high fisheries and wildlife values	Primitive	Post and pole and salvage permitted – other harvest not scheduled	Not permissible for surface management	Permissible with conditions
9	Recommended wilderness	Wild Land Recreation	Prohibited	Prohibited	Prohibited
10	Mt Jefferson further planning area for wilderness evaluation	Wild Land Recreation	Prohibited	Prohibited	Prohibited
21	Timbered lands with high wildlife values	GFRG	Permissible	Permissible	Leasing and surface occupancy permitted
24	Nonforested with significant wildlife habitat values	Backcountry	Post and pole and salvage permitted – other harvest not scheduled	Permissible for management objectives	Leasing and surface occupancy permitted
25	Key wildlife winter and summer range	Backcountry	Post and pole and salvage permitted – other harvest not scheduled	Permissible	Leasing and surface occupancy permitted

Table N-1b. Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest (Montana) proposed plans management prescriptions adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas. *

Rx #	Description	Equivalent theme	Timber cutting	Roads construction	Minerals leasing
--	Anderson Mountain managed to protect roadless character	Backcountry	Permissible	Prohibited	Controlled Surface Use – use and occupancy is allowed, but restricted to mitigate effects to a particular resource, such as requirements to meet a visual quality objective.
--	Garfield Mountain Recommended Wilderness	Wild Land Recreation	Prohibited	Prohibited	
--	Mount Jefferson managed to protect undeveloped (roadless) character,	Primitive	Prohibited	Prohibited	
--	Horse Prairie South managed for livestock and remote dispersed recreation	Backcountry	Permissible	Prohibited	
--	Medicine Lodge/Tendoy managed for livestock, dispersed recreation, and wildlife	GFRG	Permissible	Permissible	
--	Lima Peaks managed for livestock, dispersed recreation, and wildlife	Backcountry	Permissible	Prohibited	
--	Italian Peak Recommended Wilderness	Wild Land Recreation	Prohibited	Prohibited	
--	West Big Hole managed to protect roadless character	Primitive	Prohibited	Prohibited	
--	Selway-Saginaw managed for timber production	GFRG	Permissible	Permissible	

* based on Alternative 6 of the proposed plan

Anderson Mountain

In the Proposed and Modified Rules 18,500 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with 5,300 of these acres in the community protection zone (CPZ) (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans Anderson Mountain Roadless Area is in management area 21 and 25 and in the proposed plans in the Anderson Mountain management area. Management area 21 of the existing plans is more consistent with the General Forest, Rangeland and Grassland (GFRG) theme and management area 25 is consistent with the Backcountry theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, the Anderson Mountain management area is more consistent to the Backcountry theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities. Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. The 5,300 acres in the CPZ theme of the Modified Rule may have potential effects from temporary road construction for hazardous fuel treatments; however these activities are consistent with the existing plan management areas. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless

characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the 5,300 acres of the Idaho portion of the Anderson Mountain Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 31,100 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Anderson Mountain Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
21, 25	Anderson Mountain	Backcountry	Backcountry Backcountry CPZ

Garfield Mountain

In the Proposed Rule 14,500 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, 19,800 acres in the GFRG, theme, and 8,500 acres in the Primitive theme. Themes were adjusted in the Modified Rule based on a request from the State of Montana to provide compatible management direction adjacent to the Montana borders. In the Modified Rule, 32,000 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, 2,300 acres in the GFRG, theme, and 8,500 acres in the Primitive theme. In the existing plans Garfield Mountain Roadless Area is placed in management area 8 and 24 and for the proposed plans in the Garfield Mountain Recommended Wilderness management area. The existing plans management area 8 is consistent with the Primitive theme and management area 24 is consistent with the Backcountry theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, the Garfield Mountain Recommended Wilderness management area is more consistent with the Wild Land Recreation theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities. Activities in Backcountry and Primitive theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. In the Modified Rule lands adjacent to the Montana border are in the Primitive or Backcountry themes. None of the Backcountry theme overlaps CPZ, nor are there municipal water supply systems; therefore it is likely no roads would be constructed to facilitate timber cutting in the Backcountry theme under the Modified Rule.

Acres in the GFRG theme of the Proposed and Modified Rule may have potential effects from road construction for hazardous fuel treatments. The 2,300 acres in the GFRG theme in the Modified Rule are adjacent to lands already roaded. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Garfield Mountain Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 48,900 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Garfield Mountain Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
8, 24	Garfield Mountain Recommended Wilderness	Backcountry GFRG Primitive	Backcountry GFRG Primitive

Goat Mountain

In the Proposed and Modified Rules 35,700 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with 400 of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans Goat Mountain Roadless Area is placed in management area 1 and in the proposed plans in the Horse Prairie South management area. The existing plans management area 1 is consistent with the Backcountry theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, the Horse Prairie South management area is more consistent to the Backcountry theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. The 400 acres in the CPZ of the Modified Rule may have potential effects from temporary road construction for hazardous fuel treatments. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the 400 acres of the Idaho portion of the Goat Mountain Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 9,600 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Goat Mountain Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
1	Horse Prairie South	Backcountry	Backcountry Backcountry CPZ

Italian Peak

In the Proposed Rule 99,800 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, 39,700 acres in the GFRG theme, and 48,700 in the Wild Land Recreation theme. In the Modified Rule 139,500 acres in the Backcountry theme and 48,700 acres in the Wild Land Recreation theme. In the existing plans Italian Peak Roadless Area is placed in management areas 1, 8, 24, and 25 and in the proposed plans in the Medicine Lodge/Tendoy, Lima Peaks, and Italian Peak Recommended Wilderness management areas. The existing plan management areas 1, 24, and 25 are consistent with the Backcountry theme and management area 8 is more consistent with the Primitive theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules or the Backcountry with no CPZ in the Modified Rule. For the proposed plan, the Medicine Lodge/Tendoy management area is consistent to the GFRG theme, the Lima Peaks management area is consistent with the Backcountry theme, and the Italian Peak Recommended Wilderness management area is consistent with the Wild Land Recreation theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. The 39,700 acres in the GFRG theme of the Proposed Rule may have potential effects from road construction for hazardous fuel treatments. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Italian Peak Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 91,300 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Italian Peak Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
1, 8, 24, 25	Medicine Lodge/Tendoy, Lima Peaks, Italian Peak Recommended Wilderness	Backcountry GFRG Wild Land Recreation	Backcountry Wild Land Recreation

Mount Jefferson

In the Proposed Rule 13,200 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme and 41,000 acres in the Primitive theme. In the Modified Rule 2,700 acres are in the GFRG theme, 41,300 acres in the Primitive theme, and 10,200 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with 1,800 of these acres in the CPZ. In the existing plans Mount Jefferson Roadless Area is placed in management area 10 and in the proposed plans in the Mount Jefferson management area. The existing plans management area 10 is more consistent with the Wild Land Recreation theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, Mount Jefferson management area is more consistent to the Primitive theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities. Activities in the Backcountry and Primitive themes of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. The 1,800 acres in the CPZ and 2,700 acres in the GFRG theme of the Modified Rule may have potential effects from road construction for hazardous fuel treatments. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Mount Jefferson Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 4,400 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Mount Jefferson Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
10	Mount Jefferson	Backcountry Primitive	Backcountry Backcountry CPZ GFRG Primitive

West Big Hole

In the Proposed Rule 61,000 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme. In the Modified Rule 9,600 are placed in the GFRG theme and 51,400 acres in the Backcountry theme, with 8,900 of these acres are in the CPZ. 20,500 acres are in the Primitive theme for both the proposed and Modified Rules. In the existing plans West Big Hole Roadless Area is placed in management areas 1, 8, 9 and 25 and in the proposed plans in the West Big Hole and Selway-Saginaw management areas. Management area 1 and 25 of the existing plans is consistent with the Backcountry theme, management area 8 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Primitive theme, and management area 9 is consistent with the Wild Land Recreation theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, the West Big Hole management area is consistent to the Primitive theme and the Selway-Saginaw management area is consistent with the GFRG theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the 3 activities.

Activities in the Backcountry and Primitive themes of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. The 9,600 acres in the GFRG theme and the 8,900 in the CPZ of the Modified Rule may have potential effects from road construction for hazardous fuel treatments. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the West Big Hole Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 132,900 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

West Big Hole Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
1, 8, 24, 25	West Big Hole Selway-Saginaw	Backcountry Primitive	Backcountry Backcountry CPZ Primitive GFRG

Bitterroot National Forest

There are three Idaho Roadless Areas adjacent to the Bitterroot National Forest: Allan Mountain, Blue Joint Mountain, and Lolo Creek Roadless Areas. Tables N-2a and N-2b describe the existing and proposed plan management area permissions and prohibitions for the three activities (timber cutting, road construction, and mineral activities) that are analyzed for effects in this EIS.

Table N-2a. Bitterroot National Forest (Montana) existing plan management prescriptions adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas.

Rx #	Description	Equivalent theme	Timber cutting	Roads construction	Minerals leasing
5	Semi-primitive recreation activities and elk security	Primitive	Permissible for recreation objectives	Not permissible for new mineral leasing or timber cutting	Limited or no surface occupancy Mineral leasing permissible
6	Recommended wilderness	Wild Land Recreation	Not permitted	No roads for timber harvest or mineral leasing	Mineral leasing permissible
8a	Rocklands, grasslands, meadows, subalpine habitats	Backcountry	Permissible, however not scheduled	Permissible for timber cutting and mineral leasing	Mineral leasing permissible

Table N-2b. Bitterroot National Forest (Montana) proposed plans management prescriptions adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas.

Rx #	Description	Equivalent theme	Timber cutting	Roads construction	Minerals leasing
1.2	Recommended Wilderness	Wild Land Recreation	Not suitable for timber production	Not suitable	Not suitable
2.2 A,B	Backcountry (limited motorized travel)	Backcountry	Limited for low intensity to achieve desired conditions	Generally suitable	Generally suitable

Allan Mountain

In the Proposed and Modified Rules 44,400 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with 1,000 of these acres in the CPZ (of the Modified Rule). In the existing plan Allan Mountain

Roadless Area (immediately adjacent to the Idaho portion) is placed in management areas 5 (with a short segment in management area 8a) and in the proposed plan in management area 2.2A. Management area 5 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Primitive theme and management area 8a is consistent with the Backcountry theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, management area 2.2A of the proposed plan is more consistent with the Backcountry theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. The 1,000 acres in the CPZ of the Modified Rule may have potential effects from temporary road construction for hazardous fuel treatments; however these activities are consistent with management area 2.2B of the proposed plan. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Allan Mountain Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 102,300 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Allan Mountain Management Areas/Themes*

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
5, 8a,	2.2A	Backcountry	Backcountry Backcountry CPZ

Blue Joint

In the Proposed and Modified Rules Rule 500 acres are placed in the Primitive theme. In the existing plans Blue Joint Roadless Area (immediately adjacent to the Idaho portion) is placed in management areas 5 (with a short segment in management area 6) and in the proposed plan in management area 1.2 and 2.2B. Management area 5 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Primitive theme and management are 6 is consistent with the Wild Land Recreation theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, management area 1.2 of the proposed plan is more consistent to the Wild Land Recreation theme and 2.2B is consistent with the Backcountry theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in the Primitive theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Blue Joint Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 65,400 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Blue Joint Management Areas/Themes*

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
5, 6	1.2, 2.2B	Primitive	Primitive

Lolo Creek

In the Proposed Rule and Modified Rules 100 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with none of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans Lolo Creek Roadless Area is placed in management area 5 and in the proposed plans in management area 2.2A.

(Note: the Bitterroot National Forest portion of the Lolo Creek Roadless Area is not immediately adjacent to Idaho). Management area 5 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Primitive theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, management area 2.2B of the proposed plan is more consistent to the Backcountry theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the 100 acres of the Idaho portion of the Lolo Creek Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 17,400 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Lolo Creek Management Areas/Themes*

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
5	2.2A	Backcountry	Backcountry

* Lolo Creek Roadless Area also occurs on the Lolo National Forest. See table N-8.

Bridger-Teton National Forest

There is one Idaho Roadless Area adjacent to the Bridger-Teton National Forest: Gannett-Spring Creek Roadless Area. Tables N-3 describes the existing management area permissions and prohibitions for the three activities (timber cutting, road construction, and mineral activities) that are analyzed for effects in this EIS. Forest plan revision is in progress for the Bridger-Teton National Forest; however future management area designations for these roadless areas are not available in the current draft proposed plan dated on June, 14, 2006.

Table N-3. Bridger-Teton National Forest (Montana) existing plan management prescriptions adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas.

Rx #	Description	Equivalent theme	Timber cutting	Roads construction	Minerals leasing
10	Managed to allow for some resource development and roads while having no adverse and some beneficial effects on wildlife.	GFRG	Permissible	Permissible	Mineral and energy leasing permissible
12	Managed for high-quality wildlife habitat and escape cover, big-game hunting opportunities and dispersed recreation activities.	Backcountry	Permissible for habitat enhancement	Permissible	Mineral and energy leasing permissible

Gannett-Spring Creek

In the Proposed and Modified Rules 4,500 acres are placed Primitive theme, 7,900 acres in the GFRG theme, and 7,800 in the Backcountry theme, with none of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans the Gannett-Spring Creek Roadless Area is placed in management prescription 10 and 12. Management prescription 10 is more consistent with the

GFRG theme and management prescription 12 is consistent with the Backcountry theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules.

Activities in the Backcountry and Primitive themes of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. The 7,900 acres in GFRG theme may have potential effects from road construction for hazardous fuel treatments; however these activities are consistent with the existing plan prescriptions. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Gannett-Spring Creek Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 45,100 acres of this roadless area in Wyoming.

Gannett-Spring Creek Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
10, 12	NA	Primitive GFRG Backcountry	Primitive GFRG Backcountry

Caribou National Forest (Utah and Wyoming)

There are two Idaho Roadless Areas adjacent to the Utah and Wyoming portion of the Caribou National Forest: Clarkston Mountain and Stump Creek Roadless Areas. Tables N-4 describes the existing plan management area permissions and prohibitions for the three activities (timber cutting, road construction, and mineral activities) that are analyzed for effects in this EIS.

Table N-4. Caribou National Forest (Montana) existing plans management prescriptions adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas.

Rx #	Description	Equivalent theme	Timber cutting	Roads construction	Minerals leasing
2.7.1	Elk & Deer winter range critical	Backcountry	Permissible for habitat improvement	Permissible	Permissible
2.7.2	Elk & Deer winter range				
3.2	Semi-primitive recreation	Backcountry	Permissible for fuels reduction, post and pole, salvage	Limited to temporary roads for salvage harvest	Permissible
6.2	Rangeland vegetation management	GFRG	Permissible	Permissible	Permissible

Clarkston Mountain

In the Proposed and Modified Rules 9,900 acres are in the GFRG theme and 5,600 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with 3,600 of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans Clarkston Mountain Roadless Area is placed in management area 2.7.1 and 6.2. Management area 2.7.1 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Backcountry theme and management area 6.2 is consistent with the GFRG them of both the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities. Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent.

The 9,900 acres in the GFRG theme of both rules and the 3,600 acres in the CPZ of the Modified Rule may have potential effects from road construction for hazardous fuel treatments. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Clarkston Mountain Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 6,000 acres of this roadless area in Utah.

Clarkston Mountain Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
2.7.1, 6.2	NA	GFRG Backcountry	GFRG Backcountry Backcountry CPZ

Stump Creek

In the Proposed Rule 10,300 acres are in the GFRG theme, 6,300 acres are placed in the Primitive theme, and 76,600 in the Backcountry theme. For the Modified Rule 11,300 are placed in the GFRG theme, 6,300 acres are placed in the Primitive theme, and 75,600 are in the Backcountry theme, with 6,300 of these acres in the CPZ. In the existing plans Stump Cree Roadless Area is placed in management area 2.7.2 and 3.2. Management area 2.7.2 and 3.2 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Backcountry theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in the Backcountry and Primitive theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. The acres in the GFRG theme of both rules and the 6,300 acres in the CPZ of the Modified Rule may have potential effects from road construction for hazardous fuel treatments. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Stump Creek Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 700 acres of this roadless area in Wyoming.

Stump Creek Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
2.7.2, 3.2	NA	GFRG Primitive Backcountry	GFRG Primitive Backcountry Backcountry CPZ

Gallatin National Forest

There is one Idaho Roadless Areas adjacent to the Gallatin National Forest: Lionhead Roadless Area. Tables N-5 describes the existing plan management area permissions and prohibitions for the three activities (timber cutting, road construction, and mineral activities) that are analyzed for effects in this EIS.

Table N-5. Gallatin National Forest (Montana) existing plan management prescriptions adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas.

Rx #	Description	Equivalent theme	Timber cutting	Roads construction	Minerals leasing
4	Recommended Wilderness	Wild Land Recreation	Prohibited	Prohibited	Permissible with conditions
15	Grassland or rocky lands in grizzly bear habitat and dispersed recreation	Backcountry	Post and pole and other wood products permissible	Prohibited for surface management	Permissible with conditions
17	Non-forest or nonproductive	Backcountry	Post and pole and other wood products permissible	Prohibited for surface management	Permissible with conditions

Lionhead

In the Proposed Rule and Modified Rules, 500 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme and 11,200 are in the Wild Land Recreation theme. In the existing plans Lionhead Roadless Area is placed in management areas 4, 15, and 17. Management area 15 and 17 of the existing plans is consistent with the Backcountry theme and management area 4 is more consistent with the Wild Land Recreation theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities. Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Lionhead Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 32,800 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Lionhead Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
4, 15, 17	NA	Backcountry Wild Land Recreation	Backcountry Wild Land Recreation

Idaho Panhandle National Forest (Montana and Washington)

There are two Idaho Roadless Areas adjacent to the Washington and Montana portion of the Idaho Panhandle National Forest: Little Grass Mountain and Scotchman Peak Roadless Areas. Tables N-6a and N-6b describe the existing and proposed plan management area permissions and prohibitions for the three activities (timber cutting, road construction, and mineral activities) that are analyzed for effects in this EIS.

Table N-6a. Idaho Panhandle National Forest (Montana) existing plan management prescriptions adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas.

Rx #	Description	Equivalent theme	Timber cutting	Roads construction	Minerals leasing
1	Timber production	GFRG	Permissible	Permissible	Permissible
2	Timber production/grizzly bear habitat	Backcountry	Permissible, consistent with resource needs	Permissible with conditions	Permissible with conditions
4	Timber production in big game winter range	Backcountry	Permissible, consistent with resource needs	Permissible	Permissible
7	Caribou management	Backcountry	Permissible, consistent with resource needs	Permissible with conditions	Permissible with conditions
9	Non-forest	Primitive	Salvage and firewood permissible	Prohibited timber harvest Permissible for mineral leasing	Permissible
11	Proposed wilderness	Wild Land Recreation	Prohibited	Prohibited	Permissible with conditions

Table N-6b. Idaho Panhandle National Forest (Montana) proposed plans management prescriptions adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas.

Rx #	Description	Equivalent theme	Timber cutting	Roads construction	Minerals leasing
1b	Recommended Wilderness	Wild Land Recreation	Prohibited	Prohibited	Leasable and saleable prohibited
5	Backcountry	Backcountry	Permissible to improve habitat and administrative use	Permissible for public health and safety, resource protection emergencies and other rights	Mineral leasing permissible Oil and gas prohibited

Little Grass Mountain (Washington)

In the Proposed and Modified Rules 3,900 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with none of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans, Little Grass Mountain Roadless Area is placed in management areas 1, 4, 7, and 9 and in the proposed plans in management areas 5. Management areas 4 and 7 the existing plans is more consistent with the Backcountry theme, management area 9 is consistent with the Primitive theme, and management area 1 is more consistent with the GFRG theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, management area 5 is more consistent with the Backcountry theme for both Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Little Grass Mountain Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 4,000 acres of this roadless area in Washington.

Little Grass Mountain Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
1, 4, 7, 9	5	Backcountry	Backcountry

Scotchman Peaks (Montana)

Under the Proposed Rule 700 acres would fall under the GFRG, 7,500 acres under the Backcountry theme. Under the Modified Rule, there are 8,200 acres under the Backcountry theme, with 2,200 of these acres in the CPZ. There are also 10,900 acres under the Wild Land Recreation theme in both the Proposed and Modified Rules. In the existing plans, Scotchman Peak Roadless Area is placed in management areas 11 (with a short segment in management area 2) and in the proposed plans in management areas 1b. Management areas 2 the existing plan is consistent with the Backcountry theme and management area 11 is more consistent with the Wild Land Recreation theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, management area 1b is more consistent with the Wild Land Recreation theme for both Proposed and Modified Rules.

Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. The 700 acres in the GFRG theme of the Proposed Rule and the 2,200 acres in the CPZ of the Modified Rule may have potential effects from road construction for hazardous fuel treatments. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 66,100 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Scotchman Peaks Management Areas/Themes*

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
2, 11	1b	Backcountry GFRG	Backcountry Backcountry CPZ

* Scotchman Peaks Roadless Area also occurs on the Kootenai National Forest. See table N-7.

Kootenai National Forest

There are eight Idaho Roadless Areas adjacent to the Kootenai National Forest: Buckhorn Ridge, East Fork Elk, Maple Creek, Mt. Willard–Lake Estelle, Roberts, Scotchman Peaks, Trout Creek, and West Fork Elk Roadless Areas. Tables N-7a and N-7b describe the existing and proposed plan management area permissions and prohibitions for the three activities (timber cutting, road construction, and mineral activities) that are analyzed for effects in this EIS.

Table N-7a. Kootenai National Forest (Montana) existing plans management prescriptions adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas.

Rx #	Description	Equivalent theme	Timber cutting	Roads construction	Minerals leasing
2	Semi-Primitive Non-motorized recreation	Primitive	Prohibited	Roads will not be constructed for surface land mgmt purposes. Existing roads and road construction may be used on a case-by-case basis for mineral leasing.	Surface occupancy for oil and gas purposes is generally not permitted.
8	Recommended Wilderness	Wild Land Recreation	Prohibited	No road construction permitted	No mineral leasing permitted
10	Big game winter range	Backcountry	Permissible for habitat enhancement	Permissible	Permissible when compatible with resources Oil and gas permissible
11	Proposed wilderness	Wild Land Recreation	Prohibited	Prohibited	Permissible when compatible with resources Oil and gas permissible
12	Big game summer range	Backcountry	Permissible	Permissible	Permissible when compatible with resources Oil and gas permissible
14	Grizzly habitat management	Primitive	Permitted and would be coordinated with grizzly bear habitat	Permissible and would minimize grizzly bear impacts	Permissible when compatible with resources Oil and gas permissible
29	Primitive Recreation	Primitive	Will not occur	No road construction	Surface occupancy for oil and gas purposes is generally not permitted.

Table N-7b. Kootenai National Forest (Montana) proposed plans management prescriptions adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas.

Rx #	Description	Equivalent theme	Timber cutting	Roads construction	Minerals leasing
5a	Backcountry – Nonmotorized summer and winter	Backcountry	Suitable for wildlife habitat and ecosystem structure	Limited road construction	Suitable with roads
5b	Backcountry – Motorized summer and winter	Backcountry			
5c	Backcountry – Nonmotorized summer, motorized winter	Backcountry			
1d	Wildlands	Wild Land Recreation	Not suitable	Unsuitable	Unsuitable
6	General Forest	GFRG	Suitable	Road construction permissible	Suitable with roads

Buckhorn Ridge

In the Proposed Rule and Modified Rules, 6,700 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with 700 of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans, Buckhorn Ridge Roadless Area is placed in management area 2 and in the proposed plans in management area 5c. Management area 2 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Primitive theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules and management area 5c of the proposed plan is more consistent to the Backcountry theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

The 700 acres in the CPZ of the Modified Rule may have potential effects from temporary road construction for hazardous fuel treatments; however these activities are consistent with management area 5c of the proposed plan. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 of this EIS. These effects would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 22,000 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Buckhorn Ridge Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
2	5c	Backcountry	Backcountry Backcountry CPZ

East Fork Elk

In the Proposed Rule and Modified Rules 100 acres are placed in the GFRG theme. In the existing plans East Fork Elk Roadless Area is placed in management area 12 in the proposed plans in management area 6. Management area 12 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Backcountry theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules and management area 6 of the proposed plan is more consistent to the GFRG theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

The 100 acres in the GFRG may have potential effects from road construction for hazardous fuel treatments; however these activities are consistent with existing and proposed plans. Road

construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. The potential effects of the 100 acres of GFRG in the Idaho portion of this roadless area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 6,700 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

East Fork Elk Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
12	6	GFRG	GFRG

Maple Peak

In the Proposed Rule and Modified Rules 8,700 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with none of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans Maple Peak Roadless Area (immediately adjacent to the Idaho portion) is placed in management area 2 and in the proposed plans in management area 5b and 6. Management area 2 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Primitive theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, management area 5b of the proposed plan is more consistent to the Backcountry and management area 6 is consistent with the GFRG theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Maple Peak Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 7,400 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Maple Peak Management Areas/Themes*

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
	5b, 6	Backcountry	Backcountry

* Maple Creek Roadless Area also occurs on the Lolo National Forest. See table N-8.

Mt. Willard–Lake Estelle

In the Proposed Rule and Modified Rules, 56,800 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with 1,600 of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans, Mt. Willard–Lake Estelle Roadless Area is placed in management area 2 and in the proposed plans in management areas 5a and 5c. Management area 2 of the existing plan is more consistent with the Primitive theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules and management area 5a and 5c of the proposed plan is more consistent to the Backcountry theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. The 1,600 acres in the CPZ of the Modified Rule may have potential effects from temporary road construction for hazardous fuel treatments; however these activities are consistent with management area 5c of the proposed plan. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character

are described in chapter 3 of this EIS. These effects would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 9,600 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Mt. Willard-Lake Estelle Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
2	5a and 5c	Backcountry	Backcountry Backcountry CPZ

Roberts

In the Proposed Rule and Modified Rules, 7,400 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with none of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans Roberts Roadless Area is placed in management area 2 and in the proposed plans in management area 5a. Management area 2 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Primitive theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules and Backcountry with no CPZ in the Modified Rule. Management area 5a of the proposed plan is more consistent to the Backcountry theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 of this EIS. These effects would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 3,400 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Roberts Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
2	5a	Backcountry	Backcountry

Scotchman Peaks

Under the Proposed Rule 700 acres would fall under the GFRG, 7,500 acres under the Backcountry theme. Under the Modified Idaho Roadless Rule, there are 8,200 acres under the Backcountry theme, with 2,200 of these acres in the CPZ. There are also 10,900 acres under the Wild Land Recreation theme in both the Proposed and Modified Rules. In the existing plans, Scotchman Peak Roadless Area is placed in management areas 8 and 14 and in the proposed plans in management areas 5a, 5c, and 1d, with the majority of it in 1d. Management area 8 the existing plans is more consistent with the Primitive theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules and management area 14 of the existing plan is more consistent to the Wild Land Recreation theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities. For the proposed plan, management area 5a and 5c is more consistent with the Primitive theme and management area 1d is consistent with the Wild Land Recreation theme for both Proposed and Modified Rules.

Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. The 700 acres in GFRG of the Proposed Rule and the 2,200 acres in the CPZ of the Modified Rule may have potential effects from road construction for hazardous fuel treatments however these activities are consistent with management area 5a and 5c of the proposed plan. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These

effects would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 66,100 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Scotchman Peak Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
8, 14	5a, 5c, 1d	Backcountry GFRG	Backcountry Backcountry CPZ

* Scotchman Peaks Roadless Area also occurs on the Idaho Panhandle National Forest. See table N-6.

Trout Creek

In the Proposed Rule and Modified Rules 8,400 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with none of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans Trout Creek Roadless Area is placed in management area 2 and 29 and in the proposed plans in management area 5a. Management area 29 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Primitive theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules and management area 5a of the proposed plan is more consistent to the Backcountry theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 30,900 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Trout Creek Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
29	5a	Backcountry	Backcountry

West Fork Elk

In the Proposed Rule and Modified Rules 3,700 acres are placed in the backcountry theme, with none of the acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans West Fork Elk Roadless Area is placed in management area 10 in the proposed plans in management area 6. Management area 10 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Backcountry theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. Management area 5a of the proposed plan is more consistent to the Backcountry theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. The potential effects in the Idaho portion of this roadless area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 1,500 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

West Fork Elk Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
10	5a	Backcountry	Backcountry

Lolo National Forest

There are eight Idaho Roadless Areas adjacent to the Lolo National Forest: Gilt Edge-Silver Creek, Hoodoo, Lolo Creek, Maple Peak, Meadow Creek-Upper North Fork, Sheep Mountain-State Line, Stevens Peak, Wonderful Peak, and Roadless Areas. Tables N-8a and N-8b describe the existing and proposed plan management area permissions and prohibitions for the three activities (timber cutting, road construction, and mineral activities) that are analyzed for effects in this EIS.

Table N-8a. Lolo National Forest (Montana) existing plan management prescriptions adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas.

Rx #	Description	Equivalent theme	Timber cutting	Roads construction	Minerals leasing
1	Non-Forest or non commercial land maintained in near natural condition	Primitive	Limited to safety, trails, and firewood removal	Not permissible for surface management Permissible for mineral leasing	Oil and gas permissible Mineral leasing permissible
9	Lands of concentrated public use	Backcountry	Limited to safety and trails	Permissible	Oil and gas permissible New mineral leasing not permissible Existing mineral leasing continuance permissible
10	Small, unroaded parcels	Primitive	Limited to safety and trails	Not permissible for surface management Permissible for mineral leasing	Oil and gas permissible Mineral leasing permissible
11	Large, roadless blocks distinguished primarily by their natural environment	Primitive	Limited to safety and trails	Not permissible for surface management Permissible for mineral leasing	Oil and gas permissible Mineral leasing permissible
12	Wilderness or proposed wilderness	Wild Land Recreation	Not permitted	Not permitted	Not permitted
13	Lakes, riparian; includes floodplains and wetlands	Forest Plan Special Areas	Limited to safety, trails, habitat values	Permissible for management, with conditions	Oil and gas permissible Mineral leasing permissible
24	Lands of high visual sensitivity	Backcountry	Permissible	Permissible	Oil and gas permissible Mineral leasing permissible

Table N-8b. Lolo National Forest (Montana) proposed plans management prescriptions adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas.

Rx #	Description	Equivalent theme	Timber cutting	Roads construction	Minerals leasing
1.2	Recommended Wilderness	Wild Land Recreation	Not suitable for timber production	Not unsuitable	Not unsuitable
2.2 A, B	Backcountry Winter Motorized Travel	Backcountry	Limited for low intensity to achieve desired conditions	Generally suitable	Generally suitable
4.1B	General Forest Moderate Intensity Management	GFRG	Suitable for scheduled timber production	Generally suitable	Generally suitable
6.1	High Use Recreation Complexes or Use Areas	Backcountry	Permissible for desired vegetation conditions	Generally suitable	Generally suitable

Gilt-Edge Silver Creek

In the Proposed Rule and Modified Rules 200 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with 100 of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans Gilt-Edge Silver Creek Roadless Area (immediately adjacent to the Idaho portion) is placed in management areas 1 and 10 and in the proposed plans in management area 2.2B. Management area 1 and 10 of the existing plans are more consistent with the Primitive theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, management area 2.2B of the proposed plan is more consistent to the Backcountry theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. The 100 acres in the CPZ of the Modified Rule may have potential effects from temporary road construction for hazardous fuel treatments; however these activities are consistent with management area 2.2B of the proposed plan. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the 200 acres of the Idaho portion of the Gilt-Edge Creek Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 11,200 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Gilt-Edge Silver Creek Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
1, 10	2.2B	Backcountry	Backcountry Backcountry CPZ

Hoodoo

In the Proposed and Modified Rules Rule 151,900 acres are placed in the Wild Land Recreation theme and 2,000 acres are Special Areas of Historic and Tribal Significance theme (SAHTS). In the existing plans Hoodoo Roadless Area (immediately adjacent to the Idaho portion) is placed in management areas 12 and in the proposed plans in management area 1.2. Management area 12 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Wild Land Recreation theme of both the

Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, management area 1.2 of the proposed plan is more consistent to the Wild Land Recreation theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Hoodoo Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 98,100 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Hoodoo Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
12	1.2	Wild Land Recreation SAHTS	Wild Land Recreation SAHTS

Lolo Creek

In the Proposed Rule and Modified Rules 100 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with none of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans Lolo Creek Roadless Area (immediately adjacent to the Idaho portion) is placed in management areas 1, 11, and 12 and in the proposed plans in management area 1.2. Management area 1 and 11 of the existing plans are more consistent with the Primitive theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules and management area 12 is consistent with the Wild Land Recreation theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, management area 1.2 of the proposed plan is more consistent to the Wild Land Recreation theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the 100 acres of the Idaho portion of the Lolo Creek Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 17,400 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Lolo Creek Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
1, 11, 12	1.2	Backcountry	Backcountry

* Lolo Creek Roadless Area also occurs on the Bitterroot National Forest. See table N-2.

Maple Peak

In the Proposed Rule and Modified Rules 8,700 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with none of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans Maple Peak Roadless Area (immediately adjacent to the Idaho portion) is placed in management area 1 in the proposed plans in management area 2.2B. Management area 1 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Primitive theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, management area 2.2B of the proposed plan is more consistent to the Backcountry theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Maple Peak Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 7,400 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Maple Creek Management Areas/Themes*

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
1	2.2B	Backcountry	Backcountry

* Maple Creek Roadless Area also occurs on the Kootenai National Forest. See table N-7.

Meadow Creek-Upper North Fork

In the Proposed Rule 47,700 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme. In the Modified Idaho Roadless Rule 42,800 acres are in the Primitive theme and 4,900 are placed in the Backcountry theme, with none of these acres in the CPZ. In the existing plans Meadow Creek-Upper North Fork Roadless Area (immediately adjacent to the Idaho portion) is placed in management areas 11 (with a short segment in management area 9) and in the proposed plans in management area 2.2A (with a short segment in management area 4.1B). Management area 11 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Primitive theme and management area 9 is consistent with the Backcountry theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, management area 2.1A of the proposed plan is more consistent to the Backcountry theme and management area 4.1B is consistent with the GFRG theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in Backcountry and Primitive themes of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Meadow Creek-Upper North Fork Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 7,200 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Meadow Creek-Upper North Fork Management Areas/Themes*

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
9, 11	2.2A, 4.1B	Backcountry	Backcountry Primitive

Sheep Mountain – State Line

In the Proposed Rule and Modified Rules 26,900 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with none of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans Sheep Mountain-State Line Roadless Area (immediately adjacent to the Idaho portion) is placed in management areas 11 (with a short segment in management area 1) and in the proposed plans in management area 2.2A (with a short segment in 4.1B). Management area 11 and 1 of the existing plans are more consistent with the Primitive theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, management area 2.2A of the proposed plan is more consistent to the Backcountry theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Sheep Mountain-State Line Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 40,500 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Sheep Mountain-State Line Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
1 and 11	2.2A	Backcountry	Backcountry

Stevens Peak

In the Proposed Rule and Modified Rules 4,700 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with 200 of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans Stevens Peak Roadless Area (immediately adjacent to the Idaho portion) is placed in management areas 9 (with a short segment in management area 13) and in the proposed plans in management area 6.1. Management area 9 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Backcountry theme and management area 13 is consistent with the Forest Plan Special Areas of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, management area 6.1 of the proposed plan is more consistent to the Backcountry theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. The 200 acres in the CPZ of the Modified Rule may have potential effects from temporary road construction for hazardous fuel treatments; however these activities are consistent with management area 6.1 of the proposed plan and management area 9 of the existing plans. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Stevens Peak Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 600 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Stevens Peak Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
9, 13	6.1	Backcountry	Backcountry Backcountry CPZ

Wonderful Peak

In the Proposed Rule and Modified Rules 4,900 acres are placed in the Backcountry theme, with none of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans Wonderful Peak Roadless Area (immediately adjacent to the Idaho portion) is placed in management areas 9 and 10 (with a short segment in management area 24) and in the proposed plans in management area 4.1B. Management area 9, 10, and 24 of the existing plans are more consistent with the Primitive and Backcountry themes of both the Proposed and Modified Rules. For the proposed plan, management area 4.1B of the proposed plan is more consistent to the GFRG theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Wonderful Peak Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 1,600 acres of this roadless area in Montana.

Wonderful Peak Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
9, 10, 24	4.1B	Backcountry	Backcountry

Targhee National Forest (Wyoming)

There is one Idaho Roadless Areas adjacent to the Wyoming portion of the Targhee National Forest: Palisades Roadless Areas. Tables N-9 describes the existing plan management area permissions and prohibitions for the three activities (timber cutting, road construction, and mineral activities) that are analyzed for effects in this EIS.

Table N-9. Targhee National Forest (Montana) existing plans management prescriptions adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas.

Rx #	Description	Equivalent theme	Timber cutting	Roads construction	Minerals leasing
1.2	Wilderness Study Area	Wild Land Recreation	Permissible with conditions	Prohibited	Mineral leasing prohibited

Palisades

In the Proposed and Modified Rules 60,200 acres are placed Wild Land Recreation theme and 53,100 in the Backcountry theme, with 5,900 of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans the Palisades Roadless Area is placed in management area 1.2. Management area 1.2 of the existing plans is more consistent with the Wild Land Recreation theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities. A portion (76,900 acres) of the Palisades Roadless Area is also a part of the Bridger-Teton National Forest. This portion on the Bridger-Teton is also is also managed as a wilderness study area.

Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. The 5,900 acres in the CPZ of the Modified Rule may have potential effects from temporary road construction for hazardous fuel treatments. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Palisades Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 53,000 acres of the Targhee portion and the 76,900 acres in the Bridger-Teton portion of the Palisades Roadless Area in Wyoming.

Palisades Management Areas/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
1.2	NA	Wild Land Recreation Backcountry	Wild Land Recreation Backcountry Backcountry CPZ

Wasatch-Cache National Forest

There are three Idaho Roadless Areas adjacent to the Wasatch-Cache National Forest: Gibson, Mount Naomi, and Swan Creek Roadless Areas. Tables N-10 describes the existing plan management area permissions and prohibitions for the three activities (timber cutting, road construction, and mineral activities) that are analyzed for effects in this EIS.

Table N-10. Wasatch-Cache National Forest (Montana) existing plan management prescriptions adjacent to Idaho Roadless Areas.

Rx #	Description	Equivalent theme	Timber cutting	Roads construction	Minerals leasing
1.2	Existing wilderness unmodified natural environment	Forest Plan Special Area	Prohibited	Prohibited	Permissible
1.5	Recommended wilderness	Wild Land Recreation	Prohibited	Prohibited	Permissible
2.6	Undeveloped Areas, Manage to for undeveloped landscapes; other than formal recommended wilderness	Primitive	Prohibited	Prohibited	Permissible
3.2u	Terrestrial Habitats Undeveloped	Primitive	Prohibited	Prohibited	Permissible

Gibson

In the Proposed and Modified Rules 900 acres are placed in the GFRG theme and 7,400 in the Backcountry theme, with none of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans the Gibson Roadless Area is placed in management prescriptions 2.6 and 3.2u. Management prescriptions 2.6 and 3.2u is more consistent with the Primitive theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. The 900 acres in GFRG theme may have potential effects from road construction for hazardous fuel treatments. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Gibson Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 5,300 acres of this roadless area in Utah.

Gibson Management prescriptions/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
2.6, 3.2u	NA	GFRG Backcountry	GFRG Backcountry

Mount Naomi

In the Proposed and Modified Rules 2,200 acres are placed GFRG theme, 13,200 acres in the Wild Land Recreation theme, and 12,700 in the Backcountry theme, with 2,500 of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans the Mount Naomi Roadless Area is placed in management prescriptions 1.2, 1.5, and 2.6. Management prescriptions 1.2 and 1.5 of the existing plan are more consistent with the Wild Land Recreation and Forest Plan Special Areas themes and management prescription 2.6 is more consistent with the Primitive theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. The 2,200 acres in GFRG theme of the Proposed and Modified Rules and the 2,500

acres in the CPZ of the Modified Rule may have potential effects from road construction for hazardous fuel treatments. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Mount Naomi Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 45,100 acres of this roadless area in Utah.

Mount Naomi Management prescriptions/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
1.2, 1.5, 2.6	NA	Wild Land Recreation GFRG Backcountry	Wild Land Recreation GFRG Backcountry Backcountry CPZ

Swan Creek

In the Proposed and Modified Rules 7,100 are acres in the Backcountry theme, with 2,800 of these acres in the CPZ (for the Modified Rule). In the existing plans the Swan Creek Roadless Area is placed in management prescriptions 3.2u. Management prescription 3.2u of the existing plan is more consistent with the Primitive theme of both the Proposed and Modified Rules with respect to the three activities.

Activities in the Backcountry theme of Proposed and Modified Rules are expected to be infrequent. The 2,800 acres in the CPZ of the Modified Rule may have potential effects from road construction for hazardous fuel treatments. Road construction and reconstruction would likely occur on the edges of the roadless area, potentially altering roadless characteristics at the perimeter of the roadless area on the Idaho portion. See appendix C for a comparison of activities among alternatives. General effects to resources and roadless character are described in chapter 3 and appendix C of this EIS. These effects on the Idaho portion of the Swan Creek Roadless Area would contribute minimally to cumulative effects to the 9,400 acres of this roadless area in Utah.

Swan Creek Management prescriptions/Themes

Existing Plan	Proposed Plan	Proposed Rule	Modified Rule
3.2u	NA	Backcountry	Backcountry Backcountry CPZ

APPENDIX O—TEMPORARY ROADS AND DECOMMISSIONING

Abstract

This appendix describes the activities associated with temporary roads and road decommissioning. The appendix draws heavily from training materials, technical publications, Forest Service directives, and field experience. Specific treatments used during road closure and decommissioning can vary widely because of the wide differences in local conditions (USDA Forest Service, 2008k).

Introduction

The question of if, when, and where roads may be constructed in roadless areas is central to developing a management strategy for Idaho Roadless Areas. Lt. Governor Risch emphasized during the public involvement period his intent was primarily for temporary roads, and only when needed for reducing the risk of adverse effects of wildfire. Lt. Governor Risch asked the Roadless Area Conservation National Advisory Committee (RACNAC) to make recommendations on the use of temporary roads toward this purpose. During their several meetings the RACNAC wrestled with several questions that have also been raised by other members of the public.

The purpose of this appendix is to address these questions in more detail. The questions addressed are:

1. What is a temporary road?
2. Is a roadless area inalterably changed by the construction of a temporary road?
3. What is the duration of a temporary road?
4. What assurance is there a temporary road will be closed or decommissioned?
5. What is the Forest Service doing about the backlog of temporary roads?
6. How will road decommissioning be funded?
7. What exactly does road decommissioning mean?
8. What is done to minimize the environmental effects of road decommissioning?

Temporary Roads

What Is a Temporary Road?

A temporary road is a road necessary for emergency operations or authorized by contract, permit, lease, or other written authorization that is not a forest road and that is not included in a forest transportation atlas (36 CFR 212.1). Temporary road construction is appropriate when transportation and land management planning determine that road access is required only for local access of short duration and is not necessary for long-term resource management. These routes are considered an extension of the yarding/forwarding systems and lay out, and construction is considered a logging cost. Temporary road locations must be approved in advanced in writing by the timber sale administrator or the contracting officer's representative.

A temporary road may also be a low-standard, specified road in a timber sale contract that is required to be obliterated under the terms of the contract. Low-standard, specified roads are used in situations where environmental protections require the temporary road be constructed in a particular way to avoid adverse effects. For example, if a temporary road crosses a moist area, and drainage is required, mitigations would be specified in the contract to avoid sedimentation. In some situations a road may be needed for more than one season. This is another case when specifications may be used to ensure stability of the road and environmental protections over the winter. Low-standard, specified roads would be decommissioned at the end of the contract in the same manner as a temporary road. This is really a matter of contract terminology; both types of roads are temporary, but one has additional specifications to protect the environment.

Temporary roads are not intended for public use and are not subject to the Highway Safety Act of 1966. However, Idaho Forestry Best Management Practices are applied to these routes to protect water quality.

Is a Roadless Area Inalterably Changed by the Construction of a Temporary Road?

The answer to this question is somewhat subjective. However, answering questions 2 through 5 can help ascertain whether an area can be returned to its “natural” state. Figures 1–3 illustrate the restoration achieved through decommissioning.



Figure 1. Road decommissioning. *Photo by Jill Cobb.*



Figure 2. Road decommissioning 10 years after.
Photo by Jill Cobb.



Figure 3. Road decommissioning 15 years after.
Photo by Jill Cobb.

What Is the Duration of a Temporary Road?

Typically a temporary road exists 5 years at the most. It would be used only for the purposes prescribed in the contract, permit, or other authorization and would be decommissioned after its use. In many cases temporary roads are open for only one operating season. If a temporary road is needed for more than one season, it would have additional design features to mitigate seasonal weather effects. To minimize the risk associated with temporary roads, the duration of use may be minimized by postponing construction as long as possible prior to use and by decommissioning it as soon as feasible after use.

What Is the Difference in Construction of a Temporary Road?

- Season-of-use is specified and observed to minimize rutting, erosion, sedimentation, and water concentrations.
- Temporary road locations are constructed where hydrological effects can be mitigated.
- Topsoil and duff are stockpiled for re-spreading during decommissioning.
- Cut and fill, road width and length, and number and size of turnouts and widening are kept to a minimum.
- Horizontal and vertical alignments conform to the natural contour to the extent possible.

- An out-sloped surface is used with a rolling grade to break up water concentrations.
- Portable crossings are considered for use rather than rock blankets over low-bearing capacity soils.
- Portable crossing structures can provide economic short-term access while minimizing disturbances to streams and channels.

What Is the Forest Service Doing About the Backlog of Temporary Roads?

Greater awareness of the adverse environmental effects of abandoning these temporary roads and the potential effects of unregulated motorized use on these facilities has fostered a commitment within the Forest Service to minimize these impacts. The Forest Service is actively working to reduce total road mileage including the backlog of temporary roads that were never intended to be part of the transportation system.

Road Decommissioning

What Assurance Is There a Temporary Road Will Be Closed or Decommissioned?

Historically, temporary roads have most often been associated with timber-cutting operations. Timber sale contracts generally use a standard “C” clause in the contract language to require the purchaser to decommission temporary roads at the end of the harvest operation. Timber contracting officers normally have the authority to waive performance clauses in a contract when they feel it is to the benefit of the Federal Government. Past practices sometimes allowed temporary roads to remain open after the logging to facilitate access for fuels treatments, tree planting, and stand examinations. It was then difficult to fund the decommissioning work needed to reclaim the area.

The Modified Roadless Rule under consideration would remove this latitude for contracting officers for projects falling within the Idaho roadless area boundaries. Thus, temporary roads would be decommissioned by the contractor. In all cases where a temporary road is needed, the desired end result would be designed into the contract, which cannot be waived.

How Will Road Decommissioning Be Funded?

In the case of timber sales or mineral leases, the contractor or leasee enters into an agreement with the Federal Government to perform certain work in exchange for resources and a fee. A bond is posted to ensure the required work is completed prior to completion of the agreement. Thus temporary roads have the required funding to be decommissioned by virtue of the contract or lease.

What Exactly Does Road Decommissioning Mean?

Technically speaking, decommissioning is the demolition, dismantling, removal, obliteration and/or disposal of a deteriorated or otherwise unneeded asset or component, including necessary cleanup work. This action eliminates the deferred maintenance needs for the fixed asset. Portions of an asset or component may remain if they do not cause problems nor require maintenance. (Financial Health – Common Definitions for Maintenance and Construction Terms, July 22, 1998). Practically speaking, road decommissioning results in the stabilization

and restoration of unneeded roads to a more natural state (36 CFR 212.1, FSM 7705 – Transportation System).

The planning and location of temporary roads requires special consideration to facilitate their decommissioning. The principles of environmentally sensitive roads apply to the planning, location, and construction of temporary roads (Moll 1993). The short-term nature of the road and the knowledge of the specific amounts and types of vehicles the road would need to support allow for minimal design standards dictated by safety, operational requirements, and the environment. Figures 4 and 5 show the road before and after decommissioning.



Figure 4. Stream crossing before area to be decommissioned. *Photo by Anne Conner.*



Figure 5. After stream crossing is decommissioned. *Photo by Anne Conner.*

What Is Done To Minimize the Environmental Effects of Road Decommissioning?

Drainage

Decommissioning treatments initiate restoration of ecological processes interrupted or adversely affected by a road. A series of drainage treatments may be applied with the goal of making a road effectively “hydrologically inert.” These treatments include: decompacting the road surface and subgrade, removing and reshaping stream channel crossings, removing cross drains, removing unstable fills, recontouring road prisms, and reshaping in-sloped prisms with ditches to out-sloped sections. Frequently a single treatment may provide benefits to more than one resource. Abandoned roads usually revegetate effectively when closed to motorized use. Only roads not requiring treatments to become hydrologically inert should be abandoned. Decompaction of the road way and removal of large fills is generally performed to accomplish this. Decompaction improves infiltration and promotes revegetation. Placement of slash, rocks, and organic debris is frequently used to minimize rill damage.

Drainage for maintenance level 1 roads (closed to vehicle use) should be designed to require as little maintenance as possible. Typically, cross drains are pulled and replaced with the appropriate number of water bars. Water bar spacing should be adjusted for areas with steep side slopes, shallow soils, intense precipitation, high soil moisture, ground water, or frequent surface flows (Moll 1996). Refer to the Water/Roads Interaction Technology Series, March 2000, for guidance on appropriate spacing of drainage structures (USDA Forest Service, 2000s).

Erosion

Eliminating undesired concentrations of water and providing cover with organic material and vegetation is the basic strategy for limiting erosion. Application of organic material in the form of mulch has been successful in establishing vegetation on disturbed areas in difficult sites.

Temporary cover crops of fast-growing annual grasses are used to reduce erosion while permanent plant material is being established. Forest Service policy encourages the use of native plant species that are locally adapted to revegetate disturbed areas.

Limiting the area and duration of exposed soil during decommissioning activities minimizes erosion. Staged construction can be used to limit exposure at any time. Silt fences, straw bales, or slash windrows and settling structures help to retain soil on-site.

Stability

Mass wasting, failures, slides, and slumps are all stability problems. Treatments to reduce these instabilities include removing fill sections, re-contouring cut slopes, constructing a buttress, and various types of retaining walls. The preferred methods for roads being decommissioned would include removing fill sections and re-contouring cut slopes. Some forests have experimented with partially re-contouring slope, particularly in sections away from stream crossings, with good success in providing a stable slope.

Vegetation

Reestablishing vegetation on areas disturbed by road development can be split into short-term cover crops and long-term site restoration. Forest Service Native Plant Materials Policy encourages the use of site-appropriate native plant materials in the restoration of disturbed

areas. Care should be taken to avoid undesired non-native species or noxious weeds. Botanists should be consulted when developing a site-specific restoration plan.

Treatments might include: noxious weed eradication, decompaction, placement of organic debris, soil, logs, and rock; fertilizing, mulching, and chipping slash; and seeding, vegetative plantings, and transplants (USDA Forest Service 2008s).

Temporary roads can frequently be revegetated during decommissioning by stockpiling topsoil and organic slash in windrows adjacent to the road. Native seed and plant materials would often remain viable in the windrow for the life of the temporary road and can be spread with an excavator during decommissioning.

It is particularly important to refer to the noxious weed strategy for the area prior to engaging in earth moving treatments. Depending on local conditions, pre-treatment of noxious weeds may be required.

APPENDIX P—CONSIDERATION OF THEME CHANGES

This appendix describes which roadless areas were considered for theme changes based on public comment. Table P-1 lists the roadless area, the request for change, who requested the change (letter numbers and the associated names are at the end of this appendix), and the disposition of that change. Changes were generally made where there was overall support, to promote consistency, and to better align the theme with existing plan direction or location in a roadless area (for example, may change small areas on the edge of a roadless area to be the same as an adjacent theme).

Table P-1. Consideration of Theme Changes

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Boise				
Canton Lake	▪ Change GFRG and BCR to WLR	309	▪ Steep with small trees	Did not change because rule clarifies activities must be consistent with the applicable plan components. Area is in forest plan prescription 5.1. In this prescription ground-disturbing activities associated with vegetation management actions, and associated road construction and reconstruction shall be designed in a manner that the project-level analysis demonstrates that adverse effects on threatened, endangered, proposed, or candidate (TEPC) species or their habitats are avoided unless outweighed by demonstratable short- or long-term benefits to those TEPC species or their habitats. Portion of the area is near the community of Yellow Pine. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Canton Lake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change GFRG to BCR (9,600 acres) 	4156	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Important anadromous fish 	<p>Did not change because rule clarifies activities must be consistent with the applicable plan components; aquatic habitat would be protected. Area is in forest plan prescription 5.1. Ground-disturbing activities associated with vegetation management actions, and associated road construction and reconstruction shall be designed in a manner that the project-level analysis demonstrates that adverse effects to TEPC species or their habitats are avoided unless outweighed by demonstratable short- or long-term benefits to those TEPC species or their habitats. Portion of the area is near the community of Yellow Pine. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.</p>
Meadow Creek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change GFRG to BCR (8,300 acres) 	4156	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Important anadromous fish 	<p>Did not change because rule clarifies activities must be consistent with the applicable plan components; aquatic habitat would be protected. Area is in forest plan prescription 5.1. Ground-disturbing activities associated with vegetation management actions, and associated road construction and reconstruction shall be designed in a manner that the project-level analysis demonstrates that adverse effects to TEPC species or their habitats are avoided unless outweighed by demonstratable short- or long-term benefits to those TEPC species or their habitats. Portion of the area is near the community of Yellow Pine. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.</p>

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Horse Heaven	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change GFRG to BCR (2,100 acres) 	4156	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Important anadromous fish 	<p>Did not change because rule clarifies activities must be consistent with the applicable plan components; aquatic habitat would be protected. Area is in forest plan prescription 51. Ground-disturbing activities associated with vegetation management actions, and associated road construction and reconstruction shall be designed in a manner that the project-level analysis demonstrates that adverse effects to TEPC species or their habitats are avoided unless outweighed by demonstratable short- or long-term benefits to those TEPC species or their habitats. Portion of the area is near the community of Yellow Pine. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.</p>
Caribou				
Bonneville Peak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change all GFRG to BCR (7,700 acres) 	1796 1817 6546	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Area has backcountry character ▪ Intact with no roads ▪ Naturalness high ▪ Important and popular recreation center ▪ Crucial elk and mule deer summer habitat ▪ Low motorized trail riding opportunities and big areas of non-motorized 	<p>Did not change because rule clarifies activities must be consistent with the applicable plan components. This area is mostly in forest plan prescription 6.2, rangeland management, and is mostly non-forested. No phosphate deposits are located here. Goal of 6.2 is to maintain and restore ecological processes and functions of rangeland ecosystems. New road construction, other than those authorized under existing permits, would not be allowed within grazing allotments. 900 acres are in FP prescription 5.2. Roads could be constructed for vegetation treatments. Area has existing road intrusions and includes a backcountry ski area, and 37 miles of motorized trail.</p>
Caribou City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change all GFRG to Primitive (18,600 acres) 	1796 1817	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Area has backcountry character ▪ Remoteness, solitude high ▪ Adjacent to recommended wilderness ▪ Crucial elk and mule deer summer habitat ▪ Non-motorized use only – very high backcountry values 	<p>Changed 18,600 acres from GFRG to BCR because a substantial portion of the area has high remoteness and solitude. Core area offers the only primitive recreation experience on the forest. Change from GFRG to BCR would enhance the backcountry values. Additionally, the lack of motorized use highlighted the backcountry values of the area.</p>

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Clarkston Mountain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change GFRG to BCR (9,900 acres) 	1796 1817 6546	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Largely intact, with easily adjustable southern boundary, which should have a slight portion to remain in GFRG or be cherry-stemmed for Forest Road 1096 that cuts into small area of roadless area ▪ Current plan leaves the heart as GFRG, while circling its perimeter with BCR ▪ Outstanding big game hunting ▪ Important migration route for big game animals traveling west and south to winter on Malad Face winter range ▪ Low density backcountry motorized trail access ▪ Crucial elk, moose, mule deer summer habitat 	Did not change because the area exhibits a moderate level of human use. About 4 miles of forest road are in the GFRG, as well as waterlines. All lands in GFRG are in prescription 6.2, which focuses on maintaining and restoring rangeland ecosystems (see Bonneville Peak above). No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.
Deep Creek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change GFRG to BCR (4,900 acres) 	1796 1817 6546	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Intact roadless area with no roads ▪ Current plan creates small area of BCR, while not conserving heart of the roadless area ▪ Outstanding mule deer hunting, and a small but growing elk herd ▪ Contains Bonneville cutthroat trout ▪ Clean water source for Weston Creek Reservoir ▪ Important big game north/south and east/west migration corridor ▪ Low density backcountry motorized trail access ▪ Crucial elk, moose, and mule deer summer range 	Did not change because the area exhibits a moderate level of human use. All lands in GFRG are in prescription 6.2, which focuses on maintaining and restoring rangeland ecosystems (see Bonneville Peak above). Range improvements are located throughout the GFRG area, as well as a water transmission line, an area under cultivation and a pasture. About 2,600 acres are within 1-½ miles of a community.
Dry Ridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Move KPLA area in BCR to GFRG 	1795	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Move KPLAs from BCR to GFRG – then remove road construction/reconstruction allowance for phosphate from the BCR theme 	Changed 5,400 acres of KPLA (and a ½-mile buffer) to GFRG based on RACNAC and public comments that phosphate mining limited to GFRG theme.
Elkhorn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change all GFRG to BCR (28,500 acres) 	1796 1817 6546	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Area has backcountry character ▪ Large intact roadless area ▪ Outstanding mule deer hunting ▪ Naturalness “high” ▪ Low density backcountry motorized trail access ▪ Clean water source for Devil Creek Reservoir ▪ Big game north/south migration corridor ▪ Contains Bonneville cutthroat trout ▪ Crucial elk, moose, mule deer summer habitat 	Changed 26,610 acres to BCR because this is a large core area with limited disturbance. About 1,900 acres remain in GFRG. These lands are on the outer edge of roadless area, in prescription 5.2 and have existing roads.

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Gannett-Spring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change SE portion of Spring Creek from GFRG to Primitive (2,500 acres) (sportsmen) (Priority #7) ▪ Change GFRG in western portion on north end of Primitive to BCR (2,500 acres) (sportsmen) (Priority #10) 	1796 1817	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Area has backcountry character ▪ Non-motorized use only –very high backcountry values ▪ Adjacent to primitive to the north ▪ Crucial elk and mule deer summer range ▪ No roads ▪ Connects primitive areas ▪ Creates wildlife movement corridor into Wyoming ▪ Contains Bonneville cutthroat trout ▪ Low density motorized trail riding ▪ Crucial elk, moose, mule deer summer habitat 	Did not change because the area has existing livestock improvements. All lands in GFRG are in prescription 6.2, which focuses on maintaining and restoring rangeland ecosystems (see Bonneville Peak above). No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the modified rule.
Huckleberry Basin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Move KPLA area in BCR to GFRG 	1795	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Move KPLAs from BCR to GFRG – then remove road construction/reconstruction allowance for phosphate from the BCR theme 	Did not change because KPLA area already in GFRG.
Meade Peak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change all GFRG to BCR (28,600 acres) , except leave 2,500 acres in KPLA in GFRG 	1796 1817	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Area has backcountry character ▪ 3 motorized trails, but no roads ▪ Contains Bonneville cutthroat trout ▪ Destination recreation area for southeast Idaho ▪ Crucial elk, mule deer, moose summer habitat ▪ Excellent big game hunting, including black bears 	Changed 25,300 acres (outside KPLA + ½-mile buffer) to BCR because of high backcountry values and priority for big game.
Meade Peak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Move KPLA area in Primitive to GFRG 	1795	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Move KPLAs from primitive to GFRG – to allow for phosphate development 	Did not change because of high roadless area resource value.
Mount Naomi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change all GFRG to BCR (2,200 acres) 	1796 1817	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contiguous with WLR ▪ Naturalness “very high” ▪ Links northern end of Wasatch and Bear Mt ranges with Southern Wasatch mountains and Cache mountains, allowing wildlife travel through entire mountain range ▪ Contains Bonneville cutthroat trout ▪ Crucial elk, moose, and mule deer summer habitat 	Did not change because only about 500 acres are adjacent to WLR. All lands in GFRG are in prescription 5.2, which focuses on timber growth and yield while maintaining or restoring ecosystem processes and functions. Recent timber sales have occurred within this area. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.
Mount Naomi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change area in forest plan prescription 4.3 (designated dispersed recreation) from BCR to forest plan special area (FPSA) (400 acres) 	IDT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Designated dispersed sites include facilities such as picnic areas and should be managed according to forest plan direction 	Corrected 400 acres from BCR to FPSA made to place in correct designation, consistent with other forest plan prescriptions placed into FPSA. Correction is reflected in Proposed and Modified Rules.

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
North Pebble	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change GFRG to BCR 	6546	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Critical to tribal trust resources 	Did not change 1,600 acres from GFRG to BCR because of recent timber sale activities. All lands in GFRG are in prescription 5.2 which focuses on timber growth and yield while maintaining or restoring ecosystem processes and functions, including aspen restoration. No new road access to mineral leases would occur under the Modified Rule.
Oxford Mountain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change all GFRG to BCR (31,100 acres) 	1796 1817 6546	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Large, intact roadless area ▪ Outstanding mule deer hunting, growing elk herd ▪ Low density backcountry motorized trail access ▪ Large core big game security area for deer, elk and moose ▪ Contain Bonneville cutthroat trout ▪ Clean water source for local ranches and Deep Cr Reservoir 	Changed to 4,400 acres to BCR. Did not change 26,700 acres; these lands are in prescription 5.2 (800 ac) and 6.2 (25,900 ac). Area has 2.4 miles of forest roads and over 60 miles of motorized trail.
Red Mountain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change all GFRG to Primitive (5,100 acres) 	1796 1817	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Non-motorized use only ▪ Very high backcountry values ▪ Surrounds primitive ▪ Contains Bonneville cutthroat trout ▪ Crucial elk and mule deer summer range 	Changed 5,100 acres to BCR because of high naturalness, very limited disturbance, or livestock improvements.
Toponce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change all GFRG to Primitive (9,800 acres) 	1796 1817 1700 6546	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Area has backcountry character ▪ Important and popular recreation center ▪ Almost entirely non-motorized use ▪ Naturalness “high” ▪ Northern boundary contiguous with wild backcountry lands in Shoshone Bannock Reservation ▪ Crucial elk, moose, mule deer summer range 	Changed 9,800 acres to BCR because of high naturalness, high backcountry values, including backcountry yurt system, and priority for big game.
Sage Creek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change area with high likelihood of phosphate from BCR to GFRG (with ½-mile buffer) (1,900 acres) 	1796 1795	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Remove areas with high phosphate from BCR to GFRG and remove exception for road construction and reconstruction in BCR for phosphate. ▪ Not all of BCR has phosphate 	Net increase of 400 acres. Area of unleased KPLA changed from BCR to GFRG to be consistent with desire to limit post-rule phosphate activities to GFRG. Portion in Deer Creek remains BCR and a portion changed from GFRG to BCR because Caribou management plan components and the recommendation to not lease precludes phosphate development from this area.

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Schmid Peak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move KPLA area in BCR to GFRG 	1795	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove areas with high phosphate from BCR to GFRG and remove exception for road construction and reconstruction in BCR for phosphate. 	Did not change because the area in KPLA is adjacent to an area that has already been mined; therefore, there is no need to access this area.
Scout Mountain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change GFRG to BCR (2,500 acres) 	1796 1817 6546	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Largely intact with easily adjustable border on western boundary to remain GFRG for forest road 656 that cuts into very small area of the roadless area Crucial mule deer and elk summer range Important local recreation for city of Pocatello 	Did not change because of past harvest that is still evident and numerous motorized trails. In addition the rule clarifies activities must be consistent with the applicable plan components. About 2,300 acres are in forest plan prescription 6.2, rangeland management and is mostly non-forested. No phosphate deposits are located here. Goal of 6.2 is to maintain and restore ecological processes and functions of rangeland ecosystems. New road construction, other than those authorized under existing permits, would not be allowed within in grazing allotments. 200 acres are in prescription 5.2 with an emphasis on timber growth and yield while maintaining or restoring ecosystem processes and functions. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.
Scout Mountain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change area in Forest Plan Prescription 4.3 (designated dispersed recreation) from BCR to FPSA (1,700 acres) 	IDT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated dispersed sites include facilities such as picnic areas and should be managed according to forest plan direction 	Corrected 1,700 acres to place in correct designation, consistent with other forest plan prescriptions place into FPSA. Correction reflected in both Proposed and Modified Rules.
Soda Point	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change GFRG to BCR (7,800 acres) 	1796 1817	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides backcountry motorized trail experiences Important northern area of the Bear River Range Contains Bonneville cutthroat trout Crucial mule deer and elk habitat 	Did not change because of past timber harvest and roads. In addition, the rule clarifies activities must be consistent with the applicable plan components. All 7,800 acres are in prescription 5.2 with an emphasis on timber growth and yield while maintaining or restoring ecosystem processes and functions. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.
Station Creek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change GFRG portion east of forest road 406 to BCR (3,000 acres) Change GFRG portion west of Forest Road 406 to BCR (3,000 acres) 	1796 1817	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Naturalness considered "high" Contiguous with Bloomington Lakes special area Crucial mule deer and elk summer range Contains Bonneville cutthroat trout Important recreation area for southeast Idaho 	Did not change because of livestock improvements and a forest road (406). In addition, the rule will clarify that activities must be consistent with the applicable plan components. All of the GFRG is in prescription 6.2, rangeland management. Goal of 6.2 is to maintain and restore ecological processes and functions of rangeland ecosystems. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Stump Creek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change area with high likelihood of phosphate from BCR to GFRG (with ½-mile buffer) (1,800 acres) (forest) 	1796 1795	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove areas with high phosphate from BCR to GFRG and remove exception for road construction and reconstruction in BCR for phosphate. Not all of BCR has phosphate. 	Changed 1,000 acres of KPLA and ½-mile buffer changed from BCR to GFRG and the exception removed from BCR. Consistent with direction to keep post-rule phosphate activities to GFRG.
Stump Creek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change GFRG and BCR to Primitive 	756	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yellowstone cutthroat habitat Mule deer 	Did not change because of past harvest that is still evident and numerous motorized trails. In addition the rule clarifies activities must be consistent with the applicable plan components. About 3,000 acres are in forest plan prescription 6.2, rangeland management, and is mostly non-forested. No phosphate deposits are located here. Goal of 6.2 is to maintain and restore ecological processes and functions of rangeland ecosystems. New road construction, other than those authorized under existing permits would not be allowed within in grazing allotments. About 7,200 acres are in prescription 5.2 with an emphasis on timber growth and yield while maintaining or restoring ecosystem processes and functions. The Caribou Forest plan provides direction for maintenance and restoration of riparian ecosystems. This direction would apply to activities in the GFRG theme.
West Mink Creek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change GFRG to BCR 	6546	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Critical to tribal trust resources 	Did not change these 200 acres because they are on the outer edge of the West Mink Roadless Area and are in a developed area. The 200 acres are in prescription 5.2 with an emphasis on timber growth and yield while maintaining or restoring ecosystem processes and functions. The Caribou forest plan provides direction for maintenance and restoration of riparian ecosystems. This direction would apply to activities in the GFRG theme. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the modified rule.
Challis				
Copper Basin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change from BCR to Primitive 	756	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be consistent with forest plan No marketable timber 	Did not change because the area has many range improvements as well as forest roads. There are no community protection zones (CPZ) or municipal water supply systems; therefore, the area would be managed similar to the 2001 Roadless Rule.

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Pioneer Mountains	▪ Change BCR to Primitive (117,900 acres)	6785	▪ Maintain primitive character	Did not change because the area has numerous intrusions including past roading, mining, and grazing improvements including fences and water developments. About 10.7 miles of forest road exists.
Porphyry Peak	▪ Change from BCR to Primitive	756	▪ To be consistent with forest plan ▪ No marketable timber	Did not change because the area has numerous intrusions including jeep roads, stock ponds, pipelines, fences, and tractor trails.
Clearwater				
Bighorn-Weitas	▪ Change BCR to Primitive in the Kelly and Cayuse drainages	1819	▪ Important fishery ▪ Spiritual and cultural areas	Did not change because remote areas of the Backcountry theme will be managed similarly to the 2001 Rule because there is no connection to an at-risk community or a municipal water supply system. Thus, activity in this area would be very infrequent –not going against community county commissioner recommendations to permit limited activity in limited portions of the roadless area.
Mallard Larkins	▪ Change from BCR to Primitive (66,900 acres)	1721 1547	▪ Contiguous with WLR ▪ Maintain consistency with forest plan	Changed 31,600 acres from BCR to Primitive because of remoteness of area and high roadless character, adjacent to WLR, consistency with FP; remaining 35,300 acres not changed because without a connection to at-risk community or municipal water supply system it would be managed similar to the 2001 Rule.
Moose Mountain	▪ Change from BCR to Primitive (22,000 acres)	1721	▪ Maintain consistency with forest plan	Changed 14,000 acres from BCR to Primitive because of remoteness of area and high roadless character and to reflect the existing plan which emphasizes an unroaded setting (prescription A3). The remaining area (8,000 acres) is in prescriptions that permit road construction. However, only 700 acres of CPZ overlaps with this area; therefore most of the area would be managed similar to the 2001 Rule because there is limited connection to at-risk community or municipal water supply system.
Pot Mountain	▪ Change from BCR to Primitive (50,900 acres)	1721	▪ Highly erosive soils and steep terrain ▪ Not adjacent to communities	Change not made to maintain because there is no overlap with CPZ or municipal water supply systems; therefore area would be managed similar to the 2001 Roadless Rule.

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Meadow Creek-Upper North Fork	▪ Change from BCR to Primitive (43,200 acres)	1721	▪ Adjacent to proposed Great Burn Wilderness ▪ Forest plans allocated some acreage to Primitive and Wild Land Recreation	Changed 42,800 acres from Backcountry to Primitive because of close proximity of substantial acreage to proposed wilderness, importance of consistency in management, remoteness of area, and high roadless character; remaining 400 acres consistent with forest plan.
North Lochsa Slope	▪ Change BCR to Primitive in the Fish Creek, Hungry and Bimerick drainages	1819	▪ Best wild steelhead habitat in the State ▪ Spiritual and cultural areas	Changed BCR in Fish, Hungrey, and Brimerick to Primitive (55,200 acres) because of remoteness of area, high quality of anadrmous fish resources, high roadless character, and tribal interests.
Rawhide	▪ Change from BCR to Primitive (6,000 acres)	1721	▪ Adjacent to proposed Great Burn Wilderness	Changed 5,100 acres from BCR to Primitive because of remoteness of area and high roadless character. 900 not changed but would be managed similar to the 2001 Roadless Rule because there is no overlap with CPZ or municipal water supply systems.
Idaho Panhandle				
East Cathedral	▪ Change GFRG to BCR (400 acres)	4156	▪ Small areas along the edge	Changed to 400 acres from GFRG to Backcountry; removed small areas of GFRG along edge of roadless area because GFRG is unnecessary to allow for removal of hazard trees along existing roads.
Katka Peak	▪ Change GFRG to Primitive	1563 1718	▪ Viewshed above Bonners Ferry ▪ Does not want roads	Changed 1,200 acres from GFRG to BCR. This area is within Bonners Ferry viewshed (MA 19) and limits road construction. Consistent with management direction in existing or proposed revised forest plan.
Katka Peak	▪ Change GFRG to BCR	4156	▪ Portion in grizzly bear habitat	Changed 1,200 acres from GFRG to BCR. 1,300 acres that overlap grizzly bear habitat remain in GFRG because roads are permitted under the existing or proposed revised forest plan if they are consistent with grizzly bear management direction. Area is adjacent to communities and checkerboard ownership. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.
Katka Peak	▪ Change GFRG to WLR	6548	▪ Wilderness experience	Did not change this portion of the roadless area to WLR because there are no outstanding characteristics that warrant recommended wilderness in either the existing or proposed revised forest plans.

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Kootenai Peak	▪ Change GFRG to Primitive	1799	▪ Important grizzly bear and caribou habitat	Did not change because rule clarifies activities must be consistent with the applicable plan components. Portions of the area are in prescriptions for grizzly bear and caribou (prescriptions 2, 3, and 7). These prescriptions permit road construction and timber harvest in accordance with best science and recovery plans. Area is also within the Myrtle Creek watershed, which is the Bonners Ferry municipal water supply system but is outside the CPZ. The county and Kootenai Tribe of Idaho desire flexibility to reduce hazardous fuels outside the CPZ (but within the county's identified WUI). No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.
Kootenai Peak	▪ Change GFRG to BCR	4156	▪ Important grizzly bear and caribou habitat	Did not change; see Kootenai Peak above.
Magee	▪ Change GFRG to BCR (200 ac)	4156	▪ Small areas along the edge	Changed to 600 ac from GFRG to Backcountry removed small areas of GFRG along edge of roadless area because GFRG is unnecessary to allow for removal of hazard trees along existing roads.
Mallard Larkins	▪ Change from BCR to Primitive (46,200 ac)	1721	▪ Contiguous with WLR ▪ Maintain consistency with forest plan	Did not change because the area does not overlap with CPZ or municipal water supply systems; therefore, would be managed similar to the 2001 Roadless Rule and would meet the intent of this request (no roads) and would be consistent with the existing and proposed plans. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.
Mallard Larkins	▪ Change from BCR to WLR (6,900 ac)	1799	▪ Maintain consistency with forest plan	Changed 500 acres from BCR to WLR; removed small areas adjacent to existing roads. Did not change the remaining area to WLR because it was not recommended for wilderness in the existing or proposed revised forest plans (other portions were). The area does not overlap with CPZ or municipal water supply systems; therefore, would be managed similar to the 2001 Roadless Rule, so activities would occur from existing roads.
Mallard Larkins	▪ Change GFRG to BCR	4156	▪ Small areas along the edge	Changed to 100 acres from GFRG to BCR. Removed small areas of GFRG along edge of roadless area because GFRG is unnecessary to allow for removal of hazard trees along existing roads.

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Scotchman's Peak	▪ Change GFRG to BCR	4156	▪ Small areas along the edge	Changed to 300 acres from GFRG to BCR. Removed small areas of GFRG along edge of roadless area because GFRG is unnecessary to allow for removal of hazard trees along existing roads.
Selkirk	▪ Change GFRG to BCR	4156	▪ Important grizzly bear and caribou habitat	Did not change because rule clarifies activities must be consistent with the applicable plan components. Portions of the area are in prescriptions for grizzly bear and caribou (prescriptions 2, 3, and 7). These prescriptions permit road construction and timber harvest in accordance with best science and recovery plans. Area is also within the Myrtle Creek watershed, which is the Bonners Ferry municipal water supply system but is outside the CPZ. The county and Kootenai Tribe of Idaho desire flexibility to reduce hazardous fuels outside the CPZ (but within the county's identified WUI). No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.
Selkirk	▪ Change GFRG to Primitive	1563 1799 1718	▪ Viewshed from Highway 1 or 95 ▪ Important grizzly bear and caribou habitat	Did not change; see Selkirk above.
Upper Priest	▪ Change GFRG to BCR (100 acres)	4156	▪ Small areas along the edge ▪	Changed to 200 acres from GFRG to BCR. Removed small areas of GFRG along edge of roadless area because GFRG is unnecessary to allow for removal of hazard trees along existing roads.
Kootenai				
Mt. Willard-Lake Estelle	▪ Change BCR to Primitive	1939	▪ No reason given	Did not change because 30,400 acres out of 32,000 acres of BCR do not overlap with CPZ or municipal water supply systems; therefore, they would be managed similar to the 2001 Roadless Rule.
Mt. Willard-Lake Estelle	▪ Change BCR to WLR	6548	▪ Wilderness experience	Did not change because 30,400 acres out of 32,000 acres of BCR do not overlap with CPZ or municipal water supply systems; therefore, they would be managed similar to the 2001 Roadless Rule. Area does not have any outstanding features; it is a long, narrow roadless area. Most of the drainages have road development or private lands up close to the main divide.
Roberts	▪ Change BCR to Primitive	1939	▪ No reason given	Did not change because the area does not overlap with CPZ or municipal water supply systems; therefore, it would be managed similar to the 2001 Roadless Rule.

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Roberts	▪ Change BCR to WLR	6548	▪ Wilderness experience	Did not change because the area does not overlap with CPZ or municipal water supply systems; therefore, it would be managed similar to the 2001 Roadless Rule. Area does not have any outstanding features.
Nez Perce				
Rapid River	▪ Change from Primitive to WLR	1819 309 1700	▪ Contiguous with WLR ▪ One of the most important rivers for anadromous fisheries	Changed from 16,700 acres from Primitive to WLR because of remoteness, very high roadless character, wilderness suitability analysis high Tribal interests, and key anadromous fishery.
Payette				
Council Mountain	▪ Change all of Council Mountain to WLR (16,500 acres)	1480	▪ No reason given	Did not change; consistent with recent forest plan revision.
Council Mountain	▪ Change east and north sides (Middle and East Forks of the Weiser River) and the west ridge (Cottonwood Creek) from Primitive to GFRG	2364	▪ To allow treatment of a growing forest health concern that threatens adjacent private land ski areas and second homes	Did not change; consistent with recent forest plan revision.
Council Mountain	▪ Upper Mountain should be changed from Primitive to BCR	2364	▪ To allow treatment of a growing forest health concern that threatens adjacent private land ski areas and second homes	Did not change; consistent with recent forest plan revision
Cuddy Mountain	▪ Change from GFRG to BCR	309	▪ Good mule deer habitat	Did not change; consistent with recent forest plan revision, and Modified Rule clarifies activities must be consistent with the applicable plan components. Area is in prescription 5.1. Activities may be used to restore and maintain desired vegetation and fuel conditions.
Cuddy Mountain	▪ Change Primitive to BCR and GFRG	2364	▪ Conform to forest plan ▪ Ranch operations, numerous two-track roads ▪ Forest health problems	Did not change; consistent with recent forest plan revision. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the modified rule.
French Creek	▪ Change Primitive portion that overlaps areas in the Brundage Mountain long range master development plans into FPSA	1820 1805	▪ Portions of the Primitive theme overlap with expansion areas identified in the Brundage Mountain long-range master development plans ▪ Place into FPSA so that it is clear this ski area development could occur in the future	Did not change because this area is not proposed for future development in the master development plan (only the portion that overlaps Patrick Butte Roadless Area).
French Creek	▪ Change from GFRG to BCR	309	▪ No reason given	Did not change; consistent with recent forest plan revision. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.
French Creek	▪ Change the FPSA for the wild and scenic corridor around French Creek and Hazard Creek back to the surrounding theme	015	▪ Areas were not found to be eligible	This correction was made.

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
French Creek	▪ Change all of French Creek to WLR (76,600 acres)	1480 1819	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Protect wild and scenic river corridor ▪ Wildlife habitat ▪ Rugged lakes 	Did not change; consistent with recent forest plan revision. Most of area in the Primitive theme where little if any timber cutting would occur because of lack of existing roads. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.
Hells Canyon/Seven Devils Scenic	▪ Change Primitive to WLR (29,200 acres)	1700	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Part of the greater Hells Canyon ecosystem ▪ Borders Hells Canyon Wilderness on south and east side ▪ Wild, remote, and rugged ▪ Excellent opportunities for wildland hunters and anglers ▪ Irreplaceable big game habitat and migratory components to the upper Hells Canyon system ▪ Threatened steelhead and summer Chinook occur in Deep Creek 	Did not change; consistent with recent forest plan revision. The Primitive theme prohibits timber cutting with some exceptions. Little, if any, timber cutting would occur because of lack of existing roads except on the edge of the roadless area. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.
Horse Heaven	▪ Change from BCR to WLR	309	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good elk habitat ▪ Protect it from mining 	Did not change; consistent with recent forest plan revision. Surrounding roads, cherry-stem roads along the western boundary, a telephone corridor, and scattered mining claims detract from the natural integrity in some portions of the area. Area is adjacent to the community of Yellow Pine. Road construction would be prohibited to access new mining developments.
Indian Creek	▪ Change Primitive to BCR	2364	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Area is smaller than 5,000 acres ▪ County has an RS2477 assertion on the existing/closed road ▪ Several OHV roads exist ▪ Forest health concerns 	Did not change; consistent with recent forest plan revision. Rule does not change status of existing roads. Area is steep and rugged except at the bottom and although less than 5,000 acres it is manageable in its current condition. .
Needles	▪ Change all of Needles to WLR (38,600 acres)	1480	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rugged ▪ Spectacular creeks ▪ Supports wolves, bighorn sheep, bears, martens ▪ Superb views, hot springs ▪ Supports Chinook salmon and bull trout 	Did not change; consistent with recent forest plan revision. Most of area 90,200 acres are in Wild Land Recreation, 7,100 acres in Primitive and 31,500 acres in Backcountry. Most rugged area with spectacular scenery is in WLR. Area in BCR and Primitive do not have the same outstanding features.
Patrick Butte	▪ Change Primitive portion that overlaps areas in the Brundage Mountain long range Master Development Plans into FPSA	1820 1805	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Portions of the Primitive theme overlap with expansion areas identified in the Brundage Mountain long range master development plans ▪ Place into FPSA so that it is clear this ski area development could occur in the future 	Changed 7,000 acres from Primitive to FPSA. Changed portion that overlaps proposed development in master development plan to a forest plan special area to be consistent with all ski areas in Idaho. This change would not allow or prohibit these activities to occur; only when project-level NEPA is completed could this development occur.

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Patrick Butte	▪ Change all of Patrick Butte to WLR (75,800 acres)	1480	▪ No reason provided	Did not change; consistent with recent forest plan revision. All or portions of five sheep allotments and three cattle allotments cover about 60 percent of the roadless area. There is a low level of structural improvements on all of the allotments.
Rapid River	▪ Change from Primitive to WLR (51,700 acres)	1819 1700 1480	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contiguous with Hells Canyon Wilderness ▪ One of the most important rivers for anadromous fisheries ▪ Special historical, tribal, and wilderness values ▪ Pristine fish and wildlife area ▪ Best remaining aquatic bull trout stronghold within the Little Salmon River watershed ▪ Key spawning and rearing stream for steelhead and Chinook ▪ Critical water supply for federal salmon hatchery ▪ Supplies a complete and intact summer, transitional, and winter big game range with a wide range of elevation for mule deer, elk, mountain goats, and bighorn sheep ▪ Critical component to the long general hunting season 	Changed 51,700 acres from Primitive to WLR because of remoteness, very high roadless character, and tribal interests [see Rapid River above].
Rapid River	▪ Change portions within Wildhorse watershed from Primitive to GFRG or BCR	1576	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conform to restoration needs ▪ Continuing forest health issues ▪ Several mid-slope roads 	Did not change as requested. Entire area changed to WLR; see Rapid River above.
Secesh	▪ Change all of Secesh to WLR (126,200 acres)	1480	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most scenic, geological, and biologically diverse ▪ Rugged ▪ Spectacular lake ▪ Supports wolves, bighorn sheep, bears, martens 	Did not change; consistent with recent forest plan revision. Most of area (110,300 acres) is already in WLR. Of the remaining 126,300 acres, about 7,700 acres are in Primitive, and 118,500 acres are in Backcountry. Most rugged area with spectacular scenery is in WLR. Area in BCR and Primitive do not have the same outstanding features and portion of BCR overlaps a CPZ.
Snowbank	▪ Change all of Snowbank to WLR (1,500 acres)	1480	▪ No reason given	Did not change; consistent with recent forest plan revision. All of Snowbank (Boise and Payette portions) is in Primitive. The area's natural appearance and natural integrity are noticeably altered in many locations from intensive grazing and do not have the outstanding features found in WLR areas. In addition, there is a road to a Federal Aviation Administration site in this area.
Salmon				

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Agency Creek	▪ Change from BCR to GFRG	584	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Portions have been harvested ▪ Need to reduce fuel loads and help contain beetle outbreaks ▪ NOTE: Hellgate Hunters & Anglers (Montana) request no change to GFRG 	▪ Changed 1,200 acres from BCR to GFRG because already roaded. Remaining area adjacent to Montana remains in Backcountry.
Agency Creek	▪ Change to prohibit development	6546	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Important Tribal Historic Area 	▪ Changed 1,200 acres from BCR to GFRG because already roaded. Remaining area adjacent to Montana remains in Backcountry and has no CPZ so would be managed similar to 2001 Roadless Rule. No roads could be constructed in GFRG to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.
Deep Creek	▪ Change from BCR to GFRG	584	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To allow timber cutting for protection of Jesse Creek Municipal Watershed; placement in BCR could constrain needed treatment in lodgepole pine and spruce/fir forests 	Changed 7,400 acres from BCR to GFRG to allow the greatest flexibility to reduce the severe risk of unwanted wildland fire effects to the Jesse Creek municipal watershed. This area is outside the CPZ but has been identified by the Lemhi County commissioners as an area where hazardous fuel reduction projects are needed to reduce the risk to Jesse Creek. Area is also already roaded.
Haystack Mountain	▪ Change from BCR to GFRG	584	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To allow timber cutting for protection of Jesse Creek Municipal Watershed; placement in BCR could constrain needed treatment in lodgepole pine and spruce-fir forests 	Changed 2,400 acres from BCR to GFRG because area already roaded and to allow the greatest flexibility to reduce the risk of unwanted wildland fire effects to the Jesse Creek municipal watershed. Area is outside the CPZ (see Deep Creek above).
Jureano	▪ Change from BCR to GFRG	584	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Portions have been harvested ▪ Need to reduce fuel loads and help contain beetle outbreaks 	Changed 4,300 acres from BCR to GFRG because area is already roaded.
Musgrove	▪ Change from BCR to GFRG	584	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Portions have been harvested ▪ Need to reduce fuel loads and help contain beetle outbreaks 	Changed 1,000 acres from BCR to GFRG because area is already roaded.
Napias	▪ Change from BCR to GFRG	584	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To allow timber cutting for protection of Jesse Creek Municipal Watershed; placement in BCR could constrain needed treatment in lodgepole pine and spruce-fir forests 	Changed 9,300 acres from BCR to GFRG to allow the flexibility to reduce the risk of unwanted wildland fire effects to the Jesse Creek municipal watershed (see Deep Creek above).
Napoleon Ridge	▪ Change from GFRG to BCR	584	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Northern portion overlooks the drainage of the main Salmon River ▪ Need to protect scenery 	Changed 16,900 acres from GFRG to BCR to provide additional protections along the Salmon River.
Phelan	▪ Northwest corner appropriate to be in GFRG	1817	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Area already roaded and harvested 	Changed to 13,000 acres from BCR to GFRG because portion of area is already roaded (see below).

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Phelan	▪ Change from BCR to GFRG	584	▪ To allow timber cutting for protection of Jesse Creek Municipal Watershed; placement in BCR could constrain needed treatment in lodgepole pine and spruce/fir forests	Changed to 13,000 acres from BCR to GFRG to allow the flexibility to reduce the risk of unwanted wildland fire effects to the Jesse Creek municipal watershed. The Lemhi County commissioners identified Phelan as an area where hazardous fuel reduction projects are needed to reduce the risk to Jesse Creek. Phelan is due west of Jesse Creek and is outside the CPZ.
Sheepeater	▪ Change from BCR to GFRG	IDT	▪ Portions have been roaded harvested	Changed 9,100 acres from BCR to GFRG because area is already roaded.
South Deep Creek	▪ Change from BCR to GFRG	584	▪ To allow timber cutting for protection of Jesse Creek Municipal Watershed; placement in BCR could constrain need treatment in lodgepole pine and spruce/fir forests	Changed 4,800 acres from BCR to GFRG because area is already roaded.
West Big Hole	▪ Change from BCR to GFRG	584	▪ Portions have been harvested – Wagonhammer and Silverleads drainages ▪ Need to reduce fuel loads and help contain beetle outbreaks ▪ NOTE: Hellgate Hunters & Anglers (Montana) request no change to GFRG	Changed 9,600 acres from BCR to GFRG because area is already roaded. Remaining area adjacent to Montana remains in Backcountry or Primitive.
Sawtooth				
Buttercup	▪ Change BCR to FPSA	IDT	▪ Area is within ski area master development plan and forest plan prescription 4.3 (developed recreation)	Changed 400 acres from BCR to FPSA to be consistent with other ski areas in roadless areas; area to be managed under forest plan direction for ski areas and the area is within the existing special use permit.
Cache Peak	▪ Change GFRG to BCR. Independence Lake area mapped as “P” in the Sawtooth National Forest travel map should be Primitive (19,400 acres)	1796 1817	▪ Natural integrity “high” ▪ Valuable recreation opportunities for communities in Magic Valley ▪ Cache Peak highest point south of Snake River ▪ Independence Lakes are paternoster lakes ▪ Important trout fishing opportunities ▪ Crucial mule deer summer range; outstanding mule deer hunting	Changed 6,400 acres from GFRG to BCR because of roadless character (limited livestock facilities) and priority for big game. Remaining 10,800 acres stayed in GFRG. These lands are in prescription 5.1 with a focus on restoring or maintaining vegetation within desired conditions in order to provide a diversity of habitats, reduced risk from disturbance events, and sustainable resources for human use.
Lime Creek	▪ Place portion of Soldier Mountain permit boundary (including snowcat skiing) into GFRG	1496	▪ To allow for dispersed and/or developed recreation	Did not change because snowcat skiing would not be affected by the rule.

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Pioneer Mountains	▪ Change GFRG to BCR (21,000 acres)	1796 1817 1492	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contiguous with WLR ▪ Important recreation opportunities for communities in Magic Valley ▪ Natural integrity “high” ▪ Vital elk, mule deer, bighorn sheep, and mountain goat habitat ▪ Quality trout fisheries 	Changed 21,000 acres from GFRG to BCR because of roadless character (very little past disturbance in this area), high backcountry values, and priority for big game, and proximity to WLR; will allow for better consistency of management.
Pioneer Mountains	▪ Change GFRG to Primitive (21,000 acres)	6785	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintain primitive character 	Changed 21,000 acres from GFRG to BCR (not primitive) because the area better fits the Backcountry category, not Primitive. About 1,900 acres of the 21,000 acres overlaps CPZ; outside the CPZ the area would be managed similar to the 2001 Roadless Rule.
Mount Harrison	▪ Change GFRG to BCR (22,200 acres)	1796 1817	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Important clean and dependable water source for downstream irrigation, hydropower, and instream trout flows ▪ Crucial mule deer summer range; important backcountry hunting area ▪ Big-game hunting is recognized as a major use ▪ Great family recreation site, including Bennett Springs, Howell Canyon, Thompson Flat, Twin Lakes, Lake Cleveland ▪ Important big game hunting and recreation area for communities of the Magic Valley 	Changed 21,900 acres from GFRG to BCR because of roadless character, high backcountry values, and priority for big game. Remaining 100 acres stayed in GFRG. These lands are in prescription 5.1 with a focus on restoring or maintaining vegetation within desired conditions in order to provide a diversity of habitats, reduced risk from disturbance events, and sustainable resources for human use.
Fifth Fork Rock Creek	▪ Change GFRG to BCR (8,000 acres)	1796 1817	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fifth Rock contains only known strong population of redband trout in the Sawtooth National Forest ▪ Important native trout fishery ▪ Crucial mule deer summer and winter habitat ▪ Good opportunities for solitude ▪ Important big game hunting, fishing, and recreation area for the communities of Magic Valley 	Did not change because of high evidence of impacts from grazing, including livestock facilities, some primitive roads. Area is in prescription 6.1 which applies to lands that are predominantly (more than 50 percent) shrubland and grassland. Emphasis is on restoring and maintaining vegetation within desired conditions. Forest-wide management direction for aquatics and big game habitat would apply. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Mahogany Butte	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> North of Carlson Spring and South of Phantom Falls Trailhead – change GFRG to BCR (17,000 acres) 	1796 1817	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Important nonmotorized backcountry big-game habitat Numerous springs in a region known for water shortage Phantom Falls provides important hiking destination Trout Creek contains Yellowstone cutthroat trout and good fishing Crucial mule deer summer habitat and an important big game hunting area Important big game hunting and recreation area for the communities of Magic Valley 	Did not change because the area has a number of unimproved roads, heavy livestock grazing, and the presence of grazing facilities, including fencing, stock ponds, and developed springs for stock water. Area is in prescription 6.1, which applies to lands that are predominantly (more than 50 percent) shrubland and grassland. Emphasis is on restoring and maintaining vegetation within desired conditions. Forest-wide management direction for aquatics and big game habitat would apply. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.
Lone Cedar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change GFRG to BCR (6,800 acres) 	1796 1817	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Important fishing opportunities in Trapper Creek Mule deer crucial summer habitat and quality big game hunting An island of nonmotorized use surrounded by areas of motorized vehicles Important big game hunting and recreation area for the communities of Magic Valley 	Did not change because the area has past harvest, livestock grazing, and livestock grazing facilities. Area is prescription 6.1 (see Mahogany Butte above). No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.
Targhee				
Bald Mountain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change GFRG to BCR (1,600 acres) 	1796 1817 1700	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area has backcountry character Unroaded, small area contiguous with BCR Important Yellowstone cutthroat trout streams Crucial elk, mule deer, and moose habitat 	Did not change because this area has some development such as livestock fences. This area is in prescription 6.1(b) which focuses on maintaining healthy nonforested rangelands for livestock forage production and good watershed condition. Timber may be harvested to improve wildlife habitat and to provide miscellaneous products. Forest-wide direction to protect biological elements (fish) would apply. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the modified rule.
Bear Creek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change GFRG to BCR (61,500 acres) 	1796 1817 1700 017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area has backcountry character Southern border contiguous with Primitive Large intact roadless area Important Yellowstone cutthroat trout Crucial elk and mule deer summer range, vital moose habitat 	Changed (47,700 acres) from GFRG to BCR because of roadless character, high backcountry values, and priority for big game. Did not change area that was already roaded. Area already roaded is in prescription 6.1(b); see Bald Mountain above. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Caribou City	▪ Change roaded portion of BCR to GFRG (1,300 acres)	IDT	▪ Area roaded	Changed from BCR to GFRG because this portion has been roaded. Forest Plan prescription consistent with intent of GFRG. Area is in prescription 5.1.3(b) timber management with no clearcutting, and 5.4(c) elk summer range. Management direction to increase security for elk would apply. No roads could be constructed to access new mineral leases under the modified rule.
Diamond Peak	▪ Change GFRG to BCR (27,700 acres)	1796 1817 1700	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Area has backcountry character ▪ Adjacent to WLR ▪ Elk, mule deer, bighorn sheep, pronghorn, mountain goat habitat ▪ Has a few roads, but is still important for wildlife and hunting that it should still be upgraded to BCR to maintain and restore these areas 	Changed 10,900 acres from GFRG to BCR because of roadless character; high backcountry values and priority for big game. Did not change area that was already roaded which is in prescription 6.1(b) – see Bald Mountain above. No roads could be constructed in GFRG to access new mineral leases under the modified rule.
Garfield Mountain	▪ Change GFRG to BCR (19,800 acres)	1796 1817 1535 1700	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adjacent to WLR ▪ Contiguous with Montana border ; area in MT is recommended wilderness ▪ Important wild trout fisheries ▪ Elk, mule deer, bighorn sheep, pronghorn, mountain goat habitat ▪ Wildlife linkage zone from Greater Yellowstone to Selway-Bitterroot 	Changed 17,500 acres from GFRG to BCR for big game habitat and to better align with management in Montana whose adjacent portion is recommended wilderness. Roaded portion not changed and is in prescription 6.1(b) - see Bald Mountain above. No roads could be constructed in GFRG to access new mineral leases under the modified rule.
Garfield Mountain	▪ Change Primitive area (forest plan prescription 3.1.1) to BCR	1576	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Targhee forest plan placed this area in a non-motorized 3.1.1 management prescription, which does not allow motorized use; nor does the Primitive category in the Idaho Rule; ▪ Want to allow motorized use on designated routes and trails can occur 	Did not change because the Idaho Roadless Rule does not apply to motorized recreation; therefore, motorized recreation would not be affected.
Garns Mountain	▪ Change BCR to Primitive or WLR	017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yellowstone cutthroat trout ▪ Moose population 	Did not change because the area lacks outstanding Primitive or Wild Land Recreation qualities. In addition, a portion of the area is within 1-½ miles of communities.
Garns Mountain	▪ Change roaded portion of BCR to GFRG (2,600 ac)	IDT	▪ Area roaded	Changed 2,600 acres from BCR to GFRG because the area is already roaded. Forest plan prescription is consistent with intent of GFRG. No roads could be constructed in GFRG to access new mineral leases under the Modified Rule.

Roadless area	Request for change	Ltr #	Reason	Disposition
Italian Peaks	▪ Change GFRG to BCR (39,700)	1796 1817 1700	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Area has backcountry character ▪ Adjacent to WLR ▪ Contiguous with Montana border; area in MT is recommended wilderness ▪ Important wild trout fisheries ▪ Elk, mule deer, bighorn sheep, pronghorn, mountain goat habitat ▪ Wildlife linkage zone from Greater Yellowstone to Selway-Bitterroot 	Changed 39,700 acres of GFRG to BCR because of roadless character, high backcountry values, priority for big game, and to better align with management in Montana.
Mt. Jefferson	▪ Change Primitive area (forest plan prescription 3.1.1) to BCR	1576	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Area has had a significant increase in Douglas-fir bark beetle activity. Thousands of trees have died and now provide increased fuel loading. ▪ Forest plan prescription 3.1.1 does not allow these trees to be salvaged or removed; nor does the Primitive theme in the Idaho Rule 	Did not change to maintain consistency with existing forest plan.
Mt. Jefferson	▪ Change BCR area (forest plan prescription 5.1.4(b) to GFRG	1576	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 5.1.4(b) is a timber management prescription, with a big game security emphasis ▪ Should be managed to provide a mosaic of vegetation species and age classes ▪ Should allow harvest on a sustained yield basis 	Changed 500 acres of prescription 5.1.4(b) from BCR to GFRG because area already roaded. Remaining 6,300 acres in 5.1.4 (b) remain in BCR because of lack of previous disturbance. Forest plan prescription consistent with intent of GFRG.
Mt. Jefferson	▪ Change roaded portion of BCR to GFRG (1,300 acres)	IDT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Area roaded 	Changed 2,700 acres from BCR to GFRG because the area is already roaded. Forest plan prescription consistent with intent of GFRG.
Mt. Jefferson	▪ Move KPLA area in Primitive to GFRG	1795	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Move KPLAs from Primitive to GFRG to allow for phosphate development 	Did not change because of high roadless characteristics. Area is adjacent to recommended wilderness in Montana.
Palisades	▪ Change BCR to Primitive (51,300 acres)	1796 1817 1700	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contiguous with WLR ▪ Vital mule deer, elk and moose habitat ▪ Yellowstone cutthroat trout 	Did not change ; the vast majority of the BCR will be managed similarly to the 2001 Rule. About 5,900 acres are within 1-½ miles of a community but are generally not located adjacent to the portion in WLR. Forest-wide direction for management of fisheries would apply. A portion of the BCR (18,000 acres) is in prescription 2.7, which provides direction for management of elk and deer winter range.
Two Top	▪ Change from Primitive to GFRG or BCR	757	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has old, overmature stands of Douglas-fir and lodgepole pine ▪ Not unique ▪ Not needed for grizzly bear recovery 	Did not change to maintain consistency with existing forest plan. Land in is the primary conservation area for grizzly bear.

Letter #'s

015 – Jane Cropp
017 – Stephen Hunt
309 – John Lewinski
584 – Lemhi County – Office of the County Commissioners
756 – Jeff Barney
757 – James Gerber – Citizens for a User Friendly Forest
1480 – Secesch Wildlands Coalition
1492 – Lava Lake Land and Livestock
1496 – Soldier Mountain
1535 – Hellgate Hunters
1547 – Aaron Kindle
1563 – Will Vernard
1576 – Clark County Idaho Board of County Commissioners
1700 – Trout Unlimited
1718 – Boundary Backpackers
1721 – Great Burn Study Group
1795 – J.R. Simplot Company
1796 – Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership
1799 – Lands Council
1805 – National Ski Area Association
1817 – Idaho Chapter of the Safari Club
1819 – Nez Perce Tribe
1820 – Brundage Mountain Resort
1939 – Roderick Barcklay
2364 – Adams County
4156 – Idaho Conservation League, et al.
6546 – Shoshone-Bannock Tribe
6548 – Michael Richardson
6785 – Tess O’Sullivan
IDT – Idaho Roadless Area interdisciplinary team

APPENDIX Q—FOREST PLAN SPECIAL AREAS

The management direction in the Idaho Roadless Rule would not apply to the following areas, which would be managed according to management direction in the forest plans. Table Q-1 shows the forest plan special areas that overlap with Idaho Roadless Areas. Table Q-2 is a summary by type of forest plan special area.

Table Q-1. Forest plan special areas that overlap with Idaho Roadless Areas

Forest	Management prescription	Description	Associated acres
Boise	2.2	Research natural area and wild and scenic river	5,100
	2.2	Research natural area and wild and scenic river	1,000
	Forest-wide wild and scenic river direction	Overlay of eligible, suitable and designated wild and scenic river corridors	38,400
	Total		44,500
Caribou	2.2	Research natural area	5,300
	2.5	Wild and scenic rivers	1,500
	2.1.1	Bloomington Lake special emphasis area (geologic and botanical)	200
	2.1.4	Caribou Mountain special emphasis area (cultural and historic)	15,500
	2.1.5	Lander Trail special emphasis area (cultural and historic)	1,600
	2.1.2	Visual corridor along existing paved or gravel surfaced roads	6,500
	3.2	Pebble Creek ski area	100
	4.2	Special use authorization sites	900
	4.3	Designated dispersed recreation area	2,200
	8.1u	Transmission line corridors	500
	2.8.3	Riparian areas – overlay – not taken out of the themes, but the Existing Plan direction applies	0
	Total		34,300
	Challis	Forest-wide direction for research natural areas	Overlay of research natural areas
Total			12,400
Clearwater	M1	Research natural areas	4,000
	A7	Wild and scenic rivers	16,000
	A7	Research natural area and Wild and scenic river	300
	A7	Lolo-Nee Mee Poo Trail	500
	Total		20,800

Forest	Management prescription	Description	Associated acres
Idaho Panhandle	Forest-wide wild and scenic river direction	Overlay of eligible, suitable and designated wild and scenic river corridors	32,600
	Forest-wide wild and scenic river direction	Research natural areas	7,800
	Forest-wide wild and scenic river direction	Special interest areas	4,700
	2 (Existing Plan) 7 (Proposed Plan)	Primary recreation areas	200
	Total		45,300
Kootenai	2 and 2og (Existing Plan) 3 (Proposed Plan)	Special interest areas	200
	Total		200
Nez Perce	6, 11 (overlay)	Research natural areas	9,300
	8.2, 8.3	Wild and scenic rivers	9,100
	Total		18,400
Payette	2.2	Research natural area	9,200
	2.2	Research natural area and wild and scenic river	500
	Forest-wide wild and scenic river direction	Overlay of eligible, suitable and designated wild and scenic river corridors	23,100
	4.1a	Brundage Ski Area	7,100
	Total		39,900
Salmon	Forest-wide research natural areas	Overlay of research natural area	8,600
	6B	Congressionally designated wild and scenic river	7,100
	1A	Winter sports site	400
	Total		16,100
Sawtooth	2.2	Research Natural Area	1,800
	Forest-wide wild and scenic river direction	Overlay of eligible, suitable and designated wild and scenic river corridors	61,100
	4.3	Bald Mtn Ski area	400
	Total		63,300
Targhee	2.2	Research natural area	9,900
	2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.9.1, 2.9.2	Wild and scenic rivers	16,900
	2.1.1	Special interest areas	7,100
	2.1.2; 5.2.2	Visual corridors	4,500
	4.1	Developed recreation sites	20
	4.3	Designated dispersed recreation areas	300
	8.1	Concentrated development sites	300
	2.8.3	Riparian areas – overlay – not taken out of the themes, but the Existing Plan direction applies	0
	Total		39,020

Forest	Management prescription	Description	Associated acres
Wallowa-Whitman	None		0
	Total		*334,220

*Totals do not match numbers throughout EIS due to rounding errors (334,500)

Table Q-2. Summary by type of Forest Plan Special Area

Category	Acres	General management
Wild and scenic rivers	205,800	Designated rivers are managed according to their comprehensive plans which may be incorporated into forest plans. By policy eligible river segments are protected from activities which would adversely affect free flow or their outstandingly remarkable values until such time as Congress acts upon the Forest Service recommendations.
Research natural areas	68,300	Research natural areas are a specially designated area in as near a natural condition as possible which exemplifies typical or unique vegetation and associated biotic, soil, geologic, and aquatic resources. The area is established by the Forest Service to preserve a representative sample of an ecological community primarily for scientific and educational purposes.
Wild and scenic rivers and research natural areas	6,900	An area that includes both wild and scenic river corridors and research natural areas – see management direction above.
Special interest areas	29,800	Areas in the National Forest System designated for their unique or special characteristics (36 CFR 219.7).
Ski areas	8,000	Downhill ski areas with existing or future expansion. Includes lift serve areas, ski runs etc.
Developed areas	800	Phosphate development, transmission lines, etc.
Designated dispersed recreation	2,500	Heavy summer use areas such as around lakes or reservoirs; along roads and streams; or at trailheads where there are multiple campsites accessed by conventional wheeled vehicles (>50" wide) or boats. These sites may have some limited development.
Recreation sites	1,120	Campgrounds, picnic areas.
Visual corridor along highways	11,000	Areas adjacent to major travel corridors with high quality natural vistas.
	334,220	

