

Appendix A

Content Analysis Process

Public responses on the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking are documented and analyzed using a process called content analysis. This is a systematic process of compiling and categorizing all public viewpoints and concerns submitted on a plan or project. Content analysis is intended to help decision makers clarify or adjust the the next phase of the project. Information from public meetings, letters, emails, faxes, and other sources are all included in this analysis.

In the content analysis process, each response is assigned a unique number. This number allows analysts to link specific comments to original responses. All respondents' names and addresses are entered into a project-specific database program, enabling creation of a complete list of all respondents.

Analysts read and code responses using the coding structure. Each comment is coded by subject and verified by a second analyst for accuracy and consistency. Then all coded comments are entered verbatim into a comment database. Database reports track all input and allow analysts to identify public concerns and to analyze the relationships among them. The final analysis document includes an executive summary, which discusses respondents' main areas of concern, and a formal list of public concern statements. Each public concern statement is accompanied by one or more sample excerpts from original responses.

This process and the resulting document do not replace responses in their original form. Rather, they provide a map to the responses and other input on file at the office of the Content Analysis Team (CAT) in Salt Lake City. Interested parties are encouraged to read public comment firsthand.

It is important to recognize that the consideration of public comment is not a vote-counting process in which the outcome is determined by the majority opinion. Relative depth of feeling and interest among the public can serve to provide a general context for decisionmaking. However, it is the appropriateness, specificity, and factual accuracy of comment content that serves to provide the basis for modifications to planning documents and decisions. Further, because respondents are self-selected, they do not constitute a random or representative public sample. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) encourages all interested parties to submit comment as often as they wish regardless of age, citizenship, or eligibility to vote. Respondents may therefore include businesses, people from other countries, children, and people who submit multiple responses. Therefore, caution should be used when interpreting comparative terms in the summary document. Every substantive comment and suggestion has value, whether expressed by one respondent or many. All input is read and evaluated and the analysis team attempts to capture all relevant public concerns in the analysis process.

Appendix B Coding Structure

Presented below is the list of categories or “codes” used to sort public comment on the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. A more detailed description of the coding, database construction, and other elements of the methodology used for this analysis can be found in Appendix A: Content Analysis Process.

PLANN 10000 Purpose and Need for Roadless Area Policy

- 10110 Need for a national roadless rule, general
 - 10111 Necessary
 - 10112 Unnecessary
- 10120 Need for revision of the Jan. 2001 Rule
 - 10130 Abandon Rule/develop new Rule (*general reasons why*)
 - 10131 LACK OF RESPONSIVENESS TO LOCAL CONCERNS
 - 10132 ADEQUACY OF PUBLIC INPUT FOR SCOPING/DEIS
 - 10133 Volume of comment/content/participation
 - 10134 Timeframe
 - 10135 ADEQUACY OF MAPPING/OTHER INFORMATION FOR SCOPING/DEIS
 - 10136 RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES, DEIS (*GENERAL REFERENCE TO ADEQUACY OF RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES*)
 - 10137 ADEQUACY OF PRIOR INVENTORIES (*RARE I, RARE II*)
 - 10138 CONCURRENT NATIONAL PROJECTS
 - 10139 LITIGATION, FS/JD DEFENSE OF JAN. 2001 RULE
 - 10140 POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS
 - 10141 FLAWS IN JAN 2001 RULE, OTHER
 - 10150 Strengthen Rule/do not develop Rule (*general reasons why*)
 - 10151 RESPONSIVENESS TO LOCAL CONCERNS
 - 10152 ADEQUACY OF PUBLIC INPUT FOR SCOPING/DEIS
 - 10153 Volume of comment/content/participation
 - 10154 Timeframe
 - 10155 ADEQUACY OF MAPPING/OTHER INFORMATION FOR SCOPING/DEIS
 - 10156 RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES, DEIS (*GENERAL REFERENCE TO ADEQUACY OF RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES*)
 - 10157 ADEQUACY OF PRIOR INVENTORIES (*RARE I, RARE II*)
 - 10157 CONCURRENT NATIONAL PROJECTS
 - 10159 LITIGATION, FS/JD DEFENSE OF JAN. 2001 RULE
 - 10160 POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS
 - 10161 FLAWS IN JAN 2001 RULE, OTHER

PLANN 11000 Issue (Q10)

- 11100 ANPR Issue identification (*adequacy, accuracy, clarity of the 10 questions, NOT answers to the questions*)
 - 11110 1. Informed decisionmaking (role of local forest planning)

- 11120 2. Working together to address roadless values
- 11130 3. Protecting forests (from fire and fuels, insects and disease)
- 11140 4. Protecting communities, homes, and property
- 11150 5. Protecting access to property
- 11160 6. Describing values of IRAs
- 11170 7. Describing activities allowed/prohibited
- 11180 8. Designating areas
- 11190 9. Competing values and limited resources (*balancing of*)
- 11200 10. Other concerns

PLANN 12000 Decisionmaking Authority (Q1) (*Who should have authority*)

- 12100 Role/authority
 - 12110 President/exec branch
 - 12111 CURRENT ADMINISTRATION
 - 12112 FORMER ADMINISTRATION
 - 12120 Forest Service
 - 12121 WASHINGTON OFFICE
 - 12122 CHIEF
 - 12123 ID TEAM
 - 12124 CAT
 - 12125 LOCAL FOREST SERVICE PERSONNEL
 - 12130 Legislative branch
 - 12140 Judicial branch
 - 12150 City, state, and county governments
 - 12151 LOCAL, STATE, AND COUNTY AGENCIES OR ELECTED OFFICIALS
 - 12160 Tribal governments
- 12200 Trust and integrity, general
 - 12210 Current Administration
 - 12220 Former Administration
 - 12230 Forest Service
 - 12240 City, state, and county governments or officials
 - 12250 Tribal governments
- 12300 Managing across jurisdictions (*protocol and need for managing across jurisdictions*)
 - 12310 Planning and Implementation (*involving agencies, states and counties in planning*)
 - 12311 MULTI-FOREST/REGIONAL (WITHIN FOREST SERVICE)
 - 12312 OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES (BLM, PARK SERVICE)
 - 12313 STATE, LOCAL, OTHER AGENCIES
 - 12314 PRIVATE LANDOWNERS
- 12400 Interim direction (during rule revision, prior to forest plan revision, etc.)
 - 12410 Chief maintains authority
 - 12420 Regional foresters delegated authority
 - 12430 Line officers delegated authority (*Forest Sups or Districts*)
 - 12440 Moratorium on entry until rule finalized
 - 12450 Moratorium on entry until forest plans revised
 - 12451 TONGASS
 - 12460 No moratorium/no special considerations for RAs

PLANN 13000 Role of Local Forest Plan Process (NFMA) (Q1) *(How the planning process should work)*

- 13100 Appropriate scale of decisionmaking (local vs. national, who decides)
 - 13110 Forest-level (“local”) decision-making
 - 13120 National direction without local planning
 - 13130 Local planning with national direction
- 13200 Role and process of local forest planning (how to)
 - 13210 Implementation of national/WO direction
 - 13211 INCORPORATE NATIONAL RULE DURING NEXT FOREST PLAN REVISION
 - 13212 UPDATE INFORMATION/INVENTORIES
 - 13213 DETERMINE SITE-SPECIFIC AREAS FOR NATIONAL EXEMPTIONS
 - 13214 DETERMINE ADDITIONAL SITE-SPECIFIC RESTRICTIONS/PROHIBITIONS
 - 13220 Evaluation through current forest planning process *(little or no additional national guidance)*
 - 13230 Evaluation project-by-project, forest-level *(little or no national guidance)*

PLANN 14000 Public Involvement, ANPR (Q2)

- 14100 Adequacy/availability of information
 - 14110 Federal Register notice *(Federal Register notice detailed enough or not)*
 - 14120 Outreach/agency communication efforts
 - 14130 Web site
 - 14140 General request for more information
- 14200 Public meetings
- 14300 Adequacy of comment period *(for adequacy of comment period, Jan. 2001 Rule, see Purpose and Need)*
 - 14310 Extension needed
 - 14320 No extension needed
- 14400 Adequacy of timeframe *(for adequacy of timeframe, Jan. 2001 Rule, see Purpose and Need)*
 - 14410 ANPR, PR, and final rule
 - 14420 In conjunction with other national projects
 - 14421 TRANSPORTATION POLICY
 - 14422 PLANNING REGS
 - 14430 In conjunction with forest and regional level projects
- 14500 Use of science/best available information

PLANN 15000 Public Involvement in Decisionmaking, General (Q2, Q9)

- 15100 Managing National Forest System lands
 - 15110 Role of general public *(including public opinion)*
 - 15111 LOCAL CITIZENS/COMMUNITIES
 - 15112 NATION-WIDE CITIZENS/COMMUNITIES
 - 15120 Role of interest groups
 - 15121 ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS
 - 15122 INDUSTRY/BUSINESS GROUPS

- 15123 MULTIPLE USE/WISE USE, RECREATION, ETC.
- 15130 Role of state and local governments
 - 15131 COOPERATING AGENCY STATUS
- 15140 Role of other federal agencies
 - 15141 COOPERATING AGENCY STATUS
- 15150 Use of public involvement/comment (*adequacy, methodology*)
 - 15151 METHODOLOGY AND TECHNIQUES
 - 15152 SUGGESTIONS
 - 15153 SUBMITTED ON SCOPING/DEIS FOR JAN. 2001 RULE
 - 15154 ANPR
- 15160 Managing competing interests **(Q9)**
 - 15161 EXISTING LEGAL/ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDANCE
 - 15162 ENHANCED COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS
 - 15163 PUBLIC EDUCATION/INFORMATION EFFORTS
 - 15164 FS STAFF TRAINING/EDUCATION
 - 15165 WILL OF PUBLIC
 - 15166 ECONOMIC VALUES (MARKET)
 - 15167 ECOSYSTEM/PRESERVATION VALUES
 - 15168 RELATIVE IMPACTS OF COMPETING USES
 - 15169 SCIENTIFIC CONSENSUS

PLANN 16000 Relationship to Other National Planning Processes, FS (Q10)

- 16100 National and regional
 - 16110 Transportation/roads policy
 - 16120 Planning regulations
 - 16130 Interior Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Plan

PLANN 17000 Agency Organization and Funding

- 17100 Funding for Forest Service (*likelihood of future funding; budget allocation; revise funding*)
 - 17110 Tax-based funding
 - 17120 Fee-based funding/fee demo areas (recreation, etc.)
 - 17130 Other sources of revenue
 - 17140 Use of volunteers
- 17200 Funding for Roadless ANPR (*reference to existing and potential funding sources*)
 - 17210 Funding for the proposed rule
 - 17220 Cost of implementation of final rule (*reference to projected or assumed costs of implementation to agency; for impacts to business, etc. see ECONO*)
 - 17230 Monitoring and enforcement (*funding of only*)
 - 17240 Effects on other forest funding priorities
- 17300 Organization structure and staffing

LEGAL 20000 Relationship to Applicable Laws, Regulations and Policies (*for general comments or laundry lists only, specific comments should be coded to the resource*)

- 20100 Constitution
- 20200 Federal laws, acts, and policies

- 20201 NFMA (*National Forest Management Act*)
- 20202 MUSYA (*Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act*)
- 20203 NEPA (*National Environmental Policy Act*)
- 20204 Organic Act
- 20205 FLPMA (*Federal Land Policy and Management Act*)
- 20206 Wilderness Act (*including state wilderness acts*)
- 20207 ANILCA (*Alaska Native Interest Lands Conservation Act*)
- 20208 RS 2477
- 20209 APA (*Administrative Procedures Act*)
- 20210 ADA (*Americans with Disabilities Act*)
- 20211 FACAA (*Federal Advisory Committee Act*)
- 20212 FOIA (*Freedom of Information Act*)
- 20213 Civil Rights Act
- 20214 National Outdoor Recreation Act
- 20215 Government Performance and Results Act
- 20216 Paperwork Reduction Act
- 20217 RFA (*Regulatory Flexibility Act*)
- 20218 SBREFA (*Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act*)
- 20219 Unfunded Mandates Reform Act
- 20220 CAA (*Clean Air Act*)
- 20221 CWA (*Clean Water Act*)
- 20222 ESA (*Endangered Species Act*)
- 20223 Mining laws and regulations
- 20300 Executive orders
- 20400 State and local laws
- 20500 Forest Service manuals, handbooks etc.

DESIG 25000 Designating Management Categories/Allocations (Q8)

- 25100 Current legal and administrative guidance
 - 25110 Sufficient
 - 25120 Insufficient
- 25200 Recommend as wilderness
 - 25210 All RAs
 - 25220 Qualifying RAs
 - 25230 Forest-by-forest determination
 - 25240 No RAs
- 25300 Create specific roadless MA allocation(s) (*Backcountry, Primitive, etc.*)
 - 25310 Forest-by-forest
 - 25320 Do not create special allocations
 - 25330 Use existing forest MA categories
 - 25340 Forest discretion/case-by-case/apply MAs as appropriate
 - 25350 Special interest areas (*Research Natural Areas, Recreational Non-motorized, Wild and Scenic, etc.*) (*less intensive uses*)
 - 25360 Timber production, wildlife habitat, motorized recreation, etc. (*more intensive uses*)

NADIS 30000 Natural Disturbance Processes and Forest Health (Q3)

- 30100 Forest health, general comments
 - 30110 Current conditions/HRV/desired conditions
 - 30120 Differences between ecotypes/cover types
 - 30130 Economic vs. ecological perspectives on forest health
- 30200 Forest management access (*need for access to prevent disturbance*)
- 30300 Role of fire in forested ecosystems
 - 30310 Restoring fire as a natural process
 - 30320 Protection of timber resources from fire
- 30400 Fire management: response policy/decision protocol
 - 30410 Fire management plans (general references, process and integration into forest plans)
 - 30420 Planned ignitions/prescribed fire
 - 30430 Unplanned ignitions (*natural ignitions, wildland fire, etc.*)
- 30500 Mechanical fuel reduction
 - 30510 Fuels reduction, general
 - 30511 EFFICACY OF MECHANICAL TREATMENTS
 - 30512 PRIORITY AREAS
 - 30520 Timber harvest
 - 30530 Thinning
 - 30531 THINNING IN COMBINATION W/PREScribed FIRE
 - 30540 Fire breaks
 - 30550 Slash removal and other harvest prescriptions
 - 30560 Grazing and fine fuel reduction
- 30600 Other risk reduction, FS efforts/responsibility
 - 30610 Prevention and public education
- 30700 Responsibility of private individuals/landowners
- 30800 Risk to FS and natural resource lands from private property
- 30900 Costs of fire management
 - 30910 Suppression efforts
 - 30920 Ecosystem restoration
- 31100 Post-fire treatments
 - 31110 Burned Area Emergency Rehabilitation (BAER) efforts
 - 31120 Salvage logging
- 31200 Insects and disease, general
 - 31210 Role of insects/disease in natural systems
 - 31220 Prevention/treatment/detection
 - 31221 NEED FOR ROADS/ACCESS
 - 31222 HARVEST OF TIMBER RESOURCES TO AVOID LOSS TO INSECTS AND DISEASE
 - 31223 SALVAGE LOGGING (*INSECT OR DISEASE KILLED*)
- 31300 Non-native plants and noxious weeds
 - 31310 Introduction/spread
 - 31311 ROAD/ TRAIL BUILDING
 - 31312 WEED FREE FEED
 - 31313 RECREATION MANAGEMENT

- 31320 Treatment
- 31321 USE OF HERBICIDES

PRIVA 35000 Private Property Protection (Urban Interface and Inholdings) (Q4)

- 35100 Public/firefighter safety (protecting people from fire)
 - 35110 Responsibility of FS
 - 35111 SUPPRESSION
 - 35112 FUELS REDUCTION
 - 35113 PUBLIC EDUCATION
 - 35120 Responsibility of state and local governments
 - 35130 Responsibility of landowners/private citizens
- 35200 Economic loss reduction (*saving homes and private land*)
 - 35210 Responsibility of FS
 - 35220 Responsibility of state and local governments
 - 35230 Responsibility of landowners/private citizens
- 35300 Land exchanges, acquisitions, and conservation easements (*as related to protection*)

ACCES 40000 Private Property Access Across National Forest System Lands (Q5)

- 40100 Existing legal requirements
- 40200 Jan. 2001 Rule exceptions
- 40300 Additional exceptions
- 40400 Minimum means necessary
- 40500 Acquisition of inholdings (*as related to access*)
- 40600 Costs of access roads/mitigation of impacts

EVALU 45000 Characteristics of Roadless Areas (Q6)

- 45100 Roadless area characteristics general
- 45200 General comments about definition of a road
- 45300 General comments about the number of acres
 - 45310 5000 acres
 - 45320 1000 acres
 - 45330 All or any size roadless area
 - 45331 ADJACENT TO WILDERNESS/OTHER PROTECTED AREAS (NATIONAL PARKS, ETC)
 - 45340 Different geographic standards
 - 45341 EAST VS. WEST/100TH MERIDIAN
- 45400 Inventory status
 - 45410 IRA
 - 45420 Uninventoried
 - 45430 Land acquisitions
 - 45440 Most current inventory
- 45500 Prior/currently scheduled management activities
 - 45510 Should disqualify an IRA from rule provisions

- 45511 TIMBER HARVEST/SCHEDULED SALES
- 45512 ROADS
 - 45513 Roded portions of IRAs
 - 45514 Non-system roads and ways (*how can a roadless area have roads?*)
- 45515 TRAILS
- 45520 Should not disqualify an IRA from rule provisions
 - 45521 TIMBER HARVEST/ SCHEDULED SALES
 - 45522 ROADS
 - 45523 Roded portions of IRAs
 - 45524 Non-system roads and ways (restore/ignore)
 - 45525 TRAILS
- 45600 Exemptions of specific areas from a national rule
 - 45610 Do exempt from rule (do not include this area)
 - 45611 SPECIFIC REGIONS, GEOGRAPHIC AREAS
 - 45612 SPECIFIC NATIONAL FORESTS
 - 45613 Tongass
 - 45614 SPECIFIC ROADLESS AREAS
 - 45615 NATIONAL FORESTS WITH AN ROD AND APPEALS UNDERWAY OR COMPLETED
 - 45616 CURRENT OR PROPOSED TIMBER SALES (*I.E. ALLOW THEM TO PROCEED*)
 - 45617 SPECIAL USE PERMIT AREAS (*SUCH AS SKI RESORTS*)
 - 45618 LAND EXCHANGES OR OTHER AGREEMENTS (*I.E. ALLOW THEM TO PROCEED*)
 - 45619 SCIENTIFIC/RESEARCH AREAS OR FACILITIES
 - 45620 Do not exempt from rule (include this area)
 - 45621 SPECIFIC REGIONS, GEOGRAPHIC AREAS
 - 45622 SPECIFIC NATIONAL FORESTS
 - 45623 Tongass
 - 45624 SPECIFIC ROADLESS AREAS
 - 45625 NATIONAL FORESTS WITH AN ROD AND APPEALS UNDERWAY OR COMPLETED
 - 45626 CURRENT OR PROPOSED TIMBER SALES (*I.E. DO NOT ALLOW THEM TO PROCEED*)
 - 45627 SPECIAL USE PERMIT AREAS (*SUCH AS SKI RESORTS*)
 - 45628 LAND EXCHANGES OR OTHER AGREEMENTS (*I.E. DO NOT ALLOW THEM TO PROCEED*)
 - 45629 SCIENTIFIC/RESEARCH AREAS OR FACILITIES

ENVIR 50000 Environmental Values, Introduction/General (Q6)

- 50100 Ecosystem management as guiding policy
- 50200 Multiple use management as guiding policy
- 50300 Short-term vs. long-term productivity/risks
- 50400 Effects on other nations/global environment
 - 50410 Global warming/greenhouse effects
 - 50420 Deforestation/desertification (transfer of effects)

- 50500 Biological diversity (*general comments only; specific comments code to resource*)
- 50510 Ecosystems/ecoregions
- 50520 Size and configuration (island biogeography, fragmentation, etc.)

ENVIR 51000 Water and Watersheds

- 51100 Groundwater
- 51200 Water yield and streamflow
 - 51210 Water rights and diversions (on and off forest)
- 51300 Watersheds
 - 51310 Health, general comments
 - 51320 Water quantity and timing
 - 51330 Flooding
 - 51340 Water quality
 - 51341 MASS WASTING AND SEDIMENTATION
 - 51342 DRINKING WATER SOURCES

ENVIR 52000 Air Quality, Soils, and Cave Resources

- 52100 Air quality
 - 52110 Fire, smoke effects on air quality
 - 52120 Dust and particulates
 - 52130 Contribution of forest stands to air quality
- 52200 Soils
 - 52210 Soil erosion, general (not specific to water quality)
 - 52220 Soil productivity
- 52300 Cave Resources (*Karst formations, limestone*)

ENVIR 53000 Terrestrial Wildlife

- 53100 Wildlife habitat (*quality, quantity, season, including snags & down logs*)
 - 53110 Connectivity/fragmentation
- 53200 Threatened, endangered, proposed and sensitive species
- 53300 Game species (*desired non-native species, harvested species*)

ENVIR 54000 Aquatic Wildlife

- 54100 Wildlife habitat (*quality, quantity, season*)
 - 54110 Connectivity/fragmentation
- 54200 Threatened, endangered, proposed and sensitive species
- 54300 Game species (*desired non-native species, harvested species*)

VEGET 60000 Vegetation and Botanical Resources (Q6)

- 60100 Structural composition, forest canopy species/trees
 - 60110 Early successional
 - 60120 Late successional/old growth
 - 60130 Mid-elevation ecosystems
- 60200 Snags and coarse woody debris (*amount, size, location, etc.*)
- 60300 Botanical resources (non-forest canopy plants and fungi)
 - 60310 Threatened, endangered, proposed and sensitive plants (*TEPS*)
- 60400 Rare and unique communities (*Botanical Special Interest Areas*)
- 60500 Alpine communities
- 60600 Non-forested vegetation

NRCOM 65000 Natural Resource Commodities

- 65100 Rangeland resources
 - 65110 Vegetation (*incl. response to grazing*)
 - 65120 Capability, suitability, forage
 - 65130 Restoration
 - 65140 Allotment management
- 65200 Timberland resources, general
 - 65210 Current timber conditions
 - 65220 Timber harvest method
 - 65230 Future of logging
 - 65240 Importance of timber resources in IRAs (*see ECONO for economic values*)
 - 65241 ACREAGE AFFECTED/RELATIVE PORTION OF TIMBER FROM RAS
 - 65250 Forest Service expenditures on timber management (*timber revenue/timber subsidy*)
 - 65260 Timberland suitability
 - 65261 LANDS SUITED/TENTATIVELY SUITED
 - 65262 TIMBERLANDS NOT SUITABLE
 - 65263 SALE QUANTITIES (*ALLOWABLE, PROBABLE, TOTAL SALE PROGRAM*)
 - 65270 Long-term sustained yield capacity (LTSYC)
 - 65280 Best management practices
 - 65290 Importance of other forest products (fuelwood, Christmas trees, etc.)
- 65300 Mining
 - 65310 Legal and administrative framework
 - 65320 Mining access/need for roads
 - 65330 Relative importance of public lands mineral deposits
 - 65331 EXTENT OF DEPOSITS/ESTIMATES
 - 65340 Importance of mining (*see ECONO for economic values*)
 - 65350 Recreational importance of mining (including rock and fossil collecting)
 - 65360 Hazardous materials
 - 65370 Mitigation and reclamation measures/costs

SOCIO 70000 Social Environment and Values (Q6)

- 70100 Population and demographics/community types
 - 70110 Urban
 - 70120 Urban interface
 - 70130 Rural
- 70200 Cultural integrity (*community structure and stability*)
- 70300 Maintaining quality of life (*general references*)
 - 70310 Scenic quality
 - 70320 Escape from urban environment
 - 70330 Spiritual/religious values
 - 70340 Family stability/togetherness

- 70400 Future generations (bequest values)
- 70500 Intrinsic value of non-commodity resources (*ecosystems, wildlife, etc. have/don't have inherent right to exist separate from utility or value to humans*)
- 70600 Environmental Justice Executive Order compliance (*management compliance, also general social justice and equal opportunity*)
- 70700 Accessibility/opportunity for elderly/disabled

ECONO 75000 Economic Environment and Values (Q6)

- 75100 Economic diversity/resiliency
- 75200 Economic vulnerability (*assessment and mitigation*)
- 75300 Maintaining community stability (*general references*)
 - 75310 Employment (*job and income changes to communities*)
 - 75320 Business viability
- 75400 Sustaining levels of forest products and services (*need and appropriate levels*)
- 75500 Contribution of/importance to economies/businesses
 - 75510 Timber resources
 - 75520 Grazing/livestock
 - 75530 Mineral resources
 - 75540 Recreation/tourism
- 75600 Subsidies/costs of management to agency or taxpayers
 - 75610 Timber sales (*below cost*)
 - 75620 Grazing/range
 - 75630 Recreation
- 75700 State, county, and local government revenues/costs (*effects on counties/communities*)
 - 75710 Infrastructure costs associated with population growth (*effects on counties/communities*)
 - 75720 Changes in PILT revenue (*effects on counties/communities*)
 - 75730 Changes in 25% fund (*effects on counties/communities*)
- 75800 Non-Market economic values/ecosystem services
- 75900 Cost benefit analysis (*analysis of comparison of cost of Roadless revision and projected benefits*)
- 75950 Effects on other nations/global economy

CULTR 80000 Heritage Resources (Q6)

- 80100 Cultural resources
 - 80110 Potential undiscovered sites
 - 80120 Protection of American Indian heritage sites
 - 80130 Historic trails
 - 80140 Historic structures

TRIBL 85000 American Indian Rights and Interests (Q6)

- 85100 Federal trust responsibilities
 - 85110 Treaty rights
- 85200 Management of special forest products of interest (including protection of culturally important species)

- 85210 Hunting, fishing, grazing, gathering rights and interests (*medicinal plants*)
- 85220 Role of fire
- 85230 Endangered Species Act conservation measures (*protection of treaty guarantees*)
- 85240 Traditional and cultural species of interest to American Indians
- 85300 Native American use of public lands
 - 85310 Cultural interests
 - 85311 PROTECTION OF TRADITIONAL CULTURAL RESOURCES/HISTORIC USE AREAS
 - 85312 ACCESS TO TRADITIONAL CULTURAL RESOURCES/HISTORIC USE AREAS
 - 85320 Economic interests
 - 85330 Traditional interests
 - 85340 Spiritual interests
 - 85350 Government interests

ACTIV 90000 Human Uses and Management Activities (Q7)

- 90100 Allow activities general or multiple
- 90110 Prohibit/restrict activities general or multiple
- 90120 Allow road construction general
 - 90121 Temporary roads
- 90130 Prohibit/restrict road construction
 - 90131 Temporary roads
- 90210 Allow road reconstruction
- 90220 Prohibit/restrict road reconstruction
- 90310 Allow road closure/removal/decommissioning
- 90320 Prohibit/restrict road closure/removal/decommissioning
- 90410 Allow trail construction general
 - 90411 Motorized
 - 90412 Mechanized
 - 90413 Non-motorized
- 90420 Prohibit/restrict trail construction general
 - 90421 Motorized
 - 90422 Mechanized
 - 90423 Non-motorized
- 90510 Allow timber harvest, general
 - 90511 Current timber sales
 - 90512 Proposed timber sales
 - 90513 Even-aged management (clearcuts)
 - 90514 Uneven-aged management
 - 90515 Stewardship
 - 90516 Helicopter
- 90520 Prohibit/restrict timber harvest, general
 - 90521 Current timber sales
 - 90522 Proposed timber sales
 - 90523 Even-aged management (clearcuts)

- 90524 Uneven-aged management
- 90525 Stewardship
- 90526 Helicopter
- 90610 Allow livestock grazing
- 90620 Prohibit/restrict livestock grazing
- 90710 Allow exploration/development for minerals/oil and gas
 - 90711 Open withdrawn areas
- 90720 Prohibit/restrict exploration for minerals
 - 90721 Withdraw RAs
- 90810 Allow ski area permits/expansion
- 90820 Prohibit/restrict ski area permits/expansion
- 90910 Allow recreational facilities development (campgrounds, etc.)
- 90920 Prohibit recreational facilities development (campgrounds, etc.)
- 91110 Allow recreational activities, general or multiple
- 91120 Prohibit recreational activities, general or multiple
- 91210 Allow recreation activities, specific
 - 91211 Motorized activities
 - 91212 SUMMER
 - 91213 WINTER
 - 91214 Mechanized activities
 - 91215 Equestrian activities
 - 91216 Outfitter/guide permits
 - 91217 Competitive or group events
- 91220 Prohibit/restrict recreation activities, specific
 - 91221 Motorized activities
 - 91222 SUMMER
 - 91223 WINTER
 - 91224 Mechanized activities
 - 91225 Equestrian activities
 - 91226 Outfitter/guide permits
 - 91227 Competitive or group events
- 91310 Allow hunting/fishing
- 91320 Prohibit/restrict hunting/fishing
- 91410 Allow animal damage control
- 91420 Prohibit/restrict animal damage control
- 91510 Allow communication site designations and developments
- 91520 Prohibit/restrict communication site designations and developments
- 91610 Allow hydroelectric development
- 91620 Prohibit/restrict hydroelectric development
- 91710 Allow utility facilities/corridors
- 91720 Prohibit/restrict utility facilities/corridors

Alternative Field

This code is used to identify comments specific to the ten questions identified in the Federal Register.

XX – Multiple questions or no specific questions mentioned

01 – Question 1

02 – Question 2

03 – Question 3

04 – Question 4

05 – Question 5

06 – Question 6

07 – Question 7

08 – Question 8

09 – Question 9

10 – Question 10

Appendix C Public Concern List

Introduction

Public Concerns are derived directly from public comment. Each represents the gist of a statement of concern made by the public. Concerns may be derived from one person’s input, but often represent the view of many respondents. They are intended to aid decision makers in characterizing the issues to be analyzed. They may also provide a framework for preparing responses to public comment. Primarily, public concerns serve to guide readers to public comment on specific topics. As such, this index is intended to be used as a cross reference to public concerns listed in Chapters 1-6 of the Summary of Public Comment. Readers may identify their areas of concern within the list provided in this index and then reference the relevant portion of the summary document. There they will find sample quotes in support of the concern statement. Each sample quote includes a letter number reference should users wish to look at the original letter on file at the office of the Content Analysis Team (CAT) in Salt Lake City.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION TO NATIONAL ROADLESS PROTECTION RULEMAKING	1-1
NATIONAL ROADLESS PROTECTION – GENERAL REMARKS.....	1-1
Need for a National Roadless Rule General	1-1
1. Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify the need for a national roadless rule.....	1-1
Because existing law already mandates environmental protection	1-2
Because existing law already provides for adequate public involvement in forest management decisions.....	1-2
Develop a National Roadless Rule	1-2
2. Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop a national roadless rule.	1-2
Because once these areas are gone they’re gone forever	1-2
Because individual states are unable to adequately protect roadless areas	1-3
Because most National Forest System lands are already managed for multiple uses	1-3
Because roadless areas are needed to preserve environmental and human values	1-3
Because the majority of citizens enjoy using roadless areas.....	1-3
To settle controversies regarding roadless areas.....	1-4
Do Not Develop a National Roadless Rule	1-4
3. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not develop a national roadless rule.	1-4
Because current law adequately protects the environment	1-4

Because the National Forest Management Act already adequately provides for public input 1-4

Because the courts have established that national forests are not wholly dedicated to recreational and environmental values 1-4

Because forests are in better shape now than at any other time in recent history..... 1-5

Because the Agency already has enough regulatory control and management authority to protect these areas 1-5

4. Public Concern: The Forest Service should delay development of another national roadless rule 1-5

 Until judicial resolution of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 1-5

 Until forest plan revision processes take place 1-5

Need for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 1-5

Need for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule General 1-7

5. Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify the need for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 1-7

 Because the rule does not address the stated purpose and need 1-7

 Because only a small percentage of roadless areas is projected to be developed between 2000 and 2004 1-7

6. Public Concern: The Forest Service should explain how current management does not provide the protection which it is the purpose and need of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule to provide..... 1-8

Implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 1-8

7. Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it now stands..... 1-8

 Because only a national rule can guarantee protection of national forests through changing politics and personnel 1-9

 Because it provides consistent standards 1-9

 Because the five principles of roadless conservation have already been followed 1-10

 Because it is based on the best available science 1-10

 Because once these places are gone they're gone forever 1-10

 Because it is long overdue 1-10

 To avoid repeating mistakes of the past..... 1-11

 Because it represents a balanced approach to forest conservation 1-11

 Because it still leaves ample area for other uses 1-12

 Because it adequately protects other interests..... 1-12

 Because so much forest land has already been Actively managed 1-13

 Because wilderness areas are too high in elevation and too far separated from each other to adequately preserve biodiversity and wilderness recreation 1-13

 Because Roadless areas serve a different purpose than wilderness areas 1-13

 Because the original process was sufficiently local..... 1-13

 Because it represents the will of the people 1-14

Because roadless areas in eastern forests are so scarce 1-15

Because it preserves the status quo..... 1-15

8. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Court’s concerns do not justify a departure from the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 1-15

9. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that revisiting the Roadless Area Conservation Rule will have negative effects. 1-16

It is a waste of taxpayer money 1-16

It will weaken public trust in the federal government 1-16

It will weaken public trust in the Forest Service planning process 1-16

It will polarize the political climate and incite people to radical actions 1-16

10. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that many groups support the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 1-17

Some western governors..... 1-17

Local residents 1-17

Average citizens 1-18

Tribes 1-18

Do Not Implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 1-18

11. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 1-18

Because it is the product of a biased process 1-18

Because it is based on emotion, not logic 1-19

Because benefits of the Rule are inflated based on subjective reasoning..... 1-19

Because it was developed without local input and due process 1-19

Because it ignores progress made at the local level 1-20

Because roadless issues were adequately dealt with in Rare I and Rare II..... 1-20

Because roadless areas are already adequately protected..... 1-20

Because there should be no roadless areas 1-21

Because it does not represent a balanced approach to forest conservation 1-21

Because it does not address the different needs of eastern and western forests 1-22

Because it disproportionately affects western states 1-22

Because it will make the job of managing forests more difficult..... 1-22

Because it is based on inadequate information 1-22

Because its support has not been adequately demonstrated 1-23

Because there is opposition to it..... 1-23

Because it will prompt civil disobedience protests 1-23

Because it will increase safety hazards 1-23

12. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use inadequate road maintenance funding as a reason for developing the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 1-24

13. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that support for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule is the result of misrepresentation of current forest management practices..... 1-24
Revision of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 1-24

14. Public Concern: The Forest Service should revise the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 1-24
 To adequately address forest health, access, and local input 1-24
 To address access for recreation and resource USE 1-25
 To omit from consideration lands suitable for timber REMOVAL 1-25
 To provide for reasonable management 1-25
 Because it was the product of an inadequate process 1-25

15. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking does not substantiate the need to revise the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 1-26
Strengthen the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 1-26

16. Public Concern: The Forest Service should strengthen the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 1-26
 By eliminating Exceptions 1-26
 By identifying areas which should not be exempted from the Rule 1-26
Defense of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 1-27

17. Public Concern: The Administration should defend the Roadless Area Conservation Rule against lawsuits. 1-27

18. Public Concern: The Administration should not defend the Roadless Area Conservation Rule against lawsuits. 1-28

Other..... 1-28

19. Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 1-28

20. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that it has already issued a decision on the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and should now emphasize work on more pressing issues 1-28

21. Public Concern: The Forest Service should separate the Roadless Area Conservation Rule into two policies to administer lands in the eastern and western United States..... 1-29

22. Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that one state does not shoulder disproportionate effects of a national roadless rule. 1-29

ISSUE IDENTIFICATION..... 1-30
Adequacy of Questions in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking 1-30
Adequacy of Questions; General 1-30

23. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize various problems with the 10 questions asked in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. 1-30
 They are unclear 1-30
 They are biased 1-31
 They have built-in assumptions 1-32
 They lead to certain responses 1-32

They are too open to interpretation 1-33

They are not relevant..... 1-33

They distract people from the main issues 1-33

They discourage public involvement..... 1-33

They only reflect the views of the small minority who oppose
roadless area protection 1-33

They attempt to justify the reversal of the Roadless Area
Conservation Rule 1-33

Their intent is to divert attention from the Administration’s attempt to
disqualify the Rule 1-34

They are an attempt to give greater weight to local citizens’
comments 1-34

They focus exclusively on the role of local forest planning and fail to
mention the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 1-34

They encourage conflict between DIVERSE GROUPS..... 1-34

They are framed to favor RESOURCE USERS..... 1-34

They let RESOURCE USERS define the terms of the debate..... 1-34

They do not contribute to a healthy and reasonable debate about
the value of roadless areas 1-35

24. Public Concern: The Forest Service should explain why none of
the 10 questions in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
address inventoried roadless areas as fully functioning
ecosystems..... 1-35

25. Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify whether the 10
questions in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking are an
attempt to conduct scoping for a new or supplemental EIS..... 1-35

And whether previous public comments will be considered..... 1-35

26. The Forest Service should recognize that all of the issues
addressed in the 10 questions in the Advance Notice of Proposed
Rulemaking were already addressed..... 1-35

27. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the 10
questions in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking are no
substitute for the public involvement process. 1-35

28. Public Concern: The Forest Service should eliminate the use of
questions to solicit public comment. 1-36

29. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the 10
questions in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking are a
positive step toward adequate public involvement..... 1-36

Adequacy of Specific Questions 1-36

30. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that
Question 3 in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is
biased. 1-36

Because it implies that thinning and road construction are essential
to forest health..... 1-36

Because it reflects a lack of knowledge of forest ecology..... 1-36

- 31. Public Concern: The Forest Service should define “near” as used in Question 4 in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. 1-36
- 32. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that Question 4 in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is misleading. 1-36
 - Because it implies that roadless areas pose a fire threat to homes and communities 1-36
- 33. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address various problems with Question 5 in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. 1-37
 - It is out of scope for this analysis 1-37
 - It reflects an inadequate review of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 1-37
 - It raises suspicions that more is being addressed than reasonable access 1-37
 - Define “reasonable access” 1-37
- 34. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that Question 6 in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking should be asked during the National Environmental Policy Act process. 1-37
- 35. Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify whether Question 8 in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking refers to the designation of additional roadless areas. 1-38
 - Beyond those already identified in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 1-38
- 36. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that Question 8 in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is inappropriate for addressing roadless area protection..... 1-38
 - Because wilderness designation is outside THE scope 1-38
 - Because the Forest Service is already required to inventory for wilderness area candidates during the forest planning process 1-38
- 37. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that Question 9 in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking goes beyond the issue of management of inventoried roadless areas..... 1-38

CHAPTER 2 PROCESS, PLANNING, POLICIES, AND LAWS 2-1

- NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT 2-1
 - National Rulemaking General 2-1
 - 38. Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify its legal authority to issue national regulations. 2-1
 - Which change land allocations in any national forest..... 2-1
 - 39. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Secretary of Agriculture *does* have the legal authority to issue a national roadless rule. 2-2
 - Compliance with the National Forest Management Act..... 2-2
 - 40. Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the National Forest Management Act. 2-3

To ensure a fair and open public involvement process..... 2-3

By ensuring that forest plans are in compliance 2-3

By addressing specific environmental protections mandated by the Act 2-4

By providing enough staff and resources in the field to implement forest plans and achieve objectives..... 2-4

By withdrawing the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 2-4

Until the statutory system is modified 2-4

41. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the Senate’s report on the National Forest Management Act. 2-4

Which stipulated that there should be no national land management prescriptions 2-4

42. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the National Forest Management Act has not prevented development of roadless areas. 2-5

43. Public Concern: The Forest Service should apply the National Forest Management Act to national-level decisionmaking..... 2-5

To address the desires of all Americans..... 2-5

Planning Regulations 2-5

44. Public Concern: The Forest Service should coordinate the roadless area regulations with the Planning Regulations. 2-6

By evaluating the social and economic impacts of each alternative 2-6

The Secretary of Agriculture should eliminate the national application of the current rule and establish national standards to guide the forest planning process..... 2-6

45. Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule under the former Planning Regulations..... 2-6

46. Public Concern: The Forest Service should postpone decisions regarding roadless area management until completing the revision of the Planning Regulations. 2-7

Particularly the 36 Code of Federal Regulations 219 Rule 2-7

47. Public Concern: The Forest Service should review and amend the Planning Regulations. 2-7

To address the appropriate management direction for unroaded areas 2-7

With respect to emphasis given to ecological sustainability and to treatment of unroaded areas 2-8

Without weakening existing environmental safeguards 2-8

By removing the phrase “at the discretion of the decision officer” 2-8

By including oil and gas leasing decisions and procedures..... 2-8

By REMOVING the objection procedures and retaining existing appeal regulations 2-9

48. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prioritize completion of forest plan revisions once the new Planning Regulations are finalized. 2-9

49. Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the 2000 Planning Regulations.....2-9

50. Public Concern: The Forest Service should seek further public input before taking further actions regarding the Planning Regulations and Roads Policy.....2-9

51. Public Concern: The Forest Service should explain why the word “access” was removed from the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 212 rule without notifying the public in federal register notices, and should open the CFR 219 rule for full public discourse.....2-9

Relationship to Other Plans/Policies2-10

52. Public Concern: The Forest Service should coordinate roadless area management with local forest plans.....2-10

53. Public Concern: The Forest Service should coordinate land use management with the planning and land use policies of local governments.....2-10

54. Public Concern: The Forest Service should support the Giant Sequoia National Monument Management Plan.....2-11

55. Public Concern: The Forest Service should coordinate roadless area regulations with the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project planning process.....2-11

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT2-12

Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act2-12

56. Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the National Environmental Policy Act.....2-12

By holding fair and open public meetings and considering substantive written comments.....2-12

By including input from local, state, and federal elected officials.....2-13

By incorporating accurate information about roadless areas.....2-13

By adequately analyzing all issues and concerns in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule Final EIS.....2-13

By providing site-specific information2-13

By providing the public with adequate information to allow informed comment2-14

By adequately studying the issues before initiating policies.....2-14

By ensuring that the outcome is not predetermined.....2-14

By not committing resources such as to prejudice selection of an alternative.....2-14

By withdrawing the Roadless Area Conservation Rule2-15

57. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that it is circumventing the National Environmental Policy Act by requiring additional comments after the record of decision was issued for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.....2-15

58. Public Concern: The National Environmental Policy Act should be revised.....2-15

Environmental Analysis Documents.....2-15

Environmental Analysis Documents General..... 2-16

59. Public Concern: The Forest Service should require an environmental assessment or EIS before undertaking any significant action. 2-16

Rather than arbitrarily prohibiting road construction 2-16

60. Public Concern: The Forest Service should require environmental assessments for roadless areas rather than EISs. 2-16

Because many of the areas are already roaded 2-16

61. Public Concern: The Forest Service should conduct an additional environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act. ... 2-16

If the previous review was inadequate as to require additional action 2-16

62. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prepare another EIS for a revised Roadless Rule..... 2-17

Prior to releasing lands for other management purposes, as required by California v. Block..... 2-17

To facilitate working together with all interested parties 2-17

That meets page limitations..... 2-17

63. Public Concern: The Forest Service should employ the programmatic approach to EISs consistently..... 2-17

64. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the Finding of No Significant Impact document, which allowed the roadless initiative to proceed, violated legal requirements for land withdrawals over 5,000 acres. 2-18

National Environmental Policy Act and Federal Land Policy and Management Act requirements 2-18

Roadless Area Conservation Rule EIS 2-18

65. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address inadequacies in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule Draft EIS..... 2-18

It failed to substantiate statements 2-18

It was not sufficiently site-specific and did not consider a sufficient range of alternatives 2-18

It failed to adequately discuss environmental and economic impacts .. 2-19

It failed to address meaningful input by affected citizens and parties... 2-19

Its underlying analysis was insufficient..... 2-19

66. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the final Roadless Area Conservation Rule includes restrictions on lands outside of unroaded portions of inventoried roadless areas. 2-19

Restrictions were not included in the alternatives..... 2-19

67. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the public was not given the opportunity to comment on vital aspects of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule which were added to the Final EIS, but which were not part of the Draft EIS..... 2-20

68. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prepare a supplemental Draft EIS. 2-20

That quantifies miles of existing roads in inventoried roadless areas ... 2-20

That provides maps of roadless areas2-20

69. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that data from the past 30 years of Environmental impact statements is sufficient to analyze the effects of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.2-20

70. Public Concern: The Forest Service should adopt Alternative 3D.2-20
Because it represents the best characterization of roadless area values and management planning2-20

71. Public Concern: The Forest Service should adopt Alternative 4D.2-21

72. Public Concern: The Forest Service should adopt Alternative T4.2-21
Which emphasizes fragile ecosystem protection over locally controlled development2-21

INTERIM DIRECTION2-22

Interim Direction General2-22

73. Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish interim direction for roadless area management.2-22
To address roadless area management for national forests which are revising or have recently revised their forest plans under the 1982 Planning Regulations2-23
To protect areas that cannot be actively managed during the current planning cycle2-23
For smaller areas in forests through project-by-project analysis2-23
In collaboration with other agencies and affected users.....2-23

74. Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish interim direction for mining.2-23
In Gunnison County2-23

75. Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish a temporary moratorium on activities in roadless areas.2-23
For at least 50 years2-24
For development projects that are inconsistent with the Roadless Area Conservation Rule2-24
While the matter is being litigated2-24
Until the entire maintenance and reconstruction backlog is eliminated.....2-24
Until a new management policy is developed2-24
Until the Agency determines what type of forestry should be practiced.....2-24

76. Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule is not in effect and that the lands will be managed according to already existing procedures and classifications.2-25

The Interim Directive2-25

77. Public Concern: The Forest Service should make the Interim Directive permanent.2-25
Until forest plans are revised.....2-25

78. Public Concern: The Forest Service should strengthen existing interim protection of roadless areas.....2-25

To prevent any further loss of the roadless area base..... 2-25
 By adopting the Roadless Area Conservation Rule until federal officers are convinced of its need 2-25

79. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the Interim Directive would return land management to its prior state. 2-26
 By leaving the fate of roadless areas to the forest planning process.... 2-26

80. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the interim direction outlined in the June 7, 2001, memo to staff is an implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 2-26
 Which is a violation of the District Court ruling 2-26

OTHER POLICY CONCERNS 2-27

Other Policy Concerns General..... 2-27

81. Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate the cumulative effects of multiple management proposals. 2-27
 The Roadless Area Conservation Rule, the Planning Regulations, and the Roads Policy..... 2-27
 The Roadless Area Conservation Rule and other withdrawals of National Forest System lands..... 2-27
 The Roadless Area Conservation Rule, multiple use mandates, and the fire plan, etc..... 2-27

82. Public Concern: The Forest Service should concurrently address related policies and regulations. 2-28
 The Roadless Area Conservation Rule, Planning Regulations, and road management policies 2-28

83. Public Concern: The Forest Service should withdraw the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, the revised Roads Policy, and the revised Planning Regulations. 2-28

84. Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify how the topic of unroaded areas will be integrated into the Planning Regulations and the Forest Service Manual and Handbook..... 2-28

Other Policy and Project Concerns – Specific Policies..... 2-28

Forest Service Manual 2-29

85. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consult the 7703.1 Forest Service Manual for roadless area management direction..... 2-29

86. Public Concern: The Forest Service should coordinate review of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule with review of the Forest Service Manual 7710 revision..... 2-29
 Because they have complementary direction 2-29

Quincy Library Group 2-29

87. Public Concern: The Forest Service should support the Quincy Library Group legislation..... 2-29

Recreation Agenda 2-30

88. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule conforms to the Recreation Agenda. 2-30

Roads Policy 2-30

89. Public Concern: The Forest Service should support the Roads Policy.....2-30

90. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the cumulative effects of the Roads Policy in combination with the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.2-30

91. Public Concern: The Forest Service should inform the public regarding the impact of the Roads Policy on management of inventoried roadless areas.2-30

92. Public Concern: The Forest Service should coordinate the Roads Policy with the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.....2-30

93. Public Concern: The Forest Service should decide roadless area management only after completion of the Roads Policy.....2-31

Sierra Nevada Framework.....2-31

94. Public Concern: The Forest Service should support the Sierra Nevada Framework decision.2-31

Other.....2-32

95. Public Concern: The Forest Service should incorporate rulemaking 65 FR 11680m 11682 into future planning efforts.2-32

With respect to the requirement to consult with affected state, tribal, and local governments in identifying transportation needs.....2-32

96. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage the forests with the pre-1994 direction.2-32

APPEALS AND LITIGATION.....2-33

 Appeals and Litigation General.....2-33

 97. Public Concern: The appeals process should be limited.2-33

 Regarding implementation of new policies at the local level2-33

 Require litigants to submit to arbitration before their cases can proceed to court2-33

 Restrict litigation to entire management plans, not individual sales or aspects thereof2-33

 98. Public Concern: Time limitations should be imposed on litigation.2-34

 99. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow litigation to sidetrack the legitimate forest planning process as defined by the National Forest Management Act.2-34

 100. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not make settlement agreements with groups who bring ‘citizen lawsuits’ to curtail activities.....2-34

 101. Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop a land-use clearinghouse to sort out issues before litigation.....2-34

 102. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow Environmental Protection Agency data in court.2-34

 As it points to a lack of due process.....2-34

 Appeals and Litigation – Specific Cases2-35

Roadless Area Conservation Rule.....2-35

 103. Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement the existing Roadless Area Conservation Rule.2-35

To eliminate prolonged and costly legal battles 2-35

104.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that any attempt to modify the Roadless Area Conservation Rule through settlement of litigation would be illegal..... 2-35

105.Public Concern: The Forest Service should pay greater heed to public comment..... 2-36

To avoid litigation..... 2-36

106.Public Concern: The Forest Service should delay any decision on the Roadless Area Conservation Rule until judicial review. 2-36

So that the impacts of proposed management can be analyzed against the appropriate baseline 2-36

107.Public Concern: The Forest Service should meet stated objectives presented in its review of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule to the U.S. District Court. 2-37

108.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address issues related to the legal challenge brought by North Dakota interests. 2-37

State-granted public rights-of-way along section lines..... 2-37

Description of the roadless issue as it applies to the North Dakota litigation is inaccurate 2-38

Roadless areas recommended as wilderness in the North Dakota draft plan revision were also recommended as roadless areas in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 2-38

The Roadless Area Conservation Rule failed to recognize the extensive road system in areas in North Dakota identified as roadless 2-38

Other Cases..... 2-38

109.Public Concern: The Forest Service should disclose its role in the Luppi case. 2-38

OTHER LEGAL CONCERNS..... 2-39

Other Legal Concerns General..... 2-39

110.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that it has only as much authority to make law as may be delegated to it by Congress. 2-39

To maintain its legitimacy with the public..... 2-39

111.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 2-40

Because it fails to adhere to existing laws, regulations, and policies.... 2-40

112.Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop a new national roadless rule that is fully compliant with the law. 2-40

113.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with existing federal laws, acts, and regulations..... 2-41

So states, communities, organizations, and individuals may benefit from the entire range of uses..... 2-41

114.Public Concern: Legal criteria must be developed which strictly defines what government agencies and private corporations can and cannot do on public land. 2-41

Because both the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management have shown themselves incapable of protecting the environment2-41

115.Public Concern: The Forest Service should support the consolidation of existing federal legislation and rules.....2-41

116.Public Concern: The Forest Service should stop trying to enact legislation through changing rules and regulations in the Federal Register.....2-41

117.Public Concern: The Forest Service should require foresters to review their assigned territory annually and make management recommendations to their supervisors.....2-42

For the purpose of reviewing and updating relevant laws, regulations, and policies.....2-42

118.Public Concern: The Forest Service should avoid extreme interpretations of environmental laws.2-42

The U.S. Constitution2-42

119.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule is in line with the U.S. Constitution.2-42

120.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the U.S. Constitution’s doctrine of states’ sovereignty.....2-43

121.Public Concern: The Forest Service should review the U.S. Constitution’s doctrine of states’ rights before considering any actions affecting Revised Statute 2477 roads.2-43

122.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that, under the U.S. Constitution, the government may only own land for forts, post offices, and other legitimate needs.2-43

123.Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge that federal ownership of land is not a violation of the U.S. Constitution’s doctrine of states’ sovereignty.....2-43

124.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the establishment clause of the First Amendment.....2-44

By avoiding management based on religious values2-44

125.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the commerce clause in the U.S. Constitution.....2-44

By avoiding any policy that would make it easier to harvest timber in one state than in another.....2-44

126.Public Concern: The Forest Service should honor the Second Amendment.....2-44

127.Public Concern: The Forest Service should abide by the Tenth Amendment.....2-44

128.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the constitutional impacts of one administration summarily dismissing the previous administration’s rulings.....2-45

Federal Laws, Acts, and Policies2-45

Administrative Procedures Act.....2-47

129.Public Concern: The Administration should comply with the Administrative Procedures Act.....	2-47
By providing adequate information and time to comment.....	2-47
By providing effective public process in promulgating rules	2-47
<i>Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act</i>	2-47
130.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act.....	2-47
By adequately analyzing impacts of a national roadless rule on Alaska’s national forests.....	2-47
By excluding the Tongass National Forest from the final rule.....	2-48
By foregoing sweeping national level withdrawals such as the Roadless Area Conservation Rule	2-48
By foregoing any attempt to set aside lands in Alaska outside the National Forest Management Act planning regulations	2-48
By not recommending anymore areas for wilderness designation in Alaska.....	2-49
By foregoing any further roadless area review and evaluation in Alaska.....	2-49
By foregoing any further roadless reviews on the Tongass National Forest	2-49
By not closing areas of more than 5,000 acres without congressional approval.....	2-49
By providing reasonable and timely access to inholdings.....	2-50
131.Public Concern: The Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act should be amended.	2-50
To allow ownership in inventoried roadless areas without roaded access	2-50
132.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use the Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act as an excuse to grant access.	2-50
<i>Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act</i>	2-50
133.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.	2-50
By allowing access to American Indian land inholdings.....	2-50
134.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify the rights specified to Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act corporations.	2-50
<i>Americans with Disabilities Act</i>	2-51
135.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.	2-51
By providing adequate access.....	2-51
To avoid the threat of litigation	2-52
<i>Clean Air Act</i>	2-52
136.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the Clean Air Act.	2-52
<i>Clean Water Act</i>	2-52

137. Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the Clean Water Act..... 2-52
 By including in management plans roads that cross streams or wetlands 2-52
 By obtaining the necessary permits and exemptions for closing forest system roads 2-52

138. Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act. 2-53
 By not Removing timber or building roads 2-53

139. Public Concern: The Forest Service should integrate the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act early in the forest planning process. 2-53

140. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use the Clean Water Action Plan as a guideline for roadless area management. 2-53
 Until current litigation over its implementation has been settled and its impacts have been analyzed under the National Environmental Policy Act 2-53

Conservation and Reinvestment Act..... 2-53

141. Public Concern: The Forest Service should encourage the Senate to pass the Conservation and Reinvestment Act. 2-53
 If stakeholders are not allowed to remove timber 2-53

142. Public Concern: The Forest Service should delay any decisions regarding the Roadless Area Conservation Rule until the Senate votes on its version of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act. 2-54

Enabling Act..... 2-54

143. Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the Enabling Act. 2-54
 By providing a continuous supply of timber and preserving the watershed..... 2-54

Endangered Species Act 2-54

144. Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the Endangered Species Act. 2-54

145. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule will jeopardize compliance with the Endangered Species Act. 2-54
 Because it will reduce access for regular inspection for diseases and pests..... 2-54

146. Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify the relationship of the Endangered Species Act to international environmental legislation. 2-54

147. Public Concern: The Endangered Species Act should be revised..... 2-55
 Because it does not stop evolution..... 2-55
 Because it harms resource industries, recreation, and agriculture 2-55
 Because it is being used by groups as a tool against traditional uses of forest lands 2-56

Because it has not been established long enough to obtain the necessary data to declare some species endangered..... 2-56

To eliminate the principle that habitat is more important than use..... 2-56

To allow an automatic exemption to protect life and property..... 2-56

148.Public Concern: The Endangered Species Act should be eliminated in its current form..... 2-57

 Because of its impact on private property rights 2-57

 Because of its role in closing roads 2-57

 Because the science is flawed 2-57

149.Public Concern: The Forest Service should support legislation that prevents litigation over the Endangered Species Act and reimbursement of legal fees..... 2-57

 Encourage the repeal of the citizen suit provision of the Endangered Species Act..... 2-58

150.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that protection of unroaded areas on federal lands has provided state and private lands more latitude for management under the Endangered Species Act. 2-58

Federal Advisory Committee Act..... 2-58

151.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. 2-58

 By avoiding closed-door sessions with targeted groups..... 2-58

152.Public Concern: The Forest Service should seek removal of the bureaucratic requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. ... 2-58

 To facilitate formation of forest-level advisory committees 2-58

Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resource Planning Act 2-59

153.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resource Planning Act. 2-59

 By addressing roadless area management in the forest planning process..... 2-59

 By not managing roadless areas as de facto wilderness..... 2-59

Knutson-Vandenberg Act..... 2-59

154.Public Concern: The Knutson-Vandenberg Act should be repealed..... 2-59

 Because it aggravates conflicting interests..... 2-59

Mining Laws General 2-60

155.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize its legal obligation to maintain roaded access for mineral exploration and development. 2-60

 As required by multiple laws and regulatory acts 2-60

Mining Law of 1872..... 2-65

156.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the Mining Law of 1872. 2-65

 To remain free of foreign dependence on raw materials 2-65

 By maintaining access for mineral exploration and development 2-65

 By allowing unrestricted modes of transportation 2-66

By not materially interfering with prospecting, mining, or mineral processing 2-66

157.Public Concern: The Mining Act of 1872 should be revised. 2-66

 To grant royalties and leasing fees to government managers commensurate with those received from privately owned land 2-66

158.Public Concern: The Mining Act of 1872 should be repealed. 2-66

Mining and Mineral Policy Act..... 2-66

159.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the Mining and Mineral Policy Act. 2-66

 By maintaining access to mineral deposits in National Forest System lands..... 2-66

Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act 2-67

160.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act..... 2-67

 By ensuring that forest plans are in compliance 2-67

 By maintaining access 2-67

 By providing for a combination of uses in whatever matrix will best meet the needs of the American people..... 2-67

 By using multiple-use sustainability as the standard rather than ecosystem sustainability..... 2-67

 By giving equal consideration to all resources 2-68

161.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify how the Roadless Area Conservation Rule complies with the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act. 2-68

162.Public Concern: The Forest Service should analyze how many wild fires in 2000 occurred in study areas and whether the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act has been suspended. 2-68

163.Public Concern: The Forest Service should reevaluate the legal mandate to provide sustained yield of renewable resources. 2-68

National Forest Protection and Restoration Act..... 2-68

164.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the proposed National Forest Protection and Restoration Act..... 2-68

 By eliminating commercial logging and diverting subsidies to true restoration 2-68

 To eliminate future management errors 2-69

Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act 2-69

165.Public Concern: The Forest Service should support the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act, HR 488..... 2-69

 To protect remaining pristine lands 2-69

Organic Act..... 2-69

166.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the Organic Act..... 2-69

 By managing for multiple uses 2-69

Regulatory Flexibility Act 2-70

167.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the Regulatory Flexibility Act. 2-70

By providing a regulatory flexibility analysis 2-70

By stating the legal basis for the proposed action and describing
alternatives which minimize the economic impact on small
businesses 2-71

Revised Statute 2477..... 2-72

168.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with Revised
Statute 2477. 2-72

 With respect to road closures 2-72

 By acknowledging all identified Revised Statute 2477 rights-of way
as roads..... 2-72

169.Public Concern: The federal government should issue easement
deeds that title insurance companies will insure. 2-73

 Including Revised Statute 2477 routes 2-73

170.Public Concern: The Forest Service should defer action on
roadless area management until local communities complete
studies of Revised Statute 2477 claims. 2-73

171.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify its position on
Revised Statute 2477 roads..... 2-73

 With respect to roadless areas 2-73

172.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consult with counties
regarding Revised Statute 2477 roads. 2-73

 Sierra County 2-73

173.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the
Revised Statute 2477 (RS 2477) savings provisions and the
Section 108 prohibition against redefining what an RS 2477 road
is.2-74

 By respecting all valid existing rights 2-74

Tongass Timber Reform Act 2-74

174.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the
Tongass Timber Reform Act. 2-74

 By excluding the Tongass National Forest from the final rule..... 2-74

 By providing an adequate volume of timber 2-75

175.Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge legal
rulings that the Tongass Timber Reform Act does not require
unconditional timber sale offerings. 2-75

 By including the Tongass National Forest from a national rule..... 2-75

Weeks Act..... 2-76

176.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the Weeks
Act. 2-76

 By managing for multiple uses 2-76

Wild Horse Act 2-76

177.Public Concern: The Wild Horse Act should be revised..... 2-76

 Due to its role in increasing the horse population 2-76

Wilderness Acts 2-76

178.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the
Wilderness Act..... 2-76

Regarding land inventory and wilderness recommendations2-76
 By not creating de facto wilderness areas.....2-76
 179.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the
 Wyoming Wilderness Act.....2-77
 By not creating de facto wilderness areas.....2-77
 By not establishing buffer zones2-77
 By not conducting any further roadless area review and evaluation2-77
 180.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the
 Oregon-Washington Wilderness Act.....2-78
 By honoring its promised exchange of 86,000 acres of timber
 ground for designated wilderness area2-78
Executive Orders2-78
 181.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with Executive
 Order 12866.2-78
 By identifying a need for a new regulation2-78
 182.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with Executive
 Order 13211.2-79
 By preparing a Statement of Energy Effects2-79
 By ensuring an adequate land base is available for leasing with
 reasonable stipulations2-80
 183.Public Concern: The Forest Service should reevaluate its
 application of Executive Orders 11644 and 11989.2-80
 With respect to resolution of conflicts between users.....2-80
 184.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with executive
 orders directing federal agencies to expedite permitting and to
 reduce impediments to energy development.....2-80
Other.....2-80
 185.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with Public
 Law 96-550.....2-80
 By rescinding the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.....2-80
 186.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with Public
 Law 105-359.....2-81
 By providing recreation and outdoor opportunities for the
 handicapped, elderly, and physically impaired.....2-81
 187.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the 1997
 guidance document by the Council on Environmental Quality
 regarding environmental justice.....2-81
 As it relates to equal treatment and access to public lands.....2-81

CHAPTER 3 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT 3-1

INFORMED DECISIONMAKING (*QUESTION 1*)3-1
 Informed Decisionmaking General3-1
 188.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the
 Roadless Area Conservation Rule is a good example of informed
 decisionmaking.....3-1

189.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that informed decisionmaking processes have occurred under the National Forest Management Act and state wilderness bill processes. 3-2

190.Public Concern: The Forest Service should use the best available means within existing constraints in decisionmaking. 3-2

191.Public Concern: The Forest Service should streamline the decisionmaking process. 3-3

 To eliminate long delays..... 3-3

192.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not make decisions merely to avoid litigation. 3-3

193.Public Concern: The Forest Service should make roadless area decisions through an allocation decision process. 3-3

194.Public Concern: The Forest Service should issue a preliminary document for public review. 3-3

Decisionmaking Authority 3-4

The Forest Service..... 3-5

 195.Public Concern: The Forest Service Chief should retain decisionmaking authority. 3-5

 Over road construction in roadless areas 3-5

 196.Public Concern: The Forest Service should decide the management direction for roadless areas..... 3-6

 Rather than Congress 3-6

 Rather than politicians 3-6

 Rather than the public 3-6

 Because it has a duty to apply its expertise..... 3-7

 As professionals, rather than referees between competing interests 3-7

 By developing uniform direction for the procedures to be used in roadless area management decisionmaking 3-7

 By conducting large regional meetings of forest officials to decide the use of roadless areas 3-7

 By allowing each national forest to assume the lead responsibility for developing management proposals..... 3-7

 By giving the district ranger greater decisionmaking authority..... 3-7

 By allowing local forest managers to have complete decisionmaking authority..... 3-8

 197.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not give local forest managers greater latitude in management decisions. 3-8

 198.Public Concern: The Forest Service should insulate local officials from negative repercussions of decisions. 3-8

 199.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify its authority and relationship with Congress..... 3-9

 200.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify the discretionary authority of the responsible official..... 3-9

 And cease delegating authority to the responsible official without regulations requiring an EIS and public comment 3-9

201. Public Concern: The Forest Service should adhere to its agency mandate. 3-9

The Legislative Branch 3-9

202. Public Concern: Congress should manage federal lands. 3-9

 To allow input from constituents 3-10

 To address local conditions 3-10

 To allow a change in management direction with each election, and to end the present stalemate over roadless area management 3-10

 To maintain consistency in forest plans 3-10

 Due to the polarization of the issues 3-10

203. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize Congress’s authority to create, modify, or terminate withdrawals of public lands. 3-10

 To ensure the continued integrity of national resource management systems 3-10

204. Public Concern: Congress should review all land use policies adopted by the Forest Service. 3-11

 So that the public can hear the debates 3-11

205. Public Concern: The Forest Service should make recommendations regarding forest management to elected representatives for their approval. 3-11

206. Public Concern: The Forest Service should submit forest plans to a local vote, then submit voter-approved plans to Congress for approval. 3-11

State, County, and City Governments 3-11

207. Public Concern: States should manage federal lands. 3-11

208. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow local government entities to have a role in decisionmaking. 3-12

 Because excessive local control leads to exploitation-driven political pressure 3-12

Other 3-12

209. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow various groups to be decision makers. 3-12

 Disinterested, unaffiliated individuals 3-12

 A committee of experts 3-12

 Scientists and other Forest Service specialists who work with the land 3-12

 A panel of appointed people representing different interests 3-12

 A committee appointed by county commissions 3-12

Trust and Integrity 3-13

210. Public Concern: The Forest Service should maintain high ethical standards. 3-13

211. Public Concern: The Forest Service should avoid making decisions in secrecy. 3-13

 Regarding management of roadless areas 3-13

212.Public Concern: The Forest Service should avoid making decisions based on preconceived outcomes. 3-13

213.Public Concern: The Forest Service should keep politics out of the decisionmaking process. 3-13

214.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the way it handled the Roadless Area Conservation Rule has severely damaged its public relations and community support. 3-14

215.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that local managers felt constrained to identify roadless areas during development of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 3-15

216.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the public’s suspicions regarding the *real* motivation behind this round of comment. 3-15

217.Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge its bias toward commercial interests. 3-16

218.Public Concern: The Forest Service should avoid asking the same questions until it gets the desired answer. 3-17

219.Public Concern: The Forest Service should work to regain the public’s confidence. 3-17

The Forest Service Chief..... 3-17

By maintaining its objectivity..... 3-18

By being honest about the roaded/unroaded status of areas 3-18

By considering public concerns and managing users and resources fairly 3-19

220.Public Concern: The Forest Service should honor existing agreements between citizens and the government..... 3-19

221.Public Concern: The Forest Service should be abolished or replaced. 3-19

Local vs. National Decisionmaking..... 3-20

Local vs. National Decisionmaking General..... 3-21

222.Public Concern: The Forest Service should review the Western Governors Association 1999 Policy Resolution, *Principles for Environmental Management in the West*. 3-21

For guidance in resolving the tension between national and local forest planning 3-21

223.Public Concern: The Forest Service should tailor the level of decisionmaking to the scope of the issues. 3-21

National level decisionmaking for issues of national importance, forest level decisionmaking for issues specific to the forest, and site-specific decisionmaking for projects within the forest 3-21

Local (Forest Level) Decisionmaking 3-21

224.Public Concern: The Forest Service should define what and who comprises “local forest planning.” 3-21

Because virtually all national forests span numerous counties, local jurisdictions, and in many cases, state boundaries 3-21

225. Public Concern: The Forest Service should make management decisions at the local level. 3-22

 Because it is not the role of the Washington Office to micromanage resources 3-22

 Because national management will not result in protection of the values people really care about..... 3-23

 To ensure that government actions do not interfere with the objectives of local planning efforts 3-23

 Because it is required by the National Forest Management Act..... 3-23

 Because different areas have different conditions and needs 3-24

 Because local planners have a better understanding of local needs and concerns regarding land management 3-25

 Because different areas have different use demands 3-26

 Because a management change in roadless areas may adversely affect the remaining areas of the forest..... 3-26

 Because professional forest managers are trained for many years 3-26

 Because greater weight should be placed on the greater forest experience..... 3-27

 Because local residents have the most knowledge about the resources and the most to lose if a bad decision is made 3-27

 Because local residents know how their forests have been used through time 3-27

 Because roadless areas are vital to adjacent communities..... 3-27

 Because national planning does not allow an adequate timeframe to consider impacts on individual roadless areas 3-28

 Because local planners are best able to deal with problems in a timely manner..... 3-28

 In spite of the threat of litigation from Wilderness Advocacy Groups 3-28

226. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that localizing decisionmaking requires that current law be revised. 3-28

227. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow local decisionmaking only if an easily accessible appeals process is in place..... 3-28

228. Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop regional guidance for implementing the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 3-28

 Which recognizes the different conditions and management needs of forests in different areas of the country 3-29

229. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow local districts to manage forests under a sustainable yield harvest plan..... 3-29

 To enable districts to be economically self-sufficient..... 3-29

230. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow individual national forests to opt out of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 3-29

 Or to make local exceptions to the Rule’s prohibitions 3-29

231. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow individual forests to opt out of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 3-30

232. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that “local expertise” may or may not be superior to professional Forest Service expertise. 3-30
 Depending on the motivation..... 3-30

233. Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify how local expertise will provide more reliable information than was gathered for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 3-30
Local (Forest Level) Decisionmaking with National Guidance 3-30

234. Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that local forest planning adheres to the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 3-30
 By not allowing local forest planning to make exceptions to the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 3-31
 By maintaining a high threshold for granting exceptions 3-31

235. Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate local decisions regarding inventoried roadless areas within the context of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 3-32
 With regular and on-going natural resource inventories and assessments 3-32

236. Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish general guidelines for the consideration of roadless areas..... 3-32
 While allowing exceptions as approved by the Secretary of Agriculture 3-32
 While allowing forest supervisors to nominate areas suitable for designation 3-32
 While allowing forest plans to allocate lands 3-33
 While allowing forest plans to address specific forest activities that are both feasible and sustainable 3-33
 While allowing forest plans to determine the relative merits of their roadless areas and need for roads 3-33

237. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use local knowledge to enhance national planning..... 3-33
National Decisionmaking..... 3-33

238. Public Concern: The Forest Service should make management decisions at the national level. 3-33
 Because national forests are national resources 3-33
 Because decisions must be in the best interest of the whole country... 3-34
 Because a uniform policy is needed 3-35
 Because the fragmentation created by roads transcends local and regional management..... 3-36
 Because federal dollars support the Forest Service and the lands it administers 3-36
 Because local interests may be tied to the profit motive of local interests and not represent the collective will of the state or the nation..... 3-36
 Because the forest planning process has failed to adequately protect roadless areas 3-36

Because local planning has resulted in an \$8.5 billion road maintenance backlog 3-38

Because regional or national personnel have better access to qualified scientific opinion 3-38

Because local planners are often incompetent..... 3-38

Because the political will to protect roadless areas can not be found at the local level 3-38

Because allowing local decisionmaking would weaken the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 3-38

With local forest planning serving in an advisory and technical assistance capacity 3-39

239.Public Concern: The Forest Service should make management decisions *only* at the national level. 3-39

With no room for local interpretation 3-39

240.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not change the management guidelines of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule to conform to local government plans..... 3-39

The Forest Planning Process 3-39

The Forest Planning Process General..... 3-40

241.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the Secretary of Agriculture’s five principles imply that only the forest planning process must be used for managing Roadless Areas. 3-40

242.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that roadless issues have been addressed in the forest planning process. 3-41

243.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that implementation of one of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule action alternatives amounts to an amendment to or modification of forest plans..... 3-41

The Inyo Forest Plan 3-41

244.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that the forest planning process is interdisciplinary and based on site-specific ecosystem considerations. 3-41

245.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify that, with the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, many management decisions would continue to be made through the forest planning process..... 3-41

246.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that decisions reached through the local planning process cannot easily be changed by Congress..... 3-42

247.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the local forest planning process is complementary and consistent with the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 3-42

And can proceed in tandem with the full implementation of the Rule 3-42

248.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the National Forest Management Act does not mandate local forest planning..... 3-42

249.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that, by its own actions, it has disabled itself from managing roadless areas through the normal planning process..... 3-43

The Forest Planning Process – Development/Implementation of Forest Plans..... 3-43

250.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that any national forest without a forest plan in place immediately begin the public process of creating one. 3-43

Because forests with plans in place do not need additional roadless area protection 3-43

251.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that forest plans are amended and/or revised in a timely manner. 3-43

252.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the time and money that has already been invested in forest plan development. ... 3-44

253.Public Concern: The Forest Service should make efforts to remove institutional impediments to implementing existing forest plans..... 3-44

254.Public Concern: The Forest Service should use the National Forest Management Act processes in developing forest plans rather than the Forest Service Manual 7710 road management policy. 3-44

The Forest Planning Process – Public Participation 3-44

255.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure all stakeholders equal access to the forest planning process..... 3-44

By proactively seeking out stakeholders and inviting their participation 3-44

256.Public Concern: The Forest Service should encourage timely participation in the forest planning process..... 3-44

257.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that forest plans reflect public concerns..... 3-45

258.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize local contributions to forest plans. 3-45

259.Public Concern: The Forest Service should open all local forest planning processes to the American public at large..... 3-45

By posting local decisions on the Internet for all to review and comment on..... 3-45

The Forest Planning Process – Its Appropriate Role 3-46

260.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the appropriate role of the forest planning process..... 3-46

To identify local concerns, attitudes, issues, and problems that might otherwise remain unknown at the national level 3-46

To assess the impacts of a proposed action 3-46

To resolve roadless issues 3-46

To maintain maximum amounts of remaining roadless areas 3-46

To protect roadless areas..... 3-46

To restore natural processes to roadless areas 3-47

To protect public lands from undue use..... 3-47

To implement sustainable forest management practices 3-47

To determine allowable activities in roadless areas 3-47

To address activities not regulated by the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 3-48

To determine roadless suitability, recreation opportunity, and desired future conditions 3-48

To collect data and enforce federal regulations..... 3-48

To implement national directives 3-48

To implement and enforce existing laws, rules, and regulations 3-49

To carry out approved plans..... 3-49

To serve as the mediator between individuals and the Forest Service in implementing the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 3-49

To identify situations that meet the exceptions allowed in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 3-50

To identify roadless areas that are not in the current inventory and roadless areas that need to be restored..... 3-50

To address management of uninventoried and unroaded areas 3-50

To determine roadless area boundaries and develop site-specific resource prescriptions compliant with the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 3-50

To consider each roadless area and how it is intertwined with surrounding lands..... 3-51

To identify local resources that may merit additional protection 3-51

To address management of national grasslands..... 3-51

To focus on education and research 3-51

To educate communities on the ecological importance of roadless areas 3-51

261. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the appropriate role of the forest planning process cannot be determined until changes to the Planning Regulations are finalized. 3-52

WORKING TOGETHER (*QUESTION 2*) 3-53

Adequacy of Public Involvement Processes/Methods..... 3-53

Adequacy of Public Involvement Processes/Methods General..... 3-55

262. Public Concern: The Forest Service should reevaluate public participation processes..... 3-55

To ensure fairness 3-55

To ensure honesty 3-55

263. Public Concern: The Forest Service should enhance the public participation process..... 3-55

By ensuring that it is open and comprehensive..... 3-55

By adequately publicizing proposed actions and opportunities to comment 3-56

By utilizing mass media..... 3-56

By accepting input through all mediums of communication..... 3-57

By using an informal method of communication..... 3-57

By adequately soliciting public involvement..... 3-57

By using surveys to solicit public comment 3-57

By conducting nationwide polling 3-57

By using simple English rather than agency jargon 3-58

By giving due consideration to all relevant information and perspectives 3-58

By emulating the Bureau of Land Management 3-58

By emulating the White Mountain National Forest..... 3-58

By requiring participants to interact 3-58

264.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not confuse the large number of public meetings held and letters received for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as quality public involvement. 3-58

As mandated by the National Environmental Policy Act 3-58

265.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that public involvement efforts for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule were more than adequate..... 3-59

266.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the public involvement process under the National Environmental Policy Act is biased in favor of local interests. 3-60

Adequacy/Availability of Information 3-60

267.Public Concern: The Forest Service should adequately notify the public of pending management proposals. 3-60

Notify people on its mailing list of pending management proposals 3-60

Maintain a current mailing list..... 3-60

Notify students through university contacts or rangers 3-60

Post all information on local and national web sites, including opportunities to respond 3-60

Ensure that the responding email address works..... 3-61

268.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the biased and inadequate information on the roadless area homepage..... 3-61

269.Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish consistent terminology and reporting procedures for advance notices. 3-62

270.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide site-specific information..... 3-62

To allow informed comment 3-62

Showing the relative importance of specific roadless areas 3-62

271.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use the Federal Register to announce comment periods. 3-62

Adequacy of Public Meetings..... 3-63

272.Public Concern: The Forest Service should conduct public meetings. 3-63

That are legitimate..... 3-63

That comply with federal rules 3-63

In a fair and impartial manner..... 3-63

At convenient times and places..... 3-63

With adequate notice..... 3-64

That discuss local areas of concern 3-64

That discuss possible modifications to the Roadless Area
Conservation Rule..... 3-64

Instead of soliciting only written comments 3-64

273.Public Concern: The Forest Service should conduct as many
public meetings for the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
as were conducted for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 3-64

274.Public Concern: The Forest Service should conduct fewer, more
productive public meetings. 3-64

275.Public Concern: The Forest Service should improve the way forest
personnel conduct public meetings. 3-65

Ensure that personnel are well informed regarding proposed
actions..... 3-65

Ensure that personnel use unbiased language 3-65

276.Public Concern: The Forest Service should improve citizen
participation in public meetings. 3-65

Ensure that local citizens are adequately represented at meetings 3-65

Eliminate bribed attendance at meetings 3-65

Allow adequate speaking time at meetings 3-65

277.Public Concern: The Forest Service should conduct meetings on
the model of those held by the Sequoia and Kings Canyon
National Parks 3-65

278.Public Concern: The Forest Service should televise public
meetings..... 3-66

279.Public Concern: The Forest Service should conduct day-long
workshops. 3-66

280.Public Concern: The Forest Service should hold a national public
convention. 3-66

Adequacy of Comment Period 3-66

281.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow an adequate
comment period..... 3-66

To ensure a fair and open process..... 3-66

282.Public Concern: The Forest Service should extend the comment
period. 3-66

To 90 days 3-66

To 120 days 3-67

To 180 days 3-67

To 240 days 3-67

283.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that
extending the comment period would work against the Roadless
Area Conservation Rule. 3-67

284.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the
comment period for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule was too
short. 3-67

285.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that an additional comment period would be insufficient to address the deficiencies in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule Final EIS..... 3-68

286.Public Concern: The Forest Service should notify previous respondents to the Roadless Area Conservation Rule of the comment period for the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking..... 3-68

Adequacy of Timeframe 3-68

287.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the time frame for comment on the Roadless Area Conservation Rule was adequate..... 3-68

288.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the time frame for developing the Roadless Area Conservation Rule was not adequate..... 3-69

As evidenced by poor data and numerous mistakes 3-69

Use of Science/Best Information Available 3-69

289.Public Concern: The Forest Service should make decisions based on science..... 3-69

Rather than politics..... 3-70

Rather than a vote 3-70

By considering the benefits and costs of each action 3-70

By making better use of existing information 3-70

By acquiring sufficient data to understand the issues..... 3-70

By verifying the content and validity of data 3-70

To avoid a one-size-fits-all conclusion..... 3-70

To avoid bias in decisionmaking..... 3-70

To balance ecosystem stability and economic activity..... 3-71

290.Public Concern: The Forest Service should avoid relying on weak scientific analysis..... 3-71

291.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the best available science regarding individual areas is maintained at the local level. 3-71

292.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that science does not change with geographic location or political affiliation..... 3-72

293.Public Concern: The Forest Service should avoid multiple studies on the same research topic or proposed management action. 3-72

To eliminate long delays..... 3-72

294.Public Concern: The Forest Service should heed the counsel of scientific committees..... 3-72

Review information from the Union of Scientists 3-72

Follow the recommendations of the Committee of Scientists regarding the planning process 3-73

Consult with the Union of Concerned Scientists regarding the need to preserve biodiversity..... 3-73

295.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide access to science and research regarding roadless areas. 3-73

296.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not accept as scientific facts the anecdotes or opinions submitted by the public. 3-73

297.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider “The Roadless Area Initiative: Politics Makes Poor Policy.” 3-73
 Because it is well grounded in facts, science, and breadth 3-73

298.Public Concern: The Forest Service should scrutinize scientific studies submitted by representatives. 3-74
 To validate the information 3-74

299.Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop a sense of perspective when evaluating environmental impacts..... 3-74
 To avoid arbitrary and capricious reasoning based on biased science 3-74

Adequacy of Public Comment..... 3-74

300.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that there was adequate opportunity for public comment on the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 3-74

301.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the volume of comment received on the Roadless Area Conservation Rule was more than adequate..... 3-75

302.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that there has been sufficient local input. 3-75

303.Public Concern: The Forest Service should explain its assertion that there was inadequate local input on the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 3-76

304.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the only groups objecting to the adequacy of the public comment process for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule are those that don’t want it. 3-76

305.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that there is inadequate opportunity to comment on the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. 3-77

Analysis of Public Comment 3-77

306.Public Concern: The Content Analysis Team should adequately analyze and report public comments. 3-77
 So that the actual desires of respondents can be determined..... 3-77

307.Public Concern: The Forest Service should quantitatively analyze public comment. 3-77
 Accurately tabulate comments 3-77
 Quantify how public opinion has changed since earlier planning processes in which roadless areas were addressed 3-77

308.Public Concern: The Forest Service should create transcripts of public meetings. 3-78

309.Public Concern: The Forest Service should verify the validity of organized response letters. 3-78

310.Public Concern: The Forest Service should disclose the details of late submissions. 3-78

Scope of Public Comment to be Considered 3-79

311.Public Concern: The Forest Service should respect the comments already received for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 3-79

By considering comments submitted for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule along with those submitted for the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking 3-80

312.Public Concern: The Forest Service should include all previous comments regarding roadless area management in the record for the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. 3-80

Including the comments submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency on May 21, 1973..... 3-80

313.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not accept mail-in public comments..... 3-80

Because that enables groups to have undue influence 3-80

314.Public Concern: The Forest Service should disregard organized response letters. 3-81

Consideration of Public Comment..... 3-81

315.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider all comments. .. 3-81

By giving equal consideration to every viewpoint 3-81

To ensure a fair and open process 3-81

Within the context of maintaining forest health 3-82

316.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not reject consideration of issues just because they were already addressed in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule Final EIS..... 3-82

317.Public Concern: The Forest Service should give all parties’ comments equal weight. 3-82

Both local and national comments..... 3-82

Comments from all interest groups..... 3-82

Comments from organized response letters..... 3-83

318.Public Concern: The Forest Service should differentially weigh public comments..... 3-83

By giving greater weight to local and resource-dependent interests 3-83

By giving greater weight to professional foresters, wildlife biologists, and fire managers..... 3-83

By giving greater weight to individuals than to businesses..... 3-83

By giving less weight to organized response letters 3-84

By giving less weight to unfounded and bizarre viewpoints..... 3-84

By giving less weight to “non-participants” 3-84

By considering respondents’ qualifications and implications of suggested courses of action..... 3-84

At public meetings 3-85

319.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider special interest groups’ comments with caution..... 3-85

Special interest group leaders do not necessarily reflect members’ opinions 3-85

Special interest groups do not necessarily represent the views of the local community or of the public at large 3-85

320.Public Concern: The Forest Service should identify input from those with a monetary stake in the outcome. 3-85

321.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that those with financial interests in forest resources have an incentive to submit detailed and aggressive responses..... 3-86

322.Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate the consideration it ought to give to the majority opinion. 3-86

Give serious consideration to the majority opinion 3-86

Decide the management of roadless areas through a public vote..... 3-86

Do not allow the public comment process to turn into a vote 3-86

Recognize that making decisions based on majority preference is a violation of the Agency’s congressionally mandated duty 3-87

323.Public Concern: The Forest Service should avoid relying on public opinion surveys. 3-87

Because they are error prone and unreliable 3-87

324.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider material comments..... 3-87

As required by the National Environmental Policy Act 3-87

Response to Public Comment 3-88

325.Public Concern: The Forest Service should adequately respond to public comment. 3-88

Regarding specific roadless areas 3-88

To comply with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations 3-88

Other..... 3-89

326.Public Concern: Organizations which solicit comment for federal land policies should assure the public that all comments will be submitted to the appropriate agency. 3-89

Regardless of the position taken by the respondent 3-89

Public Involvement in Decisionmaking 3-89

Public Involvement in Decisionmaking General..... 3-91

327.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect the right to public participation in forest planning..... 3-91

328.Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish strong lines of communication with the public..... 3-91

To understand how management affects communities 3-91

Because many people do not understand how decisions and lifestyle choices are related to land management 3-91

329.Public Concern: The Forest Service should be responsive to the public. 3-92

By addressing concerns from all sectors of society..... 3-92

330.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that public involvement during development of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule was sufficient. 3-92

331. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that issues being raised now should have been raised during the public comment period for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 3-93
 To raise them afterward and then cry foul is contrary to the intent of the National Environmental Policy Act..... 3-93

332. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that those who are satisfied with the status quo might not participate. 3-93

333. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule expressly includes the requirement that input be sought from state and local officials, tribes, and any other interested parties..... 3-93

334. Public Concern: The Forest Service should list the tribes and communities that did not provide input on the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 3-93

335. Public Concern: The Forest Service should require those who want to participate in forest management decisions to contribute to forest stewardship activities. 3-94

The Role of the General Public 3-94

336. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow all citizens full access to the decisionmaking process. 3-94

337. Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that all interested parties have the opportunity to provide site-specific input regarding individual roadless areas. 3-94
 So that, given a recognizable local need in a specific area, an exception to the Roadless Area Conservation Rule may be provided..... 3-94

The Role of Local/Rural Residents 3-94

338. Public Concern: The Forest Service should solicit and consider local input..... 3-94

339. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow adequate local input into scoping and planning. 3-95

340. Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge that local concerns have been fully and adequately considered. 3-95

The Role of Special Interest Groups 3-95

341. Public Concern: The Forest Service should include environmental interest groups in the decisionmaking process. 3-95
 The Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Alliance 3-96

342. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that conservation organizations have the same interests as all citizens. 3-96
 That is, to ensure good public policy and protection of finite resources..... 3-96

343. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider putting environmental groups in charge of public involvement. 3-96
 Because they have a record of doing so successfully 3-96

344. Public Concern: The Forest Service should exclude environmental interest groups from the decisionmaking process..... 3-96

Environmental stakeholder councils..... 3-96

345.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not pander to environmental interest groups. 3-96

 Because they want to lock out the majority from public lands 3-97

346.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule was orchestrated by environmental groups. 3-97

347.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use environmental groups as moderators in the public involvement process. 3-99

348.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that conservation groups falsely appear to outnumber those favoring responsible land access. 3-99

349.Public Concern: The Forest Service should exclude industrial interest groups from the decisionmaking process. 3-99

350.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not pander to industrial interest groups..... 3-99

351.Public Concern: The Forest Service should include special interest groups in the decisionmaking process..... 3-100

 Local and national organizations 3-100

 Outfitters and backcountry guides 3-100

 Off-road vehicle users 3-100

352.Public Concern: The Forest Service should exclude special interest groups from the decisionmaking process. 3-100

 Stakeholder councils 3-100

Collaboration Processes..... 3-100

353.Public Concern: The Forest Service should adequately incorporate collaboration in the decisionmaking process. 3-100

354.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow flexibility in collaboration processes..... 3-101

355.Public Concern: The Forest Service should place limits on the number of active collaborative groups that operate regionally, on a concurrent basis. 3-101

356.Public Concern: The Forest Service should follow the model of collaboration used in other planning processes..... 3-101

 The collaborative stewardship process used by the Chugach National Forest..... 3-101

 The Winiger Ridge Ecosystem Management Pilot Project 3-101

 The Enlibra process for taking actions in the West 3-101

357.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that groups unwilling to collaborate have no legal standing. 3-102

358.Public Concern: The Forest Service should avoid over-reliance on collaboration. 3-102

 To avoid displacing traditional sources of legitimacy, such as the electoral process of representative democracy 3-102

 To avoid creating policies that are merely agreeable rather than high quality 3-102

Because it is limited to solving easy problems 3-102

Because agreement between parties may not be possible 3-102

Because it gives resource user interests unfair influence in
decisionmaking..... 3-103

Because the time commitment it imposes makes it an unrealistic
solution 3-103

359.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that
collaboration cannot occur until those who are party to litigation
over the Roadless Area Conservation Rule recognize the authority
of federal acts. 3-103

360.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the term
“collaboration” carries the connotation of bias in decisionmaking. 3-103

Collaboration with State and Local Governments 3-104

361.Public Concern: The Forest Service should collaborate with state
and local governments in managing roadless areas..... 3-104

By respecting state regulatory authority 3-104

By creating a staff position for a state liaison 3-104

By establishing a state oversight team 3-104

362.Public Concern: The Forest Service should designate specific
entities as cooperating agencies..... 3-105

State of Montana 3-105

State of Wyoming, County Commissioners, and Conservation
Districts..... 3-105

Western states 3-105

363.Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish a consistent
system for extending cooperating agency status to local entities. 3-105

364.Public Concern: The Forest Service should include western
governors in the development of roadless area guidelines. 3-105

365.Public Concern: The Forest Service should revise federal
regulations. 3-105

To better solicit input and cooperation from state and local
governments..... 3-105

366.Public Concern: The Forest Service should collaborate with
counties in managing roadless areas. 3-106

367.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that
consultation with other agencies, states, and American Indian
tribes was not complete prior to issuance of the Roadless Area
Conservation Rule Final EIS..... 3-106

368.Public Concern: The Forest Service should *only* notify states and
American Indian tribes of pending federal actions. 3-106

369.Public Concern: The Forest Service should make collaboration a
goal of the public involvement process at the local level. 3-106

Rather than at the national level 3-106

By encouraging local governments to help identify impacts on rural
communities and other landowners 3-107

By asking local governments to provide their preferred management prescriptions for National Forest System lands within their borders3-107

By fostering adequate dialog between Forest Service managers and local government officials3-107

370.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that revisiting the Roadless Area Conservation Rule ignores collaboration that has already occurred at the local level.3-107

371.Public Concern: The Forest Service should create policies and teams to work with state and local authorities in putting into place “right to manage” laws.3-107

To protect the Forest Service from litigation3-107

372.Public Concern: The Forest Service should have an agency representative attend community meetings.3-108

Collaboration with Agencies..... 3-108

373.Public Concern: The Forest Service should collaborate with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Department.....3-108

In forest planning.....3-108

In managing roadless areas3-108

374.Public Concern: The Forest Service should explain its relationship with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Department.3-108

375.Public Concern: The Forest Service should collaborate with other agencies in managing roadless areas.3-108

Collaboration with Other Groups..... 3-109

376.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure adequate collaboration with diverse groups.3-109

By explaining laws and how they apply to decisionmaking3-109

By arranging face-to-face working groups of all interests.....3-109

By bringing together a core group from various interest groups to draft solutions.....3-109

377.Public Concern: The Forest Service should create a Board of Trustees.3-109

To oversee management decisions, monitor enforcement, and ensure adherence to well balanced principles.....3-109

378.Public Concern: The Forest Service should create partnerships that are inclusive of all economic levels.....3-109

379.Public Concern: The Forest Service should respect the role of the Continental Divide Trail Alliance.3-109

380.Public Concern: The Forest Service should employ advisory committees.3-110

Resource advisory committees3-110

381.Public Concern: The Forest Service should accept the cooperative behavior between special interest groups as evidence of collaboration.3-110

382.Public Concern: The Forest Service should collaborate with the Mono Collaborative Planning Team.....3-110

Education 3-110

383.Public Concern: The Forest Service should educate the public about specific topics. 3-110

 About the importance of managing public lands for the greatest good for the greatest number over the long term 3-110

 About the facts and benefits of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 3-110

 About resource management needs..... 3-111

384.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider adopting the “Wood is Good” campaign. 3-111

 To change the way people view wood-based products 3-111

385.Public Concern: The Forest Service should educate the public with new materials..... 3-111

 By publishing informative articles 3-111

 By producing a television program regarding roadless areas..... 3-111

 By developing a seminar for new users and monitoring all users..... 3-112

386.Public Concern: The Forest Service should educate the public..... 3-112

 Rather than closing more land..... 3-112

Volunteerism 3-112

387.Public Concern: The Forest Service should encourage volunteerism. 3-112

 To cut maintenance costs..... 3-113

 From user groups 3-113

 From troubled youth, hunters, and anglers..... 3-113

 From retirees 3-113

American Indian Rights and Interests..... 3-113

388.Public Concern: The Forest Service should conduct meaningful consultation with American Indians regarding roadless area management..... 3-115

389.Public Concern: The Forest Service should reevaluate its relationship with tribal corporations..... 3-115

390.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage public lands for traditional tribal uses in accordance with treaties. 3-115

 By considering treaty rights during roadless area evaluations..... 3-115

 By implementing the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 3-115

391.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not abdicate tribal treaty rights in order to foster harmony between competing interests. 3-116

392.Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 3-116

 To foster treaty resource protection..... 3-116

 To promote tribal salmon recovery efforts 3-116

 To protect American Indian cultural practices..... 3-117

 To protect American Indian sacred sites 3-117

393.Public Concern: The Forest Service should exclude the Tongass National Forest from a national roadless rule. 3-117

To fulfill obligations of the United States’ trust relationship with American Indians3-117

Comments from Other Respondents Regarding American Indian Tribal Interests..... 3-117

394.Public Concern: The Forest Service should give high priority to American Indian concerns when formulating a national roadless rule.3-117

395.Public Concern: The Forest Service should conduct meaningful consultation with American Indians regarding roadless area management.3-118

396.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clearly distinguish between tribal rights and other special interests.....3-118

397.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect American Indian lands from commercial exploitation.....3-118

398.Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge the environmental consequences of the tribal corporation land grant selection process.....3-118

399.Public Concern: The Forest Service should review native corporation and institutional logging contracts in southeast Alaska...3-118

400.Public Concern: American Indians should be allowed to manage public lands.3-118

Because of their proven record of caring wisely for the land3-118

401.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow American Indians to practice traditional religious and cultural activities in roadless areas.3-119

402.Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement a national roadless rule..... 3-119

To protect American Indian cultural practices3-119

To help protect American Indian sacred sites3-120

403.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure subsistence needs are met for southeast Alaska rural communities.3-120

By maintaining wildlife and fish populations3-120

By allowing American Indian tribes to hunt in national forests.....3-120

404.Public Concern: Tribal governments should not adopt a similar roadless policy for reservation forests.3-120

Because it will have a negative economic impact on American Indians3-120

405.Public Concern: The Forest Service should support a more sustainable timber industry.....3-120

To preserve traditional northwest weaving3-120

COMPETING VALUES/LIMITED RESOURCES (*QUESTION 9*)..... 3-122

Managing Competing Interests3-122

Managing Competing Interests General3-123

406.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify its purpose and mission in order to manage competing interests.3-123

By appointing a commission to address the issue.....3-123

By developing a mission statement 3-124

407.Public Concern: The Forest Service should restore the trust of the public before attempting to manage competing interests..... 3-124

408.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage competing interests. 3-124

By implementing the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 3-124

By complying with current legislation, using the best available information, encouraging local input, and providing sufficient staff..... 3-124

By complying with all applicable laws 3-125

By identifying what is required by law and what is discretionary 3-125

By complying with the National Forest Management Act..... 3-125

By complying with the National Environmental Policy Act 3-125

By preparing environmental analyses in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act..... 3-125

By considering the results of the United States Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution..... 3-125

By consulting the volumes of literature it has published in response to public concerns..... 3-126

By adequately understanding political, management, and leadership issues and putting aside its own self-interests 3-126

By recognizing its own vested interests..... 3-126

By using scientific studies..... 3-126

By following the example of the Quincy Library Group 3-126

By using the Adaptive Environmental Management process..... 3-126

By using an Earth Governing Social System 3-127

By ensuring a fair and open process 3-127

By presenting both sides of the issue in a balanced, honest, and fair manner 3-127

By applying its policies to all interests consistently..... 3-127

By balancing competing values 3-127

By cultivating relationships with all different interest groups..... 3-128

By considering who is most affected by the decision..... 3-128

By making land use decisions based on the relative value of different uses to society..... 3-128

By evaluating the relative impacts of competing uses 3-128

By taking a long term view..... 3-128

By considering each roadless area for its contribution to a larger cause..... 3-129

By making a distinction between roaded and roadless area values. ... 3-129

By discounting the comments of exclusionary groups 3-129

By ignoring extreme viewpoints 3-129

By increasing direct contact between regions and the Washington Office 3-130

Before engaging the public..... 3-130

409.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not attempt to change the beliefs of citizens. 3-130

410.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule has magnified conflict between groups.3-130

411.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that consensus is an unrealistic goal.....3-130

412.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that not all parties will be satisfied with management decisions.....3-130

413.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that most competing values arise from radical groups.3-131

Administrative/Agency Guidance 3-131

414.Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement the desires of the current President.3-131

415.Public Concern: The Forest Service should take a leadership role and finalize its decision.....3-131

416.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow trained foresters to make decisions.....3-132

 Rather than relying on public comment.....3-132

417.Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with the law and use professional judgment.....3-132

Local Forest Planning Process 3-132

418.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the local forest planning process provides the best way to work with different groups.3-132

 By allowing competing values to be identified locally on each forest ..3-133

 By establishing local boards to make decisions3-133

 Because issues relating to specific areas can be discussed3-133

Enhanced Collaborative Efforts 3-133

419.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage conflicting interests.....3-133

 By emphasizing collaboration.....3-133

 By making every effort to meet everyone’s needs.....3-133

 By using conflict resolution strategies3-134

 By establishing local monitoring teams composed of diverse stakeholders dedicated to sustaining roadless ecosystems3-134

 By using professional negotiators, public relations consultants, and conflict resolution specialists3-134

 By forming advisory planning groups3-134

420.Public Concern: The Forest Service should collaborate with special interest groups.....3-135

 By meeting with them individually and collectively and developing agenda items equally important to both3-135

 By dealing with one representative from each interest group.....3-135

421.Public Concern: The Forest Service should advise groups that the fairest way of resolving differences is through compromise.3-135

422.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that interest groups must have an incentive to compromise.3-135

Public Education/Information Efforts 3-136

423.Public Concern: The Forest Service should use public education to
 resolve conflicts. 3-136

 Through forest rangers 3-136

 Through classrooms and service groups 3-136

 Through seminar programs 3-136

 By establishing a department of information..... 3-136

 Rather than closing access to forest lands 3-136

424.Public Concern: The Forest Service should inform the public that
 national forests are not national parks. 3-137

Forest Service Staff Training/Education..... 3-137

425.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage competing
 interests. 3-137

 Through the use of science and unbiased employees..... 3-137

 By consulting with personnel who have worked under the
 Northwest Forest Plan 3-137

 By having all Forest Service employees read “A Conspiracy of
 Optimism” 3-137

426.Public Concern: The Forest Service should employ a diverse staff. 3-137

 By having as many conservation biologists and
 educators/naturalists as foresters on its staff 3-137

427.Public Concern: The Forest Service should educate personnel. 3-138

 To understand that competing interests are nothing new 3-138

 To adequately understand political, management, and leadership
 issues 3-138

 To work with a diverse constituency 3-138

 To facilitate cooperative meetings 3-138

Will of the Public/Elected Representatives..... 3-138

428.Public Concern: The Forest Service should abide by the wishes of
 the majority. 3-138

 By preserving roadless areas 3-139

 Because National Forest System lands are owned by the majority.... 3-139

 Rather than the presidential administration 3-139

 Rather than private interests 3-139

 Rather than special interest groups 3-139

 Rather than merely avoiding litigation..... 3-140

 While protecting minority rights 3-140

429.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow elected officials
 to make decisions. 3-140

Ecosystem/Preservation Values 3-141

430.Public Concern: The Forest Service should place the highest value
 on ecosystem preservation when managing conflict..... 3-141

 By being a steward of the forests and an advocate for wildlands 3-141

CHAPTER 4 ROADLESS AREA VALUES (QUESTION 6) 4-1

 CHARACTERISTICS OF ROADLESS AREAS..... 4-1

Characteristics of Roadless Areas General4-1

Evaluation of Roadless Areas..... 4-2

431.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clearly state the benefits of having roadless areas.....4-2

432.Public Concern: The Forest Service should undertake a comprehensive evaluation of roadless areas.4-2

To determine their characteristics, resource values, and effects of various activities.....4-2

To consider similar characteristics4-2

433.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider how roadless areas are characterized in evaluating roadless areas.4-3

By a wide range of features and attributes4-3

By their inaccessibility4-4

By barren landscape, scrub-brush, rock, and ice4-4

434.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider various values when evaluating roadless areas.....4-4

The value of roadlessness4-4

The value of rareness4-4

The value of remoteness.....4-4

The value of proximity to communities4-4

The value of the overall landscape.....4-5

The values associated with wilderness areas4-5

The values associated with roadless areas contiguous to areas with special congressional designations.....4-5

Intangible and tangible values.....4-5

In conjunction with consideration of a full range of uses4-5

435.Public Concern: The Forest Service should document the other major values and opportunities provided by roadless areas.....4-6

436.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow the presence or absence of roads in an area to overshadow the appropriate consideration of other values.....4-6

Such as healthy forests and wildlife habitat.....4-6

437.Public Concern: The Forest Service should publish a compendium of submitted roadless values.4-6

Without compiling any scorekeeping statistics4-6

438.Public Concern: The Forest Service should periodically reevaluate roadless areas.....4-7

To assess change and potential impacts to adjacent nonfederal lands4-7

439.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that roadless area values were already identified.4-7

During the RARE process4-7

In previous public comment periods for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.....4-7

And it is a waste of taxpayer money to undergo another process to consider exactly the same values4-8

Roadless area evaluation in Wyoming was concluded with the passage of the Wyoming Wilderness Act 4-9

440.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not consider environmental, social, and economic values when evaluating roadless areas. 4-9

441.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not evaluate roadless areas separate from its regular, on-going natural resource inventories and assessments..... 4-9

Until the Forest Service proposes an action that may affect roadless areas 4-9

Adequacy of Analysis..... 4-9

442.Public Concern: The Forest Service should define roadless values in a context consistent with other aspects of land and resource management plans. 4-9

443.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking misrepresents the value of roadless areas. 4-9

444.Public Concern: The Forest Service should assign value to actual scientific measured valuation, not “perceived” value. 4-10

Because you can’t place a monetary value on ethereal items..... 4-10

445.Public Concern: The Forest Service should define social value and ecological value. 4-10

Adequacy of Maps and Inventories 4-10

Maps General 4-11

446.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide adequate maps..... 4-11

To foster informed decisionmaking..... 4-11

447.Public Concern: The Forest Service should distribute copies of the detailed maps of inventoried roadless areas that are currently on file in the Washington Office. 4-11

Send maps to regional offices and each national forest for citizen review and boundary adjustments..... 4-11

448.Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge that adequate maps were made available to the public. 4-11

449.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the inadequacy of maps in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule Final EIS..... 4-12

450.Public Concern: The Forest Service should adjust roadless area boundary lines where needed..... 4-12

To facilitate the economical management of roadless areas and adjacent lands 4-13

To manage areas that may have been roaded after RARE II..... 4-13

To serve all needs 4-13

By using relevant and credible information..... 4-13

Based on historic factors including operating practices and land management 4-13

451.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not arbitrarily adjust roadless area boundaries to accommodate current or future uses.....4-13
 In the inventorying process4-13

452.Public Concern: The Forest Service should make roadless area boundaries obvious.4-14
 To prevent litigation and disputes over differing interpretations4-14

453.Public Concern: The Forest Service should follow the guidelines required by 40 Code of Federal Regulations 1502.8 for document mapping.....4-14
 In the use of plain language and appropriate graphics.....4-14

454.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not delineate roadless areas on a map.4-15
 Because once these lands are designated, it will be difficult to use resources that may be needed in the future4-15

455.Public Concern: The Forest Service should adequately mark roads on maps and on the ground.....4-15

Accuracy of Maps4-15

456.Public Concern: The Forest Service should accurately map roadless areas.4-15
 To accurately identify roadless areas4-15
 To ensure that elimination of future roads does not put federal and private timber resources at risk4-15
 To ensure adequate assessment of the present and future impacts of roadless areas.....4-15
 To ensure that management options can be accurately assessed.....4-16
 As part of the public involvement program for forest planning.....4-16
 By ground validation.....4-16
 Inventory and map the geographic location of roadless areas in relation to the other similar and dissimilar areas and any cultural development.....4-16
 Map classified, unclassified, and obliterated roads in areas that qualify as roadless4-16
 Inventory and map classified roads for the Colville, Okanogan, and Idaho Panhandle National Forests4-16

457.Public Concern: The Forest Service should use updated maps.4-17
 To give the proposal credibility and to allow the public to make specific comments.....4-17

458.Public Concern: The Forest Service should correct mapping errors.4-17
 To include eligible roadless areas4-17
 To correct areas on the Tongass National Forest shown as “approved for development”4-18
 To include additional territory the inventories excluded4-18
 Correct the map of the Santa Rosa Ranger District that shows the district as roadless4-18

Identify the trail in the Three Prong area that enters the Meadow Creek roadless area on the Nez Perce National Forest as a trail rather than a road..... 4-18

459.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that past inaccuracies in determining roadless area boundaries may cause problems in the future. 4-18

Because mapping errors may prohibit improvements to areas that should not have been included in a roadless designation in the first place..... 4-18

460.Public Concern: The Forest Service should coordinate with adjoining Bureau of Land Management lands when making maps..... 4-18

461.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that Forest Visitors Maps are consistent with the Forest Travel Plan. 4-19

To decrease visitor confusion..... 4-19

462.Public Concern: The Forest Service should use Geographic Information System technology to document and map the location of uninventoried roadless areas larger than 1,000 acres. 4-19

463.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that forests have not been accurately described or represented to the public..... 4-19

Old growth and second growth have not been accurately described ... 4-19

Travelways have not been accurately described 4-20

Inventories General..... 4-20

464.Public Concern: The Forest Service should inventory certain features in roadless areas..... 4-20

Inventory and evaluate all natural resources and their potential value, including extractive minerals 4-20

Inventory all infrastructure and developments 4-20

Inventory and ground validate each road and trail to determine its recreational value and any problems requiring mitigation..... 4-20

Inventory topographic and physical characteristics 4-20

Inventory forest health conditions 4-21

Inventory values, social and economic impacts, and long-term uses ... 4-21

Inventory roadless areas, roaded areas, classifications of roads, and private access roads..... 4-21

465.Public Concern: The Forest Service should specify when the uninventoried roadless areas are to be inventoried and clarify that existing management will not change prior to completion of the inventory. 4-21

466.Public Concern: The Forest Service should delete roaded portions of inventoried roadless areas from the inventory. 4-21

467.Public Concern: The Forest Service should include previously inventoried trails in the present inventory. 4-22

468.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify that the existence of user-created routes is not an appropriate reason for removing a roadless area from the inventory..... 4-22

469.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider a road that has appeared on a forest map for more than ten years to be a road.4-22
 For the purposes of defining roadless areas4-22

470.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify the present status of lands classified as inventoried roadless areas—roaded or unroaded—since RARE II.4-22

471.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not change current inventory information.4-23
 Because it would be a violation of the National Environmental Policy Act4-23

472.Public Concern: The Forest Service should require forests to survey areas not included in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.4-23
 Through the National Forest Management Act process4-23

473.Public Concern: The Forest Service should identify all roadless areas created or enlarged by road closures.4-23

474.Public Concern: The Forest Service should state who did the roadless inventory, and explain the methodology and criteria used to determine whether an area is roadless.....4-23

Accuracy of Inventories4-23

475.Public Concern: The Forest Service should update the roadless area inventory.....4-23
 By using current information.....4-23
 By allocating money to identify roadless areas not currently in the inventory.....4-24
 By inventorying all resources4-24
 By inventorying roadless acreage4-25
 By inventorying previously unidentified roadless areas4-25
 By inventorying and mapping roads4-25
 By inventorying classified and unclassified roads4-26
 By completing a comprehensive biological inventory4-26
 By using uniform criteria.....4-26
 By using a scale appropriate for planning4-27
 By having an independent third party complete a science based inventory of roadless areas and features4-27
 By including local, state, and federally elected officials in the process.....4-28
 By using the criteria listed in the Forest Service Planning Handbook ...4-28
 Through stand examinations4-28
 With citizen inventories4-28

476.Public Concern: The Forest Service should integrate the best available information from its own road inventories.....4-29
 By using current Geographic Information System data4-29

477.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that there was an inconsistent application of data entry standards when roadless areas were inventoried..... 4-30

478.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide a physical description of the areas proposed for roadless designation..... 4-30

Definitions 4-30

479.Public Concern: The Forest Service should define certain terms. 4-30

Road 4-30

Road building 4-32

Unroaded..... 4-32

Roadless area 4-32

480.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify the relationship between inventoried roadless areas, unroaded areas, and classified roads. 4-33

481.Public Concern: The Forest Service should accurately label unroaded and roadless areas. 4-34

So that opposing interests can understand the actual situation on the ground 4-34

482.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not define areas covered by special use permits or mineral leases as roadless or unroaded lands. 4-34

483.Public Concern: The Forest Service should refer to areas with roads or motorized trails as unroaded, not roadless. 4-34

484.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use the term roadless to describe areas containing forest products necessary for the future operation of the timber industry and community recreational roads and trails 4-35

485.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use the term non-road. 4-35

486.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clearly differentiate between a road and a trail. 4-35

ENVIRONMENTAL VALUES..... 4-36

Environmental Values General..... 4-36

487.Public Concern: The Forest Service should hold the Administration accountable for maintaining environmental safeguards..... 4-37

By demanding an explanation of how it intends to further protect natural resources..... 4-37

488.Public Concern: The Forest Service should adequately identify forest environmental values. 4-37

489.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that preservation values have already been adequately addressed. 4-37

490.Public Concern: The Forest Service should preserve the environment. 4-38

To protect global ecosystems..... 4-38

To help stop deforestation 4-38

To protect ecological sYSTEMS 4-38

To preserve unique climates/ecosystems4-38

By taking a long-term view4-38

By protecting low-elevation ecosystems4-39

By monitoring traffic4-39

By rewarding Forest Service personnel for maintaining and
improving healthy ecosystems4-39

By encouraging the establishment of conservation associations to
help protect ecological forest values4-39

By encouraging the signing of the Kyoto Treaty4-39

491.Public Concern: The Forest Service should revise forest plans to
address environmental concerns.....4-39

The Northwest Forest Plan.....4-39

492.Public Concern: The Forest Service should avoid relying on
planned mitigation to offset environmental effects.....4-40

493.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the
Roadless Area Conservation Rule will promote the use of less
environmentally friendly products.4-40

494.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that pre-
settlement conditions are not attainable.4-40

495.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the
Wyoming Wilderness Act does not adequately protect the
environment and wildlife habitat.4-40

Environmental Values General – Roadless Areas4-40

496.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas. ...4-40

To preserve their ecological values4-40

To increase representative ecosystem types4-41

To preserve biodiversity4-42

To preserve the food chain.....4-43

To use as models of ecosystem management.....4-43

To restore surrounding areas4-43

To set an example for other countries4-43

497.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that protection
of roadless areas does not result in increased damage to roaded
areas.4-43

Protect roaded areas Through the National Forest Management Act ...4-43

498.Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement the
Roadless Area Conservation Rule.4-43

Because watersheds and wild habitat extend beyond local
administrative boundaries4-44

Adequacy of Analysis4-44

499.Public Concern: The Forest Service should make decisions based
on science.4-44

In order to allow ecosystem management to be the prime objective....4-44

To ensure sustainability4-44

500.Public Concern: The Forest Service should adequately evaluate
environmental impacts.....4-44

To avoid arbitrary and capricious decisionmaking 4-44

501.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the environmental impacts of modern problems on forests. 4-45

Acid rain and global warming 4-45

502.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the global ramifications of environmental destruction..... 4-45

503.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas. .. 4-45

To enable the study of the long-term effects of timber removal..... 4-45

504.Public Concern: The Forest Service should compare the negative impacts of decreased access against the environmental benefits. 4-46

505.Public Concern: The Forest Service should identify underrepresented biological communities. 4-46

506.Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate the status of non-National Forest System lands in the coastal rainforests of southeast Alaska and British Columbia. 4-46

To determine whether additional conservation efforts on the Tongass are needed to provide a buffer for region-wide cumulative effects..... 4-46

507.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide an analysis of geologic hazard mitigation opportunities that will be lost as a result of roadless area designations. 4-46

In Wyoming 4-46

508.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the concept of biodiversity is a fraud..... 4-46

Funding..... 4-47

509.Public Concern: The Forest Service should use money allocated for roads to fund ecosystem management and protection of wildlife .. 4-47

510.Public Concern: The Forest Service should fund the study of landscape ecology, conservation biology, and fire ecology. 4-47

In and next to roadless areas 4-47

511.Public Concern: The Forest Service should identify the funding required to comply with environmental requirements..... 4-47

512.Public Concern: The Forest Service should require that proponents of road construction bear the costs of damage to affected ecosystems..... 4-47

513.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow expansion of current access only if a bond is posted sufficient to repair any accompanying damage..... 4-47

514.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide funding to research the effects of habitat degradation..... 4-48

515.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide funding for reclamation projects..... 4-48

516.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide more environmental research funding..... 4-48

As long as the research is linked to authority to approve timber harvest and road construction in roadless areas. 4-48

Education..... 4-48

517.Public Concern: The Forest Service should educate the public. 4-48

 About the environment and ecology..... 4-48

 About the costs of environmental degradation 4-48

 About conservation goals 4-49

 About the need to make productive use of forests 4-49

Evaluation of Roadless Areas 4-50

518.Public Concern: The Forest Service should only consider environmental factors when making decisions. 4-50

 Because National Forests cannot accommodate every use..... 4-50

 Because claims that these areas need to be opened for economic reasons are false..... 4-50

519.Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate roadless areas with respect to general environmental considerations. 4-50

 Evaluate ecosystems 4-50

 Evaluate watersheds 4-51

 Evaluate native biodiversity..... 4-51

 Evaluate sustainability..... 4-51

 Evaluate habitat requirements..... 4-51

 Evaluate roadless areas under the current climatic period and range of variability 4-51

520.Public Concern: The Forest Service should determine how much land is needed for ecosystem integrity. 4-52

521.Public Concern: The Forest Service should conduct an inventory of soil, water, and geologic resources. 4-52

Management 4-52

Management General..... 4-53

522.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas. 4-53

 To encourage energy conservation..... 4-53

523.Public Concern: The Forest Service should concentrate protection efforts on the most ecologically important roadless areas. 4-54

524.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect areas not designated as roadless..... 4-54

525.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect areas adjacent to roadless areas..... 4-54

 To preserve the ecological value of the area..... 4-54

526.Public Concern: The Forest Service should combine the technical advances and experience of forest managers with the best available science to determine appropriate management. 4-54

 To maintain a healthy ecology in roadless areas 4-54

527.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage forests primarily for natural habitats. 4-54

528.Public Concern: The Forest Service should connect protected areas. 4-55

529.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage forests through their entire life cycle..... 4-55

530.Public Concern: The Forest Service should document the risks and impacts of management and non-management..... 4-55

531.Public Concern: The Forest Service should return environmental policies to their status before the Clinton Administration. 4-55

Ecosystem/Restoration Management 4-55

532.Public Concern: The Forest Service should emphasize long-term protection over short-term profits. 4-55

533.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that short-term solutions will not fix long-term problems. 4-56

534.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage roadless areas in an ecosystem based framework. 4-56

By managing within historic ranges of ecological variability 4-56

535.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage roadless areas using the principles of conservation biology..... 4-56

536.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow natural processes to manage fish and wildlife species. 4-57

537.Public Concern: The Forest Service should restore natural disturbance regimes. 4-57

To allow the buildup of coarse woody debris and large woody debris..... 4-57

To allow regeneration of the forest floor 4-57

538.Public Concern: The Forest Service should focus on restoring degraded areas..... 4-57

539.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure the reclamation of developed lands..... 4-57

Through technology 4-57

540.Public Concern: The Forest Service should engage the public in protecting the environment. 4-57

Encourage non-profit organizations to support the preservation of pristine areas 4-57

Allow the public to sponsor/adopt an area of the forest..... 4-58

541.Public Concern: The Forest Service should organize public/private partnerships to maintain and protect areas most in need of repair. 4-58

542.Public Concern: The Forest Service should retain roadless areas as scientific control areas. 4-58

Gravina, southeast Alaska..... 4-58

543.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that timber interests have marginalized ecological forestry. 4-58

Multiple Use Management 4-59

544.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify the meaning of multiple use..... 4-59

545.Public Concern: The Forest Service should base multiple use management on local citizen needs..... 4-59

546.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule does not threaten the tradition of multiple use..... 4-59

547.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that maintaining forested areas without roads is an appropriate measure in the context of multiple use management.4-59

548.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that preservation is in opposition to multiple use.4-60

549.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that roadless area values are attainable through multiple use management of roaded areas.4-60

Allow Multiple Use Management..... 4-60

550.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow multiple use and sustained yield management.....4-60

 By allowing the exercise of existing rights4-60

 By including recreational and economic uses4-60

 By rotating roadless area inventories4-60

 Because it best meets the needs of the people.....4-61

 Because there are already enough protected areas4-61

 Because allowing any single use to dominate the public landscape would be unfair.....4-61

 As required by law.....4-61

551.Public Concern: The Forest Service should reexamine forest plans to ensure that multiple use requirements are being met.....4-62

552.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage national forests for sustainable use.....4-62

 By implementing restrictions on timber REMOVAL methods and practices.....4-62

Do Not Allow/Reconsider Multiple Use Management 4-62

553.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not manage National Forest System lands under the multiple use philosophy.....4-62

 Because some uses should be strictly limited4-62

 Because it is not realistic.....4-63

 Because there are too few forests left to jeopardize them any further.....4-63

Other Management Philosophies..... 4-63

554.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage roadless areas according to the philosophy of Theodore Roosevelt.4-63

555.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule opposes the Roosevelt philosophy of conservation.4-63

556.Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop policies for protecting and using forest lands without excluding people.....4-64

557.Public Concern: The Forest Service should eliminate biodiversity and ecosystem management as management principles.4-64

Effects of Activities/Disturbance on the Environment..... 4-64

558.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider forms of large-scale damage to forests other than that of fire.4-64

 Including human caused damage4-64

559.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that fire results in greater environmental impact than other uses. 4-64
 Timber REMOVAL..... 4-64
 Road and fire line construction 4-64

560.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that some activities do not endanger the environment. 4-65
 Road construction..... 4-65
 Off-road vehicles 4-65

561.Public Concern: The Forest Service should use all-terrain vehicles for managing the habitat of all the forests and grasslands in the United States. 4-65

562.Public Concern: The Forest Service should permit environmental clean-up activities. 4-65

563.Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit the collection of animal and plant specimens. 4-65

564.Public Concern: The Forest Service should require a permit for destructive sampling of the forest biosystem. 4-65

565.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow the commercial use of surplus plant and animal species. 4-66
 As determined by monitoring teams 4-66

Positive Effects 4-66

566.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the positive environmental effects of activities/disturbance..... 4-66
 Roads 4-66
 Fire 4-66
 Insects and disease 4-67
 Downed timber 4-67

567.Public Concern: The Forest Service should assess the volume of additional stream sedimentation that will occur because of the absence of timber management and fire control..... 4-68
 Assess the damage this will cause to threatened and endangered species 4-68

568.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow stewardship timber removal. 4-68
 To increase the abundance of dead wood on forest floors 4-68

569.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that some ecosystems and threatened species need disturbance and roadways to exist..... 4-68

Negative Effects..... 4-69

570.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the negative environmental impacts of activities/disturbance..... 4-69
 Resource Use 4-69
 Mechanical forest health treatments..... 4-69
 Off-road vehicles and LOGGING equipment 4-69
 Roads and mines..... 4-69
 Drilling 4-70

Effects of road building on areas adjacent to roadless areas4-70

Fire4-70

Prescribed fire4-71

Water Quality4-71

Water Quality General4-72

571.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas. ...4-72

 To protect water quality4-72

 To protect against flooding and landslides4-72

 To provide baseline aquatic data4-72

 To act as biological defenses against pollution4-72

572.Public Concern: The Forest Service should adequately assess the true value of water on National Forest System lands.4-73

573.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that water is necessary for food resources.4-73

574.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the effects of wilderness designation on water quality.4-73

575.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow roaded access to water resources.....4-73

 To protect water resources from naturally occurring sedimentation4-73

576.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use the risk of sedimentation as justification for motorized recreation and access closures.4-74

 Because roads and trails can easily be hydrologically disconnected from streams4-74

577.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that good timber removal practices can ensure good water quality.....4-74

578.Public Concern: The Forest Service should use buffer zones to protect water quality.4-74

579.Public Concern: The Forest Service should explain the reason grazing and timber removal are believed to pollute water more than wild fire.4-74

Watershed Health4-74

580.Public Concern: The Forest Service should adequately address watershed protection.4-74

 As mandated by the Organic Act.....4-74

581.Public Concern: The Forest Service should assess watershed health from a ridgetop-to-ridgetop perspective.4-74

582.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the effects of certain activities on watersheds.....4-75

 Roads.....4-75

 Selective timber removal4-75

583.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage vegetation for watershed health.4-75

584.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas. ...4-76

 To preserve watershed health.....4-76

 To protect watersheds in California.....4-76

To provide for irrigation..... 4-76

To protect community water sources..... 4-76

585.Public Concern: The Wilderness Act should be revised to protect drinking water. 4-77

586.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that land designations do not interfere with management access to watersheds. 4-77

587.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that there is no inherent watershed benefit associated with roadless area conservation. 4-77

588.Public Concern: The Forest Service should identify critical areas of key watersheds..... 4-77

Water Quantity..... 4-77

589.Public Concern: The Forest Service should increase logging to increase water quantity. 4-77

590.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that increasing logging will not increase water quantity. 4-78

Air Quality..... 4-78

Air Quality General..... 4-79

591.Public Concern: The Forest Service should define air quality as a key objective..... 4-79

592.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect air quality..... 4-79

 By strengthening the Clean Air Act..... 4-79

 By prohibiting road construction 4-79

593.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas. .. 4-79

 To preserve air quality 4-79

 To create sinks for the absorption of greenhouse gas emissions 4-79

 To counteract global warming 4-79

 To reduce the threat of asthma 4-80

594.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule will not increase carbon sequestration. 4-80

595.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect forests to maintain the current radiation. 4-80

Adequacy of Analysis..... 4-80

596.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide data regarding airborne contaminants from wildfire. 4-80

Effects of Activities/Disturbance on Air Quality 4-81

597.Public Concern: The Forest Service should plant trees..... 4-81

 To counter the effects of greenhouse gases 4-81

 To absorb industrial air pollution..... 4-81

598.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the contribution of old, rotten trees to greenhouse gases..... 4-81

599.Public Concern: The Forest Service should remove mature trees and trees at risk of falling..... 4-81

 To improve air quality 4-81

600.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address impacts of
 motorized activity on air quality. 4-82
 Vehicle emissions 4-82
 Construction equipment 4-82
 601.Public Concern: The Forest Service should carry out controlled
 burns. 4-82
 To reduce air pollution..... 4-82
 Soils 4-82
Soils General 4-83
 602.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the
 environmental importance of soil. 4-83
Adequacy of Analysis 4-83
 603.Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop a national
 interagency soil survey and inventory program with standardized
 monitoring methods. 4-83
 To better assess the current and future health of these lands, as
 well as impacts from various uses..... 4-83
 604.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address soil
 composition in individual forests. 4-83
Effects of Activities/Disturbance on Soils..... 4-83
 605.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the effects of
 activities on soil. 4-83
 Effects of timber REMOVAL on surface soils 4-83
 Effects of timber LOGGING and road building on erosion and
 landslides 4-83
 Effects of soil compaction..... 4-84
 606.Public Concern: The Forest Service should retain biomass from
 habitat restoration..... 4-84
 Scenery 4-84
 607.Public Concern: The Forest Service should place greater value on
 scenic resources..... 4-84
 By completing visual assessments of all roadless areas..... 4-84
 608.Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement a national
 roadless rule..... 4-84
 To provide relief from unsightly clear cuts 4-84
 Wildlife 4-84
Wildlife General 4-86
 609.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas.... 4-86
 For wildlife 4-86
 For amphibians 4-86
 To maintain healthy fisheries..... 4-86
 To ensure reproductive capability 4-87
 For subsistence species..... 4-87
 To provide wildlife corridors..... 4-87
 610.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect wildlife..... 4-87
 By actively managing roadless areas 4-87

By returning to its original role of protecting the land and its wildlife, as in the days of Gifford Pinchot..... 4-88

By managing wildlife and wildlife habitat in cooperation with state departments of natural resources 4-88

By allowing state fish and wildlife agencies to manage populations 4-88

By allowing field research in roadless areas..... 4-88

By allowing wildlife research, trout stocking, and wildlife law enforcement activities in areas where existing roads already allow motorized access..... 4-88

By supporting legislation to preclude, prevent, or overrule lawsuits designed to mitigate the scientific management of wildlife 4-88

By implementing the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Alliance Square Deal Initiatives..... 4-88

By protecting southern Appalachian roadless areas 4-89

611.Public Concern: The Forest Service should avoid making land designations that restrict wildlife management. 4-89

612.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the long-term negative impacts of managing for individual members of species. 4-89

613.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect grassland species. 4-89

614.Public Concern: The Forest Service should treat wildlife and domestic livestock equally. 4-90

615.Public Concern: The Forest Service should value human life over wildlife and plantlife..... 4-90

616.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage wildlife under recommendations of local fish and game agencies. 4-90

Wildlife General – Species-Specific Considerations 4-91

617.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas. ... 4-91

 For brown bears 4-91

 For yellow-legged frogs 4-91

 For lynx and cutthroat trout..... 4-91

 For butterflies 4-91

 For bears and wolves in the Cooper River Delta 4-91

618.Public Concern: The Forest Service should determine the degree to which native trout are linked to undeveloped areas on public lands. 4-91

619.Public Concern: The Forest Service should reintroduce and protect predators..... 4-91

 Grizzly bears 4-91

620.Public Concern: The Forest Service should make the black bear the national wild animal. 4-91

621.Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit the killing of black bear. 4-92

622.Public Concern: The Forest Service should prevent wolf populations from expanding..... 4-92

623.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the reintroduction of coyotes, wolves and bears to certain areas is upsetting the balance between people and animals.4-92

624.Public Concern: The Forest Service should use elk as a management indicator species.4-92

Funding.....4-92

625.Public Concern: The Forest Service should more effectively utilize funds earmarked for protection of wild horses.4-92

626.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that building roads in the Skagit River watershed would route funds away from salmon recovery efforts.4-93

Effects of Activities/Disturbance on Wildlife4-93

627.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that wildlife is resilient to Active Management.4-93

628.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that roads do not harm wildlife.....4-93

 Fish4-93

 The desert tortoise4-93

 Roads do not impede wildlife movement.....4-94

629.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that vehicles do not disturb wildlife.4-94

630.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the impacts of road fragmentation are greater than the impacts of fire.4-94

631.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use elk forage enhancement as an excuse for timber removal.4-94

632.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the effects of fire on fisheries.4-94

633.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow trapping as a wildlife management tool.4-95

Positive Effects4-95

634.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow timber removal.4-95

 For the benefit of wildlife4-95

 To encourage the growth of huckleberries for grizzly bears4-95

635.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow thinning.....4-96

 To promote plant growth and feed for wildlife and birds4-96

636.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide retaining pools when installing culverts.....4-96

 For wildlife in the dry season.....4-96

637.Public Concern: The Forest Service should retain dams and fix fish passage ladders.....4-96

638.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the beneficial impact of ranch management on wildlife.4-96

639.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the benefits of fire, disease, and insects to bird species.4-96

Negative Effects.....4-96

640.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the negative effects of roads on wildlife. 4-96
 On non-native birds and plants..... 4-97
 Decreased population viability..... 4-97

641.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the negative effects of roads on fish..... 4-97
 Sedimentation 4-97
 Loss of spawning habitat..... 4-97
 Stocking non-native species, access by livestock, overfishing, and disease transmission 4-98

642.Public Concern: The Forest Service should close roads. 4-98
 To maintain unfettered migration routes for wildlife 4-98
 To increase elk populations..... 4-98

643.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the negative effects of off-road vehicles on wildlife. 4-98

644.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the negative effects of inadequate stream culverts on fish passage. 4-98
 Stop constructing new roads until existing roads and culverts are repaired 4-99

645.Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit all Active Management and Resource Use. 4-99
 To protect wildlife..... 4-99

646.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the negative effects of timber removal on wildlife..... 4-99
 Forest interior birds..... 4-99
 Salamanders 4-100

647.Public Concern: The Forest Service should restrict hiking in roadless areas. 4-100
 In areas where calving occurs 4-100

648.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the effects of fire on species extinction. 4-100

Wildlife Habitat 4-100

Wildlife Habitat General 4-101

649.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage forests for habitat rather than for “values.”..... 4-101

650.Public Concern: The Forest Service should more adequately describe desired future conditions to reflect wildlife habitat. 4-101

651.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the size of inventoried roadless areas..... 4-101
 To make sure their size is consistent with the habitat requirements of interior-dwelling species 4-101

652.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the negative effects of habitat fragmentation on wildlife..... 4-102
 Bears 4-102

653.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas. 4-102
 For wetland species protection..... 4-102

For elk reintroduction4-102

For migratory bird habitat4-102

For interior species habitat4-102

For Kenai peninsula habitat.....4-103

For Clearwater Basin habitat.....4-103

To preserve habitat for indigenous wildlife4-103

To preserve salmon habitat.....4-103

To preserve trout habitat4-104

To preserve trophic webs4-104

654.Public Concern: The Forest Service should preserve fish and
wildlife habitat as a priority.4-104

By reducing the effects of human encroachment on wildlife habitat...4-104

By avoiding development of wetland sites.....4-105

By retaining standing dead and downed trees4-105

By addressing landscape-scale habitat needs for wildlife4-105

By providing wildlife corridors between roadless areas4-105

By providing wildlife corridors in exurban and suburban zones.....4-105

By protecting critical winter and migratory range.....4-105

By increasing elk forage4-105

By protecting high volume creek habitat4-105

By identifying and mapping critical salmon habitat.....4-105

By diverting funding from stocking efforts to habitat restoration and
environmental pollution prevention efforts.....4-106

By compensating citizens willing to set aside their land for habitat4-106

By allowing continued maintenance of wildlife habitat improvements .4-106

655.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide habitat for
umbrella species.4-106

656.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide natural habitat
for wolf and fox.4-106

657.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the loss of
habitat through canopy closure.4-106

Through the forest planning process.....4-106

658.Public Concern: The Forest Service should prevent habitat
fragmentation.4-106

By protecting roadless areas.....4-106

By establishing roadless areas where the greatest connectivity can
be achieved.....4-107

By prohibiting road building4-107

To reduce aggressive animal encounters4-107

659.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide a brochure
that identifies prime habitat in all states.....4-108

Effects of Activities/Disturbance on Wildlife Habitat.....4-108

Positive Effects4-108

660.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow various activities
due to their positive effects on wildlife habitat.4-108

Limited timber removal4-108

The use of fire or some other means to clear out old growth..... 4-108

Dredging..... 4-108

661.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the beneficial impacts of timber removal, grazing, and road building on wildlife habitat. 4-108

662.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow even age management..... 4-108

To maintain habitat diversity..... 4-108

Negative Effects..... 4-109

663.Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit various activities due to their negative effects on wildlife habitat..... 4-109

All active management activities 4-109

Road construction..... 4-109

Thinning..... 4-109

Mining..... 4-109

664.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the negative effects of log transfer facilities on aquatic habitats..... 4-110

665.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the negative effects of roads on wildlife habitat..... 4-110

On American marten 4-110

On beaver..... 4-110

666.Public Concern: The Forest Service should close roads after timber removal. 4-110

To protect wildlife habitat..... 4-110

667.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address “edge effects” on songbird populations..... 4-110

Threatened and Endangered Species..... 4-111

Threatened and Endangered Species General..... 4-111

668.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas. 4-111

As endangered species habitat 4-111

As spotted owl habitat 4-112

As bald eagle habitat..... 4-112

As grizzly bear habitat..... 4-112

To prevent costly listing of species under the Endangered Species Act 4-113

669.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage roadless areas in accordance with the Canada Lynx Conservation Agreement. 4-113

670.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address habitat improvement for threatened and endangered species in forest plans. 4-113

671.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not designate roadless areas in endangered species habitat. 4-114

672.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that species extinction is a natural occurrence. 4-114

Effects of Activities/Disturbance on Threatened and Endangered Species. 4-114

673.Public Concern: The Forest Service should permit wildlife rescue operations in roadless areas.4-114
 To protect threatened and endangered species.....4-114
 674.Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit hunting of threatened or endangered species.....4-114
 675.Public Concern: The Forest Service should relocate endangered fish species during times of drought.4-114
Positive Effects.....4-115
 676.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the importance of flooding to salmonids.4-115
Negative Effects.....4-115
 677.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the negative impacts of various activities/disturbance on threatened and endangered species.4-115
 Roads.....4-115
 Timber removal4-115
 Wildfire4-115
 Vegetation and Botanical Resources4-116
Vegetation and Botanical Resources General4-116
 678.Public Concern: The Forest Service should identify the vegetative cover affected by the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.4-116
 679.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas. 4-117
 To prevent the spread of invasive species4-117
 To prevent habitat loss4-117
 To protect endemic plants4-117
 To allow old growth to return4-117
 For native forbs, lichens, and fungi4-117
 680.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect old-growth forests.....4-117
 For their ecological values.....4-118
 To compensate for global losses of old growth4-118
 To help lessen global warming.....4-118
 To preserve plant and animal species and genetic diversity4-118
 To protect against natural disasters4-119
 Because they are not replaceable.....4-119
 Because that is what the majority of citizens want4-119
 681.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that old growth cannot be preserved.4-119
 682.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the value of forest fungi.....4-120
 683.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that deforestation leads to desertification.4-120
 684.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect forests to prevent single-species monocultures.4-120
 Because they provide little habitat for bird and plant species and do not draw tourists.....4-120

Because they are not conducive to species diversity 4-120

Because there is already enough land devoted to single species 4-120

685.Public Concern: The Forest Service should promote regeneration
in previously harvested areas. 4-120

To replace valuable timber 4-120

686.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect national
grasslands. 4-121

Because they are endangered and fragmented 4-121

687.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that forest
cover is increasing. 4-121

688.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow local
decisionmakers to develop unique approaches to managing
successional disturbance..... 4-121

Vegetation and Botanical Resources – Species Specific Considerations ... 4-121

689.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect black spruce.... 4-121

690.Public Concern: The Forest Service should increase the amount of
aspen forest. 4-121

691.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect lower elevation
hardwood forests. 4-121

692.Public Concern: The Forest Service should plant more oak trees. ... 4-121

693.Public Concern: The Forest Service should discontinue the
practice of replacing hardwoods with pine. 4-122

Effects of Activities/Disturbance on Vegetation and Botanical Resources .. 4-122

694.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage vegetation
with longer harvest rotations. 4-122

Positive Effects 4-122

695.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow selective timber
removal. 4-122

To encourage growth of young trees 4-122

696.Public Concern: The Forest Service should thin second growth
forests. 4-122

To promote old growth characteristics..... 4-122

697.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow even-aged
management..... 4-122

As a method for regenerating even-aged forests 4-122

Negative Effects 4-123

698.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the negative
effects of roads on vegetation..... 4-123

Introduction of invasive species 4-123

Effects on rare plant species 4-123

699.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the negative
effects of tree farms on adjacent areas..... 4-123

700.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the role of
animals in spreading noxious weeds. 4-123

701.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the effects of
livestock grazing on vegetation..... 4-123

SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT AND VALUES.....4-124

 Social Values of Roadless Areas4-124

Social Values of Roadless Areas General4-126

 702.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas

 with a national roadless rule.4-126

 For their natural grandeur and beauty4-127

 For their intrinsic value4-127

 For their replacement value.....4-128

 For their non-monetary values4-128

 For the American experience4-129

 For the western experience4-129

 For their freedom value4-129

 For rural communities’ quality of life4-129

 For overall quality of life4-130

 For true conservative values4-130

 For spiritual renewal4-130

 To uphold religious tenets4-131

 For escape from modern pressures4-131

 For escape from capitalism4-132

 For solitude4-132

 For natural quiet4-132

 For their ability to reveal the interconnectedness of humans and

 nature4-133

 For the personal challenge in their inaccessibility4-133

 For escape from motorized vehicles4-133

 For family togetherness.....4-134

 For human sustenance4-134

 For human survival.....4-134

 For scientific research4-135

 703.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas. 4-135

 Due to increased population.....4-135

 Due to the high number of immigrants4-135

 Due to urban/suburban sprawl4-136

 704.Public Concern: The Forest Service should work with other

 government officials to promote population control.4-137

 705.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not implement a

 national roadless rule.4-137

 Because roadless areas have no intrinsic value4-137

 Because it threatens western traditions and culture4-137

 Because it restricts family stability and togetherness4-137

 Because it reduces motorized users’ quality of life.....4-138

 Because it runs counter to America’s modern, fast-paced lifestyle4-138

 Because a wilderness experience is no longer possible due to

 technology4-139

 Because it will cause emotional distress to mining industry

 employees due to loss of contact with nature.....4-139

706.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that activities on private inholdings are compatible with the social values associated with surrounding lands..... 4-139

Bequest Values..... 4-139

707.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas for future generations..... 4-139

By using tree farms for timber needs..... 4-140

708.Public Concern: The Forest Service should continue traditional multiple use management of roadless areas for future generations. 4-140

709.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect national forests for the present population. 4-140

710.Public Concern: The Forest Service should exploit national forest resources for the present population. 4-140

Educational Values 4-140

711.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the educational potential of remaining wild forests. 4-140

712.Public Concern: The Forest Service should educate children regarding our dependence on undisturbed natural systems. 4-141

Access for Special Populations..... 4-141

713.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not implement a national roadless rule that restricts access for the mobility-impaired..... 4-141

The elderly..... 4-141

The disabled..... 4-141

714.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not implement a national rule that closes existing roads..... 4-142

Because it would restrict access for the mobility-impaired 4-142

715.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use access for the elderly and disabled as an excuse to build roads in roadless areas. 4-143

Because ample access exists in roaded areas..... 4-143

716.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas from timber removal..... 4-144

To preserve opportunities for the disabled to experience unspoiled natural areas 4-144

717.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow some exceptions to a national rule to facilitate access by the disabled..... 4-144

718.Public Concern: The Forest Service should exempt ski areas from a national rule. 4-145

To ensure environmental justice to low-income families..... 4-145

Health and Wellness Values 4-145

719.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas. 4-145

For human health and welfare 4-145

For physical and emotional rejuvenation 4-145

For women’s safety 4-145

For human safety 4-146

For wilderness therapy opportunities for young people 4-146

720.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not implement a national roadless rule.4-146
 That would hamper search and rescue efforts4-146

721.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas and discourage motorized recreation.4-146
 To help combat the national obesity epidemic4-146

722.Public Concern: The Forest Service should make special land use permits available to citizens disabled by Toxicant Induced Loss of Tolerance.4-146

Noise4-147

723.Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish baseline sound levels and quantifiable noise standards for roadless areas. ...4-147
 To reduce stress4-147

724.Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish a reasonable decibel limit for exhaust systems.4-147
 To decrease conflicts between motorized users and other recreationists.....4-147

725.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not arbitrarily require roadless areas to have semi-primitive core areas in order to qualify as inventoried.4-147
 Because a complete absence of sights and sounds from surrounding areas is not possible, particularly in the East4-147

Adequacy of Analysis.....4-148

726.Public Concern: The Forest Service should reconsider sociology studies that portray rural residents in a negative light.....4-148

727.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that commercial resource users create negative social impacts in rural communities.4-148

ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT AND VALUES4-149

Economic Environment and Values General.....4-149

728.Public Concern: The Forest Service should make sound economic decisions.4-149
 By adopting the Roadless Area Conservation Rule4-149

729.Public Concern: The Forest Service should promote only economically viable activities within national forests.4-149

Economic Evaluation of Roadless Areas4-150

730.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider only economic values.4-150

731.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not base the value of the land on the value of the resources that can be removed.4-150
 Do not consider the historic economic commodity values of the last fifty years.....4-150

732.Public Concern: The Forest Service should describe values in terms of cost/benefits or some other economically definable method.4-151

Because values are meaningless without an economic analysis that can be peer reviewed 4-151

733.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider relevant economic factors in second-stage roadless area evaluations..... 4-151

734.Public Concern: The public should evaluate roadless areas, first according to economic considerations and second by social considerations..... 4-151

735.Public Concern: The Forest Service should give equal weight to the economic value of roadless areas as intact ecosystems as to other economic values..... 4-151

736.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that roadless areas do not contain economically viable timber resources..... 4-152

737.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that it has already demonstrated that the commodity values of roadless areas are insignificant as compared to recreation and non-commodity values..... 4-153

738.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not consider economic factors when evaluating roadless areas..... 4-153

Comparative Costs and Benefits of Ecosystem Protection and Resource Extraction 4-154

739.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider long-term costs/benefits a higher priority than short-term costs/benefits..... 4-154

740.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not place economic interests above other interests..... 4-154

By managing for the protection of forests rather than for profit..... 4-155

741.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow profitable natural resource management in roadless areas..... 4-155

In such a way as to offset environmental impacts 4-156

742.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that moneymaking projects on National Forest System lands are a by-product of managing for long-term forest sustainability and biodiversity..... 4-156

743.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage roadless areas for long-term local economic stability rather than short term benefits..... 4-156

Include the Tongass National Forest..... 4-157

744.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that tourism and recreation produce more revenue than commodity use..... 4-157

745.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that local communities would benefit more from investing in new technologies than from relying on forest commodity jobs..... 4-158

Adequacy of Analysis 4-158

Adequacy of Analysis General 4-159

746.Public Concern: The Forest Service should produce competent, unbiased economic analyses..... 4-159

747. Public Concern: The Forest Service should refocus its cost benefit analysis on economic consequences when evaluating a national roadless rule.....4-159

748. Public Concern: The Forest Service should conduct adequate cost benefit analyses before issuing a new rule.....4-159

 By analyzing the costs and risks associated with developed activities in roadless areas4-160

 By considering economic ecosystem values of natural resources4-160

 By accounting for resource damage from commodity uses.....4-160

 By considering the commercial interests of local areas.....4-160

 By analyzing likely trends in the future values of recreational amenities and natural resource commodities, and lost option value inherent in further development.....4-160

749. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider both market and non-market values in its economic analysis.4-160

750. Public Concern: The Forest Service should base its economic analysis on real data rather than inaccurate models.4-161

751. Public Concern: The Forest Service should improve socioeconomic input/output modeling in updated or amended forest plans.....4-161

 In collaboration with other agencies4-161

752. Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide information regarding maintenance costs of roaded and unroaded areas.4-161

753. Public Concern: The Forest Service should adopt a quantitative valuation formula for spiritual value in evaluating roadless areas.....4-161

754. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the positive effects of ski areas on local economies in greater depth.4-162

755. Public Concern: The Forest Service should incorporate the positive contribution of wilderness to nearby real estate values into its economic analysis.....4-162

756. Public Concern: National Forest System lands should be appraised and taxed like private lands.4-162

 Include non-market economic values in appraisals.....4-162

757. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the economic value of healthy ecosystems.4-163

 Including the economic benefit of existence values4-164

 Including quantified economic values for clean water4-165

Adequacy of Analysis – Economic Effects of a National Roadless Rule..... 4-165

758. Public Concern: The Forest Service should quantify recreation-based economic effects of a national roadless rule.....4-165

759. Public Concern: The Forest Service should analyze the impacts of a national rule on recreation-related economic activity.....4-166

 Negative effects of a national rule are underestimated4-166

 Positive effects of a national rule are underestimated.....4-166

760. Public Concern: The Forest Service should analyze the impacts of a national rule on agency employment levels.....4-167

761.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the impacts of a national rule on fair housing and lending provisions. 4-167

762.Public Concern: The Forest Service should assess the cost of withdrawing millions of acres from the country’s natural resource base..... 4-167

Analysis of Analysis – the Roadless Area Conservation Rule EIS..... 4-167

763.Public Concern: The Forest Service should better explain the methods and data used in the economic analysis for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule EIS. 4-167

764.Public Concern: The Forest Service should correct the Roadless Area Conservation Rule EIS timber-related job data to account for the fact that most employment resulted from taxpayer subsidies of below cost sales. 4-168

765.Public Concern: The Forest Service should correct the Roadless Area Conservation Rule EIS timber program cost analysis to include payments to counties..... 4-168

Economic Effects..... 4-168

General Effects on Local Communities and Economies 4-171

766.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the economic benefits of roadless protection to state and local economies..... 4-171

Due to their importance to companies seeking locations with high quality of life 4-172

767.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas to prevent future financial burdens caused by flooding..... 4-172

768.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the economic impacts of weakening protection for roadless areas in the White Mountains. 4-173

Effects on Resource Dependent Communities and the Timber Industry..... 4-173

769.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the negative economic impacts of roadless protection on the economy. 4-173

On resource-dependent rural communities 4-173

On timber-dependent businesses..... 4-174

770.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the economic benefits provided by the timber industry. 4-175

771.Public Concern: The Forest Service should act to create a more streamlined legal process to dispose of frivolous legal challenges to timber sales. 4-175

In order to maintain the viability of small mills 4-175

772.Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge that sustained yield has never been practiced, with prior over-harvest leading to current reductions in commercial timber volume. 4-175

773.Public Concern: The Forest Service should reiterate that negative economic impacts from reduced timber removal will be minimal. 4-176

774.Public Concern: The Forest Service should focus timber removal in roaded areas..... 4-176

To support local mills..... 4-177

775.Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement a national rule to encourage private forest landowners to make more efficient use of their resources.4-177

776.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not implement a national roadless rule because it will further encourage overharvest of private lands.4-177

777.Public Concern: The Forest Service should help local mills retool to maximize benefits to local economies.4-177

778.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the small number of jobs created by chip mills versus those created by conventional saw mills.4-177

779.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow resource development in roadless areas to meet the needs of American consumers.4-177

780.Public Concern: The Forest Service should stop claiming that the lumber needs of American consumers justify timber removal in roadless areas.4-178

781.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the negative economic impacts of roadless protection on the economy.4-178

 On the homebuilding industry.....4-178

Effects on the Agricultural and Ranching Sector.....4-178

782.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the social, cultural, and historic value of the sustained use of these areas and the local communities they support.4-178

783.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the negative economic impacts of roadless protection on the economy.4-178

 On ranchers4-178

784.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the effects of aquatic species protection on agricultural areas.....4-179

Effects on the Mining, Oil, and Gas Industries.....4-179

785.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the negative economic impacts of roadless protection on the economy.4-179

 On mining-dependent communities.....4-179

786.Public Concern: The Forest Service should prepare an Energy Impact Statement for mining-dependent communities with inelastic economies.4-179

787.Public Concern: The new rulemaking process should reevaluate coal leasing restrictions in the West Elk Roadless Area.....4-179

 Due to the importance of mining to the regional economy4-179

 Due to potential impacts on the West Elk Mine4-180

788.Public Concern: The Forest Service should adequately consider impacts to the Utah coal industry.4-181

789.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow access for mining to protect investments made by the industry.....4-181

 In Nevada gold mines4-181

790.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider negative economic impacts to the oil and gas industry. 4-181
 In North Dakota 4-181

791.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider negative economic impacts to the phosphate mining industry. 4-182

792.Public Concern: The Forest Service should abandon the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 4-182
 Due to negative economic impacts to the hardrock mining industry... 4-182

793.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the conclusions of the National Academy of Sciences report on hardrock mining. 4-182

794.Public Concern: The Forest Service should refute the allegation that coal mining results in higher road costs to the Agency..... 4-182
 Because industry reclamation bonds finance maintenance..... 4-182

795.Public Concern: The Forest Service should discourage boom and bust oil and gas development. 4-182

796.Public Concern: The Forest Service should reiterate that a national roadless rule will not impact the nation’s energy supplies. 4-183

Effects on the Recreation Sector 4-183

797.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the economic benefits of roadless protection to state and local economies..... 4-183
 Due to their importance to the tourism industry 4-183
 Due to their importance to recreational non-motorized users 4-184
 Due to their importance to the mountain biking community 4-184
 Due to their importance to recreational fishing and hunting..... 4-184
 Due to their importance to photography-related businesses 4-185
 Due to their importance to outfitter-guides..... 4-185
 Due to their importance to the outdoor gear industry..... 4-185

798.Public Concern: The Forest Service should refute the claim that roadless area protection will harm recreation-dependent communities due to loss of visitors. 4-186

799.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect big game habitat..... 4-186
 Due to the contribution of hunting to the local economy 4-186

800.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the negative economic impacts of roadless protection on the economy. 4-186
 On the recreation-dependent tourism industry 4-186
 On ski area-dependent communities 4-187
 On the motorized recreation-dependent tourism industry..... 4-187

801.Public Concern: The Forest Service should exempt the proposed Pelican Butte ski area from the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. . 4-187
 To help revive the depressed local economy 4-187

802.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not reduce trail access to recreational horse riders. 4-187
 Because this user group has a significant impact on the U.S. economy 4-187

Effects on Employment..... 4-188

803.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas. .4-188
 To contribute to the health and diversification of local economies4-188
 To encourage extractive industries to replace unsustainable
 business practices with sustainable ones4-188

804.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the effects of
 timber export on employment.4-189

805.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the effects of
 timber import from low-wage countries on domestic employment.4-189

806.Public Concern: The Forest Service should act to preserve local
 jobs by keeping roadless areas available for timber removal.4-189

807.Public Concern: The Forest Service should act to preserve high-
 paying local jobs.4-189
 By keeping roadless areas accessible to mining4-189

808.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that low-wage
 recreation-based jobs are no substitute for commodity-based high-
 wage ones.4-190

809.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide assistance in
 diversifying local rural economies.....4-190

810.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide career
 assistance.4-190
 Retrain forest workers4-190
 Provide restoration-related career opportunities to displaced timber
 and mining workers4-191
 Provide career opportunities to environmentalists.....4-191

811.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that its
 management decisions are not responsible for local timber-related
 job losses.4-192
 Automation and the timber industry are to blame4-193

812.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that raw log
 exports lead to domestic job losses in manufacturing.4-193

813.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not attempt to protect
 timber jobs.....4-193

814.Public Concern: The Forest Service should place a higher value
 on roadless areas than logging and mill jobs.....4-194

Effects on Tax Receipts/Funding to Communities 4-194

815.Public Concern: The Forest Service should discuss impacts of a
 national roadless rule on Bankhead Jones payments to states and
 counties.4-194

816.Public Concern: The Forest Service should continue removing
 timber to fund schools.4-194

817.Public Concern: The Forest Service should work to change the
 rural school financing system.4-194
 To reduce the need for high timber removal levels4-194

818.Public Concern: The Forest Service should support a 100 percent tax on lumber to reduce demand and support affected local communities..... 4-195

819.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that counties understand the impacts of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act on their tax base. 4-195

820.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not reduce minerals royalty payments and income to local governments by restricting access through a national roadless rule. 4-195

821.Public Concern: The Forest Service should exempt Utah school trust land coal resources from a national rule. 4-196

Because they were intended to compensate for Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument restrictions 4-196

822.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the positive contributions of ski areas to local and federal government revenues. 4-197

823.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize its responsibility to rural western communities harmed by the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 4-197

824.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide a fund to benefit communities impacted by roadless designations. 4-197

825.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not make payments to counties in lieu of harvest receipts..... 4-197

826.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not attempt to buy the support of affected communities with transition payments..... 4-198

827.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not develop a plan to relocate affected residents in compensation for a national roadless rule..... 4-198

Impacts on the Global Economy 4-198

828.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the potential transfer of environmental effects of timber removal to other countries with lower standards..... 4-198

Support international sustainable forestry programs 4-198

829.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow timber removal in roadless areas. 4-199

To reduce dependence on foreign sources 4-199

830.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow mineral development in roadless areas..... 4-199

To reduce dependence on foreign sources 4-199

To avoid vulnerability to supply disruptions from political and military activity abroad 4-200

831.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the effects of its management decisions on the global economy. 4-200

Exporting our natural resources continues our dependence on foreign sources..... 4-200

832.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide a model for other countries on how to preserve national forests from short-term economic benefits.4-201

User Fees4-201

833.Public Concern: The Forest Service should raise funds through user fees.....4-201

From timber removal and road usage4-202

834.Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement a user fee system based upon relative impact.4-202

To help defray the expenses of road and trail maintenance and law enforcement4-202

835.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not charge user fees for recreational use of national forests.....4-202

Because they are unfair to low-income families4-202

Because consumptive users do not pay their fair share.....4-202

836.Public Concern: The Forest Service should end the fee demonstration project.4-203

837.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the economic impacts of user fees.4-203

838.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure equal hunting and fishing fees in all states.4-203

Subsidies and Agency Expenditures.....4-203

839.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not subsidize extractive industries on public lands.4-204

Because the real value of forest lands lies in the ecosystem services they provide4-204

Because subsidization amounts to corporate welfare4-205

Because it is unfair competition with private forest owners4-205

Because it is unfair competition with recycled products4-205

840.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the value of removing timber is outweighed by the cost of mitigation measures made necessary by harvesting.4-206

841.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow below cost timber sales to occur.4-206

Add a directive that no timber sales will be allowed when full costs exceed returns by more than 10 percent.....4-206

Because it is unfair to taxpayers4-206

Because the U.S. is facing budget deficits4-206

Because tax dollars are needed for other programs4-207

Because they produce roads that the Forest Service lacks the funding to maintain.....4-207

842.Public Concern: The Forest Service should revise funding and staffing incentive policies that allow timber management to dominate forest values.4-207

843.Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement a national roadless rule.....4-208

To counteract reverse economic incentives at the local level..... 4-208

844.Public Concern: The Forest Service should eliminate below-cost
timber sales and raw log exports on the Tongass National Forest. ... 4-208

845.Public Concern: The Forest Service should improve methods for
calculating true market demand for Tongass timber. 4-208

 Include the cost of subsidies 4-208

846.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider additional
factors in timber sale decisions..... 4-209

 Continual and growing cash flow losses..... 4-209

 Rapidly increasing road rebuilding costs 4-209

847.Public Concern: The Forest Service should impose greater fiscal
requirements on timber companies..... 4-209

 Require timber companies to cover the full cost of any road
construction, removal, or restoration 4-209

 Require timber companies to post bonds for restoration 4-210

 Require timber companies to remove slash after logging..... 4-210

 Require timber companies to assume direct financial liability for
environmental damage now and in the future..... 4-210

 Place all timber contract payments in escrow until full stand
replacement is verified..... 4-210

848.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that sales of
resources are competitive..... 4-210

 By eliminating long-term contracts 4-210

849.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the
budgetary benefits of prohibiting timber removal and road building
in roadless areas. 4-210

850.Public Concern: The Forest Service should regulate all
commercial activities as monopolistic public utilities with fixed
rates of fair return. 4-211

851.Public Concern: The Forest Service should disperse subsidies
directly to local workers rather than remove unprofitable timber..... 4-211

852.Public Concern: The Forest Service should buy back timber sale
contracts. 4-211

 To help communities adapt economically 4-211

853.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide economic
incentives for responsible use of natural resources in roaded
areas..... 4-211

854.Public Concern: The Forest Service should subsidize commercial
tree farming as an alternative to logging public lands..... 4-212

855.Public Concern: The Forest Service should devote more money
and time to conservation..... 4-212

856.Public Concern: The Forest Service should subsidize wildlands
restoration..... 4-212

857.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not subsidize ranching. 4-212

HERITAGE RESOURCES 4-213

 Heritage Resources General 4-213

858.Public Concern: The Forest Service should preserve America’s national heritage.4-213
 By protecting roadless areas.....4-213
 By preserving historic structures and traditions in roadless areas.....4-214
 859.Public Concern: The Forest Service should identify historic properties which may be affected by a national roadless rule, and assess and resolve any adverse impacts.4-214
 In consultation with state historic preservation offices, American Indian tribes, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation4-214
 860.Public Concern: The Forest Service should preserve cultural resources.....4-214
 By protecting roadless areas.....4-214
 By prohibiting road building in the Tongass National Forest4-214
 861.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure motorized access to historic sites in roadless areas.4-214
 862.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide a detailed analysis of paleontological resources in roadless areas covered by a national rule.....4-215
 In Wyoming4-215

CHAPTER 5 FOREST MANAGEMENT 5-1

FOREST MANAGEMENT5-1
 Forest Management General5-1
 863.Public Concern: The Forest Service Chief should guide the Agency in the direction of balanced management.....5-2
 Emphasizing recreational improvements rather than traditional extractive uses5-2
 864.Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage National Forest System lands for a wide variety of uses.5-2
 Because taxpayers have a right to use public land5-2
 865.Public Concern: The Forest Service should assure consistent decisionmaking for all national forests.....5-2
 Because they are all a part of the National Forest System5-2
 866.Public Concern: The Forest Service should use the Sierra Nevada Framework policy as a model for management of the entire public lands system.5-3
 Until active management is prohibited5-3
 867.Public Concern: The Forest Service should adopt a management approach similar to that used to delineate and manage wetlands.5-3
 868.Public Concern: The Forest Service should employ a new “wilderness ethic.”5-3
 By emphasizing a light restorative approach to sustainable management based on indigenous practices5-3
 869.Public Concern: The Forest Service should be flexible in its management.5-3
 To reflect changing needs5-3

870.Public Concern: The Forest Service should afford local citizens the opportunity to carry out land management activities..... 5-4
 By allowing them to help with controlled burns and salvage operations..... 5-4
 By allowing carefully managed personal use timber and firewood removal..... 5-4

871.Public Concern: The Forest Service should enter into non-traditional forms of management agreements..... 5-4
 To benefit local economies and forest health 5-4

872.Public Concern: The Forest Service should support the Generational Land Stewards. 5-4

873.Public Concern: The Forest Service should pursue tree-planting restoration projects in old neighborhoods. 5-5

874.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consolidate national forests..... 5-5
 So that areas of similar economic, social, geographic, and vegetative systems are administered together 5-5

875.Public Concern: The Forest Service should either actively manage public lands or relinquish its authority. 5-5

876.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider privatization of public lands..... 5-5
 Auction to the highest bidder 5-5

Adequacy of Analysis 5-5

877.Public Concern: The Forest Service should analyze the risks of eliminating timber removal and roading as management tools in roadless areas. 5-6

878.Public Concern: The Forest Service should compare the value of management activities versus the value of leaving areas roadless. 5-6
 By using the “Choosing By Advantages” method 5-6
 On a roadless area-by-roadless area basis..... 5-6

879.Public Concern: The Forest Service should use large scale analysis to provide guidelines in establishing the role of national forests..... 5-7

880.Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate the impacts of land management decisions with respect to impacts on other public lands in the area..... 5-7

881.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that reduced road access would increase costs of forest management. 5-7

Roadless Areas Management General 5-7

882.Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule without political interference..... 5-8
 Base management decisions only on science..... 5-8

883.Public Concern: The Forest Service should explain why there are provisions for managing uninventoried roadless areas..... 5-8
 Because if areas are uninventoried, ground conditions and needed management is unknown..... 5-8

Authority for Roadless Area Management..... 5-8

884.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that there is no statutory direction for managing areas as roadless.5-8

Because it is prohibited by law from creating buffer zones around wilderness5-9

885.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify that there is statutory direction for managing areas as roadless. 5-10

Through the forest planning process.....5-10

886.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not involve Congress in management of roadless areas.5-10

Because involving Congress politicizes management.....5-10

Because Congress is unable to identify with those most affected by roadless designations 5-10

General Direction of Roadless Area Management..... 5-10

887.Public Concern: The Forest Service should immediately cancel all planned active management projects in roadless areas.....5-10

888.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that forest management activities can take place in roadless areas while still preserving roadless area characteristics and values.5-10

889.Public Concern: The Forest Service should use the Black Hills National Forest as a model for managing roadless areas.5-11

890.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not manage roadless areas as if it were the National Park Service.5-11

891.Public Concern: The Forest Service should turn protection of roadless areas over to the U.S. Department of the Interior.5-11

ACTIVITIES (QUESTION 7)..... 5-12

Activities General 5-12

Activity Management General..... 5-13

892.Public Concern: The Forest Service should seek public input regarding activities that should be allowed or prohibited.5-13

893.Public Concern: The Forest Service should govern activities through the National Environmental Policy Act process.5-13

894.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow existing individual forest plans to govern activities in roadless areas.5-13

Until these plans have been amended or revised5-13

895.Public Concern: The Forest Service should use the Roadless Area Conservation Rule to govern which activities should be permitted.....5-13

896.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the current and historic uses of roadless areas.5-13

897.Public Concern: The Forest Service should base land management activities on several established systems.5-14

Recreation Opportunity Spectrum, visual quality objectives, and the ecological capacity of the land 5-14

Adequacy of Analysis 5-14

898.Public Concern: The Forest Service should research references about management of resources and public uses.5-14

Travel Management Bringing People and Places Together and The Outdoor Recreation in American Life, A National Assessment of Demand and Supply Trends..... 5-14

Allow Activities 5-14

899.Public Concern: The Forest Service should permit a variety of activities in roadless areas..... 5-14

 In designated areas 5-15

 In areas appropriate to the activities..... 5-15

 Unless the activities are damaging an area..... 5-15

900.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not exempt activities listed in a Schedule of Proposed Actions..... 5-16

901.Public Concern: The Forest Service should permit the same activities in roadless areas that are currently allowed in other areas of National Forest System lands. 5-16

 To the extent that current forest management plans allow 5-16

902.Public Concern: The Forest Service should permit currently allowed activities in roadless areas to continue. 5-16

903.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect local communities from sudden restrictions and bans from activities that had previously been legal. 5-16

904.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow some people to live by themselves, in roadless areas. 5-16

 In small numbers 5-16

Do Not Allow/Restrict Activities 5-17

905.Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit certain activities in roadless areas..... 5-17

 Activities that are harmful to the environment or that present a liability concern 5-17

 Activities that require roads 5-17

 Activities that cause excessive noise..... 5-17

 Drug related activities 5-17

 Military training 5-17

 Military testing 5-18

906.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow individual forest plans to make exceptions for specific activities..... 5-18

Travel Management General..... 5-18

 Access 5-19

 907.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide access to roadless areas. 5-19

 Beyond narrow corridors along a few major roads 5-19

 To the boundaries of roadless areas 5-20

 908.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow the presence of an endangered species to block access to lands..... 5-20

 909.Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit new road construction and regulate commercial ventures, but continue to allow access on existing routes. 5-20

910.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not penalize the whole population because of the irresponsible actions of a few. 5-21

911.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule does not affect access. 5-21

 To Alaska’s national forests, because there is unique marine access 5-21

Adequacy of Analysis 5-21

912.Public Concern: The Forest Service should document visitor usage on forest travelways. 5-21

913.Public Concern: The Forest Service should use the FS-643 Roads Analysis publication. 5-22

 To determine the specific values of each motorized road and trail..... 5-22

914.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the impacts of roads described in “Conservation Biology.” 5-22

915.Public Concern: The Forest Service should carefully examine and evaluate the entire road system. 5-22

 For effective long-term management 5-22

 By evaluating the use of each road 5-22

 To determine which existing roads are needed for effective long-term management, what new roads should be built, and which roads should be obliterated 5-22

 To determine the environmental effects of the routes in their current conditions 5-23

 Through individual forest plans 5-23

 In North Dakota 5-23

916.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the evaluation of road impacts in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule is flawed. 5-23

 Because most roads in roadless areas are temporary roads 5-23

917.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the analysis on road impacts in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule is adequate. 5-23

918.Public Concern: The Forest Service should compare the effects of roads with other less intrusive access and recognize the basic principles of ecology. 5-24

919.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address benefits to the Appalachian National Scenic Trail. 5-24

 For roadless areas in the vicinity of the trail 5-24

920.Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that if an illegally created route is to be reclassified as a trail, it must first undergo site-specific, National Environmental Policy Act analysis. 5-24

 To gain classified status under the trail system 5-24

Funding 5-24

921.Public Concern: The Forest Service should increase the budget to fix the road system, restore degraded areas, and impose much

stricter standards on any new road construction in the Tongass National Forest. 5-24

If the Tongass National Forest is exempted from a national roadless rule..... 5-24

922.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allocate funds according to specific road priority. 5-24

923.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not charge fees for road use..... 5-25

924.Public Concern: The Forest Service should request funding to support trail programs..... 5-25

Travelways..... 5-25

925.Public Concern: The Forest Service should remember the purpose of the national forest transportation system. 5-25

To support management activities and access needs into the foreseeable future..... 5-25

926.Public Concern: The Forest Service should base road management decisions on the individual merits of each travelway..... 5-25

Because the cumulative effects of not analyzing each road and trail are significant 5-25

927.Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish a multiple use review board to guide travel management decisions. 5-25

928.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow only temporary access ways in roadless areas. 5-26

Which are obliterated within a year of construction 5-26

929.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not be responsible for road and trail management..... 5-26

930.Public Concern: The Forest Service should make parking areas available. 5-26

Roads..... 5-26

931.Public Concern: The Forest Service should incorporate management directions for public roads which are under the jurisdiction of local governments..... 5-26

932.Public Concern: The Forest Service should give due consideration to the position of local authorities regarding road rights..... 5-26

933.Public Concern: The Forest Service should respect states’ section line laws. 5-26

North Dakota’s laws..... 5-26

934.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address roads which appear on older system maps, roads which are of local importance, and Revised Statute 2477 rights-of-way. 5-27

935.Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge the existence of every access road..... 5-27

936.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not imply there are more roads than there are. 5-27

937.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider temporary/short-term roads for non-timber management objectives.5-28
 Such as wildlife habitat improvement projects, fuel treatments, preventative treatments for insect and disease problems, etc.....5-28

938.Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule does not close roads or prevent the construction of new roads in already roaded areas.5-28

939.Public Concern: The Forest Service should approve the location of roads at the national level.....5-28
 Following proposals from local authorities5-28

940.Public Concern: The Forest Service should place the burden of proof on those proposing roads as roadless areas are evaluated.5-28

Trails.....5-28

941.Public Concern: The Forest Service should explain how trail rules work with roadless designation.....5-28

942.Public Concern: The Forest Service should rotate trails in roadless areas.5-28
 To prevent resource damage5-28

943.Public Concern: The Forest Service should stop turning existing trails into roads.5-29
 To restore traditional uses.....5-29

944.Public Concern: The Forest Service should eliminate the 50-inch trail rule.....5-29

945.Public Concern: The Forest Service should reconsider its elimination of the 40-inch rule.....5-29
 And restore traditional trails that have been damaged by off-road vehicles5-29

946.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that trails which are not authorized through a public planning process are illegal.5-29

Road/Trail Construction5-29

Road/Trail Construction General5-31

947.Public Concern: The Forest Service should construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails.....5-31
 As required by the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act.5-31

Funding.....5-31

948.Public Concern: The Forest Service should tell the truth regarding the availability of funds for road construction.....5-31

949.Public Concern: The Forest Service should revise the way the accounting department handles road construction.5-31
 By calculating depreciation over the life of the road5-31

950.Public Concern: The Forest Service should shift funding priority to trail construction and maintenance.....5-31

951.Public Concern: The Forest Service should divide Green Sticker and gasoline tax funds equally between management costs and new trail costs. 5-32

Road Construction 5-32

952.Public Concern: The Forest Service should determine needed road construction at the local level..... 5-32

Based on situation and need 5-32

953.Public Concern: The Forest Service should examine the need for new road construction on a case-by-case basis. 5-32

By ecologists unassociated with the agency or commodity interests.... 5-32

954.Public Concern: The Forest Service should specify whether road construction and reconstruction in other unroaded areas is to be under the jurisdiction of local land managers..... 5-32

955.Public Concern: The Forest Service should complete a management plan for existing roads before banning new road construction. 5-32

956.Public Concern: The Forest Service should revise its discussion of roads in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule Draft EIS to reflect current improvements in road construction and maintenance. 5-32

957.Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas. .. 5-33

To reduce the backlog of improperly constructed roads 5-33

Allow Road Construction..... 5-33

958.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow road construction and maintenance in roadless areas. 5-33

To provide access to users..... 5-33

To disperse recreation users 5-33

To spare local governments the cost of repairs to maintain needed access to utility sites..... 5-33

To provide access for non-timber forest product gathering 5-34

When needed to add to the transportation infrastructure that is essential to the security and economic health of the nation 5-34

Under specific exceptions..... 5-34

Both permanent and temporary roads 5-35

Two-track roads..... 5-35

When needed for public safety 5-35

In Central Utah 5-36

959.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use the maintenance backlog as an excuse to forego road construction. 5-36

Do Not Allow/Restrict Road Construction..... 5-36

960.Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit road construction in roadless areas. 5-36

Because roads lead to increased active management 5-37

Because roads lead to increased natural resource use..... 5-37

Because roads lead to excessive gathering 5-37

Because roads lead to increased motorized use 5-37

Because roads lead to increased illegal activity 5-37

Because roads provide an avenue for abusive human behavior..... 5-37

Because increased access will lead to increased need for rescue operations 5-38

Because roads contribute to trail destruction 5-38

Because roads contribute to landslide danger 5-38

Because the difficult terrain in most roadless areas impedes road construction..... 5-38

Because the Forest Service lacks the funding to maintain existing roads 5-39

In sensitive areas 5-40

Near wilderness areas 5-40

Once inventoried areas are mapped accurately..... 5-40

Until new forest plans are in place 5-40

Until the Agency is able to better manage the existing road network 5-40

Allow Trail Construction 5-40

961.Public Concern: The Forest Service should construct more recreational trails. 5-40

962.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow trail construction. ... 5-40

 Rather than road construction 5-40

 Less than six feet wide 5-40

963.Public Concern: The Forest Service should turn unneeded roads into less damaging trails. 5-40

964.Public Concern: The Forest Service should reroute “problem” trails rather than close them..... 5-41

965.Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish connector trails..... 5-41

 To avoid dead-end trails..... 5-41

966.Public Concern: The Forest Service should construct hiking paths and trail shelters. 5-41

 Rather than roads 5-41

967.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow trail users to construct trails. 5-41

 Because the Forest Service is unable to construct them efficiently..... 5-41

968.Public Concern: The Forest Service should work with off-road vehicle users in developing and maintaining trails..... 5-41

 To ensure environmentally responsible usage and rider safety and satisfaction 5-41

Road/Trail Maintenance/Reconstruction 5-41

Road/Trail Maintenance/Reconstruction General 5-42

 969.Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish a uniform checklist and a clearly defined process to govern road and trail maintenance..... 5-42

Funding..... 5-42

 970.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide adequate funding for road maintenance..... 5-42

 By using national highway gas tax funds 5-43

971.Public Concern: The Forest Service should eliminate all road maintenance backlogs. 5-43
 By reprioritizing funding 5-43
 By considering cost-saving measures for maintenance..... 5-43
 972.Public Concern: The Forest Service should tie adequate road maintenance funding to best management practices for timber removal. 5-43
 973.Public Concern: The Forest Service should justify its claim that there is an \$8.6 billion road maintenance backlog. 5-43
 974.Public Concern: The Forest Service should seek funding for trail maintenance from states. 5-43
Road Maintenance/Reconstruction 5-44
 975.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide new direction for road maintenance. 5-44
 In the Forest Service Manual..... 5-44
 976.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify what road restoration activities will be allowed under the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 5-44
 For roads significantly damaged by natural hazards 5-44
 977.Public Concern: The Forest Service should address road maintenance needs in the Tongass National Forest..... 5-44
 978.Public Concern: The Forest Service should sign unmaintained roads indicating user liability. 5-45
Allow Road Maintenance/Reconstruction..... 5-45
 979.Public Concern: The Forest Service should maintain existing roads..... 5-45
 By rerouting roads that are causing damage..... 5-45
 By waterproofing needed roads..... 5-45
 By bringing roads up to standard..... 5-45
 980.Public Concern: The Forest Service should maintain roads that charge special use fees. 5-45
 981.Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow off-highway clubs to maintain roads that counties and states cannot. 5-45
 Because too much land and roads have been taken from the people..... 5-45
 982.Public Concern: The Forest Service should assist Permit Holders in road maintenance. 5-46
Allow Trail Maintenance/Reconstruction 5-46
 983.Public Concern: The Forest Service should maintain all existing trails in the Forest Service trail inventory. 5-46
 As part of a conservation process 5-46
 984.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clear trails early in the year..... 5-46
 To ensure maximum access and reduction of damage 5-46
Road/Trail Closure/Obliteration/Restoration 5-46
 Road/Trail Closure/Obliteration/Restoration General..... 5-47

985.Public Concern: The Forest Service should close all user-created routes. 5-47
 Until site-specific analysis can be completed to determine what status they should have 5-47

986.Public Concern: The Forest Service should obliterate non-system roads and trails. 5-47
 After they are adequately mapped 5-47
 To avoid unintentional trespassing 5-47

987.Public Concern: The Forest Service should work with off-road vehicle groups. 5-48
 To avoid unnecessary road or trail closures 5-48

988.Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide adequate signs to indicate that a road or trail has been closed..... 5-48
 Signs should state a legitimate reason for the closure 5-48

Funding..... 5-48

989.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not close roads that it does not have the funding to maintain..... 5-48

Road Closure/Obliteration/Restoration 5-48

990.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify the evaluation process for closing unclassified roads. 5-48

991.Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider public comment before closing roads. 5-49

992.Public Concern: The Forest Service should not include roads associated with mining activities in the backlog of roads needing to be reclaimed..... 5-49
 Due to the requirements for reclamation under federal and state regulation 5-49

993.Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that, absent recreational needs, roads built for timber removal could be closed after logging..... 5-49
 Because roads built solely for logging do not require the high construction standards necessary for roads which serve recreational purposes..... 5-49

994.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify whether certain roads will be closed due to their roadless designation..... 5-50
 The road near southern Arizona’s Pena Blanca Lake 5-50

995.Public Concern: The Forest Service should reconsider decisions that turned specific existing roads into trails. 5-50
 Trail 67 5-50

Allow Road Closure/Obliteration/Restoration..... 5-50

996.Public Concern: The Forest Service should decommission existing roads. 5-50

997.Public Concern: The Forest Service should eliminate from the travel plan roads that are not currently shown on maps. 5-51

998.Public Concern: The Forest Service should clearly state in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule that any road constructed in

compliance with the exceptions must be closed and rehabilitated
as soon as possible. 5-51

Do Not Allow/Restrict Road Closure/Obliteration/Restoration..... 5-51

999. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not decommission
existing roads..... 5-51

Roads that are main arteries to other areas 5-51

Because access to large areas disperses impact..... 5-51

In association with other actions..... 5-51

1000. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use the fact
that roads are not maintained properly as an excuse to
decommission them..... 5-52

Because primitive tracks are more fun to drive than high-speed
routes 5-52

1001. Public Concern: The Forest Service should remove all gates
on federal land..... 5-52

1002. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not obliterate
bridges..... 5-52

Where roads are already present 5-52

Natural Resources General 5-52

Natural Resources Management General..... 5-53

1003. Public Concern: The Forest Service should responsibly
manage natural resources. 5-53

As an impartial advocate for the public good..... 5-53

To protect areas not yet damaged..... 5-53

To preserve resources fundamental to our survival..... 5-54

To sustain the population and ecological balance of the planet 5-54

By managing non-wilderness lands with varying degrees of
intensity, depending on resource potential 5-54

1004. Public Concern: The Forest Service should make sound
resource management decisions..... 5-54

Based on science 5-54

Based on expert opinion..... 5-54

Based on new technology 5-54

Based on best management practices 5-55

1005. Public Concern: The Forest Service should promote future
sustainable yields in management of roadless areas. 5-55

By implementing sustainable management practices..... 5-55

By defining areas where sustained yield will be the management
objective 5-55

By harvesting areas that have already been cultivated 5-55

By shifting to forestry practices outlined by the Pacific Northwest
Research Station..... 5-55

1006. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prevent further
degradation of roadless areas and natural resources..... 5-55

By encouraging conservation and recycling 5-56

By developing alternative forms of energy..... 5-56

1007. Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide national oversight of forest management. 5-57
 In deciding where timber sales and other commercial operations can take place 5-57

1008. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that roadless areas account for very little of the nation’s timber, oil, and gas resources. 5-57

1009. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that allowing active management sets the precedent for more resource removal. 5-58

1010. Public Concern: The Forest Service should support legislation that regulates natural resource consumption. 5-58

1011. Public Concern: The Forest Service should reach decisions on development proposals in a timely manner. 5-58

1012. Public Concern: The Forest Service should limit active management while accommodating reasonable local practices. 5-58

1013. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule will make it difficult to meet resource requirements for the future. 5-59

1014. Public Concern: The Forest Service should monitor resource use. 5-59
 Maintain access so the public can monitor resource management 5-59

1015. Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop a national roadless rule. 5-59
 Because it will stimulate new industry innovations 5-59

Adequacy of Analysis 5-59

1016. Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate the cumulative impacts of road closures. 5-59
 On fire and timber management, and firewood gathering 5-59

1017. Public Concern: The Forest Service should determine when land use activities are approaching a management threshold. 5-60
 A threshold established in the forest plan to ensure resource sustainability and maintenance of land management continuity. 5-60

Funding 5-60

1018. Public Concern: The Forest Service should fund the development of better technology. 5-60
 To aid in resource conservation 5-60

Allow Active Natural Resource Management 5-60

1019. Public Concern: The Forest Service should construct temporary roads for resource management activities. 5-60

1020. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow regulated removal of forest products. 5-61
 Which does not require road building or inflict environmental damage, such as ginseng and morel harvest. 5-61

Do Not Allow/Restrict Active Natural Resource Management 5-61

1021. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit resource removal in roadless areas..... 5-61

 Because of overwhelming public support for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 5-61

 Because industrial exploration and wilderness preservation are mutually exclusive 5-61

 Because of the need to act for the long term..... 5-62

 Because of the intrinsic value of forests 5-62

 By adding a supplemental prohibition to the existing Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 5-62

1022. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use maintenance of private property access as an excuse to allow resource removal..... 5-63

1023. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that commodity production is not the best use of public lands..... 5-63

 Due to the harsh conditions in many roadless areas 5-63

1024. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit the removal of forest products. 5-63

 Natural materials 5-63

 Secondary forest products..... 5-63

1025. Public Concern: The Forest Service should replace logging and mining with environmentally sound alternatives..... 5-63

1026. Public Concern: The Forest Service should close land previously opened to commercial interests..... 5-64

 Because it is time to stop destroying our natural resources 5-64

1027. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit gardening of vegetation for commercial purposes. 5-64

Timber Removal..... 5-64

Timber Removal General..... 5-66

 1028. Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 5-66

 To provide forestry professionals with adequate timber removal options..... 5-66

 1029. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that keeping roadless areas in the timberland base allows the over-cutting of more productive land..... 5-66

 1030. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that timber companies have an adequate timber supply..... 5-66

 Their largest concerns are foreign competition and a glutted market ... 5-66

 1031. Public Concern: The Forest Service should collaborate with timber companies. 5-66

 In the use of sustainable timber practices 5-66

 1032. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that if it allows timber removal in roadless areas only by skid roads, it will not allow timber removal for long. 5-67

 Due to the environmental damage caused by skid roads 5-67

1033. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider public comment prior to timber sales. 5-67

1034. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that most roadless areas are unsuitable for timber removal. 5-67
 Because they are steep, remote, and the trees have little commercial value 5-67

1035. Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule would decrease timber removal on federal lands by only two percent. 5-68

1036. Public Concern: The Forest Service should replant clear-cut areas. 5-68
 To avoid harvesting other areas 5-68

1037. Public Concern: The Forest Service should monitor timber removal. 5-68

1038. Public Concern: The Forest Service should encourage the development of alternatives to wood. 5-68

1039. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the conflict of interest involved in its management of timber. 5-69

1040. Public Concern: The Forest Service should explain why it is preparing and implementing timber removal projects in roadless areas. 5-69
 Given its expressed commitment to conserving wild forests 5-69

Adequacy of Analysis 5-69

1041. Public Concern: The Forest Service should analyze the impacts of removing land from sustained yield management. 5-69

1042. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not evaluate timber removal during roadless evaluation 5-69

1043. Public Concern: The Forest Service should analyze the impact of timber sales on lands adjacent to roadless areas. 5-69

1044. Public Concern: The Forest Service should require logging companies to perform environmental impact studies. 5-69
 To prevent environmental damage 5-69

Funding 5-69

1045. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not charge a fee for dead timber gathering permits. 5-69

1046. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not sell fiber. 5-70
 Chip the brush and leave it on the forest. 5-70

Allow Timber Removal 5-70

1047. Public Concern: The Forest Service should permit timber removal in roadless areas. 5-70
 Because it would require more acres elsewhere to replace the timber volume. 5-70
 Because of the centrality of wood products to our culture 5-70
 To sustain turkey farms 5-70
 As part of ecological restoration efforts 5-70

As long as the Forest Service replaces each harvested tree with five planted trees 5-71

As long as it is not commercialized..... 5-71

1048. Public Concern: The Forest Service should permit timber removal by various methods. 5-71

 With roads 5-71

 Through a harvesting system that does not require additional roads ... 5-71

 Through the construction of temporary logging railroads..... 5-71

 By helicopter..... 5-72

 By horse 5-72

 By elephant 5-72

 Harvest saw logs and small trees 5-72

 Harvest small-diameter timber from roaded areas 5-72

 Selective timber removal 5-72

 Salvage timber removal..... 5-73

1049. Public Concern: The Forest Service should permit timber removal in certain areas. 5-73

 In Wisconsin 5-73

 In Sierra County 5-73

 In roaded areas of the Tongass National Forest 5-73

 In the Rogue River/Siskiyou National Forest 5-74

 On private lands 5-74

 Only in areas that are already accessible by existing roads 5-74

1050. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider a categorical exclusion for some routine activities. 5-75

 Such as timber removal..... 5-75

1051. Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement existing forest plans. 5-75

 To meet harvest levels adopted during the forest planning process..... 5-75

1052. Public Concern: The Forest Service should support a sustainable timber industry. 5-75

 By supporting sustainable timber removal practices..... 5-75

 By managing second growth in the Tongass National Forest..... 5-75

 By removing restrictions and limitations 5-75

1053. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow timber removal on other forest lands to replace lost timber volumes due to roadless designations. 5-76

 In Oregon 5-76

1054. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not place restrictions on timber removal on privately owned forest lands adjacent to state and national forests. 5-76

 Because the Forest Service’s refusal to thin National Forest System lands will result in more wildfires 5-76

1055. Public Concern: The Forest Service should enlist the public to help clear and thin the forests..... 5-76

 As it promotes community and cultural involvement..... 5-76

1056. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow wood gathering in roadless areas. 5-76
Do Not Allow/Restrict Timber Removal..... 5-77

1057. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit timber removal in roadless areas. 5-77
 During the ANPR comment period 5-77

1058. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit all timber removal methods..... 5-77
 Helicopter logging 5-77
 Salvage logging..... 5-77
 Clear cutting 5-77

1059. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit timber removal in certain areas. 5-78
 In Washington State 5-78
 In areas containing less than 50 percent suitable timber base..... 5-78
 In the Skykiomish Wild Country..... 5-78

1060. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit timber companies from harvesting virgin timber on National Forest System lands..... 5-78

1061. Public Concern: The Forest Service should stop preparing timber sales in the Tongass National Forest. 5-78
 Which are in violation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 5-78
 On Prince of Wales and Gravina Islands 5-79

1062. Public Concern: The Forest Service should adjust the annual sale quantity downward. 5-79
 To prevent further biological and recreational problems in roaded areas 5-79
 To reflect the interests of special interest groups and small scale gatherers 5-79

1063. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit wood gathering in roadless areas. 5-79
 Unless the area is a buffer zone..... 5-79

Mining, Oil, and Gas Development 5-79
Mining, Oil, and Gas Development General 5-81

1064. Public Concern: The Forest Service should revise management of mining leases in inventoried roadless areas. 5-81

1065. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 5-81
 Because it will make mineral exploration less feasible 5-81
 Because it will make mineral exploration impossible..... 5-82

1066. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 obviates the need to apply the Roadless Area Conservation Rule to coal mining..... 5-82

1067. Public Concern: The Forest Service should exclude mining lease renewal and modification from application of a roadless designation. 5-83

1068. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that oil and gas leasing is not a project-level decision requiring additional National Environmental Policy Act analysis. 5-84

1069. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address short-term safety issues regarding mining activities..... 5-84
Until the Roadless Area Conservation Rule is finalized..... 5-84

1070. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not subject existing mining leases to communalization agreements. 5-84

1071. Public Concern: The Forest Service should hold companies responsible for environmental damage from oil and gas development. 5-84

1072. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the efforts of the mining industry to preserve the environment and beauty of the grasslands..... 5-84

Adequacy of Analysis..... 5-84

1073. Public Concern: The Forest Service should improve post-plan monitoring of oil and gas developments. 5-84
include development of an inventory of resource data 5-84

1074. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prepare a reasonably foreseeable development scenario for analysis of effects of oil and gas development. 5-85
Which analyzes the net effect of long-term surface disturbance rather than the number of wells to be drilled..... 5-85

1075. Public Concern: The Forest Service should obtain input from the Bureau of Land Management regarding leasing areas included in the roadless inventory..... 5-86

1076. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the amount of oil reserves which lie under National Forest System lands. 5-86

1077. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use accurate data to estimate the percentage of coal that comes from National Forest System lands..... 5-87

1078. Public Concern: The Forest Service should analyze oil and gas resource potential in roadless areas. 5-87
Through a public lands inventory of hydrocarbon potential 5-88

1079. Public Concern: The Forest Service should accurately assess the impact of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule on energy potential. 5-88
On the Little Missouri National Grassland 5-88
In Wyoming 5-88

1080. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the overall process of mineral exploration. 5-88

Through detailed studies addressing mineral potential in roadless areas 5-88

1081. Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide a legal review to determine whether the Roadless Area Conservation Rule can prohibit access to mining claims. 5-89

1082. Public Concern: The Forest Service should justify its claim that inventoried roadless areas would be among the last areas entered for exploration and development. 5-89

Allow Mining, Oil, and Gas Development..... 5-89

1083. Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure access for mining 5-89

 As required by law..... 5-89

 As required by the Forest Service Manual and Regulations 5-89

 Except in wilderness areas..... 5-90

1084. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow mineral, oil, and gas exploration and extraction in roadless areas..... 5-90

 To help lower the costs of fuel in the United States 5-91

 Because hardrock minerals are critical components for defense technologies 5-91

 Only if companies agree to clean up existing super-fund sites..... 5-91

1085. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow mineral, oil, and gas exploration and extraction by various methods..... 5-91

 By slant drilling or other techniques which do not disturb the surface ... 5-91

 By manual means only 5-91

1086. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow mineral, oil, and gas exploration and extraction in certain areas. 5-91

 In the Rocky Mountains..... 5-91

 In the Rocky Mountain States 5-91

 In Colorado and Utah 5-92

 In Utah 5-92

 In the national monument in Utah 5-93

 In the Manti LaSal National Forest 5-93

 In Montana 5-93

 In North Dakota 5-93

 In the Dakota Prairie Grasslands 5-93

 In Alaska 5-94

 In the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness..... 5-94

 In Big Springs and Jerrit Canyon..... 5-94

 By mining operations controlled by the Stillwater Mining Company 5-94

 By mining operations controlled by Burlington Resources Oil and Gas Company I.P. 5-95

1087. Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify that mining leases issued by the Bureau of Land Management will not be affected by the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 5-95

 In Gunnison County 5-95

1088. Public Concern: The Forest Service should exempt geothermal leases from the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 5-95
 Including new geothermal resource areas identified by the Bureau of Land Management..... 5-95
Do Not Allow/Restrict Mining, Oil, and Gas Development..... 5-96

1089. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow mineral exploration in roadless areas. 5-96

1090. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow mineral exploration by various methods. 5-97
 Acid mine draining 5-97
 Gold mining techniques 5-97
 Recreational mining 5-97

1091. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow mineral exploration in certain areas..... 5-97
 In the Tongass National Forest 5-97
 In the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest 5-97
 In the southern Appalachians 5-97
 In North Dakota 5-98
 In the George Washington and Jefferson National Forests 5-98

1092. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit mining activities in roadless areas..... 5-98
 Due to the asbestos fibers carried by miners into homes and towns.... 5-98

1093. Public Concern: The Forest Service should revoke inactive mining claims. 5-98

1094. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit drilling in the National Forest System..... 5-99
 In the New York National Fingerlakes Forest region 5-99

1095. Public Concern: The Forest Service should oppose oil drilling in the Alaska National Arctic Wildlife Refuge. 5-99
 Because it will not provide long-term benefits 5-99

Grazing..... 5-99
Grazing General..... 5-100

1096. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address how grazing in roadless areas will be handled in the future. 5-100

1097. Public Concern: The Forest Service should insist that ranchers accept the risk that their herds will be subject to natural predators... 5-100
 By not demanding that predators be destroyed or relocated 5-100

1098. Public Concern: The Forest Service should analyze the impact of roadless designations on rangeland health and management..... 5-100
 In the national grasslands..... 5-100

1099. Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that grazing rights do not automatically go to the same rancher every decade. 5-100

Funding..... 5-101

1100. Public Concern: The Forest Service should sell unneeded grazing land. 5-101
 To people who hold leases..... 5-101

Allow Grazing..... 5-101

1101. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow grazing in roadless areas..... 5-101

 To prevent fuels from accumulating 5-101

 By including specific statements to that effect in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 5-101

 In North Dakota 5-101

1102. Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect access to livestock and range facilities 5-101

Do Not Allow/Restrict Grazing 5-102

1103. Public Concern: The Forest Service should regulate grazing in roadless areas..... 5-102

 In riparian areas and recreational campsites..... 5-102

1104. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow grazing on National Forest System lands..... 5-102

 Because of environmental damage..... 5-102

1105. Public Concern: The Forest Service should restrict off-road vehicle use by ranchers on National Forest System lands. 5-102

 For the purpose of monitoring livestock 5-102

Utility Corridors 5-102

Utilities General 5-103

1106. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consult with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Federal Communications Commission regarding the effects of proposed regulation on public utilities. 5-103

 To ensure acknowledgement of existing rights-of-way..... 5-103

Allow Utilities..... 5-103

1107. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow power line construction in roadless areas..... 5-103

1108. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow access to power lines and hydroelectric facilities. 5-103

 Through the construction of temporary roads..... 5-103

 Facilities controlled by The Tennessee Valley Authority 5-103

1109. Public Concern: The Forest Service should maintain existing roads. 5-104

 To allow local governments access to their water systems 5-104

 Raywood Flat Area..... 5-104

1110. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow motorized vehicles in roadless areas. 5-105

 To maintain water system structures..... 5-105

Do Not Allow/Restrict Utilities 5-105

1111. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit power-lines and pipelines in roadless areas. 5-105

1112. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit the construction of wireless telecommunications facilities. 5-105

1113. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit hydroelectric facilities in roadless areas. 5-106

1114. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow maintenance of existing dams. 5-106

1115. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit water extraction from roadless areas..... 5-106

1116. Public Concern: The Forest Service should limit water withdrawal that threatens to lower the water table. 5-106

Other Natural Resource Concerns 5-106

1117. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize the possible medicinal values available in forest products..... 5-106

1118. Public Concern: The Forest Service should revise the leasing process. 5-106

To allow more equitable expense sharing 5-106

1119. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit various activities in roadless areas..... 5-107

Construction of commercial facilities 5-107

Dumping of waste materials 5-107

Nuclear testing, power generation, and eco-terrorism 5-107

Nuclear waste storage..... 5-107

1120. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the most effective use of grasslands is food production. 5-107

Recreation General 5-108

Recreation Management General 5-109

1121. Public Concern: The Forest Service should take a leadership position in managing National Forest System lands. 5-109

Because it has a statutory duty to provide outdoor recreation opportunities to the public under the National Forest Management Act 5-109

1122. Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge that its goal is to provide the maximum amount of recreational opportunities. 5-109

As long as they do not cause significant, irreversible harm 5-109

1123. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider various recreational values..... 5-110

Non-wilderness, semi-primitive, motorized, and non-motorized 5-110

The value of dispersed recreation 5-110

1124. Public Concern: The Forest Service should devote more attention to recreation planning..... 5-110

Especially in the Tongass National Forest..... 5-110

1125. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage roadless areas for primitive recreation. 5-110

1126. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage to reduce fuel loading and wildfire risk..... 5-110

Because of its devastating impacts on recreational opportunities 5-110

1127. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.5-111
 Because it does not adequately consider recreation.....5-111
 Because it will be overly restrictive toward recreation uses.....5-111

1128. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage roadless areas to reduce recreation pressures on designated wilderness areas.5-111
 By providing non-motorized recreational opportunities5-111
 By providing for a wider variety of activities, including motorized.....5-111

1129. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage for multiple use.5-112
 To promote recreational diversity5-112

1130. Public Concern: The Forest Service should open non-wilderness areas to dispersed recreation.5-112
 Including roadless areas5-112

1131. Public Concern: The Forest Service should encourage recreational development of private lands.5-112
 To enhance recreation opportunities on public lands5-112

1132. Public Concern: The Forest Service should emulate the Ten Lakes Roadless Area management.....5-112

1133. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prepare a Winter Recreation Use Plan as part of the forest planning process.5-113
 To develop a system of land use allocations.....5-113

Adequacy of Analysis5-113

1134. Public Concern: The Forest Service should acquire data on the increasing recreational use of National Forest System lands.5-113

1135. Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate recreation potential in roadless areas.....5-113
 By using accurate maps5-113

1136. Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide an evaluation of seasonal suitability for various activities.....5-113
 Including motorized and non-motorized recreation5-113

Funding.....5-113

1137. Public Concern: The Forest Service should request adequate funding for recreational programs.....5-113
 In order to maintain recreational facilities without visitor fees.....5-114

1138. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use money allocated for roads to fund recreational facilities.....5-114

1139. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use funds from timber sales to build new recreational facilities.....5-114

Recreation Access.....5-114

1140. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not restrict recreation access to National Forest System lands.....5-114
 By ensuring no net loss to public land and public access5-114

1141. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow access to roadless areas by local citizens.....5-115

As the only exception to access restrictions 5-115

1142. Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure equal
access among different user groups..... 5-115

1143. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allocate land
acreage proportionally based on numbers of users for each
activity..... 5-115

Balanced with a need and cost/benefit analysis 5-115

1144. Public Concern: The Forest Service should grant proportional
access among user groups based on need for solitude..... 5-115

Allocate more land area for non-motorized users..... 5-115

1145. Public Concern: The Forest Service should take into
consideration the available opportunities for activities on other
public lands when making allocation decisions..... 5-116

User Conflicts..... 5-116

1146. Public Concern: The Forest Service should designate separate
areas for competing uses. 5-116

To minimize user conflicts 5-116

For non-motorized and motorized uses 5-116

For different motorized uses..... 5-117

That allow motorized users to view non-motorized areas..... 5-117

By adjusting roadless area boundary lines 5-117

1147. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not confuse use
conflicts with user conflicts..... 5-117

1148. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow activities
according to the landscape’s ability to tolerate them. 5-118

1149. Public Concern: The Forest Service should alleviate crowding... 5-118

By making more land available for recreation..... 5-118

By implementing the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 5-118

Motorized Recreation 5-119

Motorized Recreation General 5-120

1150. Public Concern: The Forest Service should require local forest
managers to determine the appropriate use of motorized vehicles... 5-120

Based on science rather than socio-economic factors 5-120

1151. Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement rules on
proper and responsible motorized use..... 5-120

To allow access to private and public lands 5-120

1152. Public Concern: The Forest Service should create a standard
signing convention. 5-120

To avoid confusion regarding seasonal motor vehicle restrictions 5-120

Adequacy of Analysis..... 5-121

1153. Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate the type
of motorized experiences desired by users. 5-121

1154. Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate the
available mileage of off-road vehicle trails versus the available
mileage of non-motorized trails and cross-country opportunities. 5-121

1155. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the current level of motorized recreation on classified and unclassified roads within roadless areas.....5-121
 In order to assess the costs of closing these areas and concentrating use in other areas5-121

1156. Public Concern: The Forest Service should include accurate emissions readings in EISs.5-121

Education..... 5-121

1157. Public Concern: The Forest Service should educate the public. ..5-121
 About responsible motorized recreation.....5-121

Cumulative Impacts on Motorized Recreationists..... 5-122

1158. Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate the cumulative impacts to motorized users of reduced motorized access.5-122
 In conjunction with other management proposals5-122
 Include the impacts of all past motorized closures and road and trail obliterations.....5-123
 Include impacts of motorized closures as a result of wildfire.....5-123
 Include impacts associated with environmental justice5-123
 Include negative economic impacts5-123

1159. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.5-123
 Because it unfairly impacts motorized users5-123
 Because roadless status will trump existing forest designations5-124

1160. Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop a management alternative which incorporates all existing motorized roads and trails and restricts motorized travel to those travelways. ..5-124
 To avoid contributing to further cumulative impacts on motorized recreationists.....5-124

1161. Public Concern: The Forest Service should close certain areas to prevent user-created trails while allowing use of existing motorized routes.....5-124
 Because the cumulative impacts of the travel plan and the rulemaking process on motorized recreationists have been significant5-124

1162. Public Concern: The Forest Service should reclassify roadways to restricted-width or unrestricted-width motorized trails. ..5-124
 To avoid contributing to the cumulative impacts on motorized recreation5-124

Allow Motorized Recreation 5-125

1163. Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop a comprehensive inventory of all existing motorized routes.5-125
 To assist in preserving motorized access.....5-125

1164. Public Concern: The Forest Service should designate land for motorized and mechanized access.5-125
 Where environmental damage will be minimal.....5-125

1165. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow motorized vehicles in roadless areas.....	5-125
Motorcycles	5-125
Six or eight wheeled vehicles	5-125
Battery-operated vehicles for the handicapped	5-126
To access and maintain grazing areas	5-126
To carry out big game for processing	5-126
Depending on the terrain in the area	5-126
As required by the National Environmental Policy Act.....	5-126
1166. Public Concern: The Forest Service should enhance opportunities for motorized recreation.	5-126
1167. Public Concern: The Forest Service should revise Management Areas 11 and 12 to allow motorized recreation.	5-126
1168. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use disturbance of wildlife as a reason to deny motorized access.	5-127
Because studies have shown that hikers disturb wildlife more than motorized visitors.....	5-127
1169. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow airplanes in roadless areas.	5-127
Those that can land on water	5-127
By maintaining primitive backcountry airstrips.....	5-127
By maintaining airstrips at ranger stations.....	5-127
1170. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow competitive motorized events in roadless areas.	5-128
<i>Do Not Allow/Restrict Motorized Recreation</i>	5-128
1171. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit motorized vehicles in roadless areas.....	5-128
Two-cycle engines.....	5-128
Gasoline, diesel, and alcohol engines	5-128
Vehicles that require more than a single track.....	5-129
On new but closed roads.....	5-129
To eliminate user created trails	5-129
Due to increased vandalism and crime.....	5-129
Due to animal harrassment	5-129
Due to increased wildfire danger	5-129
1172. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit helicopters and airplanes in roadless areas.....	5-129
1173. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit powerboats in roadless areas.....	5-129
<i>Other</i>	5-130
1174. Public Concern: The Forest Service should seize vehicles that violate regulations in wilderness areas.	5-130
1175. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit the development of recreational vehicle parks.....	5-130
1176. Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify how roadless area designation would impact backcountry airstrips.	5-130

Motorized Recreation – Off-Road Vehicles5-130

Off-Road Vehicles General5-131

 1177. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use Executive Order 11909 as a management tool to govern management of off-road vehicles.5-131

 To maintain resources while providing diverse off-road vehicle recreational opportunities5-131

Funding.....5-131

 1178. Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop a plan to use gas tax money to address the needs of off-highway vehicle recreationists.5-131

 1179. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use funds to enforce the exclusion of off-road vehicles from nondesignated areas.5-131

Allow Off-Road Vehicles5-132

 1180. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow off-road vehicle use in roadless areas.5-132

 Because both user conflicts and environmental damage are minimal.....5-132

 Allow off-road vehicles not licensed for the street5-132

 In California5-132

Do Not Allow/Restrict Off-Road Vehicles5-132

 1181. Public Concern: The Forest Service should restrict off-road vehicle use.5-132

 By requiring off-road vehicle users to have permits5-132

 1182. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit off-road vehicles in inventoried roadless areas.....5-133

 In the Shawnee National Forest5-133

Motorized Recreation – Snowmobiles5-133

Adequacy of Analysis5-133

 1183. Public Concern: The Forest Service should reevaluate the number of user days for snowmobiling.5-133

 In Wisconsin5-133

Allow Snowmobiles5-133

 1184. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow snowmobiles in roadless areas.5-133

 Because they do not create roads and trails and their tracks melt away in the spring5-134

 In the Hiawatha National Forest5-134

Do Not Allow/Restrict Snowmobiles.....5-134

 1185. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow snowmobiles in roadless areas.5-134

Non-Motorized Recreation5-134

Non-motorized Recreation General5-135

 1186. Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge that the need for non-motorized recreation opportunities is low.5-135

Non-motorized recreation does not depend on large unroaded areas	5-135
<i>Allow Non-motorized Recreation</i>	5-135
1187. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow non-motorized activities in roadless areas.	5-135
1188. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.....	5-136
Because it will discourage hiking	5-136
1189. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow non-motorized, backcountry recreation.....	5-136
For individuals and groups of less than 12 people	5-136
<i>Do Not Allow/Restrict Non-motorized Recreation</i>	5-136
1190. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit non-motorized recreation in roadless areas.....	5-136
Jogging.....	5-136
1191. Public Concern: The Forest Service should impose a freeze on any new classification of public land as non-motorized.	5-136
Because large areas of public land currently closed to motorized recreation are severely underused	5-136
Mechanized Recreation.....	5-136
<i>Allow Mechanized Recreation</i>	5-137
1192. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow mountain biking in roadless areas.	5-137
In the Cleveland National Forest	5-137
<i>Do Not Allow/Restrict Mechanized Recreation</i>	5-137
1193. Public Concern: The Forest Service should restrict mountain biking.	5-137
In erosion-prone areas	5-137
Ski Area Development.....	5-138
<i>Ski Area Development General</i>	5-138
1194. Public Concern: The Forest Service should review ski area requests for expansion.	5-138
With a panel advisory committee.....	5-138
1195. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use specific language to clarify its position on ski area operations.....	5-139
1196. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address ski ways, ski runs, and ski trails and the use of snowcats or other off-highway vehicles in inventoried roadless areas adjacent to ski areas.....	5-139
1197. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not implement a national roadless rule that would alter current ski area special use permit rights.	5-139
1198. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow alpine skiing in roadless areas adjacent to existing ski areas.....	5-139
<i>Allow Ski Area Development</i>	5-139

1199. Public Concern: The Forest Service should permit ski area expansion.5-139

 Due to growing demand for outdoor recreation5-140

 Because ski area operations can be compatible with roadless protection5-140

 Expansions that do not require road construction5-141

1200. Public Concern: The Forest Service should permit ski area expansion in certain areas.....5-141

 In the eastern Sierra.....5-141

 In the Granite Mountain/Slab Butte area of the Payette National Forest.....5-141

 Pelican Butte5-142

 Sipapu5-142

Do Not Allow/Restrict Ski Area Development5-143

1201. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow ski area expansion.5-143

 Outside of current ski area permit boundaries.....5-143

 Because there is no need for expansion5-143

1202. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow ski area expansion in certain areas.....5-143

 In California5-143

1203. Public Concern: The Forest Service should review ski use permits and manage such areas in a more restrictive manner.5-144

Hunting and Fishing5-144

Hunting and Fishing General5-145

1204. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider hunting and fishing values.....5-145

1205. Public Concern: The Forest Service should require that hunting and fishing licenses be issued by the federal government.5-145

1206. Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas.5-145

 For game species habitat5-145

 To prevent hunting behavior problems5-145

1207. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the negative effects of roads on game species.5-146

1208. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not decommission existing roads.5-146

 Because roaded access is needed for hunting.....5-146

1209. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow timber removal for habitat management.5-147

 To maintain quality hunting and fishing5-147

Funding.....5-147

1210. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use the fees collected from hunters and anglers to benefit hunters and anglers. ..5-147

Allow Hunting and Fishing5-147

1211. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow hunting and fishing. 5-147

 By maintaining free access..... 5-148

 In wilderness areas..... 5-148

 Because people depend on the food they obtain 5-148

1212. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow hunting and fishing. 5-148

 Mountain lion hunting 5-148

 Commercial fishing 5-148

 Trapping 5-148

 Sport shooting 5-148

1213. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage fish and wildlife habitat as valuable lands that should remain open to hunters and anglers. 5-149

1214. Public Concern: The Forest Service should open closed roads for bear hunters. 5-149

 If they are opened for deer hunters 5-149

Do Not Allow/Restrict Hunting and Fishing 5-149

1215. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit hunting in roadless areas. 5-149

 Within two miles of private property..... 5-149

 Because it is not well regulated and restrictions are poorly enforced . 5-149

 Because it is not effective for wildlife management 5-150

1216. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit hunting in roadless areas. 5-150

 With dogs 5-150

 Trapping 5-150

1217. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit fishing in roadless areas. 5-150

 In areas with endangered species..... 5-150

1218. Public Concern: The Forest Service should close off-road vehicle trails to hunters. 5-150

1219. Public Concern: The Forest Service should regulate hunting..... 5-151

 By regulating the number of tags sold 5-151

 For hunting that damages predator-prey dynamics 5-151

Outfitter-Guides 5-151

Allow Outfitter-Guides 5-151

1220. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow commercial outfitters in roadless areas..... 5-151

1221. Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 5-151

 Because it will benefit outfitter-guides 5-151

Do Not Allow/Restrict Outfitter-Guides 5-152

1222. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit commercially directed group tours and expeditions. 5-152

1223. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit outfitters from charging large fees for using public lands.5-152

Equestrian Use5-152

Allow Equestrian Use.....5-152

1224. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow equestrian use in roadless areas.5-152

Horseback riding5-152

Pack animals.....5-152

1225. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow users to transport horses to existing trailheads.....5-152

1226. Public Concern: The Forest Service should preserve equestrian access in roadless areas.5-153

Through maintenance and mapping.....5-153

1227. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow historical and recreational pack and saddle stock use.....5-153

As allowed under the Wilderness Act.....5-153

Do Not Allow/Restrict Equestrian Use5-153

1228. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit equestrian use.....5-153

Horseback riding5-153

Pack animals.....5-153

In the Shawnee National Forest.....5-153

Camping/Shelters/Accommodations/etc.5-153

Camping/Shelters/Accommodations/etc. General5-154

1229. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address privatization of forest facilities.....5-154

Campgrounds.....5-154

1230. Public Concern: The Forest Service should reevaluate the use of campgrounds by private companies.5-154

Allow Camping/Shelters/Accommodations/etc......5-154

1231. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow camping in roadless areas.5-154

By expanding facilities.....5-154

1232. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow the construction and maintenance of Adirondack shelters in roadless areas.5-154

1233. Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide shelters for maintenance equipment and survival gear.5-154

1234. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow the development of small-scale tourist accommodations.5-154

Do Not Allow/Restrict Camping/Shelters/Accommodations/etc.5-155

1235. Public Concern: The Forest Service should require permits for those camping in backcountry areas.5-155

To reduce human-caused wildfire5-155

1236. Public Concern: The Forest Service should restrict camping in roadless areas.5-155

To small groups	5-155
Special Use Permits	5-155
1237. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address issues related to special use permits.	5-155
Recreation activities that are proposed, in development, or in place but which are not currently covered in special use permits	5-155
Modifications or renewals of special use permits	5-155
1238. Public Concern: The Forest Service should streamline the permit process for state agencies.	5-155
Other Recreation Concerns.....	5-156
1239. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit various activities in roadless areas.....	5-156
Sporting events	5-156
Fireworks	5-156
Dog sleds	5-156
Activities that involve cleated hiking boots.....	5-156
Golf area development	5-156
1240. Public Concern: The Forest Service should set conservative carrying capacity limits in the Western Sound.	5-156
DESIGNATING AREAS (<i>QUESTION 8</i>).....	5-157
Designating Management Categories General	5-157
1241. Public Concern: The Forest Service should base management allocations on science.....	5-158
By assigning different management prescriptions based on ecotype.	5-158
By basing levels of protection on a scientific environmental assessment	5-158
1242. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider ecosystem dynamics when creating land use designations.....	5-158
1243. Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge that Question 8 is not an either/or issue, and no changes to the Roadless Area Conservation Rule are needed.....	5-158
1244. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider a full range of management alternatives for roadless areas, not just “roadless” or “recommended wilderness.”	5-159
Both roaded and unroaded categories	5-160
Unroaded categories only.....	5-160
1245. Public Concern: The Forest Service should determine roadless area allocations on a site-specific basis.....	5-160
1246. Public Concern: The Forest Service should assign land uses that are compatible with uses being implemented by adjoining landowners.	5-161
On the Tongass National Forest.....	5-161
1247. Public Concern: The Forest Service should remove from debate the roadless areas already designated for continued protection in existing forest plans.....	5-161

1248. Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule regardless of the current land classification status of roadless areas.5-161

1249. Public Concern: The Forest Service should apply the same planning process to both roaded and roadless areas.5-161

1250. Public Concern: The Forest Service should make land use designation decisions in a timely manner.5-162

Wilderness Recommendations5-162

Wilderness Recommendations General5-163

1251. Public Concern: The Forest Service should make decisions to recommend areas to Congress for wilderness designation through the forest planning process.5-163

1252. Public Concern: The Forest Service should designate qualifying areas as wilderness study areas until Congress takes action on them.5-164

1253. Public Concern: The Forest Service should reverse its institutional resistance to recommending roadless areas for wilderness designation.5-164

1254. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow temporary withdrawal of wilderness status for resource commodity use followed by restoration to wilderness condition.5-165

 During wartime5-165

1255. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow local communities to decide whether to establish roadless and wilderness areas.....5-165

1256. Public Concern: The Forest Service should subject all wilderness recommendations to a binding vote at the county, state, and congressional district level.5-165

Do Recommend Roadless Areas for Wilderness Designation5-166

1257. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recommend all roadless areas for wilderness status.5-166

 To preserve what wild areas are still left5-166

 To strike a balance between roaded and unroaded areas5-166

 To ensure the least possible damage to the environment.....5-167

 To ensure their continuing preservation through changing administrations5-167

 To ensure sustainability of human life5-167

1258. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recommend all roadless areas for wilderness status.5-167

 To reduce costs.....5-167

1259. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recommend as many wilderness areas as possible.5-167

1260. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recommend additional wilderness areas on a site-specific basis.5-167

 Each time a forest plan is revised5-167

 Because local input is needed.....5-168

1261. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recommend qualifying roadless areas to Congress for wilderness designation....	5-168
To comply with existing law	5-168
To preserve their wild characteristics for the long term	5-168
To prevent developers from building there	5-168
Because forest plans have no teeth	5-168
1262. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recommend qualifying roadless areas to Congress for wilderness consideration and allocate other areas for roadless management.....	5-169
To best protect large wild complexes	5-169
1263. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recommend specific roadless areas for wilderness designation.	5-170
In conjunction with the Bureau of Land Management, recommend all roadless areas in Oregon for wilderness Through a comprehensive state wilderness bill	5-171
1264. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage some roadless areas under specific management prescriptions and some under wilderness designation.....	5-171
<i>Do Not Recommend Roadless Areas for Wilderness Designation.....</i>	<i>5-171</i>
1265. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not recommend roadless areas for wilderness designation.	5-171
Because roadless area conservation will protect the same characteristics that make these areas special, but without eliminating access	5-171
Because it would eliminate too many activities.....	5-172
Because it would eliminate mountain biking	5-172
Because it would restrict state wildlife management flexibility.....	5-172
Because it would lock up needed natural resources.....	5-172
Because it is elitist, favoring the young and wealthy	5-172
Because there are enough wilderness areas already.....	5-173
1266. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not recommend additional specific areas for wilderness designation.	5-174
1267. Public Concern: The Forest Service should drop recommended wilderness status for roadless areas if Congress fails to act after a reasonable amount of time.	5-174
<i>Wilderness Recommendation Criteria.....</i>	<i>5-174</i>
1268. Public Concern: The Forest Service should follow the established legal criteria regarding recommendation of wilderness areas.....	5-174
Forest Service Handbook	5-174
Wilderness Act	5-174
1269. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use the Wilderness Attribute Rating System from RARE I and II if further evaluation is necessary.	5-175

1270. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recommend roadless areas for wilderness designation based on location criteria.....5-175
 Areas that are adjacent to existing wilderness5-175

1271. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recommend roadless areas for wilderness designation based on ecological criteria.....5-175
 Areas with underrepresented lower-elevation ecosystem types.....5-175
 Areas that contain endangered species5-176
 Areas that are ecologically sensitive5-176
 Areas that are 1,000 acres or larger that are ecologically sensitive5-176

1272. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recommend roadless areas for wilderness designation based on size criteria.....5-176
 Areas of less than 5,000 acres.....5-176
 Areas of 1,000 acres or more.....5-176
 Areas of 640 acres or more.....5-176
 5,000 acres in the West, 1,000 acres in the East.....5-176

1273. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recommend roadless areas for wilderness designation based on practical management criteria.....5-177
 Areas that are large enough to maintain the role of fire without threatening managed areas5-177
 Areas that contain no roads5-177

1274. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recommend previously overlooked roadless areas for wilderness designation.5-177
 Based on changes in forest condition, public values, and scientific understanding5-177

1275. Public Concern: The Forest Service should continually reevaluate roadless areas for wilderness characteristics.5-178
 Make new recommendations expeditiously.....5-178

Management of Roadless Areas That Do Not Meet Wilderness Criteria5-178

1276. Public Concern: The Forest Service should collaborate with organizations regarding management of areas not suitable for wilderness designation.5-178

1277. Public Concern: The Forest Service should maintain areas that do not qualify for wilderness under a roadless category.....5-178
 To allow mechanical forest maintenance equipment, but not roads or resource extraction5-178
 To protect these areas from commercial development5-178

1278. Public Concern: The Forest Service should drop areas not eligible for wilderness designation from roadless status.....5-179
 In order to fulfill the Forest Service goal of multiple use.....5-179

1279. Public Concern: The Forest Service should assign different designations to areas that do not qualify for wilderness status.....5-179
 General forest5-179

Non-motorized prescriptions consistent with the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 5-179

Relationship of Roadless and Wilderness Management..... 5-179

1280. Public Concern: The Forest Service should bear the burden of proof that roadless areas should be entered. 5-179

1281. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage roadless areas to preserve wilderness characteristics. 5-179

To ensure that they continue to qualify for congressional designation 5-180

To prevent off-road vehicle use and motorized trails from threatening recommended wilderness status 5-180

Because recreation pressures have become intense and damaging . 5-180

By allowing only activities such as hiking, horseback riding, and hunting..... 5-180

By managing them as wilderness with respect to forest health treatments 5-180

By treating fires only when they threaten structures or human life 5-181

1282. The Forest Service should manage roadless areas to preserve wilderness characteristics. 5-181

Because wilderness areas contribute to the social, economic, and environmental values of a region..... 5-181

1283. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage areas recommended for wilderness designation to preserve wilderness characteristics..... 5-181

1284. Public Concern: The Forest Service should keep all roadless areas unroaded regardless of recommended wilderness status..... 5-181

1285. Public Concern: The Forest Service should maintain inventoried roadless areas in the same condition as they appeared when inventoried..... 5-181

1286. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage roadless areas 5,000 acres or larger as wilderness and allow limited management activities in areas of less than 5,000 acres. 5-182

1287. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not manage inventoried roadless areas as de facto wilderness. 5-182

1288. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not manage uninventoried roadless areas as de facto wilderness. 5-182

Because it is contrary to congressional intent 5-182

1289. Public Concern: The Forest Service should only consider roadless units that have been recommended as wilderness but rejected by Congress through inaction. 5-183

Roadless Designation 5-183

Roadless Designation General 5-186

1290. Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify that designating areas to a roadless management category does not preclude future designation as wilderness. 5-186

1291. Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement a national roadless rule to maintain wild and scenic river eligibility for streams in roadless areas.5-186

1292. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not create special roadless designations without legislation from Congress.5-186

1293. Public Concern: The Forest Service should obtain the consent of local counties before designating any lands purchased under the Weeks Act as roadless.5-186

1294. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not create de facto wilderness through roadless area designation.5-186

1295. Public Concern: The Forest Service should emphasize that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule does not create de facto wilderness.5-187

 Because far more activities are allowed5-187

1296. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that since many roadless areas have not been recommended for wilderness, a national roadless rule is unwarranted.5-187

 On the national grasslands.....5-187

1297. Public Concern: The Forest Service should reject the argument that many roadless areas do not deserve protection under a national roadless rule.5-187

 Because they have not yet been recommended for wilderness5-187

1298. Public Concern: The Forest Service should follow the model used in the Olympic National Forest Plan.....5-188

 With respect to roadless area designation and management.....5-188

1299. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use other terms instead of “roadless.”5-188

 Use “reserve”5-188

 Use “wild”5-188

1300. Public Concern: The Forest Service should increase roadless areas.5-188

 By removing roads in currently roaded, high integrity areas to maximize the biological and ecological importance of the final suite of protected areas5-188

 By evaluating other unroaded areas for possible roadless designation.....5-188

 By making roadless areas as large as possible5-188

 By restoring lands to their roadless character5-189

1301. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the low percentage of roadless acreage in the southern Appalachians relative to the national average.5-189

1302. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not expand roadless areas by restoring roaded areas.5-189

1303. Public Concern: The Forest Service should reduce the number and size of roadless areas proposed.....5-189

Adequacy of Analysis5-190

1304. Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate roadless areas to see if they are large enough to serve as viable repositories of our natural heritage. 5-190
 Place emphasis on enlarging or linking roadless areas that are too small to support healthy forests..... 5-190

1305. Public Concern: The Forest Service should include assessments that would qualify or disqualify each inventoried roadless area for such status..... 5-190
 As part of each forest’s next scheduled forest plan revision process . 5-190

1306. Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that the roadless area evaluation process accurately presents land ownership and mineral rights information. 5-190

1307. Public Concern: The Forest Service should correct errors in forest roadless statistics that inflate the acreage of inventoried roadless areas and non-motorized categories. 5-190

1308. Public Concern: The Forest Service should accurately list all National Forest System acreage included under management categories emphasizing environmental protection. 5-191
 To allow the public to make informed comment 5-191

1309. Public Concern: The Forest Service should revise the Roadless Area Conservation Rule Final EIS Appendix C to acknowledge that many roadless areas do not qualify for wilderness status. 5-191

1310. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that science does not support the idea of resource protection through roadless designation..... 5-191

Do Designate Roadless Areas 5-191

1311. Public Concern: The Forest Service should remove all wilderness designations and use a modified roadless designation... 5-191

1312. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage roadless areas under a specific roadless management designation. 5-192
 To resolve ongoing wilderness controversies..... 5-192
 To resolve problems of competing interests 5-192

1313. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage roadless areas under a specific roadless management designation. 5-192
 Which would allow mechanized recreational activities not permissible in wilderness areas..... 5-192
 Which would allow some administrative activities not permissible in wilderness areas..... 5-193
 Which would serve as a non-motorized transition zone between wilderness and roaded areas 5-194
 Which would serve as a motorized transition zone between wilderness and roaded areas 5-194

1314. Public Concern: The Forest Service should create a dynamic roadless designation..... 5-194

Require different levels of National Environmental Policy Act analysis based on the type of entry proposed5-194

Allow boundary modifications5-195

1315. Public Concern: The Forest Service should create multiple roadless prescriptions that can be applied based on site-specific conditions.5-195

1316. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow local forest plans to add additional prohibitions to roadless management prescriptions.5-195

1317. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow local forest plans to allocate roadless areas to prescriptions that do not contain the exemptions in the national rule.5-196

1318. Public Concern: The Forest Service should only use roadless as a temporary designation.5-196

Do Not Designate Roadless Areas5-196

1319. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not create a specific roadless area designation.....5-196

Because conditions and situations vary5-196

Because the presence or absence of roads is not sufficient justification5-197

Because it will strain forest budgets5-197

Because it is an unnecessary layer of regulation5-197

1320. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not designate additional roadless areas.....5-197

Because it would negatively impact recreational access.....5-197

Until it learns to manage existing wilderness areas.....5-198

1321. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use inadequate road maintenance funding as an excuse for declaring an area roadless.....5-198

Roadless Area Designation Criteria.....5-198

1322. Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop objective evaluation criteria for local roadless area planning and management.5-198

1323. Public Concern: The Forest Service should clarify the criteria for identification of roadless areas in the Forest Service Handbook to ensure consistency.....5-199

For roadless areas in the East5-199

1324. Public Concern: The Forest Service should amend the Forest Service Handbook.5-200

To reflect the change in purpose for identifying roadless areas5-200

1325. Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide up-to-date, consistent criteria for the delineation and use of roadless areas.5-200

With all mapping being ground validated5-200

With the deletion of roaded portions of inventoried roadless areas.....5-201

1326. Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop criteria for identification of unroaded areas outside of inventoried roadless areas..... 5-201

1327. Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop criteria in the Forest Service Handbook for identifying areas to be excluded from the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 5-201
 Due to prior development activities..... 5-201

1328. Public Concern: The Forest Service should designate areas as roadless based on inventory status. 5-201
 All areas identified in past and present inventories 5-201
 Areas identified in all forest assessments for which inventory data exists 5-202
 Areas cleared through the National Environmental Policy Act process at the time of the roadless inventory and which remain roadless..... 5-202
 Areas of de facto roadless land adjacent to the inventoried areas 5-203
 Uninventoried roadless areas 5-203

1329. Public Concern: The Forest Service should designate areas as roadless based on scarcity on a forest-by-forest basis. 5-203

1330. Public Concern: The Forest Service should designate areas as roadless based on ecological characteristics..... 5-204
 Smaller roadless areas of ecological importance 5-204
 Underrepresented lower-elevation ecosystem types 5-204
 Areas with biological integrity and ecological significance..... 5-205

1331. Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide an independent scientific assessment of roadless areas 1,000 acres or more and ecologically significant areas less than 1,000 acres. 5-205
 Permanently protect these areas..... 5-205

1332. Public Concern: The Forest Service should designate areas as roadless based on size considerations. 5-205
 Areas 10,000 acres or more in Idaho 5-205
 Areas 5,000 acres or more 5-205

1333. Public Concern: The Forest Service should include smaller unroaded areas in a national roadless rule..... 5-206
 Areas less than 5,000 acres 5-206
 Areas less than 2,000 acres 5-207
 Areas 1,000 acres or more 5-207
 Areas 1,000 acres or more with a minimum width of 1/2 mile 5-208
 Areas 1,000 acres or less 5-208
 Areas 500 acres or more 5-208
 Areas 150 to 200 acres or more 5-209
 Areas large enough to allow natural processes to work 5-209

1334. Public Concern: The Forest Service should exclude unroaded areas from roadless designation based on size considerations..... 5-209
 Exclude areas smaller than 5,000 acres..... 5-209
 Exclude areas smaller than 500 acres..... 5-210

1335. Public Concern: The Forest Service should attempt to designate roadless areas in close proximity to each other.5-210

1336. Public Concern: The Forest Service should designate additional areas as roadless based on current forest plan designations.5-210

 All areas under consideration for research natural area or special interest area status, regardless of proximity to roads5-210

1337. Public Concern: The Forest Service should designate areas as roadless despite existing infrastructure.5-210

 Areas with primitive roads or off-road vehicle routes.....5-210

 Areas with ghost roads or ways5-210

 Areas with roads that are closed or not in use5-210

1338. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not designate areas with existing infrastructure as roadless.....5-211

 Areas with roads5-211

 Areas containing roads that might qualify as valid Revised Statute 2477 rights-of-way.....5-211

 Areas with trails.....5-211

1339. Public Concern: The Forest Service should designate areas as roadless despite historic motorized use.....5-211

1340. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not designate areas with specific resources as roadless.5-212

 Areas with natural resources.....5-212

1341. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not designate areas surrounding private property as roadless.5-212

Inclusion/Exclusion of Specific Areas from a National Roadless Rule5-212

Inclusion5-213

1342. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow any exemptions or exclusions from the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.5-213

 Include each national forest district.....5-214

1343. Public Concern: The Forest Service should replace any area exempted from roadless designation with equal acreage in smaller roadless areas.5-214

1344. Public Concern: The Forest Service should include certain geographic areas in a national roadless rule.5-214

 Include areas in the eastern United States5-214

1345. Public Concern: The Forest Service should include roadless areas in a national roadless rule based on proximity to other protected areas.5-215

 Include areas adjacent to national parks and designated wilderness areas5-215

 Include areas that cross administrative boundaries5-215

1346. Public Concern: The Forest Service should include roadless areas in a national roadless rule regardless of forest plan revision status.....5-215

1347. Public Concern: The Forest Service should include roadless areas in a national roadless rule based on environmental characteristics..... 5-216
 Include areas that are returning to a wild condition 5-216

1348. Public Concern: The Forest Service should include Alaskan national forests in a national roadless rule for social values. 5-217
 For future generations 5-217

1349. Public Concern: The Forest Service should include Alaskan national forests in a national roadless rule for recreational values.... 5-217

1350. Public Concern: The Forest Service should include Alaskan national forests in a national roadless rule to protect the environment. 5-218
 From destructive activities 5-218
 Because it would prevent costly and environmentally damaging state highway construction projects..... 5-220
 Because the Alaska State Forest Practices Act is ineffective..... 5-220

1351. Public Concern: The Forest Service should include Alaskan national forests in a national roadless rule to protect environmental values. 5-220
 To protect ecological characteristics..... 5-220
 To protect biodiversity 5-221
 To protect old growth..... 5-221
 To protect wildlife habitat..... 5-222
 To safeguard primary fish habitat 5-223
 To protect native species..... 5-223

1352. The Forest Service should include Alaskan national forests in a national roadless rule..... 5-223
 To reestablish the balance of multiple resource use..... 5-223
 Because these forests should be treated the same as all other forests..... 5-224
 Because there is public support for protection of these forests 5-224
 As a commitment to global rainforest conservation 5-224

1353. The Forest Service should include Alaskan national forests in a national roadless rule for economic reasons..... 5-225
 Because of their importance to the local economy 5-225
 Because many Alaskans rely on subsistence food..... 5-226
 Because timber sales are not economically viable 5-226
 Because tourism industries depend on the Tongass National Forest. 5-227
 Because roadless areas support the commercial fisheries in Alaska . 5-227

1354. Public Concern: The Forest Service should immediately implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule in the Tongass National Forest. 5-228
 Scheduled timber sales make the Rule even more necessary 5-228

1355. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use the fact that the Tongass National Forest has a recently revised forest plan as a reason to exclude it from a national roadless rule..... 5-228

Exclusion 5-231

1356. Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop additional criteria to provide guidance to forest managers regarding areas that should be excluded from the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 5-231

 Due to prior development activities 5-231

1357. Public Concern: The Forest Service should exclude certain roadless areas from roadless designation/protection based on development potential. 5-231

 Exclude areas adjacent to developed recreational sites 5-231

 Exclude special use permit areas or master development plan areas 5-231

 Exclude areas with existing or future operations at four-season resorts within or adjacent to existing or future special use permit boundaries of ski areas 5-232

 Exclude areas used for pipeline transportation and oil and gas development..... 5-233

1358. The Forest Service should exclude certain roadless areas from roadless designation/protection based on geographical location. 5-234

 Exclude areas in the western United States..... 5-234

 Exclude national grasslands..... 5-234

1359. The Forest Service should exclude certain roadless areas from roadless designation/protection based on forest plan status. 5-234

 Exclude areas that have recently completed forest management plans 5-234

1360. Public Concern: The Forest Service should exclude Alaskan national forests from a national roadless rule. 5-235

 Because inclusion of Alaska’s national forests would be contrary to Alaska state and federal laws..... 5-235

1361. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that it cannot supercede land allocations on the Tongass National Forest with a national roadless rule. 5-236

1362. Public Concern: The Forest Service should exclude the Alaskan national forests from a national roadless rule. 5-236

 Because The Tongass National Forest has just revised its Land Management Plan 5-236

 Because decisions should be made through the local forest planning process 5-237

 Because extensive local forest planning has been completed 5-238

 Because the Tongass Land Management Plan is currently under appeal 5-239

 Because the Chugach National Forest is now at the stage of releasing a Final EIS 5-239

 Because the proposed Rule was not addressed in the Chugach National Forest plan revision process 5-239

1363. Public Concern: The Forest Service should exclude Alaskan national forests from a national roadless rule for environmental reasons..... 5-240

 Because roadless values have been more than adequately provided for with non-development land use designations 5-240

 Because the unique and isolated terrain provides inherent protection..... 5-241

1364. Public Concern: The Forest Service should exclude Alaskan national forests from a national roadless rule for forest health reasons..... 5-241

 Fire hazard reduction..... 5-241

1365. Public Concern: The Forest Service should exclude Alaskan national forests from a national roadless rule. 5-242

 Because they should be managed for Traditional multiple use 5-242

1366. Public Concern: The Forest Service should exclude Alaskan national forests from a national roadless rule for economic reasons..... 5-243

 Because roadless areas must be available to provide for the basic infrastructure needs of the region 5-243

 Because communities depend on the Tongass National Forest..... 5-244

 To protect the timber job base 5-245

Use of Existing Forest Plan Designations 5-246

1367. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use appropriate existing management categories to protect roadless qualities..... 5-246

 Recommend qualifying areas for wilderness and allocate the rest to forest plan categories that preserve roadless character 5-246

 Designate roadless areas as backcountry non-motorized 5-246

 Designate roadless areas as backcountry winter non-motorized 5-247

 Do not allocate to categories that allow summer motorized use..... 5-247

 Do not allow inventoried roadless areas to be designated matrix or general forest 5-247

1368. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow individual forests to allocate roadless areas to any management prescriptions that are consistent with a national roadless rule..... 5-247

 Create or modify prescriptions if needed 5-247

1369. Public Concern: The Forest Service should assign roadless areas to the most protective designation possible. 5-247

 That will prevent road building 5-248

1370. Public Concern: The Forest Service should assign roadless areas to the category that will ensure protection as quickly and easily as possible..... 5-248

1371. Public Concern: The Forest Service should assign roadless areas to a modified National Conservation Area prescription. 5-248

 With teeth to restrict resource extraction and development..... 5-248

Other New Management Categories 5-248

1372. Public Concern: The Forest Service should classify roadless areas as recreation areas.....5-249
 Allow recreational activities but no resource extraction.....5-249

1373. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage roadless areas as backcountry recreation areas.....5-249
 To provide a range of recreational activities that are prohibited in wilderness5-250
 To provide motorized recreation opportunities5-250

AGENCY ORGANIZATION AND FUNDING.....5-251

Agency Organization.....5-251

Agency Organization General.....5-251

1374. Public Concern: The Forest Service should restructure itself to focus on ecosystem values rather than commodity production.5-251

1375. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow forests to provide inspection and oversight of district administrative and management functions.5-251
 And develop and disperse budgets.....5-251

Forest Service Personnel/Training.....5-252

1376. Public Concern: The Forest Service should employ staff trained in all forest uses.....5-252

1377. Public Concern: The Forest Service should improve screening of personnel for education and experience.....5-252

1378. Public Concern: The Forest Service should require local personnel to have at least 10 years experience on the forest before granting them decisionmaking authority.5-252

1379. Public Concern: The Forest Service should employ scientific-minded managers.....5-252
 In order to provide multiple use management5-252

1380. Public Concern: The Forest Service should encourage professionals trained in the new disciplines to join the Agency.5-252

1381. Public Concern: The Forest Service should educate personnel...5-253
 In principles of conservation biology5-253
 To advance collaborative community forestry5-253
 To implement laws5-253
 To care for the forests5-253
 To manage timber removal and transportation.....5-253
 To protect communities.....5-254
 To effectively communicate the new planning direction5-254

1382. Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide adequate staff and resources in the field.....5-254
 To implement forest plans5-254
 To ensure that prohibited activities do not occur in roadless areas.....5-254

1383. Public Concern: The Forest Service should dispose of its weapons.5-254

1384. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not employ archeologists.5-255

1385. Public Concern: The Forest Service should halt staff downsizing efforts. 5-255

1386. Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that employees support multiple use. 5-255

1387. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow local personnel to perform their duties. 5-255
 In order to save taxpayers' money..... 5-255

1388. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow its employees to voice their views without fear of recrimination..... 5-255

1389. Public Concern: The Forest Service should analyze the potential impacts on its employees resulting from implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 5-255

1390. Public Concern: The Forest Service should reduce the paperwork required of its personnel..... 5-256

Agency Funding 5-256

Agency Funding General 5-256

1391. Public Concern: The Forest Service should be adequately funded..... 5-256

1392. Public Concern: The Forest Service should request adequate funding..... 5-256

1393. Public Concern: The Forest Service should efficiently allocate its funding. 5-257

Funding Sources..... 5-257

1394. Public Concern: The Forest Service should seek more dependable funding. 5-257

1395. Public Concern: The Forest Service should continue to removal timber in roadless areas to support the Agency's budget.... 5-257

1396. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not rely on timber sales to support the Agency's budget. 5-257

1397. Public Concern: The Forest Service should insist that income from non-timber products stay within the Agency. 5-257

1398. Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that funding for individual forests is not dependent on extractive industries. 5-257

Funding Priorities..... 5-258

1399. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage its funding for certain purposes. 5-258
 For ranger stations 5-258
 For educating the public 5-258

1400. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use tax dollars for certain purposes. 5-258
 To foster environmental and human values..... 5-258

1401. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use taxpayer funds for certain purposes. 5-258
 To maintain areas that are restricted to the public..... 5-258
 To settle lawsuits filed by environmental groups 5-258

To revise the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and the Planning Regulations 5-258

To purchase agency vehicles 5-258

1402. Public Concern: The Forest Service should be concerned only with raising money to pay down the national debt. 5-258

1403. Public Concern: The Forest Service should adequately identify the costs and benefits of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 5-259

Including the costs of implementing the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 5-259

1404. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow the cost of road obliteration to take away from other funding priorities. 5-259

1405. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use money designated for the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for forest improvements. 5-259

Financial Accountability 5-259

1406. Public Concern: The Forest Service should be accountable for its expenditures. 5-259

1407. Public Concern: The Forest Service should take no action that cannot be paid for with funds raised by that action. 5-259

Monitoring/Enforcement 5-260

1408. Public Concern: The Forest Service should monitor abuse. 5-260

1409. Public Concern: The Forest Service should engage the public in identifying abuses. 5-260

1410. Public Concern: The Forest Service should enforce land use policies. 5-260

To ensure environmental integrity 5-261

To provide funds from citations 5-261

By strengthening and enforcing pollution and anti-dumping laws 5-261

By providing adequate manpower 5-261

By providing funding for additional law enforcement needs 5-261

By using money allocated for administration to prosecute those who abuse the forest 5-261

Before prohibiting further uses 5-261

1411. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prevent the interference of legal uses of forest resources. 5-262

CHAPTER 6 PROTECTING FORESTS, COMMUNITIES, AND PROPERTY ACCESS 6-1

PROTECTING FORESTS (*QUESTION 3*) 6-1

Natural Disturbance Processes and Forest Health General 6-1

Forest Health Management General 6-3

1412. Public Concern: The Forest Service should follow the precautionary principle. 6-3

To decide if additional timber removal will improve forest health 6-3

To manage these areas minimally 6-3

1413. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage forest health according to land use designation and management restrictions. 6-3
 Allow more options for managing forest health in roadless areas than in wilderness areas..... 6-3

1414. Public Concern: The Forest Service should focus its management efforts on roaded areas rather than remote roadless areas..... 6-3
 By treating forest health in roaded areas..... 6-4
 By restoring roaded areas to sustainable levels 6-4
 By consulting with local supervisors, states, communities, and tribes..... 6-5

1415. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that wilderness areas cannot be properly managed for forest health..... 6-5

1416. Public Concern: The Administration should clarify its position on natural disaster management. 6-5

1417. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow excessive support for short-term visual values to prevent the implementation of forest health treatments. 6-5

Forest Health Management General – Management Strategies 6-5

1418. Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop a detection and prevention strategy for all natural disturbance events..... 6-5
 By defining the expectations or procedures in the forest plan and associated resource program plans..... 6-5
 By including descriptions of how disturbances are allowed or are purposefully carried out in plans for all roadless areas..... 6-6

1419. Public Concern: The Forest Service should have contingency plans in place to act quickly to manage disease, blowdown, and wildfires..... 6-6
 Including preparation of an EIS 6-6
 Include unexpected events in forest plans so the forests can be managed effectively and responsibly..... 6-7

1420. Public Concern: The Forest Service should develop plans and strategies similar to those used by the Federal Emergency Management Agency..... 6-7

Forest Health Management General – Public Involvement..... 6-7

1421. Public Concern: The Forest Service should employ local non-profit groups to observe forest health conditions. 6-7
 To offset the cost of forest health management 6-7
 If the Forest Service does not manage for forest health; a local nonprofit organization should do it..... 6-7

1422. Public Concern: The Forest Service should engage other government entities to educate and advocate practices to promote forest health. 6-7

1423. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not ask the public how to manage forest health on public lands..... 6-8

Leave it to professional Forest Service personnel.....6-8

Forest Health Management General – Roadless Areas 6-8

1424. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider forest health when managing roadless areas.6-8

 By making it a top priority6-8

 By considering the health of the entire forest/region6-9

 By focusing on long-term forest health and ecosystem management6-9

 By using a stewardship forestry concept.....6-9

 By allowing decisions about forest health to be made at the local level.....6-9

 By conducting activities with clear procedures that are open to the public.....6-11

 By basing management decisions on roadless areas’ individual characteristics6-11

 To protect adjacent lands from insect, disease, and fire6-11

1425. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage roadless areas no differently than the rest of the forest.6-12

1426. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not designate areas as roadless if they cannot manage those areas to keep them healthy.....6-12

1427. Public Concern: The Forest Service should determine federal management objectives achievable by a specific roadless area.6-13

 By collaborating with the public and adhering to federal designation goals6-13

1428. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule does not preclude management actions to control insects, disease, and fire.6-13

Adequacy of Analysis 6-13

1429. Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate forest health.....6-13

 By inventorying current forest health conditions at the local level6-13

 By continuously collecting forest health data.....6-14

 By conducting a formal, localized risk assessment of the consequences of prohibiting active forest health management.....6-14

 By completing an inventory of all National Forest System Lands with full disclosure of the consequences of various management strategies.....6-14

 By analyzing the effects of management activities, the need for timber stand improvement treatments, and developing a strategy to address the backlog of vegetation management needs6-14

1430. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use up-to-date science conservation and biology principles.....6-15

 To restore ecological processes.....6-15

1431. Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas as a baseline to gauge the effects of management techniques on forest health in other areas.....6-15

1432. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that our infrastructure programs, budgets, and knowledge of the best way to deal with forest health concerns are rudimentary. 6-15

1433. Public Concern: The Forest Service should define and publicize the forest health risks that will result from roadless designation. 6-16
 To adjacent private and state lands..... 6-16

1434. Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide scientific data to support the claim that a national roadless rule will have a positive effect on fire and insect management..... 6-16

1435. Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide empirical studies to support the claim that thinning small-diameter trees will restore ecological processes, provide habitat for endangered species, and avert catastrophic wildfire. 6-16
 Because otherwise, local employees may exploit areas in the name of forest health..... 6-16

1436. Public Concern: The Forest Service should bring together a bi-partisan group to discuss forest management tools and to make science-based recommendations. 6-17
 For forest health 6-17

1437. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow staff scientists to make recommendations about forest health and other situations, and then allow the general public to comment on those recommendations. 6-17

Adequacy of Analysis – Concepts..... 6-17

1438. Public Concern: The Forest Service should define “healthy.”..... 6-17
 As the meaning may vary according to an industrial or an ecological perspective 6-17
 As the meaning may vary according to management objectives on each site 6-18

1439. Public Concern: The Forest Service should go beyond the traditional concept of “healthy forests” to embrace the concept of healthy ecosystems and natural processes. 6-18

1440. Public Concern: The Forest Service should measure forest health in terms of clean water, biodiversity, and solitude. 6-19

1441. Public Concern: The Forest Service should define temporary and short-term treatments. 6-19

1442. Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge the concept of natural disturbance regimes. 6-19

Funding..... 6-19

1443. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that policy changes, and attendant litigation, have cost a great deal of money that could have gone to forest health treatments. 6-19

1444. Public Concern: The Forest Service should hold litigants responsible for the damages caused by their lawsuits that prevent forest health treatment or management activities. 6-20

Because management of national forests will continue to be stifled,
 further exacerbating forest health..... 6-20

Active Management..... 6-20

1445. Public Concern: The Forest Service should actively manage
 natural resources in roadless areas..... 6-20

By evaluating practices in other states 6-20

By using information from its extensive database on wildfire and
 insect risk and elements from the national fire plan 6-20

By considering the site-specific characteristics of each forested
 area 6-20

By actively managing to control insects, disease, and fire 6-21

By taking specific areas out of roadless designation to minimize
 insects, disease, and fire..... 6-22

By allowing the responsible harvest of trees and wildlife 6-22

By cleaning up woody debris..... 6-22

By relying on access other than roads 6-22

By working with state and local governments to actively improve
 forests and rangelands..... 6-23

Because unmanaged lands and wildlife will suffer 6-23

1446. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow helicopters in
 roadless areas..... 6-23

To harvest dead trees and fuels or to pile and burn 6-23

Ecosystem/Restoration Management..... 6-23

1447. Public Concern: The Forest Service should utilize best
 management practices..... 6-23

To reduce the risk of catastrophic events..... 6-23

1448. Public Concern: The Forest Service should restore forest
 health..... 6-24

1449. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that
 forest health does not require the destruction of old growth
 vegetation..... 6-24

1450. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use conditions that
 existed just prior to Euro-American contact as a baseline for
 management. 6-24

To avoid unforeseen and negative consequences..... 6-24

1451. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that
 permitting states and local jurisdictions to develop lands adjacent
 to national forests interferes with natural forest health processes. 6-24

1452. Public Concern: The Forest Service should replant burned or
 cut timber areas..... 6-24

1453. Public Concern: The Forest Service should find a variety of
 low-resource using, non-polluting alternatives to road-based
 management practices..... 6-25

Ecosystem/Restoration Management – Roadless Areas..... 6-25

1454. Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless
 areas. 6-25

Because once areas are roaded, they are extremely difficult to restore 6-25

1455. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not actively manage natural resources in roadless areas. 6-25

 Allow natural ecosystem processes to operate 6-25

 Remove barriers to natural processes 6-26

 Because of the lack of funding 6-26

1456. Public Concern: The Forest Service should restore roadless areas damaged by past management practices. 6-26

 By allowing natural processes to operate 6-26

 To improve forest health 6-27

1457. Public Concern: The Forest Service should close loopholes in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule for stewardship logging and fire suppression. 6-27

1458. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that human activities cause more damage in roadless areas than natural processes. 6-28

 Roaded access causes more damage 6-28

 Timber removal causes more damage 6-29

Management Exceptions 6-30

1459. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule provides resource management exceptions 6-30

 To restore ecological processes 6-30

 To preserve access rights 6-31

 To control fires and insects 6-31

1460. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the road building and timber removal exceptions to the Rule are too narrow to provide the needed flexibility 6-31

 Include a policy statement that allows local forest supervisors to tailor forest plans and respond to local circumstances 6-31

1461. Public Concern: The Forest Service should define specific national criteria for management exceptions requiring roads in designated roadless areas 6-31

1462. Public Concern: The Forest Service should constrain exceptions to Roadless Area Conservation Rule regulations by specific conditions and restrictions. 6-31

 Including time limits, spatial limits, detailed descriptions, and monitoring and reporting 6-31

Roads/Access – Forest Health Management 6-33

Roads/Access General 6-33

 1463. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the impacts of new roads in roadless areas on forest fires 6-33

Funding 6-33

 1464. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that budget constraints and prohibitions on road development and

maintenance will render many projects unfeasible and impose unacceptable risk on many roadless areas. 6-33

Allow Roads/Access 6-34

1465. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow road construction/access. 6-34

For forest health management 6-34

For resource management 6-35

For fire hazard reduction 6-35

For the use of helicopters for fire management 6-36

For firefighter and public safety 6-36

For pest management 6-36

To allow response to additional hazards such as landslides, earthquakes, etc. 6-36

To allow cost-effective forest health treatments that can provide long-term protection of watershed quality 6-37

To Remove dead timber 6-37

With the restriction that roads be open only for fire protection and emergencies 6-37

Because otherwise state agencies may not allow their firefighters to assist with firefighting efforts on federal lands 6-37

1466. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow road construction/access. 6-38

Low impact roads 6-38

Temporary roads 6-38

1467. Public Concern: The Forest Service should include an alternative in the National Environmental Policy Act process that gives direction for road construction. 6-38

For forest health management 6-38

1468. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow the use of motorized vehicles. 6-38

For forest health management 6-38

For forest health management only, with access prohibited unless authorized by a forest plan 6-39

Allow heavy equipment for fire containment and other management needs 6-39

To facilitate firefighting in wilderness areas 6-39

1469. Public Concern: The Forest Service should comply with Revised Statute 2477. 6-39

To maintain motorized access for forest health management 6-39

1470. Public Concern: The Forest Service should modify the criteria for roadless designation to allow the construction of new roads for fire and disease management. 6-39

Because they are less damaging than roads constructed during firefighting 6-39

1471. Public Concern: The Forest Service should maintain trails. 6-39

For forest health 6-39

Do not Allow Roads/Access 6-40

1472. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use forest health as an excuse to build roads in roadless areas. 6-40

 Because it is cost prohibitive 6-40

 Because fires will burn areas regardless of their roaded/roadless designation 6-40

 In the Tongass National Forest 6-40

1473. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit road construction. 6-41

 Because roads can spread disease and noxious weeds 6-41

 Because roads and disturbances enable exotic plants and animals to enter previously undisturbed areas..... 6-42

 Because boat trailers can introduce exotic species to watersheds and lakes 6-42

 Because adequate roads exist and are not needed for fire suppression 6-42

 Because Forest Service personnel can access roadless areas by other means 6-43

 Because helicopters can be used for controlled burns and air tankers can be used for fire suppression..... 6-43

 Because roads won't stop fires..... 6-43

 As a good way to manage wildfires 6-44

1474. Public Concern: The Forest Service should obliterate any roads or temporary access required for forest health management as soon as possible after the event. 6-44

1475. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit vehicles in roadless areas. 6-45

 To prevent arson and wildfires 6-45

 To prevent the spread of plant pathogens 6-45

Timber Removal 6-46

Timber Harvest General..... 6-47

 1476. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow volume and revenue targets to drive silvicultural decisions..... 6-47

 Because commercial harvesting usually takes the most fire-resistant trees 6-47

Adequacy of Analysis..... 6-47

 1477. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that fuel buildup and undergrowth is natural for forest progression and forest ecology. 6-47

 Do not place blame on commercial timber removal..... 6-47

 Consider other factors that contribute to fuel build up 6-47

 1478. Public Concern: The Forest Service should analyze the benefits and harm of thinning and clearing projects..... 6-48

 Before undertaking any action 6-48

 1479. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that scientific evidence does not support the hypothesis that intensive

salvage, thinning, and other harvesting activities reduce the risk of catastrophic fire. 6-48

Funding..... 6-48

1480. Public Concern: The federal government should fund Forest Service thinning projects. 6-48

 To remove fuel build up..... 6-48

1481. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the increased costs of fuel treatment..... 6-48

1482. Public Concern: The Forest Service should fine previous timber harvesters..... 6-48

 To recover any future loss due to severe wildfires, buildup of hazardous fuels, and any insect or disease damage 6-48

Allow Timber Removal..... 6-49

1483. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow timber removal..... 6-49

 To reduce fires, insects, and disease 6-49

 To restore a natural fire regime 6-50

 To ensure firefighter safety..... 6-50

 By removing 24” trees on the stump and using the money to pay for road repair..... 6-51

 By removing timber less than 14 inches in diameter or 50 years of age 6-51

 By removing mature trees before their commercial value is gone, accompanied by controlled burning to reduce fuel 6-51

 By removing old growth..... 6-51

 By removing every sixty years and clearing underbrush every twenty years 6-51

 By allowing small scale timber removal..... 6-51

 By identifying and removing timber that can be harvested without environmental harm 6-52

 By employing sustainable timber harvesting techniques for forest health 6-52

 With helicopters..... 6-52

 With horses 6-53

1484. Public Concern: The Forest Service should reduce the basal area index of stands of trees. 6-53

 To make trees more resistant to insects and disease 6-53

1485. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow clear cutting..... 6-53

 In less than five acre, widely dispersed parcels 6-53

1486. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow salvage removal..... 6-53

 For forest health 6-53

 As soon as possible after a fire 6-54

 To utilize the timber before it rots 6-54

 To thin old growth..... 6-54

 Without creating new roads..... 6-55

With environmentally friendly techniques 6-55

In areas where insect and disease outbreaks will be intense 6-55

1487. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow selective timber harvest. 6-55

To keep forests thinned and fire free 6-56

To remove dead and dying timber 6-56

To provide barriers to fires and provide a safe haven for wildlife 6-56

1488. Public Concern: The Forest Service should thin fuels. 6-56

As necessary 6-56

Ten percent every ten years 6-56

Year-round 6-56

Thin trees and brush less than ten inches in diameter 6-57

Allow restoration thinning programs 6-57

Pile the brush and burn in the winter 6-57

To reduce unnatural fuel loads in roaded areas 6-57

If studies indicate thinning is beneficial..... 6-58

Within a half mile of major developed areas 6-58

In the urban interface area 6-58

In wilderness areas..... 6-58

1489. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow firewood collection..... 6-58

To reduce fuel loads and fire hazards 6-58

Allow farmers, ranchers, and low-income people to harvest, at no cost, diseased, damaged, or excess trees for firewood rather than using controlled burning as a fuel reductions tool..... 6-59

1490. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow hand removal of woody debris and small diameter understory trees..... 6-59

1491. Public Concern: The Forest Service should create defensible fuel zones. 6-59

With profitable timber sales conducted with over-the-snow equipment..... 6-59

Do Not Allow/Restrict Timber Removal..... 6-59

1492. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use forest health as an excuse to remove timber. 6-59

Do not claim harvesting is needed to reduce insect infestation 6-59

Do not claim harvesting is needed to reduce fuel buildup and undergrowth 6-59

1493. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit timber removal. 6-60

Because timber removal increases fire severity 6-60

Prohibit commercial timber removal 6-60

1494. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit even age management..... 6-61

Because it increases wildfire risk..... 6-61

Because the broken mosaic boundaries of clear cuts increase the mortality of beneficial species and allow insect encroachment on surrounding areas 6-61

1495. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit salvage removal..... 6-61

1496. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit thinning 6-62

In moist or high elevation fir, hemlock, spruce, and cedar forests 6-62

Because thinning to reduce overgrown forests is cost prohibitive 6-62

Because silvicultural activities do more harm than good 6-62

Because roadless areas should not be disturbed..... 6-63

Fire Management..... 6-63

Fire Management General..... 6-65

1497. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address fire management. 6-65

Because fire impacts regions differently..... 6-65

1498. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address fire management in a national roadless rule..... 6-65

Relative to the national fire program 6-65

Relative to the federal interagency wildland fire policy, the national fire plan, and the 10-year federal/state strategy to address forest ecosystem health 6-65

Because the effect of fire varies by area 6-66

1499. Public Concern: The Forest Service should review the recommendations of the General Accounting Office on reducing wildfire threats and take immediate action..... 6-66

1500. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that national grasslands are also at risk for fire danger. 6-66

Because fires threaten homes, range improvements, oil and gas structures, vegetation and wildlife habitat, and outlying farm and ranch structures 6-66

1501. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit fires in dry areas. 6-66

Ban outdoor burning when there is a lack of moisture 6-66

1502. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule will not likely result in an increase of wildfires in California. 6-67

In addition, continued implementation of the National Fire Plan and the California Fire Plan will increase protection of forests and communities 6-67

Fire Management General – Management Strategies..... 6-67

1503. Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement various fire policies and plans. 6-67

Implement the 1995 wildlands fire policy..... 6-67

Implement the national fire strategy 6-68

Implement the National Fire Plan 6-68

1504. Public Concern: The Forest Service should change traditional Smokey the Bear fire suppression policies. 6-68
 To solve wildfire problems 6-68

1505. Public Concern: The Forest Service should specify, to the extent possible, the roadless areas in which fire reduction management exceptions would apply 6-69
 In the forest plan revision process 6-69

1506. Public Concern: The Forest Service should work with all federal agencies, including the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management, to set sound and consistent policies for fire management..... 6-70
 In national parks, wilderness areas, and roadless areas 6-70

1507. Public Concern: The Forest Service should employ the same forest management strategies in roadless areas that are used to protect communities and private property from fires beginning on other lands..... 6-70
 Because forest fires often begin on developed private lands 6-70
Adequacy of Analysis..... 6-70

1508. Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate wildfire risks. 6-70
 Consider that roadless areas do not have a higher risk of wildfire 6-70
 Consider that there is no causal link between uncontrolled wildfires and the presence or absence of roads 6-72
 Consider that the majority of roadless areas are not situated in areas of high fire risk 6-72
 Consider that fire frequency increases as road density increases..... 6-73

1509. Public Concern: The Forest Service should conduct more studies about how to control fires. 6-73
 So that fires do not get out of hand as a result of the many variables that can affect them..... 6-73

1510. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider the impact of human activities on fire intensity and severity..... 6-73

1511. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider other factors which may increase fuel loads and fire hazards..... 6-74
 Wind 6-74
 Weather 6-74
 Slash piles 6-74
 Some tree species have a naturally severe fire regime 6-74
Adequacy of Analysis – Management Strategies..... 6-75

1512. Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate its firefighting practices. 6-75

1513. Public Concern: The Forest Service should fairly and fully consider the effects of fuel management. 6-76
 Before a final decision on managing areas as roadless is made 6-77

1514. Public Concern: The Forest Service should adequately analyze the appropriateness and need for prescribed fire. 6-77

In the unique settings of the roadless areas..... 6-77

1515. Public Concern: The Forest Service should fully analyze restoration projects designed to address catastrophic wildfires..... 6-77

To ensure adequate safeguards are taken to preserve roadless and wilderness qualities of inventoried roadless areas 6-77

1516. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address the cumulative impacts of the fire suppression program on national forests, and how it has impacted roadless areas..... 6-77

1517. Public Concern: The Forest Service should reassess vegetation management on the national grasslands. 6-78

Because increasing vegetation height and shrub structure on the uplands affects fire control and suppression 6-78

1518. Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate the impacts of no management versus the impacts of roading or other management activities..... 6-78

1519. Public Concern: The Forest Service should conduct ecological assessments. 6-78

For all fuel reduction projects 6-78

1520. Public Concern: The Forest Service should categorize inventoried roadless areas in accordance with fire regime, condition class, vegetation, and risk of disease..... 6-78

Areas at greater risk of ecosystem damage from catastrophic fires should be prioritized for appropriate treatment..... 6-78

Then create a management plan to obtain and maintain desired future conditions..... 6-79

1521. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that thinning has not been shown to systematically reduce the intensity of wildfires. 6-79

1522. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow public review of the Wildland Fire Management Policy. 6-79

Funding..... 6-79

1523. Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate costs and funding associated with fire management. 6-79

Fire suppression costs 6-79

Fire suppression costs and controlled burn funding 6-80

Funding for firefighting 6-80

The use of funds appropriated for fuels reduction projects in the wild-urban interface zone 6-81

Consider that reduced access increases firefighting expenses..... 6-81

Consider that the majority of firefighting funds are spent on protecting structures in developed areas 6-81

1524. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use tax dollars to fund firefighters and their equipment..... 6-81

Brought in from distant places rather than the local area 6-81

Use the money for other purposes 6-82

1525. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use tax dollars for fire suppression and timber removal..... 6-82
 In roadless areas located far from residents..... 6-82

1526. Public Concern: The Forest Service should contract with an independent organization to analyze expenses associated with fire management if roads are destroyed. 6-82

1527. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that as fuel loads increase in roadless areas, firefighting costs also increase. 6-82

1528. Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide funding to conduct controlled burns and non-commercial thinning..... 6-82
 To reduce wildfire 6-82

1529. Public Concern: The Forest Service should take into account the effects of a national roadless rule on the costs of fire management..... 6-83
 Negative effects..... 6-83

1530. Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that emergency funds are spent in areas where wildfire truly threatens communities..... 6-83

1531. Public Concern: The Forest Service should continue its current fire plan funding to treat fuels in the wild-urban interface..... 6-83

1532. Public Concern: The Forest Service should take legal action against organizations which have blocked fuel load removal. 6-83
 To recover costs for fires that have resulted from such lack of action..... 6-83

Education 6-83

1533. Public Concern: The Forest Service should educate the public. ... 6-83
 About fire safety 6-83
 About the reasons for controlled burning 6-83
 About the role of fire and disturbance in forests 6-84
 About what is needed to support firefighting efforts..... 6-84

Active Management 6-84

1534. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use various techniques for fire prevention..... 6-84
 If required by management objectives..... 6-84
 Monitoring..... 6-84
 Grazing..... 6-84

1535. Public Concern: The Forest Service should control fire size and frequency on public lands to approximately that of pre-settlement conditions..... 6-85
 By reducing fuel loads through thinning, grazing, and prescribed burning, and by maintaining natural and engineered firebreaks 6-85

1536. Public Concern: The Forest Service should reduce fire hazards..... 6-85
 By employing young people 6-85
 By actively managing to reduce fire hazards 6-86

By developing a fire management plan 6-86

By allowing the clearing of underbrush during the interim 6-86

By allowing many small burns 6-87

By clearing fuel in areas 40-100 meters surrounding communities 6-87

In already roaded and accessible areas adjacent to roadless areas 6-87

Because fires often do more harm than good 6-87

1537. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use prescribed burning techniques as a tool to reduce fire danger..... 6-87

In areas outside of wilderness or roadless areas 6-88

In late fall..... 6-88

In forests which border communities 6-88

Every four to five years 6-88

At low-risk times of the year 6-88

With guidelines established in the forest planning process 6-89

Only after preventative steps to reduce fuel loads are taken, such as harvesting, thinning, and grazing..... 6-89

To reduce the ecological impacts of fires and firefighting..... 6-89

Use techniques that adhere to local fire management plans and that contain monitoring provisions to assess the usefulness of the burns 6-89

1538. Public Concern: The Forest Service should carry out controlled burns. 6-89

To manage forest health 6-89

In strips of forest that have previously been harvested, similar to a crop rotation management activity 6-90

In areas where fires have been artificially suppressed 6-90

In areas where the risk for extreme temperatures and intensive volumes of smoke have been addressed 6-90

Where possible, otherwise thin timber without building new roads 6-90

1539. Public Concern: The Forest Service should construct firebreaks..... 6-90

Only if really necessary 6-90

By using roads as firebreaks 6-90

By decommissioning some roads and managing the remaining as a defensible perimeter against wildland fire 6-91

By clearing dead timber and thinning stands next to private property to an appropriate width..... 6-91

By creating a boundary around roadless areas with multiple use, motorized trails 6-91

By maintaining fire lanes but closing them to all but foot traffic 6-91

By encouraging volunteers to assist with fire break maintenance 6-91

Outside of roadless areas 6-91

1540. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow ski areas located on the fringes of roadless areas to help provide defense zones..... 6-91

Which allow for development while decreasing fuel loads 6-91

1541. Public Concern: The Forest Service should maintain existing fire trails. 6-92
 In the Shawnee National Forest 6-92

1542. Public Concern: The Forest Service should suppress forest fires. 6-92
 Because letting forests burn is not responsible land management..... 6-92
 By using chemicals to extinguish fires 6-92
 By allowing fires to burn to a certain landscape feature before suppressing them 6-92
 By enlisting military aircraft converted into water tankers as a suppression tool 6-93

1543. Public Concern: The Forest Service should concentrate firefighting efforts in urban-forest interface areas..... 6-93
 Because these areas are already roaded and pose the greatest threat to life and personal property 6-93

1544. Public Concern: The Forest Service should enlist prisoners to clean up dead and dying timber and brush and to construct and maintain trails..... 6-93
 Materials collected could be used to operate a co-generation power plant..... 6-93

1545. Public Concern: The Forest Service should specify the criteria under which the Roadless Area Conservation Rule exceptions would apply..... 6-94
 For management activities to reduce the threat of wildfire 6-94

Ecosystem/Restoration Management 6-94

1546. Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge that wildfire is a component of a healthy forest..... 6-94

1547. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not suppress forest fires..... 6-95
 Because natural fire maintains diverse forests and wildlife habitat..... 6-95
 Because fire rejuvenates ecosystems 6-95
 Because natural fire regimes should be restored 6-95
 Because firefighting is a waste of money, dangerous, and harms the environment..... 6-95
 Because dead timber is a critical part of the forest ecosystem..... 6-95
 Except in the event of insect or disease infestation that is uncontrollable by natural means..... 6-95
 Except in the event it is not possible to control the fire, then rely on more air-power 6-95
 Except in the event the fire is human induced 6-96
 In remote areas 6-96
 In wilderness areas..... 6-96
 Prohibit firebreaks and retardant dumping..... 6-96

1548. Public Concern: The Forest Service should reintroduce fire into forest ecosystems..... 6-96

1549. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage fire in roadless areas following wilderness fire management policies. 6-97
 By extending the “let burn” policy to roadless areas..... 6-97

1550. Public Concern: The Forest Service should ban the use of fire in roadless areas. 6-98

1551. Public Concern: The Forest Service should avoid artificial fires, backburning, and prescribed burning. 6-98
 Because forests in the southeastern United States do not have a fuel load..... 6-98

1552. Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless and roaded areas. 6-98
 By designing restoration projects to manage potential catastrophic wildfires 6-98

1553. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow a categorical exemption for restoring burned areas. 6-99
 Including needed road building, salvage logging, soil preparation, seeding, planting, riparian restoration, and follow up work to help the survival of seedlings 6-99

Other..... 6-99

1554. Public Concern: The Forest Service should utilize burned timber as biomass energy. 6-99

Insects, Disease, and Noxious Plants 6-99

Insects, Disease, and Noxious Plants General..... 6-100

1555. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not weaken the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 6-100
 Because the Rule will aid federal, state, and local efforts to combat the spread of noxious weeds..... 6-100

1556. Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that its policies support rather than hinder the campaign to minimize damage caused by invasive exotic plants. 6-100

1557. Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement standards for insect and disease control. 6-101
 As part of the forest planning process 6-101

1558. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that roadless area and transportation regulations and policies interfere with local grazing associations’ work in controlling noxious weeds. .. 6-101
 Which are a persistent problem on the national grasslands 6-101

1559. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not require horses to be diapered. 6-101
 Because deer and elk also spread seeds in the forest..... 6-101

Adequacy of Analysis 6-101

1560. Public Concern: The Forest Service should evaluate the role of insects and disease in a forest ecosystem. 6-101

1561. Public Concern: The Forest Service should examine insect and disease outbreaks. 6-102

By enlisting the aid of hikers/volunteers to monitor and report outbreaks..... 6-102

By examining outbreaks on foot, horseback, or with the use of aircraft 6-102

By establishing an entomological collection station at the borders of National Forest System lands..... 6-103

With regular surveys..... 6-103

And then act accordingly 6-103

1562. Public Concern: The Forest Service should fairly evaluate all sources that contribute to the noxious plant problem..... 6-103

Including hikers, mountain bikers, equestrians, wildlife, and natural processes 6-103

Including roads 6-103

1563. Public Concern: The Forest Service should reevaluate insect and disease risk..... 6-104

And incorporate specific direction for insect and disease response within the unroaded and roadless areas..... 6-104

1564. Public Concern: The Forest Service should expand its studies of ecosystem interactions. 6-104

Because few areas are in danger from insects and disease 6-104

Funding..... 6-104

1565. Public Concern: The Forest Service should direct its funding to the management of disease, insects, and noxious plants..... 6-104

Insects and diseases of livestock and mammals..... 6-104

1566. Public Concern: The Forest Service should increase funding for research and development of biological means of preventing and controlling insect and disease..... 6-104

1567. Public Concern: The Forest Service should reallocate money earmarked for timber removal to hiring a staff large enough, and capable enough, of recognizing forest health problems early on..... 6-105

1568. Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge the financial contribution made by off-road vehicle users to noxious plant abatement programs..... 6-105

Active Management 6-105

1569. Public Concern: The Forest Service should control insects, disease, and noxious plants..... 6-105

To reduce fire hazards..... 6-105

To save game range..... 6-105

By prescribing and implementing treatments through the forest planning process 6-105

By reintroducing fire to roadless areas 6-105

By implementing reasonable fire policies in roadless areas 6-106

By prohibiting single-species replanting 6-106

With proper forest management and protection practices to prevent the spread to adjoining private lands 6-106

With advice from professionals..... 6-107

With the implementation and enforcement of U.S. Department of Agriculture recommended initiatives 6-107

With multiple methods 6-107

With chemicals and other solutions 6-108

With aerial applications 6-108

In roaded areas identified as suitable for logging 6-108

Outside of roadless areas 6-108

Except in large-scale tracts of land 6-108

At the local level 6-108

1570. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow even age management only in areas experiencing an onslaught of pests. 6-109

Ecosystem/Restoration Management 6-109

1571. Public Concern: The Forest Service should acknowledge that native insects and diseases are part of a healthy ecosystem. 6-109

Because they are vital to ecological sustainability and biodiversity 6-109

By explaining the role insects play in forest nutrient cycling and renewal 6-109

By not assuming roadless areas are in an unhealthy state 6-109

1572. Public Concern: The Forest Service should control insects, disease, and noxious plants. 6-110

With natural remedies 6-110

With species diversity and multi-age stands 6-110

By prohibiting road construction in roadless areas 6-110

By encouraging a proliferation of songbirds and other natural predators that feed on insects 6-111

By closing roads 6-111

1573. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow wildfires to destroy insects and disease. 6-111

Rather than using timber removal to destroy them 6-111

1574. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use pesticides and herbicides. 6-111

1575. Public Concern: The Forest Service should control only exotic or non-native insects and diseases. 6-111

1576. Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas. 6-112

To curtail invasions by exotic or alien species of plants 6-112

1577. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use forest health as an excuse to harvest timber. 6-113

Do not claim harvesting is needed to prevent insects and disease 6-113

Because insects and disease rarely rise to epidemic levels 6-113

PROTECTING COMMUNITIES (*QUESTION 4*) 6-115

Private Property Protection 6-115

Private Property Protection General 6-118

1578. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that there are few concentrated populations of either individuals or communities near inventoried roadless areas. 6-118

Due to these low population densities, a fire spreading from an inventoried roadless area would have little opportunity to endanger human life or property..... 6-118

1579. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule will have no impact on protecting communities from forest fires. 6-118

Near the San Juan National Forest 6-118

1580. Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide accurate maps depicting the location of private lands within roadless areas... 6-118

1581. Public Concern: The Forest Service should formulate a very limited management plan to address fuels reduction in stands of trees close to towns. 6-119

Adequacy of Analysis..... 6-119

1582. Public Concern: The Forest Service should conduct a formal risk assessment of the consequences of prohibiting active management within roadless areas. 6-119

1583. Public Concern: The Forest Service should complete an inventory of communities at risk..... 6-119

With the cooperation of other firefighting organizations..... 6-119

Management..... 6-119

1584. Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect private property in accordance with the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. 6-119

Because it allows activities to protect adjacent lands 6-119

1585. Public Concern: The Forest Service should continue to use the same basic fire-fighting policies it has in place now for protecting communities and homes. 6-120

With the exception of road building..... 6-120

1586. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not allow timber removal in the name of fire prevention for private property..... 6-120

1587. Public Concern: The Forest Service should reconsider its policy to temporarily suspend wilderness standards regarding wildfire suppression. 6-120

When communities are threatened..... 6-120

1588. Public Concern: The Forest Service should assign a land use category to protected areas which allows locally specific management activities. 6-120

To protect communities in the urban-forest interface zone..... 6-120

1589. Public Concern: The Forest Service should retract policies that interfere with local fire suppression and control..... 6-121

1590. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow management activities on national forests..... 6-121

To ensure the protection of private lands 6-121

1591. Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish different wildfire management policies for areas where there are whole functioning communities on or near national forests..... 6-121

1592. Public Concern: The Forest Service should be forthcoming with information regarding management of private property and surrounding areas.....6-121

1593. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not seek to manage private lands.6-121

1594. Public Concern: The Forest Service should scrutinize the appropriateness of roadless designations near private property.6-121

1595. Public Concern: The Forest Service should balance private development with open space and critical wildlife habitat.....6-122

1596. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not risk human life to save private property.6-122

Land Use Ordinances/Building Codes6-122

1597. Public Concern: The Forest Service should encourage development of land use ordinances which keep residential development away from public lands.....6-122

1598. Public Concern: The Forest Service should discourage settlement in roadless areas due to natural disaster risks.6-122

By making private developments less qualifiable for recovery insurance.....6-122

1599. Public Concern: The Forest Service should revise building codes.....6-122

To set a standard for construction in fire-prone areas6-122

To prohibit cedar shingles for roofing6-122

1600. Public Concern: The Forest Service should work with the homebuilding industry to ban roofs that put people at risk from fires.....6-123

1601. Public Concern: The Forest Service should alleviate fire danger to private property through integration of diverse biological systems into the building material’s infrastructure.6-123

1602. Public Concern: The Forest Service should require property owners to consent to a conservation easement on their property.6-123

To emphasize protection and preservation of natural forests.....6-123

Urban-Forest Interface.....6-123

1603. Public Concern: The Forest Service should identify urban-forest interface areas and develop appropriate management prescriptions for them.6-123

To reduce the risk from wildfire6-123

1604. Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect roadless areas as a buffer between wilderness and the urban-forest interface.....6-123

1605. Public Concern: The Forest Service should establish buffer zones between private property and roadless areas.6-123

That are 500 feet wide6-124

In the form of a reverse greenbelt6-124

By maintaining minimally urbanized areas as buffer zones.....6-124

By purchasing inholdings6-124

If the adjacent private property values warrant such protection..... 6-124

1606. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow private communities to construct buffer zones. 6-125

To protect private property 6-125

1607. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider ski areas located adjacent to communities as modifications supporting and complementing fire protection..... 6-125

In the urban-forest interface 6-125

1608. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not fragment roadless areas by constructing buffer zones..... 6-125

1609. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that extensive vegetation management in forest-urban interface areas does not reduce potential home fire losses. 6-125

1610. Public Concern: The Forest Service should focus on other management activities besides urban-forest interface activities. 6-125

In Region 5 6-125

Urban-Forest Interface – Funding 6-126

1611. Public Concern: The Forest Service should stop its misuse of the emergency fuels management funding earmarked for the urban-forest interface zone..... 6-126

Public Collaboration 6-126

1612. Public Concern: The Forest Service should work with local agencies to plan for and combat natural disasters near private property. 6-126

Through local fire management plans 6-126

Through an established educational plan 6-126

Through fire prevention seminars 6-126

By consulting officials in New Mexico and Montana 6-126

1613. Public Concern: The Forest Service should work with other federal agencies to implement better land use planning..... 6-127

1614. Public Concern: The Forest Service should keep a log of nearby property owners. 6-127

In order to send them a list of emergency contacts 6-127

1615. Public Concern: The Forest Service should view private inholders as partners in forest stewardship..... 6-127

Responsibility for Protecting Private Property 6-127

Responsibility of the Forest Service 6-128

1616. Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect private property from natural disasters. 6-128

After determining the risk involved..... 6-129

Through coordination between residential and rural fire-fighting teams..... 6-129

Through science-based management decisions 6-129

By revising regulations and legal authority as necessary to secure timely measures to protect private resources 6-129

By establishing quick response procedures 6-129

By providing adequate maps of roadless areas 6-129

By conducting an inventory of communities located near roadless areas 6-129

By allowing forest management decisions to be made at the local level..... 6-130

By enlisting the aid of the National Guard 6-130

By enlisting the aid of Forest Service research stations 6-130

By allocating resources 6-130

By management activities 6-130

By constructing roads for access 6-130

By constructing temporary roads for access 6-131

By thinning dense stands near communities 6-131

By reintroducing fire 6-131

By prescribed burns 6-131

By maintaining a ‘defensible space’ from the boundary of private property to the forest 6-131

By zoning and prohibition of structures within 200 feet of private property boundaries 6-131

By clearing hazardous materials 200 meters from communities 6-132

By clearing hazardous materials 40-100 meters from communities 6-132

By creating jobs that enable people to remove fuelwood 6-132

By providing local water access for fire hoses..... 6-132

For homes that existed prior to inclusion in the National Forest System 6-132

On the Little Missouri National Grasslands 6-132

At the Brundage Mountain Ski Resort 6-132

1617. Public Concern: The Forest Service should educate private property owners regarding the dangers that exist in roadless areas. 6-132

And the steps they should take to protect their property 6-132

By using *Living With Fire* as a guide 6-133

By hiring displaced timber workers to train landowners 6-133

1618. Public Concern: The Forest Service should protect federal property with private improvements from natural disasters. 6-133

Ski resorts 6-133

1619. Public Concern: The Forest Service should hold forest managers accountable for decisions that create dangerous situations. 6-133

Responsibility of Private Property Owners..... 6-134

1620. Public Concern: Private property owners should be responsible for protecting their property from natural disasters. 6-134

By digging trenches around their property 6-134

By providing fire lookouts 6-134

By establishing fire and rescue departments..... 6-134

By developing fire management plans and stricter building and zoning codes 6-134

1621. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow private property owners to clear a safe area around their property. 6-135
 Up to 100 yards away 6-135
Financial Responsibility..... 6-135
 1622. Public Concern: The Forest Service should pay for damages to private property if they allow disease or insects to spread..... 6-135
 1623. Public Concern: The Forest Service should pay private property owners for property damaged by wildfire. 6-135
 1624. Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide funding to private property owners. 6-135
 To clear fuels around their home 6-135
 1625. Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide royalties from extractive industries to communities near roadless areas. 6-135
 1626. Public Concern: The Forest Service should use federal funds to relocate private property owners to safe areas. 6-135
 In the event of a natural disaster 6-135
 1627. Public Concern: Private property owners, not taxpayers, should bear the cost of fire protection. 6-136
 1628. Public Concern: The Forest Service should charge private property owners an annual fee and service charge for assistance. ... 6-136
 1629. Public Concern: States should raise property taxes for homes near forested areas..... 6-136
 To cover fire fighting costs..... 6-136
 1630. Public Concern: The Forest Service should encourage private insurance companies to either increase rates or refuse coverage for homes built in locations at risk of wildfire..... 6-136
 1631. Public Concern: The Forest Service should encourage fire insurance carriers to offer reduced rates to those that meet fire danger reduction standards. 6-137
Other..... 6-137
 1632. Public Concern: Organizations opposed to access to roadless areas should protect communities and private property and assume liability for any loss. 6-137
 PROTECTING ACCESS TO PROPERTY (*QUESTION 5*)..... 6-138
 Protecting Access to Property General 6-138
 1633. Public Concern: The U.S. Department of the Interior and Bureau of Land Management should survey the boundaries of private and federal property..... 6-139
 To establish adjoining boundaries 6-139
 1634. Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure access to private property..... 6-139
 Through the forest planning process 6-139
 Through special use permits 6-139
 On a case-by-case basis 6-139
 1635. Public Concern: The Forest Service should avoid additional delays regarding decisions on access to private property. 6-139

1636. Public Concern: The Forest Service should notify private property owners when considering changes that could affect access to their property.6-140
 To allow property owners to ascertain the impacts of road policies6-140

1637. Public Concern: The Forest Service should spell out conditions of ingress and egress in forest plans.6-140

1638. Public Concern: Local governments should ensure that properties for sale are guaranteed access.6-140

1639. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address access to parcels not presently accessible by road.....6-140
 On a case-by-case basis.....6-140

1640. Public Concern: The Forest Service should oversee local residential access decisions.6-140
 To ensure compliance with statutory federal residential requirements, protections, and planning processes6-140

1641. Public Concern: The Forest Service should require private property owners to prevent interloping along routes of ingress and egress to their property.....6-141

1642. Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure that private property owners do not conduct activities that harm adjacent ownerships.6-141

1643. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow the advocates of non-wilderness use to compete for access to privately held lands.....6-141

Roadless Area Management6-141

1644. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address, on a forest-by-forest basis, the potential impacts of roadless area management on access.6-141
 To other public and private lands6-141

1645. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule has no impact on access to state and private inholdings.....6-142
 Because access is already protected by existing law.....6-142

1646. Public Concern: The Forest Service should retain the provision in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule which provides exceptions to the prohibitions on road construction when necessary to maintain access to inholdings.6-142

1647. Public Concern: The Forest Service should revise the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.6-142
 To ensure that reasonable access routes to private property are maintained.....6-142

1648. Public Concern: The Forest Service should identify roadless areas in private property deeds.6-142

1649. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule has adverse impacts on private property access.6-143

1650. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prohibit home building in roadless areas. 6-143

Access to National Forest System Lands Through Private Property 6-143

1651. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prevent public lands from being landlocked by private lands. 6-143

In the Los Padres National Forest 6-143

1652. Public Concern: The Forest Service should maintain public rights-of-way through private property. 6-143

When public land is bordered on all sides by private land 6-143

1653. Public Concern: The Forest Service should prevent private property owners from blocking access to other private inholdings.... 6-144

1654. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow public access through private or tribal grazing allotments. 6-144

Maintenance of Routes through National Forest System Lands to Private Property..... 6-144

1655. Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide access routes to private property. 6-145

By maintaining existing roads 6-145

By allowing private property owners to build roads 6-145

By constructing low-impact roads 6-146

By maintaining historically accessible routes 6-146

By establishing the shortest route 6-146

By defining levels of vehicular access 6-146

By patterning access routes after the National Park Service 6-146

By constructing minimum sized trails 6-146

By allowing foot and horseback trails 6-146

By allowing *only* foot and horseback trails 6-147

By enforcing regulations 6-147

By complying with Revised Statute 2477 6-147

By training personnel regarding laws governing private property access 6-147

By allocating more funds to preserve access 6-147

By refraining from creating small areas of protected roadless regions..... 6-147

By not designating areas adjacent to private property as roadless 6-147

Only if public access to public land is preserved 6-147

Only if public access to National Forest System lands in general is preserved 6-147

Within ten days of a property owner's request..... 6-148

Through geodetic grid lines 6-148

Through established access points 6-148

Through non-motorized easements 6-148

Through airstrips and helispots 6-148

Through an exception to the Roadless Area Conservation Rule 6-148

Through the forest planning process 6-148

Through meetings with individual stakeholders 6-149

Through collaboration with county sheriffs 6-149

Through the National Forest Management Act..... 6-149

By conducting a case-by-case access alternatives analysis for each inholding..... 6-149

To restore the public’s faith in government 6-149

While preventing access by unauthorized parties 6-149

In Alaska 6-149

In North Dakota 6-149

Lands controlled by the Stimson Timber Company..... 6-150

1656. Public Concern: The Forest Service should allow property owners seasonally unrestricted ground-based access. 6-150

 Within environmentally reasonable constraints 6-150

1657. Public Concern: The Forest Service should provide access routes to state-owned lands. 6-150

 In Minnesota..... 6-150

 In Montana 6-150

1658. Public Concern: The Forest Service should grant access to property owners previously denied..... 6-150

1659. Public Concern: Local authorities should determine permissible access routes to private property. 6-151

1660. Public Concern: The Forest Service should manage access routes in a way that contributes to a feeling of inaccessibility..... 6-151

1661. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not require private property owners to comply with wilderness standards..... 6-151

 With regard to access 6-151

1662. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not require fees for access to private property. 6-151

1663. Public Concern: The Forest Service should block access to ecologically damaging groups. 6-151

1664. Public Concern: The Forest Service should recognize that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule has no impact on access to state and private inholdings..... 6-151

 In Idaho 6-151

Road Construction/Maintenance..... 6-152

1665. Public Concern: The Forest Service should permit road construction to land that was privately owned prior to the government’s ownership of surrounding property..... 6-152

1666. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not construct roads for the sole purpose of providing access to private inholdings. 6-152

1667. Public Concern: The Forest Service should address its contradictory statements regarding special use permits and public roads. 6-152

Road Construction/Maintenance – Funding..... 6-153

1668. Public Concern: Private property owners should bear the cost of constructing or maintaining access roads..... 6-153

Legal Considerations 6-153

1669. Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure access to private property as required by existing law..... 6-153

 By abiding by the requirements of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act 6-154

 By abiding by the requirements of Revised Statute 2477 6-154

 By abiding by the requirements of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act 6-154

 By issuing non-appealable decisions..... 6-154

1670. Public Concern: The Forest Service should review current laws governing private property access..... 6-154

 To ensure that access is maintained 6-154

1671. Public Concern: The Forest Service should disclose its legal obligations to provide access routes under existing laws. 6-155

 To avoid misleading the public 6-155

1672. Public Concern: The Forest Service should familiarize personnel with laws regarding access to private lands..... 6-155

1673. Public Concern: The Forest Service should consider that state statutes already ensure access to private property..... 6-155

 Colorado State statutes 6-155

1674. Public Concern: The Forest Service should uphold valid existing rights..... 6-155

 On the Chugach National Forest 6-155

1675. Public Concern: The Forest Service should implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 6-155

 Because it adequately protects valid existing rights 6-155

1676. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not implement the Roadless Area Conservation Rule..... 6-156

 Because it will not protect valid existing rights..... 6-156

1677. Public Concern: Private property owners should have the right to appeal unreasonable constraints on access..... 6-156

1678. Public Concern: The Forest Service should ensure consistent treatment of inholders with respect to the appeals process. 6-156

 Over the establishment of ownership rights..... 6-156

Land Exchanges/Purchases..... 6-156

Land Exchanges/Purchases General..... 6-157

 1679. Public Concern: The Forest Service should cease acquiring more private property within inventoried roadless areas..... 6-157

 Until it has regained control over other resources, such as its roads and maintenance backlog..... 6-157

 1680. Public Concern: The Forest Service should condemn private property located in roadless areas..... 6-157

 To obtain inholdings 6-157

Land Exchanges 6-157

 1681. Public Concern: The Forest Service should exchange other federal land for private inholdings located in roadless areas. 6-157

 Exchange peripheral federal land..... 6-158

To prevent private interests from influencing management activities ..6-158

1682. Public Concern: The Forest Service should exchange federal land outside roadless areas for state lands within roadless areas.....6-158

Because the cumulative effect of national management rules would prevent reasonable access to inholdings in roadless areas6-158

1683. Public Concern: The Forest Service should exchange other federal land for private inholdings located in wilderness areas.....6-158

1684. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not designate an area roadless unless all private inholders first agree to a land exchange.....6-159

Purchases..... 6-159

1685. Public Concern: The Forest Service should purchase private inholdings.6-159

If the area is to be declared wilderness6-159

Only if other areas are to be reopened to multiple uses6-159

With Land and Water Conservation Fund money.....6-159

To build connections between roadless areas and designated wilderness areas6-159

In the Tongass National Forest6-160

1686. Public Concern: The Forest Service should either buy private property or negotiate an access schedule with property owners.6-160

If traffic levels escalate the environmental impact of access6-160

1687. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not use Conservation and Reinvestment Act funding to purchase privately owned forest lands.6-160

1688. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not force private landowners to sale their property.6-160

For the reason of obtaining inholdings6-160

1689. Public Concern: The Forest Service should discourage private profiteering over the Agency’s purchase of private property in roadless areas.....6-160

1690. Public Concern: The Forest Service should not succumb to blackmail by private property owners.6-160

Who threaten to construct large buildings on inholdings6-160

1691. Public Concern: The price of private property within roadless areas should reflect the presence or absence of an access route to the property.6-161

Appendix D Demographics

Introduction

CAT demographic analysis presents an overall picture of respondents; specifically, where they live, their general affiliation to organizations or government agencies, and the manner in which they respond. CAT’s database organizes public comments under subject categories (see Appendix B) and demographic information. A report can be generated from the database to show public comments from certain geographic locations or to show comments associated with certain types of organizations. Thus demographic coding combined with comment coding allows use of the database to focus on specific areas of public concern that are linked to geographic areas, organizational affiliations, and response formats.

The total number of responses is as follows:

52,432	original responses
674,008	organized campaign responses
726,440	total responses

It is important to recognize that public comment analysis is not a vote-counting process in which the outcome is determined by the majority opinion. Because respondents are self-selected, they do not constitute a random or representative public sample. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) encourages all interested parties to submit comment as often as they wish regardless of age, citizenship, or eligibility to vote. Respondents may therefore include businesses, people from other countries, children, and people who submit multiple responses. Therefore, caution should be used when interpreting the numbers provided in this report. While demographic information can provide insight into the perspectives and values of respondents, it does not necessarily reveal the desires of society as a whole. All input is considered and the analysis team strives to identify the concerns raised by all respondents.

CAT identifies several categories for demographic purposes. Responses are the individual letters, postcards, emails, etc., received. Respondents are the individual response writers. Signatures refer to the people (respondents) who signed these individual responses. The number of signatures may be greater than the number of responses as there may be more than one signature per response. Likewise, the number of total responses may be larger than the number of total respondents due to multiple submissions by the same respondents. CAT determines the number of responses received for a given project, the number of respondents, and the number of signatures.

Organizational Affiliation

Organizational affiliation is tracked for each response.

Table D-1 displays, by organization type, the number of responses and signatures. The first box indicates respondents who write on behalf of themselves or whose affiliation is unclear.

Table D-1. Number of Responses and Signatures by Organization Type

Organization Type	Number of Responses	Number of Signatures
Individual/Unaffiliated	51,036	55,763
University/Professional Society	56	59
Federal Agency/Elected Official	45	70
State Agency/Elected Official	114	116
County Agency/Elected Official	204	209
Town/Municipality Agency/Elected Official	72	81
Government Employees, Organizations, and Unions	9	9
Tribal Official/Member	15	15
Agriculture Industry/Association	19	20
Conservation District	2	2
Business	110	1,951
Place Based Group	13	13
Civic Group	39	74
Range/Grazing Organization	10	12
Timber or Wood Products Industry/Association	90	102
Mining Industry/Association	17	18
Oil and Pipeline Industries	12	12
Recreational Non-Motorized Organization	35	38
Recreational Motorized Organization	34	35
Special Use Permittee	23	25
Conservation/Preservation Organization	344	1,209
Utility Group/Organization	11	12
Multiple Use, Wise Use, Land Rights Organization	41	44
Other	14	236
Single Responses signed by Multiple Organizations	67	735
Total	52,432	60,860

Response Type

CAT tracks response formats. The public uses a variety of response formats including letters, emails, faxes, petitions, resolutions, action alerts, and organized response campaign letters. Tracking response formats allows CAT and its clients to be better prepared for what future projects may bring in terms of number of responses, human resource needs, and computer system needs.

Table D-2 displays, by response format, the number of original responses and signatures. The majority of responses received were letters, followed by emails, faxes, and petitions.

Table D-2. Number of Responses and Signatures by Response Format

Response Format	Number of Responses	Number of Signatures
Letter	39,154	42,375
Email	12,601	13,303
Fax	632	847
Petition	38	4,327
Resolution	6	7
Action Alert	1	1
Total Responses	52,432	60,860

Geographic Representation

Geographic representation is tracked for each response. For petitions, geographic representation is not tracked for each individual signature. Instead, petition signatures are all assigned to the state of the person or organization originating the petition.

Table D-3 displays, by origin, the number of responses and signatures. Note that 3,009 responses did not indicate geographic information.

Table D-3. Number of Responses and Signatures by Origin

State	Number of Responses	Number of Signatures
Alabama	256	312
Alaska	1,771	1,834
Arizona	917	957
Arkansas	244	266
California	6,356	6,860
Colorado	3,070	3,646
Connecticut	404	425
Delaware	71	74
District of Columbia	165	205
Federated States of Micronesia	1	1
Florida	1,320	1,386
Georgia	739	793

Guam	1	1
Hawaii	92	94
Idaho	1,261	1,494
Illinois	1,196	1,481
Indiana	406	426
Iowa	287	305
Kansas	203	217
Kentucky	255	263
Louisiana	185	194
Maine	260	276
Maryland	580	600
Massachusetts	932	1,199
Michigan	1,067	1,133
Minnesota	1,125	1,230
Mississippi	80	81
Missouri	561	587
Montana	3,843	4,134
Nebraska	128	135
Nevada	301	345
New Hampshire	466	504
New Jersey	818	1,019
New Mexico	433	476
New York	1,770	1,909
North Carolina	766	813
North Dakota	83	84
Ohio	1,006	1,047
Oklahoma	156	161
Oregon	3,760	6,069
Pennsylvania	1,361	1,461
Puerto Rico	1	1
Rhode Island	108	114
South Carolina	278	290
South Dakota	228	234
Tennessee	515	546
Texas	1,181	1,214
Utah	807	1,583
Vermont	431	475
Virginia	1,254	1,337
Washington	3,920	4,195
West Virginia	260	268
Wisconsin	945	1,249
Wyoming	683	735
International	105	115
Response submitted by Multiple States	67	724
Anonymous/Unknown	2,953	3,383

Total	52,432	60,860
--------------	---------------	---------------

Appendix E

Organized Response Report

Organized responses represent 93 percent of the total responses received during the public comment period for the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (674,008 out of 726,440). Five or more responses received from different individuals but containing identical text, or identical text plus brief additional comments similar in content, are defined as organized response campaigns.

Organized Response Campaigns

Five or more responses, received separately but containing identical text, constitute an organized response campaign. Once an organized response campaign letter is identified, a “master” is entered into the database with all of the content information. All responses with matching text are then linked to this master within the database with a designated number. If a response does not contain all of the text presented in a given organized response, or if it includes additional text, it is entered as an individual letter. Identical responses from four or fewer respondents are also entered as individual letters.

Organized responses are identified with a number. The following table presents the total number received of each organized response campaign letter and summarizes the concerns found therein. Note: Some of the letters show less than five received; this is because a number of organized response campaign letters were submitted by government officials and their numbers are included in Table D-1 in Appendix D.

Table E-1. Organized Response Campaigns

Organized Response Campaign Letter Number	Total Received	Summary of Organized Response Campaign Letter
1	119	Supports the immediate implementation of a roadless area policy that applies to all roadless areas 1,000 acres and larger, and that restricts road construction, timber harvest, and other harmful activities in roadless areas.
2	39,482	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it provides a balanced approach to forest conservation. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas and requests the inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
3	1586	Expresses concern regarding past damages to roadless areas. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it provides a balanced approach to forest conservation. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas and requests the inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
4	7114	Suggests restricting timber harvest, mining, and drilling in roadless areas. Also suggests that oil and gas companies should not be given local influence in the management of roadless areas. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it was adopted after sufficient public input. Also describes important values of

		roadless areas such as wildlife habitat and watershed protection.
5	4	Suggests that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule was the most important accomplishment of the Clinton Administration and that governmental restrictions are the only hope to protect natural beauty and balance. Also suggests that roadless areas are buffers against pollution and environmental damage. Expresses support for any agency or elected representative who protects and preserves natural lands.
6	114	Requests the full protection of grizzly bears and their habitat through the implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Also requests that any process that leads to clearcutting or development of roadless areas be prohibited.
7	1067	Supports immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as written. Suggests that all roadless areas be protected from timber harvest, roadbuilding, and mining and that the Rule include the Tongass and Chugach National Forests.
8	6597	Letter does not support the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, suggesting it was part of a flawed National Environmental Policy Act process. Requests the Rule be revised to adequately address forest health concerns, access to private and state inholdings, and local input. Also requests that roadless areas be accurately mapped at the forest level including an inventory of classified and unclassified roads. Modifications to the Rule must also take into consideration the need to access national forests to provide for congressionally mandated multiple uses. Includes responses to the ten questions which generally oppose the Rule.
9	13	Suggests that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule should be revised to address the issues of recreational access, forest health, access to private and state inholdings, and local input. Also suggests that modifications to the Rule must take into account the need to access national forests to provide for Congressionally-mandated multiple uses. Supports local forest-level decisionmaking. Provides responses to the ten questions which generally oppose the Rule.
10	6685	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and urges abandonment of efforts to weaken roadless area protections. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking and suggests that the Rule already contains the exemptions necessary to protect forest health, communities, homes and property and access to inholdings.
11	817	Letter does not support the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, suggesting it was part of a flawed National Environmental Policy Act process. Requests the Rule be revised to adequately address forest health concerns, access to private and state inholdings, and local input. Also requests that roadless areas be accurately mapped at the forest level including an inventory of classified and unclassified roads. Modifications to the Rule must also take into consideration the need to access national forests to provide for congressionally mandated multiple uses. Other suggestions include the need to use up-to-date criteria for delineation of roadless areas, deletion of roaded portions of inventoried roadless areas from the inventory, evaluation of economic and social relationships impacting working families and local communities, and inclusion of a full range of management alternatives. Suggests that wilderness recommendations and local forest level decision making should also be addressed.
12	167	Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that forest plans must

		provide for multiple use and protect forest resources from fire and insects through local planning. Also suggests that public hearings be held to involve all parties in the process, that the protection of communities should be the primary factor in determining the way a fire is fought, and that roadless areas should be managed no differently than any other area of the forest.
13	7210	Letter does not support the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it was the product of a flawed National Environmental Policy Act process. Suggests the Rule be revised to adequately address forest health concerns, access to private and state inholdings, and local input. Also requests that roadless areas be accurately mapped at the forest level including an inventory of classified and unclassified roads. Modifications to the Rule must also take into consideration the need to access national forests to provide for congressionally mandated multiple uses. Other suggestions include the need to use up-to-date criteria for delineation of roadless areas, deletion of roaded portions of inventoried roadless areas from the inventory, and evaluation of economic and social relationships impacting working families and local communities. Requests a process to allow those most affected by management decisions on public lands to be heard.
14	2532	Supports the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Alliance's "Square Deal Initiative #1." Suggests that the 58 million acres under consideration should be kept roadless and that criteria should be carefully defined for the consideration of any exceptions for providing road access for forest management. Also suggests that decisionmaking should include the interests of local people while the final decision authority to build roads in roadless areas should be retained by the Chief of the Forest Service.
15	2230	Expresses disappointment and distrust toward the Bush Administration's attempt to weaken forest protections and ignore public input. Requests the immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.
16	485	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and all efforts to oppose the weakening of forest protections. Suggests that roadless areas are valuable for high quality fish and wildlife habitat, backcountry recreation, and clean water supplies.
17	4	Opposes the Gravina Island timber sale as it is in violation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Suggests that this timber sale will harm the wilderness character and pose a threat to the historical, cultural, and recreational values of the area. Also suggests that significant damage to the native historical uses and cultural resources will result from this timber harvest as well as damage to fish and wildlife habitat.
18	32,728	Expresses disappointment and distrust toward the Bush Administration's attempt to weaken forest protections and ignore public input. Requests the immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.
19	184	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and urges abandonment of efforts to weaken roadless area protections. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking and suggests that the Rule already contains the exemptions necessary to protect forest health, communities, homes and property, and access to inholdings. Also suggests that previous public involvement processes have proven public support for roadless area protections.
20	129	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule to protect all roadless areas, including the Tongass and Chugach National Forests. Suggests that roadless areas

		are vulnerable to development and should be protected for future generations and clean drinking water.
21	522	Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the management of roadless areas should be determined in forest plans on a site-specific basis, that effective communication is conducted at the forest level, and that road access is necessary for forest health management and private inholdings. Provides an extensive list of factors that should be considered in the evaluation of roadless areas. Suggests that a full range of alternatives should be considered for the management of roadless areas.
22	36	Requests that the flaws in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule be fixed to address forest health, public access, local input, the mapping and classification of roads, and congressionally mandated multiple uses. Suggests that concern for each forest requires active local management.
23	730	Supports the continuance and protection of dispersed recreation opportunities in roadless areas. Provides responses to some of the ten questions that have a direct impact on recreation and offers suggestions regarding appropriate management of motorized recreation.
24	73	Opposes the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it is excessively restrictive regarding access to lands for recreational use. Supports the court ruling that the Rule was predetermined and violated the National Environmental Policy Act. Requests that the Rule be withdrawn.
25	4	Opposes the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it is illegal, politically driven, and ignores legitimate access concerns. Suggests that protection of access to public lands should be done through a program of thinning and timber harvest management. Also suggests that environmental protection should take into account the realities about multiple use and recreational opportunities and that roadless area decisions should occur at the local level.
26	26	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it strikes a balance between preserving wildlands and accommodating competing uses. Expresses specific concerns about roadless areas in the Los Padres and Six Rivers National Forest. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking regarding roadless area management.
27	41,413	Opposes any changes to the Roadless Area Conservation Rule that would allow timber harvest in pristine areas of any national forest, especially the Tongass National Forest. Also opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking for roadless area management. Suggests that the Tongass is valuable for abundant wildlife and should be protected. Also suggests that previous public support for the Rule should not be ignored.
28	1722	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it strikes a balance between preserving wildlands and accommodating competing uses. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking regarding roadless area management. Suggests that most national forests are already open to development and that the last remaining wildlands should be preserved.
29	129	Suggests that all roadless areas should be managed to prohibit timber harvest and roadbuilding. Requests implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.
30	9	Suggests that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule enjoys overwhelming public

		support and should be implemented because local planning has failed to adequately protect roadless areas. Describes the value of roadless areas to be sources of clean drinking water, wildlife habitat, areas for scientific research and study, and to provide open space and areas for cultural observances. Also suggests that the Rule received adequate public support, already provides exceptions for forest health management, has no affect on access to inholdings, and should be retained and implemented as is. Includes a list of specific areas in Texas to be included in the roadless area inventory.
31	105,980	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects roadless areas in the national forests, especially the Tongass National Forest. Opposes any changes that would weaken the January Rule including forest-by-forest decision-making.
32	275	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it strikes a balance between preserving wildlands and accommodating competing uses. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking regarding roadless area management. Also suggests that previous public support for the Rule should not be ignored, and the Rule should be implemented to preserve roadless areas for future generations.
33	18	Requests that roadless areas be closed to timber harvest, mining, road building, and drilling and that previous public comment on the Roadless Area Conservation Rule be included in this analysis. Suggests that roadless areas should be kept roadless because wildfires are more likely to start in areas with roads, because roadless area conservation is important to the diversification of rural economies, and because roadless areas provide clean water and wildlife habitat.
34	5	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it received much public support. Suggests that we need to preserve forest areas rather than mine and harvest them.
35	300	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, as roadless areas are critical fish and wildlife habitat. Suggests that fishing and hunting values should be considered in decisions regarding roadless area management. Also suggests that economic values of roadless areas should be considered because fishing contributes to the nation's economy. Requests that roadbuilding should be prohibited in roadless areas because roads threaten vital fish habitat by increasing sediment in streams.
36	404	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and its immediate implementation on all national forests. Suggests that adequate public support for the Rule has already been exhibited and all interested parties had the opportunity to address their concerns about roadless values. Also suggests that the Rule provides for the protection of forest values while adequately addressing local forest managers' communities' needs and competing interests.
37	28	Suggests that only a national rule can adequately protect roadless areas. Also suggests that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule allows forest health management, ensures access to inholdings, and considers the economic benefit of revenue from recreational activities.
38	1	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Suggests that the Rule is a compromise between protection and industrial development and provides a balance between recreational and extractive uses. Suggests that the White Mountain National Forest provides solitude and recreational value for its residents as well as visitors and that the Rule helps protect biological, economic, and private property resources.

39	7	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Suggests that protecting roadless areas is important for outdoor experiences. Also suggests that local forest planning has failed to provide adequate protection and that the Rule has overwhelming public support.
40	7	Supports the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Alliance's Square Deal Initiatives. Suggests balancing accessibility to National Forest System lands with management requirements. Also suggests increasing funding and accountability for fish and wildlife habitat management programs at all levels.
41	149	Requests implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and supports permanent protection for roadless areas in the Plumas National Forest. Suggests that roadless areas provide clean drinking water, recreational opportunities, and critical wildlife habitat.
42	120	Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that decisions be made at the local level with adequate public involvement, that fire breaks, thinning and fuel reduction should be performed, and that access needs should be met. Also suggests that natural resources should not be wasted, that recreation should be accommodated, that Congress should designate roadless areas, and that the Forest Service should recognize the increasing demand for roads.
43	1420	Suggests that the recreational community was not given adequate opportunity to comment on the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Requests that local communities have the opportunity to have their view incorporated into management plans and that national forests remain open to responsible recreational activities.
44	29	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that local forest planning has not adequately protected roadless areas and that the Rule is needed to provide additional protection. Also suggests that the Rule received adequate public support, already provides exceptions for forest health management, has no affect on access to inholdings, and should be retained and implemented as is.
45	6	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as a national Rule is essential to safeguarding roadless areas. Opposes local control by timber, mining, and extraction interests.
46	24	Requests implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Suggests that the role of local forest planning is to add additional restrictions to the Rule based on local situations. Also suggests that the Rule sufficiently addresses forest health management, public involvement, roadless area values, and economic considerations. Requests that off-road vehicles and mining should be prohibited.
47	19	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it stands for ensuring wilderness and wild rivers. Also supports permanent protection of the Chugach and Tongass National Forests. Suggests that these forests are valuable for economic resources, healthy fisheries, clean water, wildlife, cultural heritage, and recreational opportunities.
48	7	Expresses concern that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule was rushed through and public meetings were not adequately announced. Suggests that roadless area decisions should be made on a forest-by-forest basis within the forest planning process. Also suggests that there is a forest health crisis in Idaho that must be

		addressed through proper forest management. Provides responses to the ten questions which generally support local forest management and active forest health management.
49	228	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as roadless areas are important for recreational experiences and ecosystem protection. Suggests that the Rule is the result of extensive participation and adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input.
50	3021	Supports the scientific management of fish and wildlife habitat that will remain open to hunters and anglers. Requests that existing roads be fixed while roadless areas remain roadless.
51	835	Requests that roadbuilding be restricted in 58.5 million acres, that fish and wildlife be a priority in habitat management, and that decisions be made on science rather than politics. Suggests that all comments should be given equal weight.
52	75	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it is the product of an extensive federal rulemaking with overwhelming public support. Suggests that the Rule represents a balanced approach to forest conservation and adequately addresses the issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking on roadless area development.
53	6	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because Montanans have voiced strong support for permanent roadless area protection.
54	24	Letter does not support the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, suggesting it was part of a flawed National Environmental Policy Act process. Requests the Rule be revised to adequately address recreational access, forest health concerns, access to private and state inholdings, and local input. Also requests that roadless areas be accurately mapped at the forest level including an inventory of classified and unclassified roads. Modifications to the Rule must also take into consideration the need to access national forests to provide for congressionally mandated multiple uses. Other suggestions include the need to use up-to-date criteria for delineation of roadless areas, deletion of roaded portions of inventoried roadless areas from the inventory, and inclusion of a full range of management alternatives. Suggests that wilderness recommendations and local forest level decisionmaking should also be addressed.
55	9	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because forests and wildlife are precious and should be protected. Suggests that roadless area protection reflects the desires of the citizens of Oregon.
56	1	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it provides a balanced approach to forest conservation. Suggests that the previous public involvement process should ensure decision makers of public support for the Rule. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas.
57	215	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because it would protect areas in the White River National Forest. Suggests that the Rule is a sound compromise between protection and development. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on roadless area development.
58	3245	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because individual forest planning

		has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the role of local forest planning is to provide additional protection of roadless areas, that the Rule is the result of an extensive public involvement process, and that the Rule already adequately provides for forest health management, access to inholdings, wilderness designations, and identifies roadless area values. Also suggests that the economic value of roadless areas comes from recreation and environmental quality, that timber harvest and roadbuilding should be prohibited, and that the Bush Administration should respect the fact that the Rule enjoys overwhelming public support.
59	5120	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the role of local forest planning is to provide additional protection of roadless areas, that the Rule is the result of an extensive public involvement process, and that the Rule already adequately provides for forest health management, access to inholdings, wilderness designations, and identifies roadless area values. Also suggests that the economic value of roadless areas comes from recreation and environmental quality, that timber harvest and roadbuilding should be prohibited, and that the Bush Administration should respect the fact that the Rule enjoys overwhelming public support.
60	3466	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the role of local forest planning is to provide additional protection of roadless areas, that the Rule is the result of an extensive public involvement process, and that the Rule already adequately provides for forest health management, access to inholdings, wilderness designations, and identifies roadless area values. Also suggests that the economic value of roadless areas comes from recreation and environmental quality, that timber harvest and roadbuilding should be prohibited, and that the Bush Administration should respect the fact that the Rule enjoys overwhelming public support.
61	2544	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the role of local forest planning is to provide additional protection of roadless areas, that the Rule is the result of an extensive public involvement process, and that the Rule already adequately provides for forest health management, access to inholdings, wilderness designations, and identifies roadless area values. Also suggests that the economic value of roadless areas comes from recreation and environmental quality, that timber harvest and roadbuilding should be prohibited, and that the Bush Administration should respect the fact that the Rule enjoys overwhelming public support.
62	7	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the role of local forest planning is to provide additional protection of roadless areas, that the Rule is the result of an extensive public involvement process, and that the Rule already adequately provides for forest health management, access to inholdings, wilderness designations, and identifies roadless area values. Also suggests that the economic value of roadless areas comes from recreation and environmental quality, that timber harvest and roadbuilding should be prohibited, and that the Bush Administration should respect the fact that the Rule enjoys overwhelming public support.
63	339	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule without proposed amendments as it is a balanced approach to forest conservation and adequately addresses issues of

		fire management, forest health, access, and local input.
64	10	Opposes roadless area designation. Suggests that roadless areas endanger forest health because timber cannot be adequately managed or protected. Also suggests that the forest is for the use and enjoyment of all people, not for a select few.
65	399	Letter does not support the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, suggesting it was part of a flawed National Environmental Policy Act process. Requests the Rule be revised to adequately address forest health concerns, access to private and state inholdings, and local input. Also requests that roadless areas be accurately mapped at the forest level including an inventory of classified and unclassified roads. Modifications to the Rule must also take into consideration the need to access national forests to provide for congressionally mandated multiple uses. Suggests that modifications adequately address the forest health crisis threatening our national forests and supports individual forest plan decisions for management of roadless areas. Includes responses to the ten questions which reflect the above information.
66	24,261	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Expresses distrust toward the Bush Administration for refusal to implement the Rule.
67	787	Suggests that roads be kept out of roadless areas and that roadless areas should be managed for fish and wildlife habitat. Also suggests that roadless areas be open to hunting and fishing and that existing forest roads be maintained.
68	1580	Requests immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, including protection of the Tongass National Forest. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development. Suggests that roadless areas should be protected from road building and commercial extraction.
69	13	Requests immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, including the protections for the Tongass National Forest. Suggests that roadless areas are valuable for drinking water, ecosystem protection, scientific study, and biodiversity. Also suggests that the economic value of roadless areas comes from recreation and environmental quality of life.
70	51	Opposes the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it was imposed without going through proper channels of local public input. Suggests that road closures put undue hardship on local economies and eliminates currently available motorized recreation uses.
71	25	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because one million people voiced support for the Rule. Suggests that roadless areas have the highest quality fish and wildlife habitat, backcountry recreation, and clean water supplies. Also suggests that many areas not included in the Rule should be included and all off-road vehicle use in roadless areas should be prohibited.
72	8	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because roadless areas have the highest quality fish and wildlife habitat, backcountry recreation, and clean water supplies. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on roadless area development. Letter provides opportunity to respond to the ten questions.
73	0	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects roadless areas in our national forests, especially the Tongass National Forest. Opposes any changes that would weaken the January Rule including forest-by-forest decision-making.

74	462	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.
75	10	Suggests that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule was based on a process that was poorly and hastily executed. Also suggests that the Rule should be fixed by allowing for greater local input, by providing an assessment of the long-term impact of withdrawing lands from the resources base, and by compliance with congressionally mandated multiple uses of the forests. Supports individual forest plan level decisions for roadless area management. Provides responses to the ten questions which generally reflect the above concerns.
76	4	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because one million people voiced support for the Rule. Suggests that roadless areas have the highest quality fish and wildlife habitat, backcountry recreation, and clean water supplies. Also suggests that many areas not included in the Rule should be included and all off-road vehicle use in roadless areas should be prohibited.
77	3	Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that local managers should manage roadless areas, that local people should control forest decisions, that forest management access should be maintained, and that social and economic considerations should play a large role in roadless area evaluations. Also suggests that ski areas should be allowed in roadless areas, that roadless areas should not be proposed for wilderness designation, and that great emphasis should be placed on local impacts.
78	164	Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the role of local forest planning is to enforce the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Also suggests that the Rule received adequate public support, has no effect on fire management, access to inholdings, or wilderness considerations, and has adequately identified roadless area values. Requests that roadbuilding, timber harvest, drilling, mining, and off-road vehicles be prohibited in roadless areas. Also requests that the Forest Service should stop preparing timber sales in the Tongass National Forest and stop undermining the legality of the Rule.
79	174,220	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects pristine areas and is a compromise between protection and development. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas.
80	99	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it is the result of an extensive public involvement process. Suggests that roadless areas are a great treasure and should be preserved for future generations.
81	1057	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it is ecologically necessary and immensely popular. Suggests that the ten questions are biased and may undermine a fair comment process. Also suggests that the Rule adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input.
82	324	Letter does not support the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, suggesting it was part of a flawed National Environmental Policy Act process. Requests the Rule be revised to adequately address forest health concerns, access to private and state inholdings, and local input. Also requests that roadless areas be accurately mapped at the forest level including an inventory of classified and unclassified roads. Modifications to the Rule must also take into consideration the need to access national forests to provide for congressionally mandated multiple uses. Other suggestions include the need to use up-to-date criteria for delineation of

		roadless areas, deletion of roaded portions of inventoried roadless areas from the inventory, evaluation of economic and social relationships impacting working families and local communities, and inclusion of a full range of management alternatives. Suggests that wilderness recommendations and local forest level decisionmaking should also be addressed.
83	98	Suggests that roadless areas provide clean water, high quality fish and wildlife habitat and should be protected by implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on roadless area management.
84	25	Letter contains no text.
85	866	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because National Forests deserve protection from destructive activities. Suggests that roadless areas are valuable for high quality fish and wildlife habitat, backcountry recreation, and clean water supplies.
86	31	Opposes the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Suggests that road access should be maintained to control and prevent fire and that controlled burns to improve forest health are good. Also requests that National Forests provide wildlife habitat, recreation, and watershed management.
87	74	Suggests that management decisions should be made in the forest plans. Expresses concerns regarding the lack of data to support the assertion that existing roads are having significant negative effects on the environment and the lack of consideration of alternatives to minimize road maintenance. Suggests that the quantity of water delivered at the forest boundary should be increased by silvicultural practices.
88	96	Suggests that the recreational community was not given adequate opportunity to comment on the roadless issue. Supports developing specific management plans for each national forest that allow local needs to be met. Also suggests the importance of motorized access to National Forest System lands.
89	6	Opposes the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because it will devastate forest health, cripple rural communities, and lead to future undue lawmaking regarding access to inholdings. Suggests that the Rule should be revised to address forest health, permit access, and allow for local input. Also suggests that forest management decisions should be made at the local level.
90	994	Suggests that roadless areas provide clean water, high quality fish and wildlife habitat and should be protected by implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on roadless area management.
91	14,965	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects pristine areas while still allowing access for forest health management. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas.
92	153	Requests implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and that the Camp Hutchins area be included as a roadless area. Suggests that the role of local forest planning is to add additional restrictions to the Rule based on local situations. Also suggests that the Rule sufficiently addresses forest health management, public involvement, roadless area values, and economic

		considerations. Requests that off-road vehicles and mining should be prohibited.
93	20	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it is the product of an extensive federal Rulemaking with overwhelming public support. Suggests that the Rule represents a balanced approach to forest conservation and adequately addresses the issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Requests the inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
94	27	Supports protecting roadless areas in the Green Mountain and White Mountain National Forests and opposes weakening of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Suggests that roadless areas should be protected from roadbuilding, mining, and timber harvest.
95	245	Supports repealing all prohibitions regarding roadless areas because local economies would be damaged by not allowing timber harvest companies to harvest dead wood. Also expresses concern regarding limited ability to manage for forest health due to restricted road access to roadless areas. Suggests that more local control is needed, that Congress should designate roadless areas, and that competing interests should be resolved by considering who the decision affects the most.
96	7	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects 60 million acres from commercial extraction industries. Suggests that these industries do not own National Forest System lands and that citizens have spoken in support of protecting roadless areas. Also suggests that the Rule represents a balanced approach to forest conservation and adequately addresses forest issues.
97	155	Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that roadless area Rulemaking should be postponed until the Planning Rule changes are finalized, that each roadless area should be managed individually to preserve the exact composition of each area, and that decisions must be made to minimize the risk of wildfire, insects, and disease. Also suggests that the Forest Service should avoid acquiring more property within roadless areas. The Forest Service should consider the nation's needs for lumber, motorized and non-motorized recreational opportunities, size and character of a roadless area, historic use, economic impacts, and overall health of the area when evaluating roadless areas. Suggests that decisions regarding allowable activities should be made on a case-by-case basis, and that sound science should prevail when working with competing interests.
98	11	Letter does not support the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, suggesting it was part of a flawed National Environmental Policy Act process. Requests the Rule be revised to adequately address forest health concerns, access to private and state inholdings, and local input. Also requests that roadless areas be accurately mapped at the forest level including an inventory of classified and unclassified roads. Modifications to the Rule must also take into consideration the need to access national forests to provide for congressionally mandated multiple uses. Supports individual forest plan decisions for roadless area management.
99	20	Suggests that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule was developed with adequate public input and review and that it received overwhelming public support. Also suggests that local planning processes have failed to adequately protect roadless areas. The Rule adequately addresses issues regarding local involvement, access to inholdings, forest management, fire management, and recreational opportunities. Requests that roadbuilding, timber harvest, mining, off-road vehicle

		use and commercial extraction be prohibited in all roadless areas 1,000 acres and larger.
100	12	Expresses concern that the primary impacts of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule are a loss of local forest planning ability and a corresponding loss of consideration of local needs and concerns. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the local forest planning process should continue to decide roadless area management, that local plans should contain provisions for addressing natural events, that reasonable access to inholdings should be provided, and that a full range of factors should be considered in evaluating roadless areas. Requests that any review of roadless policy should be coordinated with reviews of forest planning regulations and the forest transportation policy.
101	5	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, including protection for the Tongass National Forest, as it adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on development in roadless areas.
102	8	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and urges the prohibition of all development projects in roadless areas. Suggests that local management is insufficient to protect wilderness characteristics of national forests.
103	37	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that local forest planning has failed to protect roadless areas, that the Rule was developed with adequate public involvement, and that the Rule provides exceptions that allow forest health management. Suggests that property owners should be educated about fire proofing their property, that roadbuilding, mining, timber harvest, and off-road vehicle use be prohibited in roadless areas, and requests the immediate implementation of the Rule to abide by the will of the public.
104	5	Requests implementation of a strong roadless area policy that would permanently halt roadbuilding, timber sales, mining, and oil and gas development in roadless areas 1,000 acres or larger.
105	522	Opposes the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because it is a thinly disguised effort to reduce the multiple use of forests. Suggests that roads are necessary for forest health management access as well as access to harvest raw materials. Expresses concern regarding the ability to fight fires in roadless areas.
106	420	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it offers a balanced approach to forest conservation without compromising public health and safety or access to inholdings. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on roadless area management.
107	28	Suggests that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule is the result of a misguided attempt to produce a healthier forest. Requests that the Rule be revised to address the forest health crisis, the need to access forests for multiple use, and to support individual forest plan decisions. Suggests that the decisionmaking process should include people directly affected by the decision.
108	12	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and expresses concern regarding the Bush Administration's attempt to thwart preservation of wildlands. Requests that trapping activities be prohibited within roadless areas because leghold traps are precarious and inhumane. Suggests that additional road development will

		encroach upon wildlife habitat.
109	5988	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, including protection for the Tongass National Forest, as it adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on development in roadless areas.
110	4163	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and its immediate implementation and inclusion of the Tongass National Forest. Suggests that the public rejects changes to the Rule.
111	629	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that local forest planning has failed to adequately protect roadless areas and that the Rule was developed through an extensive public involvement process. Also suggests that the Rule already provides exceptions for forest health management, that forest fires should be left to burn in most cases, and that access to private property is already ensured in the Rule. Letter provides a list of environmental, social, and cultural values associated with roadless areas and requests that timber harvest, mining, oil drilling, off-road vehicle use, and pack animals should be banned. Suggests that the ten questions are highly biased and unnecessary because the public has already spoken in support of the Rule.
112	236	Supports the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Alliance's "Square Deal Initiative #1." Suggests that the 58 million acres under consideration should be kept roadless and that criteria should be carefully defined for the consideration of exceptions for providing road access for forest management. Also suggests that decisionmaking should include the interests of local people while the final decision authority to build roads in roadless areas should be retained by the Chief of the Forest Service.
113	115	Expresses belief that the remaining roadless areas should be spared from the consumption of exhaustible resources because they are critical for drinking water, air quality, spaces of unspoiled beauty, and recreational opportunities. Suggests that ecosystems should be allowed to exist for their intrinsic value. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and opposes forest-by-forest decisions on roadless area management.
114	13	Requests protection of all National Forest Inventoried Roadless Areas through a national policy that prohibits road construction and timber harvest in these areas, specifically in the Colville and Umatilla National Forests.
115	20	Opposes the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because it will restrict multiple use and have a negative effect on rural economies. Expresses concern that fuel loading and fire risk as well as forest health are not adequately addressed by the Rule. Suggests that the roadless plan be managed through the local forest planning process with emphasis on protecting the local economy. Emphasizes the need to solicit and include local input in decisionmaking and apply a system that gives higher priority to those that are most impacted by the decisions. Suggests that public resources should be protected from insect, disease and wildfire that affect adjacent communities, homes, businesses, and property. Also includes concerns regarding firewood permits and dead tree removal, access to property, use of tax dollars for road and trail closure, and the designation of roadless areas as wilderness.

116	12	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because it adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking as well as road building, timber harvest, and other development in roadless areas as they provide critical sources of clean water, healthy fisheries, and wildlife habitat. Suggests that the backlog of road maintenance should justify the implementation of the Rule. Also suggests that roadless areas are a source of employment and income for thousands of local businesses in the Northern Rockies.
117	541	Mentions that 95 percent of Americans support the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Requests that actions be taken to ensure that the Rule is not undermined and that the Forest Service listen to the will of the American people. Requests that the Rule be implemented immediately and without exemption.
118	298	Requests that the Forest Service fix the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it is the product of a flawed NEPA process, and is contrary to the agency's legal authority. Suggests that the process also ignored substantial concerns raised by local, state, and federal elected officials. Requests that the Rule be revised to adequately address forest health concerns, access to private and state inholdings, local input, and that roadless areas be accurately mapped at the forest level. Supports forest management at the local level as well as individual forest plan decisions for management of roadless areas. Requests that a process be put into place that allows those who are most affected by management decisions on public lands to be included and heard. Includes a listing of the ten questions with no responses.
119	208	Opposes the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because it will threaten the harvesting of diseased trees to be used for commercial purposes. Expresses concern that the Rule will cause a loss of jobs as well as keep people out of the housing market due to soaring lumber prices. Suggests that harvesting dead and dying timber helps prevent forest fires, and provides space for new tree growth. Also suggests that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule will prevent recreational use by the elderly and handicapped citizens as well as take land away from Americans.
120	134	An action alert sent out by the Sierra Club which encourages people to send in comments requesting that the Forest Service keep the Roadless Area Conservation Rule intact.
121	8	Opposes the Roadless Area Conservation Rule suggesting that locking up vast areas in a roadless condition causes them to die from fires and/or diseases. Requests that forests be managed for multiple use by professionals.
122	7	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, including protection for the Tongass National Forest, as it provides a balanced approach to forest conservation. Suggests that roadless areas are healthier than roaded forests and are less prone to devastating wildfires and insect damage.
123	7	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule including protection for the Tongass National Forest. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest, road building, and other developments. Suggests that people residing near national forests should have no more influence on forest plans than other citizens living far from forests.
124	6	Requests immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule

		including protection for the Tongass National Forest. Requests protection in order to preserve drinking water, provide family activities, and protect fish and wildlife habitat. Suggests that the Rule already contains provisions to address wildfires and forest health. Supports national guidelines for roadless areas and opposes modifying the Rule to allow forest-by-forest decisionmaking on timber harvest, roadbuilding, or development in pristine areas.
125	6	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects millions of acres of roadless forest from road construction, timber harvest, and mining. Suggests the need for the United States to set an example to other countries regarding conservation of wild areas. Also suggests the importance of maintaining areas of untouched wilderness.
126	25	Same as form 118 and includes responses to the ten questions. Responses generally oppose the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.
127	3515	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects forests from timber harvest, mining, and drilling activities already allowed on most National Forest System lands. Makes reference to the extensive public support and involvement for the Rule. Suggests that the Rule adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, and access, and gives local decision makers the necessary flexibility for sound forest management. Requests inclusion of protection for the Tongass National Forest and asserts that letting the Rule stand is the best way to protect roadless values.
128	4	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Requests protection of the last of America's wild national forests from timber harvest, road building, and mining.
129	6	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and makes reference to the extensive public support and involvement regarding the Rule. Lists a number of negative environmental impacts that have taken place over the last 150 years. Suggests that the Rule adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, and access, and gives local decision makers the necessary flexibility for sound forest management. Requests inclusion of protection for the Tongass National Forest and suggests that letting the Rule stand is the best way to protect roadless values.
130	12	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and requests that all development projects be immediately halted that are inconsistent with the Rule. Expresses concern about the negative environmental impacts that timber harvest projects will have in national forests. Opposed to forest-by-forest decisionmaking on roadless area management as it has resulted in thousands of miles of roads and an \$8.5 million dollar maintenance backlog at cost to the taxpayer. Includes responses to the ten questions. Responses express opposition to local forest planning, satisfaction with the extensive public involvement process used to develop the Rule, and opposition to road building to prevent wildfire. Responses also assert that the Rule will have no effect on access to property, note the economic value of recreation and environmental quality of life, oppose exceptions for destructive activities, support the wilderness recommendation process, provide suggestions for how to move towards forest restoration while providing economic benefits, suggest that timber sales be halted in the Tongass National Forest as they are a violation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, and finally, request that a vigorous defense be set up against the lawsuits challenging the Rule.
131	17	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and opposes forest-by-forest

		decisionmaking for the management of roadless areas.
132	6	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking for the management of roadless areas.
133	4	Opposes any changes to the Roadless Area Conservation Rule that would allow timber harvest in forests protected by the Rule, especially the Tongass National Forest. Also opposes allowing individual forests to opt out of the Rule and allowing timber harvest, road building, and other development of these pristine areas. Requests that the Rule be implemented immediately and defended against industry and other lawsuits to preserve the Tongass National Forest and other forests for future generations.
134	230	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects 4.4 million acres in Colorado. Mentions the overwhelming number of comments, 28,000 of them from Coloradoans. Suggests that the Rule adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes the weakening of national forest protection through forest-by-forest decisionmaking and requests the protection of roadless areas from road construction, timber harvest, and drilling.
135	959	Opposes the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, as it will negatively impact public access to forest lands. Supports access to recreational roads and trails, as they provide opportunities for families to spend time together. Expresses concern that road closures will be detrimental to the economic well being of the nation. Disappointed that the Rule will limit use of our national forests by older and disabled Americans. Opposes closing more land on the Ottawa National Forest as proposed in the 1986 Forest Plan. Also suggests that diverse recreational opportunities are important to rural economies.
136	136	Requests that the Forest Service fix the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it is the product of a flawed NEPA process, and is contrary to the agency's legal authority. Suggests that the process also ignored substantial concerns raised by local, state, and federal elected officials. Requests that the Rule be revised to adequately address forest health concerns, access to private and state inholdings, local input, and that roadless areas be accurately mapped at the forest level. Supports forest management at the local level as well as individual forest plan decisions for management of roadless areas. Also requests that the Forest Service provide access to private and state lands. Suggests that the Forest Service provide up to date criteria for the delineation of roadless areas, as well as remove roaded portions of inventoried roadless areas from the inventory. Also suggests that economic and social relationships be evaluated, including those that directly impact working families and local communities. Requests a process be put into place that allows those who are most affected by management decisions on public lands to be included and heard.
137	1209	Requests protection of all national forest roadless areas through a national policy to prohibit road construction and timber harvest.
138	10	An action alert that requests input regarding a list of questions. Responses to the questions are included in the alert. Some of the responses include concerns regarding the need for decisions to be made at the local level, establishing "fire breaks" to contain fires, fuel reduction through thinning, contacting stakeholders to ensure that needs are met, providing access, and providing multiple use. Supports more roads as well as systematic timber harvest.

139	29	Opposes the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, as it is the product of a flawed NEPA process, conducted without accurate information about roadless areas. Requests revision of the Rule to address recreation access, forest health, access to private and state inholdings, local input, and accurate mapping of roadless areas at the forest level. Supports forest management the local level as well as a “Backcountry” land use designation that offers motorized and non-motorized recreation choices together with resource protection and management for forest health. Also includes responses to the ten questions that mainly focus on the need for local control for forest planning.
140	5	Requests that the Forest Service fix the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it is the product of a flawed NEPA process, and is contrary to the agency’s legal authority. Suggests that the process also ignored substantial concerns raised by local, state, and federal elected officials. Requests that the Rule be revised to adequately address forest health concerns, access to private and state inholdings, local input, and accurate mapping of roadless areas at the forest level. Supports forest management at the local level as well as individual forest plan decisions for the management of roadless areas. Also requests that the Forest Service provide access to private and state lands. Suggests that the Forest Service provide up to date criteria for the delineation of roadless areas, as well as remove roaded portions of inventoried roadless areas from the inventory. Also suggests that economic and social relationships be evaluated, including those that directly impact working families and local communities. Requests a process be put into place that allows those who are most affected by management decisions on public lands to be included and heard.
141	4	Requests that the Forest Service scientifically manage all fish and wildlife habitat in the National Forest System as lands that will remain open to hunters, anglers, and other public users. Expresses concern about the need for accessibility and comments on the need to keep roadless areas unroaded. Supports science-based exceptions in the Rule for local and regional forest health as well as forest restoration. Suggests that roadless areas be kept roadless, that public process should decide how areas should be used, that criteria should be carefully defined for consideration of any exception regarding roads and forest management, and that the interests of local people should be included in decisionmaking.
142	25	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, as it is the product of the most extensive federal rulemaking in history. Comments on the quality recreational opportunities provided by roadless lands in Colorado. Suggests that the Rule provides a balanced approach to forest conservation as well as addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking as it weakens forest protection. Supports preservation of roadless areas for recreational experiences.
143	1281	Requests that roadless areas in the Shoshone National Forest be considered for wilderness designation. Suggests that the Forest Service should protect all roadless areas for recreation and wildlife, and restrict oil and gas development, taxpayer subsidized timber harvest, and increased off-road vehicle use.
144	7	Generally supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule with a few exceptions. Expresses disappointment that the Rule does not prohibit timber harvest in inventoried roadless areas, exempts the Tongass National Forest, provides no immediate protection for uninventoried roadless areas greater than 1,000 acres, and does not protect roadless areas from mining or off-road vehicles. Requests a final policy that adequately protects roadless areas by immediately prohibiting road building and timber harvest in all national forest roadless areas, includes the

		Tongass National Forest in the prohibition on road building and timber harvest, and provides interim protection from destructive activities for all non-inventoried roadless areas of 1,000 acres or larger.
145	14	Requests a final roadless policy that provides immediate and lasting protection for all roadless areas, including those in the Tongass National Forest. Also requests that the policy permanently stop all road building and timber sales along with mining, oil and gas development, off road vehicle use and other destructive activities in roadless areas larger than 1,000 acres.
146	43	Supports implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses include support for national roadless area protection, comments regarding the extensive public involvement and support for the Rule, suggestions for keeping roadless areas roadless for forest health, a discussion of discretion given to forest managers to thin small diameter trees where needed to restore ecological processes, and the suggestion that the Rule has no effect on access to state and private inholdings. Suggests that roadless area values have already been identified through the public involvement process and that the real economic value of national forests comes from recreation and environmental quality of life. Requests protection from road building, commercial timber harvest, off-road vehicle use, and hard-rock mining, and suggests the need for evaluation of roadless areas for wilderness potential. Comments on the overwhelming public involvement and support for the Rule. Requests that the Forest Service stop preparing timber sales in the Tongass National Forest.
147	8	Opposes having millions of acres held in a roadless status. Suggests there is no need for this if resource managers are allowed to manage for legal uses. Requests that road decisions be made locally and guided by NFMA.
148	4	Opposes the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it circumvents the intent of Congress and existing forest plans and was formulated with inadequate public involvement at the local level. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses support local forest management, active management for forest health, request a complete inventory of forest stands, request that recreation potential evaluation must utilize accurate maps, and suggest using the collaborative concept at the beginning of the planning process. Responses also suggest that sustainable healthy forests should be the goal of all management by including descriptions for how disturbances can take place. Provides suggestions for private property management and access as well as suggestions for wilderness management and general forest management. Includes more discussion on public involvement and managing competing interests.
149	9	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Suggests that wilderness should be preserved for generations to come as well as for its intrinsic value.
150	10	Requests that roadless areas be kept off-limits to timber harvest, mining, new road development and drilling. Mentions the overwhelming public response and support for the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Suggests that local forest plans should identify roadless areas omitted from current inventories as well as prevent damage from off-road vehicles. Also suggests that most roadless areas should be preserved as wilderness and remain roadless in order to help prevent wildfires. Suggests that roadless area conservation is important to local economies because of the large amount of revenue generated from recreation. Also suggests that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule represents a balanced approach to forest management, and recommends that the Forest Service stop preparing timber sales that violate the Rule in the Tongass National Forest.

151	4	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and suggests that the Forest Service should protect roadless areas, including Alaska's National Forest, from timber harvest, road building, and mining.
152	3	Expresses support for TRCA's "Square Deal Initiative #1" which includes support for scientific management of fish and wildlife habitat, forest health, and restoration. Requests accessibility to forest lands for public use, especially hunters and anglers, while maintaining a functioning forest system and keeping roadless areas roadless. Supports a public process to determine designation of use. Suggests that criteria should be carefully defined for consideration of any exception regarding roads and forest management, that the interests of local people should be included, and that more wilderness areas should not be created by declaring them roadless.
153	20	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it stands and expresses concern that the Bush Administration wants to undermine this policy by opening public wildlands to industrial development. Suggests that the policy should remain as it is in order to respect the will of the people.
154	9	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as a means to stop unsustainable activities by the timber industry. Expresses concern that although timber harvest creates jobs, it kills living organisms and makes it difficult for future generations to subsist. Questions the need to break into protected roadless areas when timber harvest opportunities already exist. Requests that the mapping error for Saltery Bay and Crab Bay in Tenakee inlet and others be fixed so that protected land is not exploited.
155	10	Opposes changes to the Roadless Area Conservation Rule that would weaken protection of roadless areas in the Tongass National Forest, specifically Crab and Saltery Bays in the Tenakee Inlet. Suggests that timber harvest in these areas would affect views, employment, tourism, and recreation due to restricted access to salmon streams. Lists specific areas where mapping areas need to be fixed as well as areas where roadless protection should be expanded. Requests that the Forest Service listen to the people of Alaska as it is "their" land.
156	6	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and mentions the overwhelming public response and support for the Rule. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking and requests immediate protection of roadless areas including the Tongass National Forest.
157	11	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and mentions the overwhelming public response and support for the Rule. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking and requests immediate protection of roadless areas including the Tongass National Forest.
158	199	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it stands and opposes any changes that might weaken the Rule. Specifically mentions the social and economic importance of Alaska's Tongass and Chugach National Forests and the opportunities they provide for clean water, recreational and visitor opportunities, and habitat. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking on timber harvest and mining because it puts corporate interests before public interest.
159	8	Supports road building and maintenance in proposed roadless areas. Suggests that forests be managed for multiple use as activities can benefit local people and local

		economies. Considers it wasteful for us not to use our natural resources as best we know how.
160	11	Requests that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule be immediately implemented, including the Tongass National Forest, to protect roadless areas from road construction, timber harvest, mining, and other forms of commercial extraction. Mentions the large number of public comments and support for protection of remaining roadless areas on national forests.
161	12	Expresses concern that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule did not give the recreational community enough opportunity to express concerns. Supports motorized and non-motorized use of national forests using local management along with NFMA and NEPA to tailor each area with appropriate management prescriptions. Suggests that roadless areas be set aside to increase water production in the future. Supports collaboration at the local level, forest protection through prescribed fire, timber harvest and allocations made in context of the forest plan, and consideration of the importance of resources to local areas and the nation. Requests that the Forest Service not prohibit activities and supports road building when necessary. Roadless areas should not automatically be proposed to Congress for Wilderness designation and should not be maintained under a specific designation for roadless area management under the forest plan. Suggests that regulations for roadless area management be general, short, and simple and guide the allocation process.
162	4	Provides a list of the ten questions and one-sentence responses to each which do not support the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Some of the comments include, a request for no more roadless areas, the need to keep public land public, as well as the need for forest management access.
163	33	Requests immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it stands including the Tongass National Forest, and mentions the large number of public comments and support for the Rule. Supports road building to ensure forest health and access to state and private lands. Opposes weakening of roadless protection through forest-by-forest decisionmaking because this approach has cost taxpayers an \$8.4 million dollar backlog on the existing road system. Requests protection of roadless areas from road construction, timber harvest, mining, and other activities that compromise social and ecological values.
164	5	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and expresses concern regarding development in national forests. Requests that mining and timber industries stop destroying public land and that roadless areas should remain pristine and undeveloped to provide quieter forms of recreation. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking because a national policy can provide quality experiences for all. Supports inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
165	0	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it represents a balanced approach to forest conservation. Suggests that preserving open space is a high priority for the residents of Lake County and has become a precious commodity. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas and requests the implementation of the Rule.
166	10	Responds to five questions supporting the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Responses support a national policy to avoid local interests caving to timber interests. Mentions the overwhelming public support for the Rule and suggests that adherence to the Rule will allow local forest rangers to restore ecological

		processes and avert catastrophic wildfires. Supports prohibition of timber harvest, snowmobiling, and off-road vehicles; supports wilderness designation where criteria is met; and supports inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
167	4	Opposes the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and requests that forests be managed by a pre-1994 policy. Expresses concern that the Rule is part of a Clinton-Gore agenda that caters to environmental groups without the consent of Congress. Also expresses concern about the negative impact that the Rule may have on Alaskan taxpayers and employment. Mentions the effect of the Dwyer Injunction (spotted owl study) on fire management and how this study resulted in the Los Alamos and Cloud Croft fires. Expresses concerns regarding Chief Dombeck and his political agenda.
168	17	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because roadless areas are priceless. Repeatedly mentions the overwhelming public involvement and support for the Rule.
169	15,697	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it provides roadless area protection while maintaining public access to national forest land and adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking as well as road building, timber harvest and other development in roadless areas. Also supports inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
170	14	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects roadless areas from road building and timber harvest. Disappointed in the reopening of public comment after the overwhelming response and support previously shown suggesting that adequate opportunities for input have already taken place. Opposes taxpayer subsidies for timber harvest and road building. Supports inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
171	3	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and mentions the overwhelming public response and support for the Rule. Suggests that local planning does not provide adequate protection against roadbuilding and timber harvest and suggests that these activities should be prohibited. Also suggests that road building and timber harvest provide no economic advantage due to loss of revenue from recreation. Comments that fire suppression is not an issue, the Rule will have no effect on access to private land inholdings as well as no effect on the nation's energy supplies. Requests the Forest Service stop preparing timber sales on the Tongass National Forest as well as in Colorado.
172	78,479	Requests the Roadless Area Conservation Rule be implemented as written, including the Tongass National Forest. Mentions the large public response and support for the Rule. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking regarding timber harvest, road construction, and other development in these pristine areas.
173	4	Opposes any changes to the Roadless Area Conservation Rule that would allow timber harvest in forests protected by the Rule, especially the Tongass National Forest. Also opposes allowing individual forests to opt out of the Rule and allow timber harvest, road building, and other development of these pristine areas.
174	1040	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it stands. Opposes any changes that might weaken the Rule, suggesting that the Rule adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Specifically mentions the importance of Alaska's Tongass and Chugach National Forests and the

		opportunities they provide for clean water, recreational and visitor opportunities, and habitat.
175	5	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.
176	9	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects 4.4 million acres in California. Mentions the overwhelming number of comments, 140,000 of them from Californians. Suggests that the Rule adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes the weakening of national forest protection through forest-by-forest decisionmaking and requests protection from road construction, timber harvest, and drilling. Lists specific potential wilderness areas for protection as well as specific eligible and potential Wild and Scenic River sections. Requests the maintenance of scenic and recreational qualities of California.
177	24	Requests that forest roads and trails be maintained for expected use as an important part of forest management. Expresses concern that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule will lock up federal lands, negatively impacting recreation. Requests a "Back Country Recreation Area designation" to provide protection of natural resources as well as enhance back country recreation opportunities. Lists high points about responsible OHV recreationists and requests funding to support recreation and trail programs. Opposes the use of the term "roadless" for areas currently used. Suggests the importance of recreation to rural economies.
178	15	Supports every effort to protect roadless areas from exploitation, specifically road building and timber harvest. Expresses concern about development of roadless areas and the potential for subsidies at cost to the taxpayer. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule due to overwhelming public support and asserts that environmental protection should be the top priority.
179	0	Suggests that the protection of national forests is crucial for clean water and air, wildlife habitat, biodiversity, recreation, and economic values. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as a first step toward conservation but requests the further protection of all roadless areas 1,000 acres and greater through wilderness designation.
180	65	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it stands for wilderness and wild rivers, and specifically for protection of the Tongass and Chugach National Forests.
181	32	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects 4.4 million acres in Colorado. Mentions the overwhelming number of comments, 28,000 of them from Coloradoans. Suggests that the Rule adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes the weakening of national forest protection through forest-by-forest decisionmaking and requests protection from road construction, timber harvest, and drilling. Requests immediate protection of wildlife sanctuaries and immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.
182	5	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, as it is not only ecologically necessary but has overwhelming public response and support as well. Suggests that the ten questions are biased and seem to invite opposition to the policy. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking and suggests a national policy is needed to protect roadless areas. Suggests that the policy adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Requests inclusion of the

		Tongass National Forest.
183	67	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because only national protection will guarantee that wildlands remain intact regardless of changing politics and personnel.
184	784	Supports implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses include support for national roadless area protection, comments regarding the extensive public involvement and support for the Rule, support for keeping roadless areas roadless for forest health, discussion of discretion given to forest managers to thin small diameter trees where needed to restore ecological processes, that the Rule has no effect on access to state and private inholdings, assertion that roadless values have already been identified through the public process and that the real economic value of national forests comes from recreation and environmental quality of life, request that road building and commercial timber harvest be prohibited, and the roadless areas be evaluated for wilderness potential. Requests that the Forest Service stop preparing timber sales in the Tongass National Forest.
185	18	Opposes all trapping activities in roadless areas as they have been banned in many areas and have been deemed inhumane. Expresses concern that trapping is poorly regulated and not enforced and identifies some of the inhumane ways in which animals are treated throughout the trapping process.
186	0	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Suggests that the Rule is a compromise between protection and industrial development and provides a balance between recreational and extractive uses. Suggests that the White Mountain National Forest provides solitude and recreational value for its residents as well as visitors and that the Rule helps protect biological, economic, and private property resources.
187	20	Requests that truth and facts be used when the final decision is made regarding the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Expresses concern that special interest groups will do anything underhanded to get what they want and for that reason, the comment period has be reopened given that some procedures and protocols may not have been followed.
188	4	Suggests forest management should take place at the local level, and that the current planning process already requires consultation with local parties. Requests access for forest health management as well as unrestricted access to private and state inholdings. References ANILCA and the need to protect social and economic values in Alaska, including the direction no more lands in Alaska be proposed for wilderness designations. Requests that Alaska National Forests be reviewed by local officials in order to reestablish a reliable timber base for jobs that depend on the Tongass National Forest.
189	23	Expresses distrust toward the Administration's lack of desire to consider previous public comment and the Administration's actions to continue to seek comments in order to cater to industrial interests. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.
190	5	Requests protection of America's Heritage Forests by prohibiting timber harvest, road construction, and mining in all roadless areas with no exclusions or exemptions. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it provides protection for roadless areas by providing clean air and water for our nation as

		well as habitat for rare, threatened, endangered, and sensitive species. Also mentions the overwhelming public response and support for the Rule.
191	20	Opposes all trapping activities in roadless areas as they have been banned in many areas and have been deemed inhumane.
192	721	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as forest protection is vital to the sustainability to the outdoor industry that supports over one million jobs. Supports long-term forest preservation without forest-by-forest review in order to avoid postponing preservation.
193	19	Supports immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule including protection for the Tongass National Forest since the Rule adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Expresses opposition to forest-by-forest decisionmaking as well as road building, timber harvest, and other development in roadless areas. Requests protection of roadless areas from road construction, timber harvest, and mining.
194	22	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule with no exemptions.
195	6	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule with no exemptions or exclusions. Specifically requests protection for the Copper Mountain Roadless Area, the proposed Copper Salmon Wilderness, and all presently unroaded areas of the Elk River watershed.
196	20	Opposes any changes to the Roadless Area Conservation Rule that would allow timber harvest or road building on forests protected by the Rule, especially the Tongass National Forest. Also opposes allowing individual forests to opt out of the Rule and allow development of these pristine areas. Requests that the Rule be implemented immediately and defended in court to preserve the Tongass National Forest and other forests for future generations. Suggests that consideration of new comments is just a delaying tactic because two million Americans have already gone on record as supporting the Rule.
197	7296	Opposes weakening of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, as it is already a compromise in that it allows road building, timber harvest, mining, and drilling. Also opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking regarding development of roadless areas. Along with 95% of Americans who commented on this policy, supports protection of pristine forests, especially the Tongass National Forest,
198	24	Requests consideration of responses from the fourth volume of the Roadless Area Conservation Final Environmental Impact Statement. Recommends that national forest land be managed to provide a broad range of activities that reflect the diversity of our nation. Includes responses to the ten questions including concerns regarding local forest planning, community partnerships, fuel load buildup, sustaining forest health, access to private property, flexible management for changing conditions, wilderness designation, the need to base decisions on scientific data, litigation, reclamation of roads, and implementation based on a case-by-case basis.
199	4	Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest the need to accommodate local needs and interests through public meetings with local residents, the need for wildfire and insect and disease management, landowners to be responsible, and the need for access to private property. Also recommends no new road construction, seeking input from all types of user groups, and managing

		lands for long-term renewal for wildlife and present use.
200	13	Requests that the Forest Service fix the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it is the product of a flawed NEPA process, and is contrary to the agency's legal authority. Suggests that the process also ignored substantial concerns raised by local, state, and federal elected officials. Requests that roadless areas be accurately mapped at the forest level with access provided to private and state inholdings. Supports forest management at the local level to ensure forest health and wildlife protection. Suggests that economic and social relationships be evaluated, including those that directly impact working families and local communities. Also suggests a full range of management alternatives for forest plan revisions.
201	6	Opposes the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it does not provide adequate information and is the result of a deeply flawed NEPA process. Suggests that the process also ignored substantial concerns raised by local, state, and federal elected officials. Requests that the Rule be revised to adequately address forest health concerns, access to private and state inholdings, and local input. Suggests that designated areas are poorly mapped and that areas should be returned to multiple use.
202	27	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it is the product of an extensive federal rulemaking. Suggests that industrial extraction is allowed in more than half of National Forest System lands and that protecting remaining roadless areas allows diverse recreational opportunities. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking on timber harvest and development in roadless areas.
203	11	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule to safeguard forests from all roadbuilding, timber harvest, mining, and industrial development. Suggests that an overwhelming majority of comments support the Rule.
204	34	Suggests that the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is an inadequate alternative to protecting roadless areas. Suggests that wilderness cannot be commodified and that timber harvest, mining, and destructive activities should be prohibited on public lands.
205	8	Suggests that the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is an inadequate alternative to protecting roadless areas. Suggests that wilderness cannot be commodified and that timber harvest, mining, and destructive activities should be prohibited on public lands. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that local planning has failed to provide adequate protection of roadless areas and that the Rule is needed to provide additional protection. Also suggests that the Rule received adequate public support, already provides exceptions for forest health management, has no affect on access to inholdings, already identifies roadless area values, and should be retained and implemented as is.
206	6	Expresses distrust toward President Bush regarding his disregard of public opinion for roadless areas. Suggests that certain ecosystems are unique to this country and should be protected for their intrinsic value as well as for the enjoyment of citizens. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule to protect all roadless areas from timber harvest, roadbuilding, and mining.
207	13	Requests the Roadless Area Conservation Rule remain intact with no exemptions for the Tongass National Forest or any other roadless area on any national forest.
208	4	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule with inclusion of protection for the

		Tongass National Forest. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking as the Rule adequately upholds valid existing rights to property landowners. Mentions the overwhelming public comment and support for the Rule.
209	4	Requests a final roadless policy that provides immediate and lasting protection for all national forest roadless areas, including those in the Tongass National Forest. Also requests that the policy prohibit all road building and timber sales along with mining, oil and gas development, off-road vehicle use, and other destructive activities in roadless areas larger than 1,000 acres.
210	102	Lists five statements with options underneath to circle the level of support the individual gives to the statement. Strongly agrees in the following areas. First, the Roadless Area Conservation Rule failed to address concerns of local, state and federal officials; second, the Rule must be revised to better address forest health concerns at the local level; third, mapping of roadless areas needs to be improved and the Rule must address access to private and state lands; fourth, social and economic effects must be considered with special attention given to local communities surrounding roadless areas; and finally, requests exemption of the Black Hills National Forest from the Rule.
211	227	Expresses concern regarding plans to drill for oil in wildlife refuges because it would be unjust to native cultures and wildlife species. Requests that roadless areas be protected from roadbuilding and timber harvest and that the Endangered Species Act be strengthened. Suggests that the above concerns should be addressed for spiritual reasons.
212	4	Requests the Roadless Area Conservation Rule be kept in place as is.
213	388	Requests permanent protection of America's wild places by adding them to the country's National Wilderness Preservation System. Requests that wildlands receive permanent protection from timber harvest, mining, suburban sprawl, over-development, oil and gas drilling, off-road vehicles, air and water pollution, and the effects of climate change.
214	6	Requests that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule be immediately implemented, including the Tongass National Forest, to protect roadless areas from road construction, timber harvest, mining, and other forms of commercial extraction. Mentions the large number of public comment and support for protection of remaining roadless areas on national forests. Requests protection of remaining roadless areas in Oregon, especially Roaring River and Helso.
215	18	Requests that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule be immediately implemented, including the Tongass National Forest, to protect roadless areas from road construction, timber harvest, mining, and other forms of commercial extraction. Mentions the large volume of public comments and support for the protection of remaining roadless areas.
216	26	Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that local planning has failed to provide adequate protection of roadless areas and that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule is needed to provide additional protection. Also suggests that the Rule received adequate public support, already provides exceptions for forest health management, has no affect on access to inholdings, already identifies roadless area values, and should be retained and implemented as is.
217	8	Requests that national forests be protected from commercial timber harvest and

		other destructive activities. Supports a final roadless protection policy that immediately protects all national forest roadless areas of more than 1,000 acres and smaller areas of special biological importance. Requests the policy include the Tongass and Chugach National Forests and areas not previously inventoried as roadless. Also requests protection for all roadless areas from new road construction, timber harvest, mining, off-road vehicle use, oil and gas development, and other harmful activities.
218	4	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule to protect national forests. Requests protection of the Tongass National Forest and opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking in order to prevent timber harvest. Suggests that timber companies grow their own trees and not take the public's forest.
219	5	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule in order to protect national forests from timber harvest, road building, and other developments. Mentions the large volume of public comment and support for the Rule as well and opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking.
220	2	Requests that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule be revised to adequately address issues of recreational access, forest health, access to private and state inholdings, and local input. Also requests that roadless areas be mapped at the forest level with an inventory of classified and unclassified roads and that recreationists be involved in that process.
221	4	Requests immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule with no modifications, exemptions, or deletions.
222	102	Opposes all trapping activities in roadless areas as they have been banned in many areas and have been deemed inhumane.
223	1557	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it provides a balanced approach to forest conservation from timber harvest, mining, and drilling activities in national forests.
224	6	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, mentioning the 47,000 Illinois residents who asked for a strong policy during the original comment period. Requests the Camp Hutchins area in the Shawnee National Forest be included as a roadless area. Includes responses to the ten questions. Responses identify additional roadless areas; and suggest protection of wildlife habitat and recreational values, maintenance of existing roads before building new ones, development of an adequate policy for forest management and private property access, public involvement, consideration of economic and recreational values, and request for prohibition of timber harvest, road construction, and off-road vehicles.
225	18	Requests a strengthened policy that provides immediate and lasting protection of roadless areas by prohibiting road building and timber harvest in national forests, including the Tongass National Forest. Also requests a moratorium on destructive activities in unroaded areas pending local forest plan revisions.
226	5702	Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and mentions the overwhelming public support for the Rule. Requests that Congress oppose any attacks that attempt to undermine the protection of publicly owned forests and the environment.

227	5	Opposes restrictions that the Roadless Area Conservation Rule may have on recreational access in national forests. Supports wilderness designation, as it will protect sensitive areas while allowing other areas to provide recreational opportunities.
228	13,658	Letter contains text from Form 169 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it provides roadless area protection while maintaining public access to national forest land, and adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking as well as road building, timber harvest, and other development in roadless areas. Also supports inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
229	53	Letter contains text from Form 169 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless Rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it provides roadless area protection while maintaining public access to national forest land. It adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access and local input. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking as well as road building, timber harvest and other development in roadless areas. Also supports inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
230	1161	Letter contains text from Form 127 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects forests from timber harvest, mining, and drilling activities already allowed on most National Forest System lands. Makes reference to the extensive public support and involvement for the Rule. Suggests that the Rule adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, and access, and gives local decision makers the necessary flexibility for sound forest management. Requests inclusion of protection for the Tongass National Forest and asserts that letting the Rule stand is the best way to protect roadless values.
231	968	Letter contains text from Form 127 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule as it protects forests from timber harvest, mining, and drilling activities already allowed on most National Forest System lands. Makes reference to the extensive public support and involvement for the Rule. Suggests that the Rule adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, and access, and gives local decision makers the necessary flexibility for sound forest management. Requests inclusion of protection for the Tongass National Forest and asserts that letting the Rule stand is the best way to protect roadless values.
232	3630	Letter contains text from Form 169 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it provides roadless area protection while maintaining public access to national forest land, and adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking as well as road building, timber harvest, and other development in roadless areas. Also supports inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
233	1484	Letter contains text from Form 172 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Requests the Roadless Area Conservation Rule be implemented as written including the Tongass National Forest. Mentions the large public response and support for the Rule. Opposes forest-by-forest

		decisionmaking regarding timber harvest, road construction, and other development in these pristine areas.
234	1275	Letter contains text from Form 172 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Requests the Roadless Area Conservation Rule be implemented as written including the Tongass National Forest. Mentions the large public response and support for the Rule. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking regarding timber harvest, road construction, and other development in these pristine areas.
235	1272	Letter contains text from Form 172 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Requests the Roadless Area Conservation Rule be implemented as written including the Tongass National Forest. Mentions the large public response and support for the Rule. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking regarding timber harvest, road construction, and other development in these pristine areas.
236	2960	Letter contains text from Form 172 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Requests the Roadless Area Conservation Rule be implemented as written including the Tongass National Forest. Mentions the large public response and support for the Rule. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking regarding timber harvest, road construction, and other development in these pristine areas.
237	449	Letter contains text from Form 197 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Opposes weakening the Rule, as it is already a compromise in that it allows road building, timber harvest, mining, and drilling. Also opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking regarding development of these pristine areas. Along with 95% of Americans who commented on this policy, supports protection of pristine forests, especially the Tongass National Forest
238	641	Letter contains text from Form 197 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Opposes weakening the Rule, as it is already a compromise in that it allows road building, timber harvest, mining, and drilling. Also opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking regarding development of these pristine areas. Along with 95% of Americans who commented on this policy, supports protection of pristine forests, especially the Tongass National Forest
239	311	Letter contains text from Form 197 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Opposes weakening the Rule, as it is already a compromise in that it allows road building, timber harvest, mining, and drilling. Also opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking regarding development of these pristine areas. Along with 95% of Americans who commented on this policy, supports protection of pristine forests, especially the Tongass National Forest
240	749	Letter contains text from Form 197 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Opposes weakening the Rule, as it is already a compromise in that it allows road building, timber harvest, mining, and drilling. Also opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking regarding development of these pristine areas. Along with 95% of Americans who commented on this policy, supports protection of pristine forests, especially the Tongass National Forest
241	471	Letter contains text from Form 174 plus extra comments that express concerns

		regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it stands. Opposes any changes that might weaken the Rule, suggesting that the Rule adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access and local input. Specifically mentions the importance of Alaska's Tongass and Chugach National Forests and the opportunities they provide for clean water, recreational and visitor opportunities, and habitat.
242	215	Letter contains text from Form 174 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it stands. Opposes any changes that might weaken the Rule, suggesting that the Rule adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Specifically mentions the importance of Alaska's Tongass and Chugach National Forests and the opportunities they provide for clean water, recreational and visitor opportunities, and habitat.
243	145	Letter contains text from Form 174 plus extra comments that suggest the need of a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule as it stands. Opposes any changes that might weaken the Rule, suggesting that the Rule adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access and local input. Specifically mentions the importance of Alaska's Tongass and Chugach National Forests and the opportunities they provide for clean water, recreational and visitor opportunities, and habitat.
244	68	Letter contains text from Form 174 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it stands. Opposes any changes that might weaken the Rule, suggesting that the Rule adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Specifically mentions the importance of Alaska's Tongass and Chugach National Forests and the opportunities they provide for clean water, recreational and visitor opportunities, and habitat.
245	670	Letter contains the text from Form 79 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects pristine areas and is a compromise between protection and development. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas.
246	385	Letter contains the text from Form 79 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects pristine areas and is a compromise between protection and development. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas.
247	334	Letter contains the text from Form 79 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects pristine areas and is a compromise between protection and development. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas.
248	232	Letter contains the text from Form 79 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule as it protects pristine areas and is a compromise between protection and development. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas.

249	418	Letter contains the text from Form 169 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it provides roadless area protection while maintaining public access to national forest land and adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking as well as road building, timber harvest and other development in roadless areas. Also supports inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
250	515	Letter contains the text from Form 109 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule, including protection for the Tongass National Forest, as it adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on development in roadless areas.
251	462	Letter contains the text from Form 109 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, including protection for the Tongass National Forest, as it adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on development in roadless areas.
252	875	Letter contains the text from Form 109 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, including protection for the Tongass National Forest, as it adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on development in roadless areas.
253	408	Letter contains the text from Form 109 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, including protection for the Tongass National Forest, as it adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on development in roadless areas.
254	504	Letter contains the text from Form 127 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects forests from timber harvest, mining, and drilling activities already allowed on most National Forest System lands. Makes reference to the extensive public support and involvement for the Rule. Suggests that the Rule adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, and access, and gives local decision makers the necessary flexibility for sound forest management. Requests inclusion of protection for the Tongass National Forest and asserts that letting the Rule stand is the best way to protect roadless values.
255	274	Letter contains the text from Form 127 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects forests from timber harvest, mining, and drilling activities already allowed on most National Forest System lands. Makes reference to the extensive public support and involvement for the Rule. Suggests that the Rule adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, and access, and gives local decision makers the necessary flexibility for sound forest management. Requests inclusion of protection for the Tongass National Forest and asserts that letting the Rule stand is the best way to protect roadless values.
256	46	Letter contains the text from Form 2 plus extra comments that suggest the need for

		a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule as it provides a balanced approach to forest conservation. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas and requests the inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
257	149	Letter contains the text from Form 2 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it provides a balanced approach to forest conservation. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas and requests the inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
258	100	Letter contains the text from Form 2 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it provides a balanced approach to forest conservation. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas and requests the inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
259	53	Letter contains the text from Form 2 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it provides a balanced approach to forest conservation. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas and requests the inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
260	29	Letter contains the text from Form 3 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Expresses concern regarding past damages to roadless areas. Supports the Rule as it provides a balanced approach to forest conservation. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas and requests the inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
261	10	Letter contains the text from Form 3 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Expresses concern regarding past damages to roadless areas. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it provides a balanced approach to forest conservation. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas and requests the inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
262	4	Letter contains the text from Form 3 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Expresses concern regarding past damages to roadless areas. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it provides a balanced approach to forest conservation. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas and requests the inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
263	16	Letter contains the text from Form 3 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Expresses concern regarding past damages to roadless areas. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it provides a balanced approach to forest conservation. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas and requests the inclusion of the Tongass National Forest.
264	10	Letter contains the text from Form 7 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports immediate implementation of the Rule as written.

		Suggests that all roadless areas be protected from timber harvest, roadbuilding, and mining and that the Rule include the Tongass and Chugach National Forests.
265	8	Letter contains the text from Form 7 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Supports immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as written. Suggests that all roadless areas be protected from timber harvest, roadbuilding, and mining and that the Rule include the Tongass and Chugach National Forests.
266	24	Letter contains the text from Form 7 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as written. Suggests that all roadless areas be protected from timber harvest, roadbuilding, and mining and that the Rule include the Tongass and Chugach National Forests.
267	10	Letter contains the text from Form 7 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Supports immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as written. Suggests that all roadless areas be protected from timber harvest, roadbuilding, and mining and that the Rule include the Tongass and Chugach National Forests.
268	4	Letter contains the text from Form 10 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and urges abandonment of efforts to weaken roadless area protections. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking and suggests that the Rule already contains the exemptions necessary to protect forest health, communities, homes and property, and access to inholdings.
269	5	Letter contains the text from Form 13 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Letter does not support the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it was the product of a flawed NEPA process. Suggests the Rule be revised to adequately address forest health concerns, access to private and state inholdings, and local input. Also requests that roadless areas be accurately mapped at the forest level including an inventory of classified and unclassified roads. Modifications to the Rule must also take into consideration the need to access national forests to provide for congressionally mandated multiple uses. Other suggestions include the need to use up-to-date criteria for delineation of roadless areas, deletion of roaded portions of inventoried roadless areas from the inventory, and evaluation of economic and social relationships impacting working families and local communities. Requests a process to allow those most affected by management decisions on public lands to be heard.
270	5	Letter contains the text from Form 14 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Supports the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Alliance's "Square Deal Initiative #1." Suggests that the 58 million acres under consideration should be kept roadless and that criteria should be carefully defined for the consideration of any exceptions for providing road access for forest management. Also suggests that decisionmaking should include the interests of local people while the final decision authority to build roads in roadless areas should be retained by the Chief of the Forest Service.
271	60	Letter contains the text from Form 14 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Alliance's "Square Deal Initiative #1." Suggests that the 58 million acres under consideration should be kept roadless and that criteria should be

		carefully defined for the consideration of any exceptions for providing road access for forest management. Also suggests that decisionmaking should include the interests of local people while the final decision authority to build roads in roadless areas should be retained by the Chief of the Forest Service.
272	31	Letter contains the text from Form 14 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Supports the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Alliance's "Square Deal Initiative #1." Suggests that the 58 million acres under consideration should be kept roadless and that criteria should be carefully defined for the consideration of any exceptions for providing road access for forest management. Also suggests that decisionmaking should include the interests of local people while the final decision authority to build roads in roadless areas should be retained by the Chief of the Forest Service.
273	5	Letter contains the text from Form 15 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Expresses disappointment and distrust toward the Bush Administration's attempt to weaken forest protections and ignore public input. Requests the immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.
274	6	Letter contains the text from Form 16 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and all efforts to oppose the weakening of forest protections. Suggests that roadless areas are valuable for high quality fish and wildlife habitat, backcountry recreation, and clean water supplies.
275	18	Letter contains the text from Form 18 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Expresses disappointment and distrust toward the Bush Administration's attempt to weaken forest protections and ignore public input. Requests the immediate implementation of the Rule.
276	42	Letter contains the text from Form 18 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Expresses disappointment and distrust toward the Bush Administration's attempt to weaken forest protections and ignore public input. Requests the immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.
277	60	Letter contains the text from Form 18 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental concerns. Expresses disappointment and distrust toward the Bush Administration's attempt to weaken forest protections and ignore public input. Requests the immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.
278	32	Letter contains the text from Form 18 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Expresses disappointment and distrust toward the Bush Administration's attempt to weaken forest protections and ignore public input. Requests the immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.
279	24	Letter contains the text from Form 19 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule and urges abandonment of efforts to weaken roadless area protections. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking and suggests that the Rule already contains the exemptions necessary to protect forest

		health, communities, homes and property, and access to inholdings. Also suggests that previous public involvement processes have proven public support for roadless area protections.
280	36	Letter contains the text from Form 19 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental concerns. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and urges abandonment of efforts to weaken roadless area protections. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking and suggests that the Rule already contains the exemptions necessary to protect forest health, communities, homes and property, and access to inholdings. Also suggests that previous public involvement processes have proven public support for roadless area protections.
281	17	Letter contains the text from Form 19 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and urges abandonment of efforts to weaken roadless area protections. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking and suggests that the Rule already contains the exemptions necessary to protect forest health, communities, homes and property, and access to inholdings. Also suggests that previous public involvement processes have proven public support for roadless area protections.
282	21	Letter contains the text from Form 27 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Opposes any changes to the Rule that would allow timber harvest in pristine areas of any national forest, especially the Tongass National Forest. Also opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking for roadless area management. Suggests that the Tongass is valuable for abundant wildlife and should be protected. Also suggests that previous public support for the Rule should not be ignored.
283	27	Letter contains the text from Form 27 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Opposes any changes to the Roadless Area Conservation Rule that would allow timber harvest in pristine areas of any national forest, especially the Tongass National Forest. Also opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking for roadless area management. Suggests that the Tongass is valuable for abundant wildlife and should be protected. Also suggests that previous public support for the Rule should not be ignored.
284	67	Letter contains the text from Form 27 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Opposes any changes to the Roadless Area Conservation Rule that would allow timber harvest in pristine areas of any national forest, especially the Tongass National Forest. Also opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking for roadless area management. Suggests that the Tongass is valuable for abundant wildlife and should be protected. Also suggests that previous public support for the Rule should not be ignored.
285	15	Letter contains the text from Form 27 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Opposes any changes to the Roadless Area Conservation Rule that would allow timber harvest in pristine areas of any national forest, especially the Tongass National Forest. Also opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking for roadless area management. Suggests that the Tongass is valuable for abundant wildlife and should be protected. Also suggests that previous public support for the Rule should not be ignored.
286	4	Letter contains the text from Form 31 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it

		protects roadless areas in our national forests, especially the Tongass National Forest. Opposes any changes that would weaken the January Rule including forest-by-forest decision-making.
287	16	Letter contains the text from Form 31 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects roadless areas in our national forests, especially the Tongass National Forest. Opposes any changes that would weaken the January Rule including forest-by-forest decision-making.
288	7	Letter contains the text from Form 31 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects roadless areas in our national forests, especially the Tongass National Forest. Opposes any changes that would weaken the January Rule including forest-by-forest decision-making.
289	64	Letter contains the text from Form 49 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule as roadless areas are important for recreational experiences and ecosystem protection. Suggests that the Rule is the result of extensive participation and adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input.
290	26	Letter contains the text from Form 49 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as roadless areas are important for recreational experiences and ecosystem protection. Suggests that the Rule is the result of extensive participation and adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input.
291	19	Letter contains the text from Form 49 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as roadless areas are important for recreational experiences and ecosystem protection. Suggests that the Rule is the result of extensive participation and adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input.
292	21	Letter contains the text from Form 49 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as roadless areas are important for recreational experiences and ecosystem protection. Suggests that the Rule is the result of extensive participation and adequately addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input.
293	16	Letter contains the text from Form 58 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the role of local forest planning is to provide additional protection of roadless areas, that the Rule is the result of an extensive public involvement process, and that the Rule already adequately provides for forest health management, access to inholdings, wilderness designations, and identifies roadless area values. Also suggests that the economic value of roadless areas comes from recreation and environmental quality, that timber harvest and roadbuilding should be prohibited, and that the Bush Administration should

		respect the fact that the Rule enjoys overwhelming public support.
294	3	Letter contains the text from Form 58 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the role of local forest planning is to provide additional protection of roadless areas, that the Rule is the result of an extensive public involvement process, and that the Rule already adequately provides for forest health management, access to inholdings, wilderness designations, and identifies roadless area values. Also suggests that the economic value of roadless areas comes from recreation and environmental quality, that timber harvest and roadbuilding should be prohibited, and that the Bush Administration should respect the fact that the Rule enjoys overwhelming public support.
295	7	Letter contains the text from Form 58 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the role of local forest planning is to provide additional protection of roadless areas, that the Rule is the result of an extensive public involvement process, and that the Rule already adequately provides for forest health management, access to inholdings, wilderness designations, and identifies roadless area values. Also suggests that the economic value of roadless areas comes from recreation and environmental quality, that timber harvest and roadbuilding should be prohibited, and that the Bush Administration should respect the fact that the Rule enjoys overwhelming public support.
296	10	Letter contains the text from Form 59 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the role of local forest planning is to provide additional protection of roadless areas, that the Rule is the result of an extensive public involvement process, and that the Rule already adequately provides for forest health management, access to inholdings, wilderness designations, and identifies roadless area values. Also suggests that the economic value of roadless areas comes from recreation and environmental quality, that timber harvest and roadbuilding should be prohibited, and that the Bush Administration should respect the fact that the Rule enjoys overwhelming public support.
297	8	Letter contains the text from Form 59 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the role of local forest planning is to provide additional protection of roadless areas, that the Rule is the result of an extensive public involvement process, and that the Rule already adequately provides for forest health management, access to inholdings, wilderness designations, and identifies roadless area values. Also suggests that the economic value of roadless areas comes from recreation and environmental quality, that timber harvest and roadbuilding should be prohibited, and that the Bush Administration should respect the fact that the Rule enjoys overwhelming public support.
298	7	Letter contains the text from Form 59 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation

		Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the role of local forest planning is to provide additional protection of roadless areas, that the Rule is the result of an extensive public involvement process, and that the Rule already adequately provides for forest health management, access to inholdings, wilderness designations, and identifies roadless area values. Also suggests that the economic value of roadless areas comes from recreation and environmental quality, that timber harvest and roadbuilding should be prohibited, and that the Bush Administration should respect the fact that the Rule enjoys overwhelming public support.
299	6	Letter contains the text from Form 60 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the role of local forest planning is to provide additional protection of roadless areas, that the Rule is the result of an extensive public involvement process, and that the Rule already adequately provides for forest health management, access to inholdings, wilderness designations, and identifies roadless area values. Also suggests that the economic value of roadless areas comes from recreation and environmental quality, that timber harvest and roadbuilding should be prohibited, and that the Bush Administration should respect the fact that the Rule enjoys overwhelming public support.
300	5	Letter contains the text from Form 60 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the role of local forest planning is to provide additional protection of roadless areas, that the Rule is the result of an extensive public involvement process, and that the Rule already adequately provides for forest health management, access to inholdings, wilderness designations, and identifies roadless area values. Also suggests that the economic value of roadless areas comes from recreation and environmental quality, that timber harvest and roadbuilding should be prohibited, and that the Bush Administration should respect the fact that the Rule enjoys overwhelming public support.
301	6	Letter contains the text from Form 61 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the role of local forest planning is to provide additional protection of roadless areas, that the Rule is the result of an extensive public involvement process, and that the Rule already adequately provides for forest health management, access to inholdings, wilderness designations, and identifies roadless area values. Also suggests that the economic value of roadless areas comes from recreation and environmental quality, that timber harvest and roadbuilding should be prohibited, and that the Bush Administration should respect the fact that the Rule enjoys overwhelming public support.
302	6	Letter contains the text from Form 61 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that the role of local forest planning is to provide additional protection of roadless areas, that the Rule is the result of an extensive public involvement process, and that the Rule already

		adequately provides for forest health management, access to inholdings, wilderness designations, and identifies roadless area values. Also suggests that the economic value of roadless areas comes from recreation and environmental quality, that timber harvest and roadbuilding should be prohibited, and that the Bush Administration should respect the fact that the Rule enjoys overwhelming public support.
303	170	Letter contains the text from Form 68 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Requests immediate implementation of the Rule, including protection of the Tongass National Forest. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development. Suggests that roadless areas should be protected from road building and commercial extraction.
304	9	Letter contains the text from Form 68 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Requests immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, including protection of the Tongass National Forest. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development. Suggests that roadless areas should be protected from road building and commercial extraction.
305	31	Letter contains the text from Form 68 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Requests immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, including protection of the Tongass National Forest. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development. Suggests that roadless areas should be protected from road building and commercial extraction.
306	42	Letter contains the text from Form 68 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Requests immediate implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, including protection of the Tongass National Forest. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development. Suggests that roadless areas should be protected from road building and commercial extraction.
307	32	Letter contains the text from Form 74 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or suggest keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule.
308	8	Letter contains the text from Form 74 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding trust and integrity. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.
309	28	Letter contains the text from Form 74 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.
310	37	Letter contains the text from Form 74 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.
311	11	Letter contains the text from Form 80 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule as it is the result of an extensive public involvement process. Suggests that roadless areas are a great treasure and should be preserved for future generations.

312	20	Letter contains the text from Form 80 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it is the result of an extensive public involvement process. Suggests that roadless areas are a great treasure and should be preserved for future generations.
313	27	Letter contains the text from Form 80 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it is the result of an extensive public involvement process. Suggests that roadless areas are a great treasure and should be preserved for future generations.
314	96	Letter contains the text from Form 83 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Suggests that roadless areas provide clean water, high quality fish and wildlife habitat and should be protected by implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on roadless area management.
315	12	Letter contains the text from Form 83 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Suggests that roadless areas provide clean water, high quality fish and wildlife habitat and should be protected by implementation of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on roadless area management.
316	4	Letter contains the text from Form 91 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule as it protects pristine areas while still allowing access for forest health management. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas.
317	4	Letter contains the text from Form 91 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects pristine areas while still allowing access for forest health management. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on timber harvest and development in roadless areas.
318	5	Letter contains the text from Form 106 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it offers a balanced approach to forest conservation without compromising public health and safety or access to inholdings. Opposes forest-by-forest decisions on roadless area management.
319	7	Letter contains the text from Form 111 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that local forest planning has failed to adequately protect roadless areas and that the Rule was developed through an extensive public involvement process. Also suggests that the Rule already provides exceptions for forest health management, that forest fires should be left to burn in most cases, and that access to private property is already ensured in the Rule. Letter provides a list of environmental, social, and cultural values associated with roadless areas and requests that timber harvest, mining, oil drilling, off-road vehicle use, and pack animals should be banned. Suggests that the ten questions are highly biased and unnecessary because the public has already spoken in support of the Rule.
320	5	Letter contains the text from Form 111 plus extra comments that express concerns

		regarding trust and integrity. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that local forest planning has failed to adequately protect roadless areas and that the Rule was developed through an extensive public involvement process. Also suggests that the Rule already provides exceptions for forest health management, that forest fires should be left to burn in most cases, and that access to private property is already ensured in the Rule. Letter provides a list of environmental, social, and cultural values associated with roadless areas and requests that timber harvest, mining, oil drilling, off-road vehicle use, and pack animals should be banned. Suggests that the ten questions are highly biased and unnecessary because the public has already spoken in support of the Rule.
321	4	Letter contains the text from Form 111 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule because individual forest planning has inadequately protected roadless areas. Provides responses to the ten questions. Responses suggest that local forest planning has failed to adequately protect roadless areas and that the Rule was developed through an extensive public involvement process. Also suggests that the Rule already provides exceptions for forest health management, that forest fires should be left to burn in most cases, and that access to private property is already ensured in the Rule. Letter provides a list of environmental, social, and cultural values associated with roadless areas and requests that timber harvest, mining, oil drilling, off-road vehicle use, and pack animals should be banned. Suggests that the ten questions are highly biased and unnecessary because the public has already spoken in support of the Rule.
322	14	Letter contains the text from Form 112 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Supports the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Alliance's "Square Deal Initiative #1." Suggests that the 58 million acres under consideration should be kept roadless and that criteria should be carefully defined for the consideration of exceptions for providing road access for forest management. Also suggests that decisionmaking should include the interests of local people while the final decision authority to build roads in roadless areas should be retained by the Chief of the Forest Service.
323	10	Letter contains the text from Form 112 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Alliance's "Square Deal Initiative #1." Suggests that the 58 million acres under consideration should be kept roadless and that criteria should be carefully defined for the consideration of exceptions for providing road access for forest management. Also suggests that decisionmaking should include the interests of local people while the final decision authority to build roads in roadless areas should be retained by the Chief of the Forest Service.
324	27	Letter contains text from Form 117 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Mentions that 95% of Americans support the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Requests that actions be taken to ensure that the Rule is not undermined and that the Forest Service listen to the will of the American people. Requests that the Rule be implemented immediately and without exemption.
325	10	Letter contains text from Form 117 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Mentions that 95% of Americans support the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Requests that actions be taken to ensure that the Rule is not undermined and that the Forest Service listen to the will of the

		American people. Requests that the Rule be implemented immediately and without exemption.
326	36	Letter contains text from Form 134 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule as it protects 4.4 million acres in Colorado. Mentions the overwhelming number of comments, 28,000 of them from Coloradoans, supporting the Rule. Comments that the Rule adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes the weakening of national forest protection through forest-by-forest decisionmaking and requests protection from road construction, timber harvest, and drilling.
327	16	Letter contains text from Form 134 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects 4.4 million acres in Colorado. Mentions the overwhelming number of comments, 28,000 of them from Coloradoans, supporting the Rule. Comments that the Rule adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes the weakening of national forest protection through forest-by-forest decisionmaking and requests protection from road construction, timber harvest, and drilling.
328	70	Letter contains text from Form 134 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it protects 4.4 million acres in Colorado. Mentions the overwhelming number of comments, 28,000 of them from Coloradoans, supporting the Rule. Comments that the Rule adequately addresses fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes the weakening of national forest protection through forest-by-forest decisionmaking and requests protection from road construction, timber harvest, and drilling.
329	75	Letter contains text from Form 137 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Requests protection of all national forest roadless areas through a national policy to prohibit road construction and timber harvest.
330	25	Letter contains text from Form 137 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Requests protection of all national forest roadless areas through a national policy to prohibit road construction and timber harvest.
331	18	Letter contains text from Form 137 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Requests protection of all national forest roadless areas through a national policy to prohibit road construction and timber harvest.
332	5	Letter contains text from Form 142 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule, as it is the product of the most extensive federal Rulemaking in history relating to public involvement and response. Comments on the quality recreational opportunities provided by roadless lands in Colorado. Also comments on how the Rule provides a balanced approach to forest conservation and addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking as it weakens forest protection and asserts that timber harvest leads to the degradation of these lands. Supports preservation of roadless areas for recreational experiences.

333	4	Letter contains text from Form 142 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, as it is the product of the most extensive federal Rulemaking in history relating to public involvement and response. Comments on the quality recreational opportunities provided by roadless lands in Colorado. Also comments on how the Rule provides a balanced approach to forest conservation and addresses issues of fire management, forest health, access, and local input. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking as it weakens forest protection and asserts that timber harvest leads to the degradation of these lands. Supports preservation of roadless areas for recreational experiences.
334	37	Letter contains text from Form 158 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it stands and opposes any changes that might weaken the Rule. Specifically mentions the social and economic importance of Alaska's Tongass and Chugach National Forests and the opportunities they provide for clean water, recreational and visitor opportunities, and habitat. Opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking on timber harvest and mining because it puts corporate interests before public interest.
335	7	Letter contains text from Form 180 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Supports the Rule as it stands for wilderness and wild rivers, specifically for protection of the Tongass and Chugach National Forests.
336	15	Letter contains text from Form 180 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding future generations. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it stands for wilderness and wild rivers, specifically for protection of the Tongass and Chugach National Forests.
337	58	Letter contains text from Form 180 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule as it stands for wilderness and wild rivers, specifically for protection of the Tongass and Chugach National Forests.
338	5	Letter contains text from Form 215 plus extra comments that suggest the need for a national roadless rule or support keeping or strengthening the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Requests that the Rule be immediately implemented, including the Tongass National Forest, to protect roadless areas from road construction, timber harvest, mining, and other forms of commercial extraction. Mentions the large number of public comments and support for protection of remaining roadless areas on national forests.
339	4	Letter contains text from Form 219 plus extra comments that express concerns regarding general environmental issues. Supports the Roadless Area Conservation Rule in order to protect national forests from timber harvest, road building, and other developments. Mentions the large number of public comments and support for the Rule and opposes forest-by-forest decisionmaking.

Appendix F

Site-Specific Requests for Inclusion/Exemption

The following tables list the specific places respondents request to be included in/excluded from national roadless area protection or to be recommended/not recommended to Congress for wilderness designation. Note that because respondents sometimes reference multiple areas, there is some overlap in the requests.

Table F-1. Site-Specific Requests that Areas be Included in National Roadless Area Protection

Region 1 Northern

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
Idaho. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Williams, OR - #A21210.45500)	Multiple	ID
Idaho's remaining 8 million acres of wild lands. (Business, Boise, ID - #A20362.10150)	Multiple	ID
Idaho's wild forests. (Individual, La Canada Flintridge, CA - #A803.90110)	Multiple	ID
Northern Rockies (Idaho). (Individual, Boise, ID - #A5873.90110)	Multiple	ID
I live in Idaho . . . I want to see all 9 million of those acres protected by the roadless rule. . . . including the Boulder-White Clouds, the Pahsimeroi, the Pioneer Mountains, the Smokey Mountains, The Lost River Range. (Individual, Stanley, ID - #A16269.45620)	Multiple	ID
The Continental Divide Trail (Individual, Helena, MT - #A7359.45621)	Multiple	ID, MT
Areas of Montana, Idaho, and Washington, such as the Gallatin Range, the Big Belts, the Whitetail-Haystack-O'Neill roadless area, the White Sand and Cove-Mallard roadless areas, and the Kettle Range. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Bozeman, MT - #A20601.45621)	Multiple	ID, MT, WA
The following National Forests: Beaverhead, Bitterroot, Clearwater, Custer, Deerlodge, Flathead, Gallatin, Helena, Idaho Panhandle (ID), Kootenai, Lewis and Clark, Lolo, Nez Perce (ID). (Individual, Missoula, MT- #A17281.45622)	Multiple	ID, MT, WA
All roadless areas including those encompassed in the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act and including one thousand acres in size should be protected to preserve their wilderness character and eligibility for congressional Wilderness designation, rather than being deferred later to the forest planning process. (Individual, Elmhurst, IL - #A15290.45320)	Multiple	ID, MT, WY
The Greater Yellowstone area. (Individual, Santa Monica, CA - #A9909.45331)	Multiple	ID, MT, WY
6 million acres in Greater Yellowstone. (Individual, Bozeman, MT - #A661.50510)	Multiple	ID, MT, WY
Cove/Mallard, Selkirk Mountain Roadless Area in Idaho, the South Fork Mountain Area, Quartzite Roadless Area, Kettle Range, Tucannon, Wenatchee Creek, Dark Divide, Long Swamp, Granite Mt., Jackson/Graphite, and Mt. Bonaparte in Washington are just a few designated roadless areas. (Business, Spokane, WA - #A22047.45621)	Multiple	ID, WA
Montana. (Individual, Lebanon, NH - #A4286.90110)	Multiple	MT
Roadless areas in Montana. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #A5604.45621)	Multiple	MT
6.4 million acres in Montana. . . . the Bitterroot forest. (Individual, Hamilton, MT - #A5804.10150)	Multiple	MT
Timberlands in N.W. Montana. (Individual, Libby, MT - #A5586.90130)	Multiple	MT
The City of Bozeman lies in the heart of an area surrounded by spectacularly	Multiple	MT

beautiful—yet unprotected—roadless lands, including the Bridger Mountains, the Gallatin Range, the Tobacco Root Mountains, and portions of the Madison Range. (Joe N. Frost, Commissioner, Bozeman City Commission, Bozeman, MT - #A20731.45620)		
The Scotchman Peak area of the West Cabinets, the northern reaches of the Swan Mountains and the Bitterroots. (Individual, Kalispell, MT - #A21027.10111)	Multiple	MT
The 17.2 million acres of remaining Roadless Areas of the Northern Rockies—including but not limited to the Glacier National Park, the Swan Range, the Rocky Mountain Front, the Gallatin Range, the Absoroka-Beartooth Wilderness, the Rattlesnake Wilderness, and the Bitterroot Wilderness. (Individual, No Address - #A23580.45621)	Multiple	MT
Montana . . . Pryors, Snowies. . . (Individual, Missoula, MT - #A17700.45621)	Multiple	MT
The Scotchman Peaks, Cube Iron-Silcox, Trout Creek, Cabinet Additions, Cataract, Galena, Allen Peak, Roderick, Gold Hill, Northwest Peaks, Buckhorn Ridge . . . Montana. (Individual, Somers, MT - #A8210.45624)	Multiple	MT
Elkhorns, Big Belts, Continental Divide and Rocky Mountain Front. (James Smith, Commissioner, Helena City Commission, Helena, MT - #A20615.45621)	Multiple	MT
The Gallatin, Yellowstone and Madison Rivers. (Individual, San Antonio, TX - #A10116.45620)	Multiple	MT, WY
The Snake and Yellowstone Rivers. (Individual, Gladwyne, PA - #A10116.45620)	Multiple	MT, WY
Wyoming. (Individual, East Greenbush, NY - #A8821.90110)	Multiple	WY
I would like to see the Roadless Area Rule apply to <u>ALL</u> national forests (New England, Eastern, Midwest, Western, Alaskan Tongass, and other Alaskan forests etc.) (Individual, Endeavor, WI - #A8231.45622)	Multiple	Multiple
The North/West Big Hole and East/West Pioneers. (Individual, Butte, MT - #A16710.45624)	Beaverhead-Deerlodge	MT
Roadless areas in Montana. . . . Helena Forest Areas: Camas Lakes—Big Belt Mountains Mount Baldy—Big Belt Mountains Hedges Mountain—Big Belt Mountains Elkhorn Mountains Range Black Mountain—Near Helena Nevada Mountain—Continental Divide Silver King/Falls Creek Grassy Mountain—Big Belt Mountains Electric Peak/Blackfoot Meadows—Continental Divide. Lewis & Clark Forest Areas: All areas along the Rocky Mountain Front Lola Forest Area: Cuba Iron/Silcox Deerlodge/Beaverhead Forest Areas: Tobacco Root Mountains East Pioneer Mountains. (Individual, Helena, MT- #A29425.45620)	Beaverhead-Deerlodge, Lewis and Clark, Helena	MT
Places like the Bitterroot Selway. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #A16787.10150)	Bitterroot	ID, MT
Roadless lands in my area - the Bitterroot Valley. (Individual, Corvallis, MT - #A8285.50000)	Bitterroot	MT
Tepee Point lookout (Bitterroot Forest, Sula Dist.) . . . the Anaconda-Pintlar Wilderness . . . the Sapphires. (Individual, Billings, MT - #A8697.45621)	Bitterroot	MT
The Targhee, Boise, and Payette. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Nevada City, CA - #A4941.45621)	Boise, Payette, Targhee	ID, MT, WY
The Great Burn Roadless Area of the Clearwater NF. (Individual, Moscow, ID - #A5712.45622)	Clearwater	ID
Idaho Panhandle National Forests: (only portions in the Big Wild Ecosystem, mainly the upper St. Joe River drainage are listed—others outside the ecosystem should also be protected) <u>Mallard-Larkins</u> (see Clearwater National Forest) <u>Meadow Creek/Vanderbilt-Upper St. Joe</u> (see Clearwater National Forest) <u>Mosquito Fly—1150.</u> <u>Midget Peak—1151.</u> This area borders the St. Joe River. . . . Simmons Creek is a tributary to the fabled St. Joe River.	Clearwater, Idaho Panhandle, Lolo	ID, MT, WA

<p><u>Sheep Mountain/State Line (also Lolo National Forest)—1779</u> . . . near the headwaters of the St. Joe River. . . the Bitterroot Crest. <u>Grandmother Mountain—1148</u>. . . around Widow Mountain. . . a corner of it drains into the St. Maries River. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.25200)</p>		
<p><u>Clearwater National Forest</u> <u>The Great Burn—1301</u> (or Hoodoo also on the Lolo National Forest) . . . Kelly Creek and includes its confluence with Cayuse Creek. . . the North Fork of the Clearwater. . . Fish Lake . . . in the Jap, Siam, Boose and Shell Creek drainages. <u>Weitas Creek—1306</u> (Bighorn-Weitas) . . . along lower Weitas Creek. . . the North Fork Clearwater. . . Upper Cayuse Creek. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.91220) <u>Pot Mountain—1304</u>. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.50520) <u>Moose Mountain—1305</u>. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.45310) <u>Meadow Creek/Vanderbilt and Rawhide—1302 and 1313</u> (also Idaho Panhandle and Lolo National Forests) . . . both the North Fork proper and the St. Joe Rivers . . . lakes like Trail, Oregon, and St. Joe Lakes. Closure of unneeded and deteriorating road 5428 was suggested to unite this area with the Rawhide Roadless Area in the Clearwater Forest Plan appendices (page C-224). This has been done and the two areas should be considered as one roadless area. . . the North Fork River. Selway-Bitterroot Additions: These are all logical additions to the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness and many were previously included in the old Selway Primitive Area. They contain crucial low elevation habitat and important wet meadow complexes. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.25200) <u>White Sand Creek, North Fork—1309</u>. . . land near Beaver Creek. . . This is a wet, high elevation area in the upper Lochsa. <u>Sneakfoot—1314</u>. . . White Sand and part of the Lochsa Face <u>Lochsa Face—1311</u>. This is the steep face of the Lochsa River adjacent to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness. It contains the famous Jerry Johnson Hot Springs and important tributaries to the Lochsa River. <u>Lolo—1805</u> (mostly on the Lolo National Forest) This is part of a large roadless area that encompasses the north flank of Lolo Peak, the northern boundary of the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.45310) <u>Section 16 Roadless—1310</u> This area is adjacent to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and just south of the Lolo Creek area. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.45400) <u>North Lochsa Country</u> This is the northern flank of the scenic Lochsa River. <u>Fish and Hungery Creek—1307</u> (also called North Lochsa Slope). . . the Lochsa River corridor. It also contains the only unroaded section of the Lewis and Clark trail remaining in the entire country. <u>Weir/Post Office—1308</u>. . . Ashpile Peak and Weir Creek Hot Springs and is adjacent to Indian Post Office. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.45100) <u>Eldorado Creek—1312</u>. . . White Pine region. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.45310)</p>	<p>Clearwater, Lolo</p>	<p>ID, MT</p>
<p>Clearwater, Nez Perce and St. Joe National Forest. (Individual, Moscow, ID - #A11643.45621)</p>	<p>Clearwater, Nez Perce, St. Joe</p>	<p>ID</p>
<p>Beartooth District. (Individual, Red Lodge, MT - #A12473.90130)</p>	<p>Custer</p>	<p>MT</p>
<p>The Beartooths, and the Bob. (Individual, Missoula, MT - #A6480.10150)</p>	<p>Custer, Flathead, Lewis and Clark</p>	<p>MT</p>
<p>Here on the Flathead National Forest the roadless areas of the Swan Front, Swan</p>	<p>Flathead</p>	<p>MT</p>

Crest, Mt. Hefty, Tuchuck, Thompson-Seaton, Nasukoin, Lost Jack, Jewel Basin, and Le Beau. (Individual, Kalispell, MT - #A28230.45621)		
Northwest Montana, between Glacier National Park and the Flathead National Forest. (Individual, Winnebago, IL - #A1471.90110)	Flathead, Glacier National Park	MT
Seeley Lake, Montana in the heart of the Swan Valley and near the Bob Marshall and Scapegoat Wilderness Areas. (Individual, Seeley Lake, MT - #A6434.45621)	Flathead, Helena, Lewis and Clark, Lolo	MT
The Lolo and Flathead National Forest. (Individual, Condon, MT - #A13397.45621)	Flathead, Lolo	MT
The Roadless Area on Lie Creek in the Gallatin National Forest. (Individual, Livingston, MT - #A6409.45621)	Gallatin	MT
The Montana side of Yellowstone. (Individual, Boulder, CO - #A9968.50000)	Gallatin	MT
Near Gallatin National Forest roadless areas. . . . The Crazy Mountains. (Individual, Gallatin Gateway, MT - #A19100.45622)	Gallatin	MT
The Gallatin-Yellowstone Divide Trail in the Gallatin N.F. (Individual, Madison, WI - #A866.91221)	Gallatin	MT
Gallatin Range . . . Wyoming & Montana. (Individual, Middlebury, VT - #A10033.45621)	Gallatin	MT, WY
The Shoshone and Gallatin National Forests. (Individual, Gardiner, MT - #A27498.45621)	Gallatin, Shoshone	MT, WY
Glacier Parks. (Individual, Littleton, CO - #A9935.45331)	Glacier National Park	MT
The Elkhorns, Big Belts, Continental Divide, and Rocky Mountain Front . . . the Helena National Forest. (Christian Kaufman, Representative, Helena, MT - #A30149.45621)	Helena	MT
The Ten Mile watershed on the Helena National Forest . . . from roadless tracts east of the Continental Divide in the Black Mountain Roadless Areas. (Christine Kaufman, Representative, Montana House of Representatives, Helena, MT - #A30149.45622)	Helena	MT
The Blackfoot Meadows and Avalanche Gulch to US 12 portions of the Helena NF. (Individual, Helena, MT - #A30941.10150)	Helena	MT
Roadless areas on the Idaho Panhandle National Forest. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Couer d'Alene, ID - #A5697.90110)	Idaho Panhandle	ID, MT, WA
Idaho Panhandle National Forest. . . . timber sale (the Myrtle Cascade). (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Spokane, WA - #A18013.90520)	Idaho Panhandle	ID, MT, WA
The St. Joe R. D. of the Idaho Panhandle forest. (Individual, Saint Maries, ID - #A15516.45621)	Idaho Panhandle	ID, MT, WA
Lake Pend Oreille area . . . of the Northern Idaho Panhandle forest. (Individual, Sandpoint, ID - #A28585.90421)	Idaho Panhandle	ID, MT, WA
The Yaak, MT, watershed (a Kootenai tributary). (Individual, Troy, MT - #A13457.45624)	Kootenai	ID, MT
Roadless areas in the Kootenai National Forest in Western Montana. (Individual, Trout Creek, MT - #A10498.45622)	Kootenai	ID, MT
Montana's Yaak valley, in the northern half of the Kootenai National Forest. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Missoula, MT - #A17234.45621)	Kootenai	ID, MT
The Ten Lakes Proposed Wilderness Area. . . . The areas surrounding the Cabinet Mountain Wilderness Area and the Bob Marshall Wilderness Complex. (Individual, Libby, MT - #A8346.45621)	Kootenai	ID, MT
In Montana's Rocky Mountain Front, on the inventoried roadless areas of the Lewis and Clark National Forest, Rocky Mountain Division, which is known to Montanans as the fabulous, wild Rocky Mountain Front. (Individual, Choteau, MT - #A5653.45621)	Lewis and Clark	MT
The Snowy Mts. Wilderness Study Area, Bitter Cr., Woodhawk. (Individual, Lewistown, MT - #A15660.45629)	Lewis and Clark	MT
Little Missouri National Grasslands. . . . The Theodore Roosevelt National	Little Missouri	ND

<p>Park’s South Unit, located within the boundaries of the Grasslands, is bordered by the Teddy Roosevelt Oil Field. The Park’s North Unit is similarly at risk. . . . Bell Lake and Wannagan Roadless Areas. . . . Dawson’s Waterhole Roadless Area’s east side. . . . Kinley Plateau and Bullion Butte, roadless areas the Dakota Prairie Grasslands Office deems unsuitable for Wilderness. Lone Butte and Bennett-Cottonwood Roadless Areas. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Bismarck, ND - #A19108.45620)</p>	<p>National Grasslands, Theodore Roosevelt National Park</p>	
<p><u>Nez Perce National Forest</u> <u>River of No Return/Gospel Hump Additions.</u> These roadless areas are contiguous to the River of No Return and Gospel Hump Wilderness Areas (areas that are contiguous) and make logical additions. . . . Furthermore, the closure of the unneeded Magtruder Road would unite this largest wildland in the lower 48 with the Selway-Bitterroot and surrounding wildlands. <u>Cove and Mallard—1921 and 1847.</u> . . . Cove/Mallard timber sales. . . . four sales went forth and road reclamation should take place on the Noble, Jack, Grouse and Small sales roads. . . . part of the Salmon River country. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.53110) <u>Gospel Hump Additions</u> This is the site of the Wing Creek/Twentymile Roadless Area (south Fork Clearwater drainage) . . . Tenmile and Johns Creeks. Other key additions include Indian Creek (southeast portion) which is a crucial tributary to the Salmon River, Boulder Creek (west), and the remaining roadless portion of the upper Crooked River (northeast). Furthermore, a roadless portion of upper Twentymile Creek (Lost Lake and Twentymile Butte). . . . <u>Selway-Bitterroot Additions</u> These are all logical additions to the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness. A portion of Meadow Creek was previously included in the old Selway Primitive Area. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.45400) <u>Meadow Creek-1845.</u> . . . Meadow Creek is the major tributary to the Selway River. <u>Rackcliff-Gedney—1841</u> (also Clearwater National Forest) This large area occupies the divide between the Lochsa and Selway Rivers. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.45100) <u>Upper Bear Creek.</u> . . . the headwaters of Bear Creek, contiguous to the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness and at the top of Lost Horse Canyon. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.25200) <u>South Fork Clearwater</u> <u>Dixie Summit/Nut Hill—1235.</u> <u>Lick Point—1227.</u> This is the headwater of the American River. Selway-Middle Fork Clearwater These roadless areas drain into the Selway and Middle Fork Clearwater. <u>O’Hara Falls—1226.</u> O’Hara Creek. <u>Goddard Creek—1843.</u> . . . between O’Hara Falls and Middle Fork Face. <u>Middle Fork Face—1842.</u> . . . The Middle Fork sale . . . in the Horse Creek watershed. <u>Lower Salmon</u> These areas drain into the Salmon River . . . They form a transition between the Salmon River country to the east and the Blue Mountains to the west. . . . The Slate. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.90310) <u>Clear Creek—1844.</u> <u>North Fork Slate—1850.</u> Slate Creek <u>Little Slate—1851.</u> . . . tributaries to Slate Creek . . . A unique lake in Nut Basin and an RNA in No Business Creek. <u>John Day—1852.</u> . . . John Day and Allison Creeks. <u>Kelly Mountain—1857.</u> This area drains into the Salmon east of Riggins.</p>	<p>Nez Perce</p>	<p>ID</p>

(Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.45100)		
Cove/Mallard, Selkirk Mountain Roadless Area, South Fork Mountain Area, Quartzite Roadless Area. . . . roadless areas, such as Cove/Mallard in the Nez Perce National Forest in central Idaho. . . . the Myrtle-Cascade Project just west of Bonners Ferry . . . the Selkirk Roadless Area! (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Spokane, WA - #A2840.45614)	Nez Perce	ID
Roadless lands in Yellowstone Nat'l Park. (Individual, Southampton, PA - #A10089.45620)	Yellowstone National Park	WY
The areas in the National Grasslands need to be protected. . . . (Individual, Center, ND - #A6904.45621)	Multiple	ND

Region 2 Rocky Mountain

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
Colorado's roadless areas. (Individual, Coal Creek, CO - #A15770.50000)	Multiple	CO
Colorado's wild forest. (Individual, Boulder, CO - #A21023.45620)	Multiple	CO
The Colorado Plateau and Southwest. (Individual, Burke, VA - #A30052.90130)	Multiple	CO
4.4 million acres in Colorado. (Business, Crested Butte, CO - #A31274.45300)	Multiple	CO
Southwest Colorado...San Juan County, Colorado. (Peter McKay, Commissioner, San Juan County Board of Commissioners, Silverton, CO - #A8590.10150)	Multiple	CO
The Bighorns, Medicine Bows and Wind River Mountains. (Individual, Casper, WY - #A21035.10111)	Multiple	CO, WY
The Continental Divide Trail. (Individual, Helena, MT - #A7359.45621)	Multiple	CO, WY
Wyoming. (Individual, Sheridan, WY - #A12145.10150)	Multiple	WY
Wyoming's national forest lands. (Individual, Cheyenne, WY - #A15034.10150)	Multiple	WY
The West, especially the Colorado Plateau. (Individual, Burke, VA - #A30052.90130)	Multiple	Multiple
The Rocky Mountains. (Individual, Rindge, NH - #A4812.90130)	Multiple	Multiple
The Southern Rockies. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Boulder, CO - #A22130.90130)	Multiple	Multiple
Colorado—the Canyonlakes Ranger District of the Roosevelt National Forest. (Individual, Fort Collins, CO - #A21116.10111)	Arapaho-Roosevelt	CO
In the Front Range . . . the James Peak Area. (Individual, No Address - #A23544.45621)	Arapaho-Roosevelt	CO
The City of Boulder has a great interest in the protection of roadless areas in the Arapahoe and Roosevelt National Forests. . . . In Colorado . . . more than 4.4 million acres. (William R. Toor, Mayor, City of Boulder, Boulder, CO - #A21473. 45622)	Arapaho-Roosevelt	CO
Please, please, please protect all of our roadless areas in all of our national forests. Including the Arapaho-Roosevelt, my next door neighbor. (Individual, Boulder, CO - #A20728.45620)	Arapaho-Roosevelt	CO
Roadless areas on the Grand Mesa National Forest—the Salt Creek and Priest Mountain roadless areas. Moreover, three forests in Colorado—the Routt, Rio Grande, and Arapaho Roosevelt National Forests—as well as the Black Hills National Forest in South Dakota and Wyoming . . . Bushy Creek, Morrison Creek, and South Fork roadless areas on the Routt and the Beaver Park roadless area in the Black Hills. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Missoula, MT - #A17234.45622)	Arapaho-Roosevelt, Black Hills, Grand Mesa, Medicine Bow-Routt, Rio Grande	CO, SD, WY
Bushy Creek and Morrison Creek (Morrison Creek Timber Sale—Routt National Forest); Salt Creek and Priest Creek (Sheep Flats Timber Sales, Grand Mesa-	Arapaho-Roosevelt, Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre-	CO, WY

Uncompahgre-Gunnison National Forest); Gunbarrel, Rampart and Thunder Butte (Upper South Platte Project, Pike-San Isabel National Forest); Nipple Peak North Roadless Areas and possibly others (Routt Bark Beetle Project, Routt National Forest); Cherokee Park (Sheep Creek Timber Sale, Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest); Dome Peak (Dome Peak Timber Sale, White River National Forest); and HD Mountains (coalbed methane production, San Juan National Forest). (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Denver, CO - #A12008.45624)	Gunnison, Medicine Bow-Routt, Pike-San Isabel, San Juan, White River	
Grand County. (Individual, Watkins, CO - #A100.45400)	Arapaho-Roosevelt, Medicine Bow-Routt	CO, WY
WY's roadless areas. . . . the Bighorn Mtns. . . . the Rock Creek, Littlehorn Canyon and Devils playground areas. . . . Rock Creek and Buffalo Creek in the Med Bow area. (Individual, Sheridan, WY - #A16801.45620)	Big Horn, Medicine Bow-Routt	WY
Roadless areas in Wyoming . . . the deep canyon lands of the Rock Creek and Littlehorn Roadless Areas in the Bighorns . . . the Mt. Leidy Highlands and Wyoming Range Roadless Areas in the Bridger-Teton . . . forests of Rock Creek and Buffalo Peak Roadless Areas in the Medicine Bows . . . mountains of Deep Lake/Beartooth Plateau and Franc's Peak Roadless Areas in the Shoshone National Forest. (Individual, Jackson, WY - #A28333.45621)	Bighorn, Bridger-Teton, Medicine Bow-Routt, Shoshone	WY
Wyoming forests (Medicine Bow and Bighorn) . . . The Bridger-Teton and Shoshone National Forests. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Sheridan, WY - #A17593.45622)	Bighorn, Bridger-Teton, Medicine Bow-Routt, Shoshone	WY, CO
Roadless Areas in the Shoshone, Big Horn and Medicine Bow National Forests. (Individual, Pinedale, WY - #A5307.45622)	Big Horn, Medicine Bow-Routt, Shoshone	CO, WY
The Shoshone National Forest and Bighorn National Forest roadless areas. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Sheridan, WY - #A17593.45622)	Bighorn and Shoshone	WY
The Brent Creek area in Duboise. (Individual, Casper, WY - #A21049.45622)	Bridger-Teton Shoshone	WY
Custer and Shoshone National Forests. (Individual, Red Lodge, MT - #A5778.10150)	Custer, Shoshone	MT, SD, WY
Gunnison National Forest. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Crested Butte, CO - #A21706.91221)	Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre-Gunnison	CO
The North Fork Valley. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Paonia, CO - #A20478.90130)	Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre-Gunnison	CO
The Uncompahgre, HD Mountains 25 miles east of Durango and an area close to Fort Collins need to remain protected as Roadless Areas. (Individual, Aurora, CO - #A21657.45621)	Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre-Gunnison	CO
Troublesome Roadless Area (Routt NF). . . . San Juan National Forest. . . . Salt Creek and Priest Mountain Roadless Areas (GMUG NF). (Individual, Boulder, CO - #A21450.45624)	Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre-Gunnison, Medicine Bow-Routt, San Juan	CO, WY
15 million acres in Colorado, of which more than 4.4 million acres are roadless. In Wyoming, national forests cover about 9.3 million acres, including 3.5 million acres of roadless lands. These roadless lands include such special places as the Dome Peak and Basalt Mountain Roadless Areas on the White River NF, the Salt Creek and Priest Mountain Roadless Areas on the Grand Mesa NF, the Turkey Creek Roadless Area on the San Juan NF, and Coon Creek on the Medicine Bow NF. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Denver, CO - #A21367.45100)	Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre-Gunnison, Medicine Bow-Routt, San Juan, White River	CO, WY
National Forest roadless areas in the Southern Rockies . . .	Grand Mesa-	CO,

<p>Below is a partial list of pending threats to roadless areas in Colorado and southern Wyoming—these pending agency projects could move forward immediately, although they would be prohibited in their current form under the Roadless Rule: Sheep Flats Timber Sale would damage parts of the Salt Creek and Priest Mountain Roadless Areas - two of the three remaining roadless areas on the Grand Mesa National Forest. Jackson Mountain Timber Sale on the San Juan National Forest Trout Mountain Timber Sale on the Rio Grande National Forest Morrison Creek Timber Sale on the Routt National Forest On the White River National Forest, the proposed Dome Peak and South Quartzite timber sales both include some logging in roadless areas. The Upper Blue Stewardship Project on the White River NF would degrade the Ten Mile Roadless Area. . . . Oil and gas leasing and development would invade the HD Mountains Roadless Area on the San Juan National Forest. The West Elk Roadless Area and the Springhouse Park Roadless Area on the Gunnison National Forest. . . . A proposed timber sale on Basalt Mountain on the White River NF would damage the Basalt Mountain Roadless Area; The Upper South Platte Project on the Pike-San Isabel NF could damage parts of four inventoried roadless areas—the Gunbarrel, Green Mountain, Thunder Mountain, and Rampart Roadless Areas. On the Medicine-Bow National Forest in Wyoming, the Cold Springs Timber Sale proposed in 1998 would log 5.4 million board feet, including logging on more than 1,000 acres, in two RARE II areas—the Buffalo Peak and Deer Creek Roadless Areas. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Denver, CO - #A21367.12440)</p>	<p>Uncompahgre-Gunnison, Medicine Bow-Routt, Rio Grande, San Juan, White River</p>	<p>WY</p>
<p>Areas of local concern that I would like to see remain roadless include the ED Mountains on the San Juan National Forest and all roadless areas on the White River and Grand Mesa National Forests. (Individual, Littleton, CO - #A29784.45620)</p>	<p>Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre-Gunnison, San Juan, White River</p>	<p>CO</p>
<p><u>Rock Creek Roadless Area (Medicine NF)</u>. . . . Rock Creek Roadless Area on the Medicine Bow National Forest (NF). (Individual, Boulder, CO - #A21450.45621)</p>	<p>Medicine Bow-Routt</p>	<p>CO, WY</p>
<p>On the Medicine Bow National Forest, roadless areas . . . Libby Creek and French Creek...the Snowy Range Roadless Area. . . . the Big and Little Sandstone, Huston Park Additions, and Solomon Creek roadless areas. . . . The Middle Fork and Rock Creek roadless areas. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Laramie, WY - #A20904.45100)</p>	<p>Medicine Bow-Routt</p>	<p>CO, WY</p>
<p>Routt/Medicine Bow National Forest. . . . I am asking that you protect completely the remaining roadless areas in that forest, as well as in all national forests. (Individual, No Address - #A22378.10150)</p>	<p>Medicine Bow-Routt</p>	<p>CO, WY</p>
<p>Roadless areas on the Medicine Bow National Forest. The Tie Camp Timber Sale, Jack Creek Timber Sale and Cold Springs Timber Sale would seriously impact roadless areas on the Medicine Bow National Forest if allowed to go forward. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Laramie, WY - #A20904.30100)</p>	<p>Medicine Bow-Routt</p>	<p>CO, WY</p>
<p>The area east of Ptarmigan Peak Wilderness. (Individual, Silverthorne, CO - #A28101.45624)</p>	<p>Medicine Bow-Routt, White River</p>	<p>CO</p>
<p>Roadless areas on the Pike National Forests. . . . The eastern edges of the Pike are important refuges for increased metropolitan development. Further, Audubon’s new Nature Center is located at the very edge of the Pike forest were the S. Platte River leave the mountain valleys to continue its journey across</p>	<p>Pike-San Isabel</p>	<p>CO</p>

Colorado's eastern plains. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Littleton, CO - #A8829.45622)		
The Roadless Area Conservation Rule would protect 5.2 million acres across the Southern Rockies and 669,000 acres in the Pike and San Isabel National Forests. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Denver, CO - #A8824.45622)	Pike-San Isabel	CO
The San Isabel National Forest. . . . in the Wet Mountains. (Individual, Wetmore, CO - #A13477.45622)	Pike-San Isabel	CO
This summer I had the opportunity to map two areas of Colorado for possible roadless/wilderness inventory. One area, East of Twin Lakes, includes a large roadless area that is pristine, home to much wildlife, is used by hikers, runners, and backpackers, has two major Colorado trails and is in need of protection. (Individual, Evergreen, CO - #A17159.70400)	Pike-San Isabel	CO
The Pike-San Isabel National Forest. . . . the Kreutzer-Princeton Roadless Area. (Individual, Colorado Springs, CO - #A25621.45622)	Pike-San Isabel	CO
This regards Gray Back Peak, a roadless area on the Pike-San Isabel National Forest which has consistently been overlooked in roadless inventory. This area should be included under the Roadless Conservation Rule when the current revision is finalized. . . . This tract is in the upper watersheds of Little Fountain Creek and Rock Creek, centered on Gray Back Peak, near Colorado Springs on the Pikes Peak Ranger District. . . . this tract is adjacent to the BLM's Beaver Creek Wilderness Study Area. . . . (We again urge the U.S. Forest Service to inventory and include this area in the Roadless Area Conservation Rule.) (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Monument, CO - #A20695.45624)	Pike-San Isabel	CO
The lands the Rule protects are an excellent buffer to the Weminuche Wilderness area in our county. (Christine K. Smith, Chairperson, San Juan County Board of Commissioners, Silverton, CO - #A8596.45621)	Rio Grande, San Juan	CO
The Hermosa roadless area in southwest Colorado, 10 miles north of Durango . . . the Hermosa Creek Drainage. (Recreational Non-Motorized Organization, Boulder, CO - #A17233.45621)	San Juan	CO
The Hermosa Creek area—the largest unprotected roadless area in the San Juans. (Individual, Boulder, CO - #A3501.45100)	San Juan	CO
The San Juan Mountain Range in Hermosa. (Individual, Boulder, CO - #A3489.45621)	San Juan	CO
Several National Forest roadless areas are adjacent to the City of Durango or located nearby. These roadless areas on the San Juan National Forest provide some of the most cherished backcountry recreation opportunities for Durango city residents and visitors. Junction Creek is one such roadless area. The Colorado Trail begins at Junction Creek and offers popular hiking, mountain bicycling, and cross-country skiing trips for locals and tourists. Junction Creek comprises a portion of the Hermosa Roadless Area. The Haflin Creek and Missionary Ridge Trails are other popular trails just a few miles outside the Durango city limits. These trails are located in a roadless area adjacent to the Weminuche Wilderness Area. The Roadless Area Conservation Rule as originally published would maintain these undeveloped, roadless national forest lands in their present condition and perpetuate the roadless, backcountry settings cherished by our city's residents. (Virginia Castro, Council Member, City of Durango, Durango, CO - #A8598.45624)	San Juan	CO
The San Juan and White River National Forests. (Individual, Broomfield, CO - #A6301.90110)	San Juan, White River	CO
White River NF. (Individual, Aurora, IL - #A916045620)	White River	CO
The forests of Basalt and Table Mountain on the White River National Forest. (Individual, Aspen, CO - #A5116.50000)	White River	CO
Over 600,000 roadless acres in the White River National Forest . . . including	White River	CO

Dome Peak, Big Ridge, and Red Table Mountain. . . Big Ridge to South Fork Roadless Area, adjacent to Flat Tops Wilderness Area in northwestern Colorado. . . Basalt Mountain, Red Table Mountain, and Gypsum Creek Roadless Area encompass the largest unprotected wild area on the White River National Forest covering 78,500 acres. . . The Red Table area. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Denver, CO - #A17162.45621)		
Dome Peak and Two Elk roadless areas in the White River National Forest. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Nevada City, CA - #A4941.90110)	White River	CO
Dome Peak Roadless Area...the Flat Tops Wilderness...roadless areas on the White River NF. (Individual, Boulder, CO - #A21450.45621)	White River	CO
Beaver Creek, Breckenridge and Vail in Colorado, (Individual, Alta, WY - #A19643.90820)	White River	CO
The Frind Range Roadless Area. (Individual, Colorado Springs, CO - #A22145.45621)	Unknown	CO

Region 3 Southwestern

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
Areas of the West, such as Arizona. (Individual, Bloomsburg, PA - #A15515.45621)	Multiple	AZ
160,000 roadless acres in the Greater Grand Canyon region. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Flagstaff, AZ - #A21368.45621)	Multiple	AZ
1.2 million acres of forest in Arizona and 1.3 million acres in New Mexico. (Individual, Tucson, AZ - #A6021.10150)	Multiple	AZ, NM
The west especially . . . Southwest. (Individual, Burke, VA - #A30052.90130)	Multiple	AZ, NM
In New Mexico . . . nearly 1.6 million acres of inventoried roadless acres in need of protection. (Individual, Santa Fe, NM - #A19211.90110)	Multiple	NM
The Continental Divide Trail. (Individual, Helena, MT - #A7359.45621)	Multiple	NM
In the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest in the White Mountains of Arizona. (Individual, Sonoita, AZ - #A22274.45621)	Apache-Sitgreaves	AZ
Cibola National Forest in central New Mexico. (Individual, No Address - #A5287.70000)	Cibola	NM
Santa Fe NF. (Individual, Aurora, IL - #A916045620)	Santa Fe	NM
On the Santa Fe National Forest, inventoried roadless areas border the Pecos and Dome Wilderness areas and significant portions of the Jemez Mountains contain roadless areas. (Individual, Santa Fe, NM - #A19211.45611)	Santa Fe	NM
Phoenix, Arizona, near the Tonto National Forests. A favorite hiking area in the forest is near the Mazatzal Wilderness northeast of Phoenix. It is a beautiful, yet rugged part of Arizona. Southeast of the small village of Sunflower, Forest Road 22 links several trails in the Mazatzal Wilderness to the Four Peak Wilderness. (Individual, Phoenix, AZ - #A15726.90130)	Tonto	AZ

Region 4 Intermountain

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
Our state of California. . . San Luis Obispo County itself has roadless and wilderness areas which must be protected. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, San Luis Obispo, CA - #A31202.45621)	Multiple	CA
All Roadless national forest land in California and the Pacific Northwest. (Individual, Westminster, SC - #A9412.45620)	Multiple	CA, OR, WA
Colorado. (Individual, Lebanon, NH - #A4286.90110)	Multiple	CO
The Northern Rockies. (Individual, No Address - #A928.70300)	Multiple	CO, ID, MT,

		WY
Idaho's wild forests. (Individual, La Canada Flintridge, CA - #A803.90110)	Multiple	ID
Idaho's remaining 8 million acres of wild lands. (Business, Boise, ID - #A20362.10150)	Multiple	ID
Idaho. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Williams, OR - #A21210.45500)	Multiple	ID
The proposed roadless areas in Idaho (Boulder/White Clouds, S. Fork of the Salmon River, S. Fork of the Snake, etc.). (Individual, No Address - #A27595.90110)	Multiple	ID
I live in Idaho . . . I want to see all 9 million of those acres protected by the roadless rule. . . . including the Boulder-White Clouds, the Pahsimeroi, the Pioneer Mountains, the Smokey Mountains, The Lost River Range. (Individual, Stanley, ID - #A16269.45620)	Multiple	ID
All roadless areas including those encompassed in the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act to and including, one thousands acres in size should be protected to preserve their wilderness character and eligibility for congressional Wilderness designation, rather than being deferred later to the forest planning process. (Individual, Emhurst, IL - #A15290.45320)	Multiple	ID
Proposed roadless areas in Idaho (Boulder/White Clouds, S. Fork of the Salmon River, S. Fork of the Snake, etc.) (Individual, No Address - #A27595.90110)	Multiple	ID
Places like Cove/Mallard, the Lost River Range, the Boulder-White Clouds, Mallard Larkins, Meadow Creek, Kelly Creek, South Fork Snake, Deadwood River, St. Joe River and Long Canyon, to just mention a few wild Idaho places. . . . (Individual, Boise, ID - #A20071.45100)	Multiple	ID
Areas of Montana, Idaho, and Washington, such as the Gallatin Range, the Big Belts, the Whitetail-Haystack-O'Neill roadless area, the White Sand and Cove-Mallard roadless areas, and the Kettle Range. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Bozeman, MT - #A20601.45621)	Multiple	ID, MT, WA
The Clearwater, Nez Perce, Idaho Panhandle, Targhee, Boise, and Payette. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Nevada City, CA - #A4941.45621)	Multiple	ID, MT, WA, WY
The Greater Yellowstone area. (Individual, Santa Monica, CA - #A9909.45331)	Multiple	ID, MT, WY
6 million acres in Greater Yellowstone. (Individual, Bozeman, MT - #A661.50510)	Multiple	ID, MT, WY
Utah, Wyoming, Nevada . . . Bridger-Teton near Grand Teton National Park. . . . The Red Canyon area in Dixie near Bryce Canyon National Park. (Individual, East Greenbush, NY - #A8821.90110)	Multiple	NV, UT, WY
Roadless areas in Utah. (Individual, Salt Lake City, UT - #A4857.90110)	Multiple	UT
Utah. (Individual, Lebanon, NH - #A4286.90110)	Multiple	UT
Wyoming. (Individual, Sheridan, WY - #A12145.10150)	Multiple	WY
Wyoming's national forest lands. (Individual, Cheyenne, WY - #A15034.10150)	Multiple	WY
Wyoming wildlands. (Individual, Gillette, WY - #A12084.50000)	Multiple	WY
Commissary Ridge is not only the far southwestern corner of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, but it is also one of the most crucial links between the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem and the Uinta Range in Utah and the southern Rockies in Colorado. . . . Public lands within the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem including the 170,000 roadless acres of Commissary Ridge. (Individual, Salt Lake City, UT - #A2369.53110)	Multiple	WY, UT
Pristine forests of the Inter-mountain west. (Individual, Sequim, WA - #A4527.45620)	Multiple	Multiple
The Yellowstone/Teton area . . . the Gallatin, Yellowstone and Madison Rivers. (Individual, San Antonia, TX - #A10116.45620)	Multiple	Multiple
The Snake and Yellowstone Rivers. (Individual, Gladwyne, PA -	Multiple	Multiple

#A10116.45620)		
I would like to see the Roadless Area Rule apply to <u>ALL</u> national forests (New England, Eastern, Midwest, Western, Alaskan Tongass, and other Alaskan forests etc.) (Individual, Endeavor, WI - #A8231.45622)	Multiple	Multiple
The Ashley and Fish Lake National Forests. (Individual, Kearns, UT - #A7590.65280)	Ashley, Fish Lake	UT
The Uintas. (Individual, Dutch John, UT - #A13402.45621)	Ashley, Uinta, Wasatch-Cache	UT
Roadless areas in Wyoming . . . lands such as the deep canyon lands of the Rock Creek and Littlehorn Roadless Areas in the Bighorns . . . the Mt. Leidy Highlands and Wyoming Range Roadless Areas in the Bridger-Teton . . . forests of Rock Creek and Buffalo Peak Roadless Areas in the Medicine Bows . . . mountains of Deep Lake/Beartooth Plateau and Franc’s Peak Roadless Areas in the Shoshone National Forest. (Individual, Jackson, WY - #A28333.45621)	Bighorn, Bridger-Teton, Medicine Bow-Routt, Shoshone	WY
Boise National Forest, primarily along the north, middle and south forks of the Boise River. . . the Sawtooth and Trinity mountain ranges, which are located in the same general vicinity. (Individual, Phoenix, AZ - #A15726.90130)	Boise	ID
The Smokys are 347,880 acres, immediately south of the Sawtooths. They’re from 5,000 [feet] in elevation by the South Fork of the Boise River to 10,000 feet beside “Big Peak”. . . the South Fork of the Boise. (Individual, Boise, ID - #A213693.45100)	Boise	ID
Idaho’s . . . in roadless areas, like Deadwood river and Middle Fork Payette River. (Individual, Boise, ID - #A6970.50000)	Boise	ID
Targhee, Boise, and Payette National Forests. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Missoula, MT - #A17234.45622)	Boise, Payette, Targhee	ID, WY
Roadless areas such as the Deadwood River, Lime Creek, Snowbank Mountain, and Trinity Mountains are easily accessible from Boise. (Business, Boise, ID - #A20362.45624)	Boise, Sawtooth	ID
The Boise National Forest and the Sawtooth National Forest. (Individual, Boise, ID - #A21215.45621)	Boise, Sawtooth	ID
Bridger-Teton National Forest. (Individual, South Lake Tahoe, CA - #A5108.90720)	Bridger-Teton	WY
Bondurant, WY adjacent to the Gros Ventre Wilderness Area. (Individual, Bondurant, WY - #A15081.45620)	Bridger-Teton	WY
The Mt. Leidy Highlands and Wyoming Range Roadless Areas in the Bridger-Tetons. (Individual, Jeffrey City, WY - #A27115.45100)	Bridger-Teton	WY
The Wyoming Range roadless area in the Bridger-Teton National Forest. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Sheridan, WY - #A17593.45330)	Bridger-Teton	WY
On the south side of the same roadless area, at the headwaters of Devil’s Hole Creek. . . I’ve hiked along the ridge overlooking Devil’s Hole Creek from the south. The panorama north to Electric Peak and the Salt River Range is superlative. . . Commissary Ridge. (Individual, Salt Lake City, UT - #A2369.50000)	Bridger-Teton	WY
The Brent Creek area in Duboise. (Individual, Casper, WY - #A21049.45622)	Bridger-Teton, Shoshone	WY
Tippets Valley, an IRA, on the Cedar District . . . The Dixie (Individual, Las Vegas, NV - #A5694.45622)	Dixie	UT
The Targhee National Forest . . . Boulder Mountain on the Dixie National Forest in Utah is a 150,000+ acre uninventoried roadless area. Areas adjacent to Boulder Mountain comprise 60,000-80,000 acres of roadless lands that were not included in the Dixie inventory. All these areas should receive immediate protection and should not have to wait for the forest planning process. In a 1999 citizens’ inventory of the Manti-La Sal National Forest in Utah, 30	Dixie, Manti-La Sal, Targhee, Uinta	ID, UT

percent more roadless areas were found in the La Sal mountains and 50 percent more were found in the Abajos than what is currently in the Forest Service's inventories. In a 1998 citizens' inventory of the Uinta National Forest 123,500 more acres of roadless lands were found than the Uinta's own 1999 inventory. These areas also deserve immediate protection. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Missoula, MT - #A21359.45622)		
Fishlake National Forest and Manti-LaSal National Forest. (Individual, Apo, NY - #A27804.45622)	Fishlake, Manti-La Sal	UT
Boulder Mountain, Thousand Lake Mountain, Cascade Peak, Pump Ridge, Hammond Canyon and the LaSal High Peaks are just some of the magnificent and unprotected Forest Service roadless lands in Utah. (Individual, Salt Lake City, UT - #A2369.10150)	Fishlake, Manti-La Sal	UT
Gallatin Range . . . Wyoming and Montana. (Individual, Middlebury, VT - #A10033.45621)	Gallatin	MT, WY
The Spring Mountains in Nevada, which are part of the Toiyabe National Forest. (Individual, Henderson, NV - #A4904.45622)	Humboldt-Toiyabe	NV
The Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest in Nevada . . . in the west part of the Grant Range and Clement Mountains. All of the roadless areas in the Schell Creek range. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Missoula, MT - #A17234.45622)	Humboldt-Toiyabe	NV
Roadless areas on the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest in Nevada. . . . These include: Arc Dome south, the Toiyabe crest, Bunker Hill, Georges Canyon, land directly adjacent to the Alta Toquima Wilderness, and Mahala Creek in the Independence Range. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Nevada City, CA - #A4941.90720)	Humboldt-Toiyabe	NV
Inventoried Roadless Areas in Utah. . . roadless areas in the Moab and Monticello Ranger Districts in the Manti-La Sal National Forest . . . the Wasatch-Cache NF. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moab, UT - #A30528.45622)	Manti-La Sal, Wasatch-Cache	UT
Two logging projects, the North Valley and Fourmile timber sales, on the Payette National Forest threaten roadless areas in Idaho. The North Valley Sale, 10 miles northwest of New Meadows on the New Meadows Ranger District, calls for logging 8.8 mmbf and 3.1 miles of roads. Several of the cutting units are in the Rapid River roadless area, one of the areas set aside for tradeoff for dams near Hell's Canyon. The Fourmile Sale, five miles northeast of New Meadows in the New Meadows Ranger District, will log 637 acres and build eight miles of roads. Part of the sale is the Patrick Butte roadless area, and 80,000-acre roadless area that hugs close to the Salmon River and comes up to the high, mountainous country above. The sale area is critical for the migration of elk, moose, and bear. Other roadless areas in Idaho are at risk South Fork Snake, Deadwood River, St. Joe River, Long Canyon, and the greater Cove/Mallard-Jersey-Wing/Ten Mile area on the Nez Perce National Forest. (Individual, Boise, ID - #A20396.45621)	Payette	ID
Specifically the French Creek, Patrick Butte, Needles, Secech, Rapid River, Council Mountain, and Cuddy Mountain roadless areas need to be conserved in their entirety. . . . All the way from the desert-like canyon bottoms of Hells Canyon and the main Salmon River canyon to the alpine regions of Cuddy Mountain and Bear Pete. (Individual, Weiser, ID - #A15804.45624)	Payette	ID
French Creek and Patrick Butte Roadless areas. . . . Elkhorn Creek areas . . . Lake and Partridge Creeks are the most pristine drainages aside from French Creek, and all three should remain roadless in perpetuity. The boundary should be extended to include the BLM property to the Salmon River. Hazard Creek and Hard Creek should be protected . . . Granite Mountain, at the south end of Patrick Butte, is threatened by a ski area and further random skiing but should remain roadless at least through the next planning period. The boundary of the roadless area is adequate up past Grassey Lakes and by Scribner Lake, Lave	Payette	ID

Butte, and Hershey Point. Beyond that point the boundary in the hydrogeologic boundary of Partridge Creek. In the French Creek drainage the roadless areas boundaries should follow Little French Creek as close as possible, skirting clearcuts and the road down to include the BLM property. From there the boundary following the French Creek road up to Burgdorf property. From there the boundary following the French Creek road on up to Burgdorf then to Nethger and Josephine lakes and Cloochman Saddle, following the paved road to near Copet Creek, missing Granite Reservoir and Fisher Creek Saddle then dipping south again to past Slab Butte and following along Brundage Mountain Road to near Hard Creek Lake and Upper Hazard Lake and back to Little French Creek. The clearcuts along Little French and French Creeks should be managed to favor habitat management. The utmost concern should be taken to include the hydrogeologic boundary of French Creek, especially along Klip Creek, where no timber management should be undertaken. The Slab Butte, Bruin Mountain, and Little French Creek country should not be managed for recreation, timber, or sheep, but rather for their plants and alpine habitat; it is fragile and in some cases burned. (Individual, Boise, ID - #A21369.45624)		
The Sawtooth Valley between the Sawtooth and White Cloud mountains. (Individual, Kittery, ME - #A21218.45621)	Sawtooth	ID
The Smokys are 347,800 acres, immediately south of the Sawtooths. They're from 5,000 in elevation by the South Fork of the Boise River to 10,000 feet beside "Big Peak". (Individual, Boise, ID - #A20514.45621)	Sawtooth	ID
Lake Tahoe. (Individual, Carmel Bay, CA - #A1278.45621)	Tahoe	CA, NV
Roadless areas in the Sierra Nevada. . . . For example, the Tahoe National Forest . . . Devils Canyon . . . Lafayette Ridge . . . an area near Downieville and north of New York Ravine. (Individual, Oklahoma City, OK - #A17236.45621)	Tahoe	CA, NV
Targhee. (Individual, Hailey, ID - #A17172.10150)	Targhee	ID, WY
Island Pk. (Individual, Salt Lake City, UT - #A9719.45621)	Targhee	ID
I am writing to ask you to preserve the roadless forest areas in our district. I am 81 yrs old and have hiked & backpacked in this area since 1975, when we moved to Utah. Two days ago I climbed to the Saddle just below Ben Lomond. (Individual, Ogden, UT - #A800.45621)	Wasatch-Cache	UT
Wasatch-Cache National Forest (Individual, Apo, NY - #A27804.45622)	Wasatch-Cache	UT
[Areas adjacent to] Snowbird and Snowbasin ski areas in Utah. (Individual, Alta, WY - #A19643.90820)	Wasatch-Cache	UT

Region 5 Pacific Southwest

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
California. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Williams, OR - #A21210.45500)	Multiple	CA
Wild areas of Northern California. (Individual, San Diego, CA - #A17921.90110)	Multiple	CA
4.4 million acres in California. (Individual, Fresno, CA - #A7072.10150)	Multiple	CA
National Forests in the Sierra Nevada. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Davis, CA - #A21666.90100)	Multiple	Multiple
Throughout the Sierra Nevada and in National Forests in southern California. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Nevada City, CA - #A4941.90110)	Multiple	CA
All roadless areas in northwestern California. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Arcata, CA - #A21750.45621)	Multiple	CA
The Sierra Nevada Mountains and forests. (Individual, Chicago, IL - #A19019.45622)	Multiple	CA
The forests I visit here in California . . . the Sierra Nevada. Roadless area	Multiple	CA

designation would protect San Diego County's Cypress, which does not grow anywhere else and is down to the last few. (Individual, La Mesa, CA - #A30753.45621)		
Roadless areas in the National Forests covered by the Northwest Forest Plan. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Missoula, MT - #A17234.45621)	Multiple	CA, OR, WA
My concern is primarily in protecting the existing roadless status of the tracts of the National Forests of the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Coastal provinces. (Individual, El Granada, CA - #A5061.45621)	Multiple	Multiple
The Angeles National Forest. (Individual, Altadena, CA - #A13450.10150)	Angeles	CA
Areas of Eldorado and Tahoe forests. (Individual, Carmichael, CA - #A7051.45622)	Eldorado, Tahoe	CA, NV
The Eldorado NF, near my home contains the Desolation Wilderness. . . . In the Tahoe NF, very little of the spectacular country north of Interstate 80 is protected. Those wishing to enjoy nature as it is are crammed into the Castle Peak and Grouse Ridge areas. These areas are very heavily used and as yet do not have wilderness protection. (Individual, Sacramento, CA - #A8271.45622)	Eldorado, Tahoe	CA, NV
The Tulare County Democratic Central Committee has endorsed permanent protection for the eligible roadless area in Tulare County. These include Black and State Mountain, Dennison Peak, Moses, Ripcon, Monache Meadows, Woodpecker, Freeman Peak, Split Mountain, Chico, Redwood canyon, North Fork and Mineral King, and several Bureau of Land Management Wilderness Study Areas including the Sheep Ridge and Mild Ranch areas. . . . Other areas including potential additions to the Golden Trout Wilderness and State and Black Mountain . . . Already, the Moses area has been recommended for Wilderness designation in the Mediated Settlement Agreement of July 1990. (Tulare County Democratic Central Committee, Porterville, CA - #A41226.45621)	Inyo	CA
Roadless areas in the Sierra Nevada that deserve protection may not be spared from logging and road building. For example, the Tahoe National Forest, which has nearly 3,000 miles of roads, forest activists found that Devils Canyon, which contains the largest stand of old growth trees in Nevada County, Lafayette Ridge, which also has old growth, and an area near Downieville and north of New York Ravine, which is important springs habitat to four rare subspecies of Caddis fly, could be logged and roaded because all three areas are less than 5,000 acres and may be overlooked by the Regional Forester. (Individual, Boise, ID - #A20396.45621)	Tahoe	CA
Inyo and Toiyabe National Forests. (Individual, Bridgeport, CA - #A7075.30100)	Inyo, Toiyabe	CA, NV
Mt. Hoffman Roadless Area in the Medicine Lake Highlands in Northern California . . . Roadless areas along the Rogue River in Oregon. (Individual, Mt. Shasta, CA - #A1649.45621)	Klamath, Modoc, Shasta-Trinity	CA, OR
[Areas adjacent to] Mammoth Mountain and Heavenly [ski areas] in California. (Individual, Alta, WY - #A19643.90820)	Inyo, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit	CA, NV
Roadless areas surrounding Lassen Volcanic National Parks, including the Heart Lake area, on the Lassen the Medicine Lake area on the Modoc National Forest; the roadless area between Hat Creek and East Lava Rim Roads (administered by the Shasta-Trinity National Forest); the forests of the McCloud River watershed; roadless areas surrounding the Shasta Lake National Recreation Area; roadless areas in the South Fork of the Trinity River watershed on the slopes of South Fork Mountain; The New River watershed; Mt. Eddy region, and other roadless areas adjacent to the Trinity Alps Wilderness. Roadless areas throughout the Klamath-Siskiyou region, on the Shasta-Trinity, Klamath, Modoc, Six Rivers, and Lassen National Forests. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Kelsey,	Klamath, Lassen, Modoc, Shasta-Trinity, Siskiyou, Six Rivers	CA, OR

CA - #A15815.45000)		
I have recently enjoyed the Siskiyou Mountains, and the Los Padres National Forest in California. (Individual, Sacramento, CA - #A8254.45620)	Los Padres, Siskiyou	CA, OR
Roadless areas here, including those in Los Padres National Forest and Six Rivers National Forest . . . the Trinity Alps area. (Individual, San Francisco, CA - #A3058.45620)	Los Padres, Six Rivers	CA
Mendocino National Forest. (Individual, Willits, CA - #A12242.45622)	Mendocino	CA
I particularly support permanent protection for roadless areas such as Feather Falls, Bucks Lakes, Chips Creek in the Plumas National Forest, that are eligible for such designation. (Individual, Fairfax, CA - #A4539.45623)	Plumas	CA
Sequoia National Forests and also near sequoia groves in the Giant Sequoia National Monument. (Individual, No Address - #A16299.91221)	Sequoia	CA
The Shasta-Trinity Forest of Northern California . . . the Yolla-Bolly Middle Eel Wilderness. (Individual, Providence, RI - #A11681.90523)	Shasta-Trinity	CA
Roadless areas in California are also at risk. Timber sales in the Six Rivers and Shasta-Trinity National Forests are located in the largest concentration of ancient forest in the region, including unprotected roadless areas adjacent to the Trinity Alps Wilderness. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Nevada City, CA - #A4941.45621)	Shasta-Trinity, Six Rivers	CA
The South Kalmiopsis and North Kalmiopsis Roadless Areas (among others) in the Siskiyou National Forest of Oregon, and about the Orleans Mountain Roadless areas in the Six Rivers and Shasta/Trinity National Forests. . . . in southwestern Oregon and northwestern California. (Individual, Los Angeles, CA - #A17161.45611)	Shasta-Trinity, Siskiyou, Six Rivers	CA, OR
Glasscreek Meadow, headwaters of the Owens River. (Individual, Mammoth lakes, CA - #A3816.45621)	Sierra	CA
I am especially concerned with protection of the roadless areas in the Elk and Sixes Rivers here where I live in southwest Oregon. There are two roadless areas in these adjoining coastal rivers, the Grassy Knob and Copper Mountain Roadless Areas I fully support creation of the Copper Salmon Wilderness Area that would essentially encompass the Copper Mountain Roadless Area and extend the protection currently afforded by the existing Grassy Knob Wilderness on up the river to include the upper portion of the Elk and adjacent portions of the Sixes. (Individual, Port Orford, OR - #A27697.45621)	Siskiyou, Six Rivers	CA, OR
Six Rivers National Forest in northern California. (Individual, Edmonds, WA - #A6927.45500)	Six Rivers	CA
Stanislaus National Forest. (Individual, No Address - #A4572.90310)	Stanislaus	CA
Tahoe National Forest (TNF) . . . two of our remaining Roadless Areas, Duncan Canyon, and the North Fork of the Middle Fork American River. (Individual, Dutch Flat, CA - #A22445.91221)	Tahoe	CA, NV
The Tahoe National Forest. (Individual, Nevada City, CA - #A1595.45621)	Tahoe	CA, NV

Region 6 Pacific Northwest

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
Roadless areas in the National Forests covered by the Northwest Forest Plan. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Missoula, MT - #A17234.45621)	Multiple	CA, OR, WA
Areas of Montana, Idaho, and Washington, such as the Gallatin Range, the Big Belts, the Whitetail-Haystack-O'Neill Roadless Area, the White Sand and Cove-Mallard roadless areas, and the Kettle Range. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Bozeman, MT - #A20601.45621)	Multiple	ID, MT, WA
Cover/Mallard, Selkirk Mountain Roadless Area in Idaho, the South Fork Mountain Area, Quartzite Roadless Area, Kettle Range, Tucannon, Wenatchee	Multiple	ID, WA

Creek, Dark Divide, Long Swamp, Granite Mt., Jackson/Graphite, and Mt. Bonaparte in Washington are just a few designated Roadless Areas. (Business, Spokane, WA - #A22047.45621)		
Oregon. (Individual, Gresham, OR - #A14964.90110)	Multiple	OR
Oregon’s National Forests. . . . Moose Creek Roadless Area of Pelican Butte. (Individual, Eugene, OR - #A14267.45621)	Multiple	OR
1.9 million acres of roadless areas in Oregon. (David Wu, United States Representative, Oregon, Washington, DC - #A15553.10150)	Multiple	OR
North and South Santian areas and lakes, Brietenbush River, Willamette Rivers, Siuslaw, Rogue and Umpqua Rivers, Nestuoca, Columbia, Clackamas. . . . the McKenzie. (Individual, Corvallis, OR - #A14589.45621)	Multiple	OR
Oregon. . . . Larch Mountain, Eagle Creek, and the Malheur River Canyon. . . . the Siskiyou Crest Wilderness, Hells Canyon Wilderness and Wallawa Mountains wilderness. (Individual, Portland, OR - #A13916.45624)	Multiple	OR
For completeness, we will list all the Oregon roadless areas that we wish to see undisturbed from commercial enterprises: Mill Creek Wilderness Additions, Marble Point Roadless Area, Lord Hat Roadless Area, Beaver Creek Roadless Area, Bachelor and Coffin Mountain Roadless Area, Canyon Creek and East Detroit Roadless Areas, Mouse Creek Roadless Area, Pyramid Mountain Roadless Area, Maiden Peak Roadless Area, Eagle Creek Roadless Area, Memalouse Creek Roadless Area, Roaring River Roadless Area, Brice Creek Roadless Area, Diamond Lake Ranger District Roadless Area, Hardesty Mountain Roadless Area (30 miles from Eugene, OR my residence), Kangaroo Roadless Area, Zane Grey Roadless Area, North and South Kalmiopsis Roadless Area, and Pelican Butte Roadless Area. . . . (Individual, Eugene, OR - #A30137.45614)	Multiple	OR
Oregon’s wild forests. (Susan Castillo, State Senator, State of Oregon, Salem, OR - #A23660.45320)	Multiple	OR
Throughout the Willamette Valley and Oregon. (Individual, Corvallis, OR - #A19506.45621)	Multiple	OR
Washington State . . . 716,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas. (Individual, Redmond, WA - #A27191.10111)	Multiple	WA
In Washington State, King County and the rest of the United States. (Larry Phillips, Councilmember, Metropolitan King County Council, Seattle, WA - #A5761.10150)	Multiple	WA
Forests in Washington. (Individual, East Greenbush, NY - #A8821.90110)	Multiple	WA
I would like to see the Roadless Area Rule apply to <u>ALL</u> national forests (New England, Eastern, Midwest, Western, Alaskan Tongass, and other Alaskan forests etc.) (Individual, Endeavor, WI - #A8231.45622)	Multiple	Multiple
Pristine forests of my home state of Washington such as the Kettle Range Mountains in Northeast Ferry County. (Individual, Kirkland, WA - #A4832.45621)	Colville	WA
We believe that the Roadless Rule should be amended to decrease unreasonable access. For example, it is not reasonable to bulldoze roads into old growth, and a caribou or grizzly recovery area. Yet, this is happening on the Colville and Idaho National Forests, where the Stimson Access project is being allowed to proceed, in spite of endangered species living in the access areas. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Spokane, WA - #A18013.40200)	Colville	WA
Roadless areas in Mount-Baker Snoqualmie, Okanogan, Wenatchee, Gifford Pinchot, Colville, Umatilla, Siskiyou . . . Lewis and Clark, Jefferson, and George Washington national forests, and hold each of them in equal esteem. (Individual, Bainbridge Island, WA - #A6010.45622)	Colville, George Washington, Gifford Pinchot, Jefferson, Lewis and Clark, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie, Okanogan, Siskiyou, Umatilla, Wenatchee	ID, OR, WA

<p>In eastern Washington the following roadless areas are in peril: Colville National Forest Twin Sisters Hoodoo Canyon Thirteen Mile Salmon Priest Additions A & B Abercrombie-Hooknose South Fork Mountain Cougar Mountain Profanity Bald Snow Grassy Top Umatilla National Forest Upper Tucannon Sheep Willow Springs. (Individual, Boulder, CO - #A15473.45624)</p>	<p>Colville, Umatilla</p>	<p>OR, WA</p>
<p>The Umpqua, and . . . the Willamette and Deschutes National Forest. (Individual, Roseburg, OR - #A19127.45621)</p>	<p>Deschutes, Umpqua, Willamette</p>	<p>OR</p>
<p>On the Gifford Pinchot National Forest, there are 97 uninventoried roadless areas greater than 1,000 acres in size. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Olympia, WA- #A12004.45622)</p>	<p>Gifford Pinchot</p>	<p>WA</p>
<p>The Gnat timber sale—located on the Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Monument—would log parts of the 8,500-acre Clearwater Creek Roadless Area and the Smith Butte Roadless Area. . . . In addition to the Acci and Gnat timber sales, the Forest Service has prepared dozens of other sales that compromise the integrity of roadless areas, including the Alpha, Beta/Omega, Goose Egg, Johnson, Kirk, LaRoux, Limbo, Lock, Swell, Silver Watch, Upper Greenhorn, Upper Iron, and Willame timber sales. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Olympia, WA - #A12004.45320)</p>	<p>Gifford Pinchot</p>	<p>WA</p>
<p>Examples of other proposed roadless area timber sales in Region 6 include: Gifford Pinchot, Aloha, Cispus Flats, Dark Canyon, Johnson, Kirk, La Roux, Limbo, Omega, P/B, Papa Bare, Swill, Upper Iron Creek, Upper Greenhorn, Mt. Hood, Salmonberry, Umpqua, Felix. (Individual, Cottage Grove, OR - #A27337.45626)</p>	<p>Gifford Pinchot</p>	<p>WA</p>
<p>29,000-acre roadless area near Portland in southwest Washington. (Individual, Portland, OR - #A1736.90520)</p>	<p>Gifford Pinchot</p>	<p>WA</p>
<p>Dark Divide, Pompey, Siouxan, Silver Star, Bourbon, Big Lava Bed, Horseshoe, Dixon Mountain, Strawberry, Spencer Ridge, Bear Creek, South Midway, West Mount Adams, Gotchen Creek, Red Lake, Red Mountain, Backbone, Cortwright, Deer Creek, Walupt, Chambers, Packwood Lake, Angry Mountain, Coal Creek Bluff, Carlton Ridge, Laughingwater, White Pass, and Tumwater. (Individual, Vancouver, WA - #A5724.45620)</p>	<p>Gifford Pinchot</p>	<p>WA</p>
<p>The Red Lake and Red Mountain (RARE II # 6076). . . . these two parcels are adjacent and contiguous to the existing Indian Heaven Wilderness Area. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Lyle, WA - #A13303.45620)</p>	<p>Gifford Pinchot</p>	<p>WA</p>
<p>The inventoried roadless areas within the Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Monument should come under the protection of the Roadless Area Conservation Rule: Mount Margaret, St. Helens, and Kipuka. (Individual, Vancouver, WA - #A5724.45621)</p>	<p>Gifford Pinchot</p>	<p>WA</p>
<p>Include the Mt Baker/Snoqualmie and Gifford Pinchot National Forests in Washington. (Individual, Seattle, WA - #A16860.45622)</p>	<p>Gifford Pinchot, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie</p>	<p>WA</p>
<p>Middle Fork Snoqualmie Valley, the rugged South Cascades' Rock Creek, Myrtle Lake and Chelan roadless areas, Eastern Washington's Entiat, the soothing Mad River country, the amazing Dark Divide, the high elevation Kettle</p>	<p>Gifford-Pinchot, Wenatchee</p>	<p>WA</p>

Range, the wildlife rich, upper Tucannon, and in the Olympics, the lush Upper South Fork Skokomish River Valley. (Individual, Seattle, WA - #A4835.45621)		
Also, the Kalmiopsis . . . in Oregon. . . . (Individual, Los Angeles, CA - #A19087.45622)	Siskiyou	OR
The Klamath-Siskiyou area. (Individual, Medford, OR - #A12075.90110)	Klamath, Siskiyou	OR
Klamath-Siskiyou ecoregion. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Ashland, OR - #A20421.45310)	Klamath, Siskiyou	OR
The roadless areas in eastern Oregon. . . . Greenhorn Mtn, Twin Mtn Myrtle-Silvies, Dixie Butte, Nipple Butte, Malheur Canyon, Utley Butte, Fox Creek, Aldrich Mtn, Dry Cabin, McClellan Mtn, Glacier Mtn, Pine Cr, Canyons (Ocheco), Flay Cr, North Fork Malheur, Lookout Mtn. (Individual, Bend, OR - #A21667.45621)	Malheur	OR
The Nature Conservancy of Washington recently acquired 387 acres along White Creek, which feeds into one of the Skagit's major tributaries, the Sauk River . . . Our purchase protects the majority of the portion of this watershed that lies outside the national forest boundary, and we are working to protect the remaining portion of the stream. . . . The extraordinary health of this tributary is due to the fact that the upper watershed is almost solely contained within a roadless area of the MBSNF. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Seattle, WA - #A21904)	Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie	WA
The Columbia Gorge Wilderness and Clackamas Wilderness. (Individual, No Address - #A13930.45621)	Mt. Hood	OR
The northwest side of Mt. Hood. . . . From the wilderness boundary westward into the Bull Run Watershed. (Individual, Portland, OR - #A1337.90523)	Mt. Hood	OR
Our family has spent a fair amount of time in the Roaring River Roadless Area. This beautiful area deserves protection and offers so many benefits with its quality river, forests, and diversity of life. (Individual, Portland, OR - #A13938.45621)	Mt. Hood	OR
Please protect our remaining roadless areas in Oregon, especially Roaring River and Helso. (Individual, Portland, OR - #A41509.45621)	Mt. Hood	OR
The proposed Roaring River Wilderness in the Mt. Hood National Forest (Estacada Ranger District). (Individual, Portland, OR - #A13942.45622)	Mt. Hood	OR
Unroaded areas in the Mt. Hood, Willamette and Umpqua National Forests. (Individual, Eugene, OR - #A24155.45310)	Mt. Hood, Umpqua, Willamette	OR
Here in Oregon, areas such as the Roaring River and Twin Lakes roadless areas in the Mount Hood National Forest, Hardesty Mountain in the Willamette National Forest, and Pelican Butte in the Winema National Forest. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Portland, OR - #A21669.45622)	Mt. Hood, Willamette, and Winema	OR
On the Olympic Peninsula the few remaining roadless areas around the National Park. (Individual, Sequim, WA - #A6258.50000)	Olympic	WA
Inventoried roadless areas in Olympic National Forest . . . Upper Skokomish, South Quinault Ridge, Moonlight Dome, Lightning Peak, Jefferson Ridge, Jupiter Ridge, Green Mountain, Mount Zion, Quilcene, and Rugged Ridge. (Individual, Bainbridge Island, WA - #A6010.45622)	Olympic	WA
Washington State . . . the Olympic Peninsula. The history of reducing the size of the original 2 million acre Olympic Forest Reserve, created in 1897, is a heartbreaking story of unhindered natural resources consumption without regard to sustenance and long term protection of our forest resources. From a low of 300,000 acres, following President Wilson's slashing the size of the Mount Olympus National Monument during World War I, we have slowly but steadily increased the number of protected acres. The USFS Roadless initiative will continue the positive public policy embodied in the Olympic National Park designation in 1938, addition of the ocean beaches to the Park in 1953 and the Olympic National Forest Wilderness designation activities of 1984. (Individual, Vashon, WA - #A4545.45611)	Olympic	WA

Oregon . . . McDonald Peak Roadless Area. (Individual, Ashland, OR - #A18705.45621)	Rogue River	OR
Comment specific to Southern Oregon. Rogue Valley Audubon Society wishes to emphasize several vitally important roadless areas in southern Oregon. –Pelican Butte (Winema National Forest) . . . It provides cold, pure water to Upper Klamath Lake and thus into the Klamath Basin National Wildlife Refuge complex, one of the most important waterfowl migration areas in North America. . . . –McDonald Peak (Rogue River National Forest)—this area is also threatened by ski development, in this case a proposed expansion of the Mt. Ashland Ski Area. The McDonald Peak area, along with nearby roadless areas (Wagner Gap, Condrey Mountain, and Kangaroo) form a critical biological connectivity zone along the Siskiyou Crest, passing high-elevation species between the Cascades to the east and other ranges of the Klamath-Siskiyou Bioregion to the west. –Rough and Ready Creek (Siskiyou National Forest)—this area, part of the huge 105,000 acres South Kalmiopsis roadless area, is internationally known as a center of plant biodiversity. . . . –Copper Salmon (Siskiyou National Forest) . . . the headwaters of the Elk River. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Ashland, OR - #A30398.45621)	Rogue River, Siskiyou, Winema	OR
The South Kalmiopsis and North Kalmiopsis Roadless Areas (among others) in the Siskiyou National Forest of Oregon, and about the Orleans Mountain Roadless areas in the Six Rivers and Shasta/Trinity National Forests. . . . in southwestern Oregon and northwestern California. (Individual, Los Angeles, CA - #A17161.45611)	Shasta-Trinity, Siskiyou, Six Rivers	CA, OR
Six Rivers and Shasta-Trinity National Forests located in the largest concentration of ancient forests in the region and including unprotected roadless areas adjacent to the Trinity Alps Wilderness, near my home in southern Oregon. (Individual, Ashland, OR - #A23399.45622)	Shasta-Trinity, Six Rivers	CA, OR
Please protect our Siskiyou—Cascade Monument. (Individual, Gold Hill, OR - #A15303)	Siskiyou	CA, OR
I have visited one of these roadless areas, Wasson Creek in the Coast Range of Oregon. (Individual, Eugene, OR - #A19263.45621)	Siskiyou	CA, OR
Roadless Areas on the Siskiyou National Forest. (Individual, Grants Pass, OR - #A30000.45100)	Siskiyou	CA, OR
The following roadless areas on the Siskiyou National Forest. . . . These inventoried roadless areas are: South Kalmiopsis . . . North Kalmiopsis . . . Kalmiopsis Additions . . . Shasta Costa—Steep slopes, major tributary to Rogue River . . . Windy Valley . . . Squaw Mountain . . . Briggs . . . Kangaroo - National Recreation Trail . . . Copper Mountain—Proposed Copper Salmon wilderness . . . Packsaddle . . . Mount Emily—Important salmon runs and contributor of quality water to Chetco River (Individual, Cave Junction, OR - #A1711045621)	Siskiyou	CA, OR
Roadless Areas in the Kalmiopsis/Wild Rogue, Elk River/Grassy Knob, Red Butte, and High Siskiyou in southwestern Oregon. (Individual, Cave Junction, OR - #A5950.50000)	Siskiyou	CA, OR
The Wild & Scenic Elk River located in the Powers Ranger District of the Siskiyou National Forest. . . . fully protect the Copper Mountain Roadless Area, the proposed Copper Salmon Wilderness, and all presently unroaded areas of the Elk River watershed. (Individual, Portland, OR - #A22094.45621)	Siskiyou	CA, OR
The range that is known as the Josephine Sheet . . . the South Kalmiopsis and North Fork Smith (and other smaller, associated) roadless areas. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Cave Junction, OR - #A17235.50500)	Siskiyou	CA, OR
I am especially concerned with protection of the roadless areas in the Elk and Sixes Rivers here where I live in southwest Oregon. There are two roadless areas in these adjoining coastal rivers, the Grassy Knob and Copper Mountain	Siskiyou, Six Rivers	CA, OR

Roadless Areas. . . . I fully support creation of the Copper Salmon Wilderness Area that would essentially encompass the Copper Mountain Roadless Area and extend the protection currently afforded by the existing Grassy Knob Wilderness on up the river to include the upper portion of the Elk and adjacent portions of the Sixes. (Individual, Port Orford, OR - #A27697.45621)		
In Siuslaw National Forest: Township 15S, Range 8W section 33, and Township 16S, Range 8W, sections 4 and 5. (Individual, Deadwood, OR - #A881.45621)	Siuslaw	OR
The Siuslaw and Willamette National forests. (Individual, Eugene, OR - #A3657.45622)	Siuslaw, Willamette	OR
Wildwood National Forest Park and Tryon Creek State Park. (Individual, Gresham, OR - #A14376.45000)	Tryon Creek State Park, Wildwood National Forest Park	OR
The “Lost Forest” in the southeast area of Oregon. (Individual, Gladstone, OR - #A14249.90130)	Umatilla	OR
The Umpqua’s designated roadless areas. (Individual, Queensbury, NY - #A4963.45622)	Umpqua	OR
Cottage Grove Ranger District of the Umpqua National Forest. . . . The areas such as those around Mt. June, Cedar Creek and Fairview Creek. (Individual, Cottage Grove, OR - #A6241.45621)	Umpqua	OR
Places like the Mt. Bailey roadless area, the largest unprotected roadless area on the Umpqua National Forest. (Individual, Roseburg, OR - #A1497.45622)	Umpqua	OR
Umpqua National Forest. . . . In particular, in the Umpqua National Forest the large roadless area west and north of Diamond Lake. . . . the roadless area west of Boulder Creek Wilderness and north of Highway 138. . . . roadless areas just south of the North Umpqua River on the western edge of the national forest. (Individual, Glide, OR - #A22303.45622)	Umpqua	OR
The McKenzie River basin. (Individual, Portland, OR - #A14265.45621)	Umpqua, Willamette	OR
Please leave areas such as Eagle Wilderness in northeastern Oregon as it is. (Individual, No Address - #A23521.45621)	Wallowa-Whitman	OR
Wenatchee National Forest. (Individual, Claremont, CA - #A15513.90520)	Wenatchee	WA
The Mad River country in the Wenatchee National Forest. (Individual, Seattle, WA - #A16824.45621)	Wenatchee	WA
Mission/Sand Creek Watersheds 1. Devil’s Gulch Roadless Area Ingalls Creek Watershed 2. Ingalls Creek 3. Wedge Mountain Icicle River Watershed 4. Snow Creek Cle-Elum Ranger District 5. Mt. Cashmere 6. Trout Creek 7. Icicle Ridge Nason Creek watershed 8. Chiwaukum Creek 9. White Pine 10. Nason Ridge White River & Little Wenatchee 11. Smith- Brock 12. Little Wenatchee 13. Canyon Creek Roadless Area Chiwawa River Watershed 15. Chiwawa 16. Rock Creek Entiat River Watershed 17. Myrtle Lake Roadless Area (10,918 acres)	Wenatchee	WA

<p>18. Entiat Roadless Area (72,526 acres) 19. Stormy Mountain Roadless Area 20. Slide Ridge Roadless Area Lake Chelan Watershed 21. South Shore 22. North Shore 23. Domke 24. Holden Cle-Elum Ranger District 25. Naneum 26. Lion Rock 27. Wilson Creek 28. Swauk 29. Red Top 30. Teanaway st 31. Upper Cle Elum River 32a. So. Alpine Lakes Cooper Lake 32b. So. Alpine Lakes Mineral Creek 32c. So. Alpine Lakes Box Canyon 34. Thorp Mountain 36. Mt. Clifty 37. Taneum 39. Quartz Naches Ranger District 38. Manastash Ridge 33. Annette Ridge 35. Blowout Mountain Mountain 40. Little Naches 41. American River 42. Bumping 43. Naches 44. William O. Douglas Adjacent 45. Devil's Table 46. Bethel Ridge 47. White Pass 48. Blue Rocks Adjacent 49. Goat Rocks Adjacent (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Peshastin, WA - #A28181.45621)</p>		
<p>Bethel Ridge Roadless Area. (Individual, Peshastin, WA - #A28210.45621)</p>	<p>Wenatchee</p>	<p>WA</p>
<p>Blue Slide Roadless Area Boz Creek Roadless Area Mineral Creek Roadless Area Cooper River Roadless Area (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Peshastin, WA - #A28181.45621)</p>	<p>Wenatchee</p>	<p>WA</p>
<p>The Cornpatch Inventoried Roadless Area located on the Willamette National Forest. (Conservation/Preservation Oregon, Eugene, OR - #A21798.45621)</p>	<p>Willamette</p>	<p>OR</p>
<p>Roadless Areas in the Old Cascades/Middle Santiam of the central Willamette National Forest: Moose Lake RS, Gordon Meadows RA, Jumpoff Joe RA, Browder Ridge RA, Echo Mt. RA, Three Pyramids RA, Pyramid Creek RA and Big Meadows RA. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Albany, OR - #A19057.45621)</p>	<p>Willamette</p>	<p>OR</p>
<p>Examples of current timber sales impacting roadless areas in the Willamette National Forest include: Moose Timber Sale, Sweet Home District, Willamette National Forest (EIS completed, Decision Notice signed). The sale includes commercial harvest in the</p>	<p>Willamette</p>	<p>OR</p>

<p>5,674 acres RARE I Moose Creek Roadless Area, which currently provides important connectivity for wildlife between the Menagerie and Middle Santiam Wilderness Areas. Moose Creek proper is eligible for designation as a Wild and Scenic River. . . .</p> <p>South Pyramid Timber Sale, Sweet Home District, Willamette National Forest (EA in scoping). . . . The Three Pyramids unroaded area is an extremely popular recreation destination and the Sough Pyramid Creek Trail travels through the heart of the planning area.</p> <p>Helldun Timber Sale, Middle Fork District, Willamette National forest (EA completed, currently offered as replacement volume to Scott Timber). . . .</p> <p>Currently, the Helldun ancient forest is part of a 2,000-acre block of fragmented ancient forest that connects the Waldo Wilderness with the RARE II inventoried Cornpatch roadless area. Combined, these roadless areas total over 35,000 acres, one of the largest intact forests in the Middle Fork District. The timber sale calls for logging over the popular Eugene to Crest Trail and degrading the Eagle Creek special Interest Area, one of only two special interest areas in the Willamette National forest. The planning area has also been proposed as a Research Natural Area to be preserved for scientific study of its unique ecological characteristics.</p> <p>Coffin Timber Sale, Detroit District, Willamette National Forest (EA completed, Decision Notice signed, sale unawarded). While the EA for the Coffin timber sale proposed logging 2.77 mmbf from 277 acres of the Coffin/Bachelor Mountain roadless “semiprimitive area” after the decision notice was signed, the volume doubled to 5.37 mmbf. The Coffin Mountain timber sale is located within the Marys Creek Sub-basin of the upper North Santaim watershed, which contributes to the municipal drinking water supply for over 165,000 Oregonians. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Missoula, MT - #A17234.45626)</p>		
<p>The Willamette National Forest in Oregon is particularly egregious in their drive to log late seral and old growth where ever they can and much is in roadless areas. Moose Creek above Sweet Home is a low elevation roadless area, usable over an extended part of the year, scheduled for logging. South Pyramids is a higher elevation roadless area SE of Detroit (but within the Sweet Home Ranger District) which exhibits fabulous alpine character. Trails rise to this IRA from the Middle Cascades Wilderness with logging planned all along the way! Helldun on the Middle Fork of the Willamette is another. Why in the world log over the Eugene-to-Crest Trail and within sight of Waldo Lake? It also forms a significant connection through the Cornpatch IRA to the Waldo Lake Wilderness Area. There are timber sales planned in the Coffin/Bachelor Mountain IRA semi-primitive area in the Detroit Ranger District. This in the city of Salem municipal water supply!</p> <p>Mt. Hood logs incredible swaths in direct view from the lodge at Mt. Hood. Tourists ask what kind of place is this! Alpine vistas show the clearcuts in stark relief in the wintertime snows: from Mt. Hood, and on public roads through the Willamette.</p> <p>Further, there are wilderness areas such as Opal Creek which are islands within a sea of either IRA or unroaded areas (many in the 1000-5000 acre range). Cummins Creek and Drift Creek on the Siuslaw where I hike every winter (rainforests aren’t rainforests unless they are wet and drippy). I hike the Olympics and North Cascades National Parks, and again roadless areas, both IRA, and unroaded areas 1000-5000 acres in size define the boundaries of these incredible areas. I hike on trails in the Leavenworth area logged over in an IRA. (Individual, Corvallis, OR - #A15303.4561)</p>	<p>Willamette</p>	<p>OR</p>
<p>Areas in Oregon such as Moose and Hardesty roadless areas. (Individual, Eugene, OR - #A24106.45621)</p>	<p>Willamette</p>	<p>OR</p>
<p><i>(3 Pyramids Roadless Areas) or (Browder Ridge RA in the Willamette NF) (should not be exempted from protection.)</i> (Conservation/Preservation</p>	<p>Willamette</p>	<p>OR</p>

<p>Organization, Albany, OR - #A19057.25200)</p>		
<p>Protection of the Willamette National Forests is crucial to Salem’s water supply in addition to the protection of habitat for threatened and endangered species, biodiversity, and recreation. (Mike Swain, Mayor, City of Salem, Salem, OR - #A23678.45622)</p>	<p>Willamette</p>	<p>OR</p>
<p>Roadless areas in the Willamette National Forest in Oregon. Many are listed in Appendix C of the FEIS of the Land and Resource Management Plan. –Bull of the Wood - Steep and mountainous, trails, adjacent to Bull of the Wood Wilderness. . . . –Elkhorn . . . Phantom Natural Bridge. –Mt. Jefferson North and South . . . adjacent to Mt. Jefferson Wilderness . . . –Echo Mountain—Six peaks over 5,000 feet including Crescent Mountain and Iron Mountain trails, meadows, wildflowers. –Moose Lake . . . Moose Lake and Creek. . . . –Gordon Meadows. . . . –Mt. Washington North, West, and South . . . adjacent to existing wilderness, trails, Santiam wagon Road. –Mt. Hagan. . . . –McLennon Mountain. . . . –Chucksney Mountain. . . . –Fuji Mountain, Salmon Creek, Many Prairies, Koch, Moolack. . . . –Cornpatch. . . . –Maiden Peak . . . Gold Lake Bog. . . . –Diamond Peak North and South - Lower slopes of Diamond Peak, adjacent to wilderness, trails, Lopez Lake. –Many others outside of the Willamette National Forest: Soda Mountain, Pelican Butte, Hells Canyon, John Day, Malheur Basin, Blue Mountains, Metolius River, Upper Deschutes, Newberry Crater, Wallowa Mountains. (Individual, Eugene, OR - #A13952.45624)</p>	<p>Willamette</p>	<p>OR</p>
<p>Pelican Butte. (Individual, Klamath Falls, OR - #A3651.10000)</p>	<p>Winema</p>	<p>OR</p>
<p>Our property is bordered on three sides by the 1.1 million acre Winema National Forest. Of that 1.1 million acres a mere 32,200 acres or 2.97% would be managed under the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. It is my belief that this is not enough, especially given the fragmented and disconnected nature of roadless areas in the Winema. . . . Water quality and quantity is the most important issue in the Klamath Basin. Pelican Butte is a Tier II Watershed and is recognized as a significant source of the highest quality water entering Upper Klamath Lake. It is also a critical element in the ecological health if the Upper Klamath Marsh and Wildlife Refuge. Pelican Butte would also become the largest continuous roadless area in the Winema National Forest and must be provided the highest level of protection afforded under Roadless Area Conservation. (Individual, Klamath Falls, OR - #A4970.45622)</p>	<p>Winema</p>	<p>OR</p>
<p>We live in Washington State, at the foot of Mt. Rainer, on the northwest corner of the National Park. Surrounding the mountain inside of Park is a VIRGIN, TEMPERATE, INLAND RAINFOREST, with well over 200 inches of annual rainfall. We live on our own privately owned lands in the middle of timber company holdings, just a few miles from the entrance to the Park. There are about 50 people that live in our unincorporated area of Fairfax. We see the atrocities that are inflicted on the forests during clear-cutting and spraying of poisons. We are first-hand witnesses to this destruction, because we see it everyday. Our VIRGIN TEMPERATE, INLAND RAINFOREST in the park is being affected by industry logging RIGHT UP TO IT’S BORDER in three separate sections on the north side, seven miles of the west places. We barely have one mile of Forest Service lands as a buffer for the Park in many places.</p>	<p>Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie</p>	<p>WA</p>

Clear-cutting was drastically escalated before the salmon plan kicked in. They logged all of our seven-mile INLAND, TEMPERATE, RAINFOREST valley in just a few short years. (We have only [small] sections that are public-owned 'islands' of land in our valley, and the oldest tree farm is just 28 years old.) (Conservation/Preservation Organization, South Prairie, WA - #A28978.65200)		
I would especially be opposing any logging in the Skykomish Wild Country near INDEX. (Individual, Seattle, WA - #A41071.90520)	Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie	WA
The Late Succession Reserves of the owl region. (Individual, Redmond, WA - #A27191.45000)	Multiple	WA

Region 8 Southern

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
State of Alabama. (Individual, Sylacauga, AL - #A1486.90520)	Multiple	AL
Gulf Coast of Florida. (Individual, Marietta, GA - #A5226.90720)	Multiple	FL
This is especially important for restoring Florida's Ancient forests, as part of Everglades Restoration. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, No Address - #A9063.45622)	Apalachicola, Ocala, Osceola	FL
National Forests, especially those here in South Carolina and in North Carolina. (Individual, Charleston, SC - #A23690.50000)	Multiple	NC, SC
Roadless areas on the National Forests in North Carolina and South Carolina. (Individual, Walhalla, SC - #A6292.90520)	Multiple	NC, SC
Texas. (Individual, Grapevine, TX - #A19161.45310)	Multiple	TX
Please preserve those that we still have, especially the Piney Woods and grasslands of Texas. (Individual, Houston, TX - #A25958.45621)	Multiple	TX
Virginia. (Individual, East Greenbush, NY - #A8821.90110)	Multiple	VA
The southern Appalachians. (Individual, Rindge, NH - #A4812.90130)	Multiple	Multiple
In Appalachian forests. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Ashland, OR - #A20421.45310)	Multiple	Multiple
National Forests in the Southern Appalachians. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Bland, VA - #A17007.45621)	Multiple	Multiple
Land bordering the Long and Appalachia Trails. (Individual, Norwhich, VT - #A15153.45624)	Multiple	Multiple
Include areas identified in the Southern Appalachian Assessment. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Santa Fe, NM - #A22092.45400)	Multiple	Multiple
National forests and ranger districts with few or no roadless areas, such as those on the Alleghany NF, Daniel Boone NF, Mississippi NF, Clinch RD and other NFs in the Deep South, Midwest, and Piedmont and Coastal Plain should designate 35-40% of the NF or RD as "roadless restoration areas" where road obliteration, stream restoration, and other ecological restoration techniques are used to return the land to a healthy and wild condition. (Individual, Roanoke, VA - #A23081.10150)	Multiple	Multiple
I would like to see the Roadless Area Rule apply to <u>ALL</u> national forests (New England, Eastern, Midwest, Western, Alaskan Tongass, and other Alaskan forests etc.) (Individual, Endeavor, WI - #A8231.45622)	Multiple	Multiple
Smaller forests such as Angelina, Davy Crockett and Sabine here in Texas. (Individual, Shiro, TX - #A5015.10152)	Angelina, Davy Crockett, Sabine	TX
Here is a list of large areas you should include in the State of Texas: Long Leaf Ridge Special Area in the Angelina NF (32,300 acres) Little Lake Creek in the Sam Houston NF (671 adjacent acres) Big Creek Wilderness Area in the Sam Houston NF (1,920 acres) Winters Bayou Scenic Area in the Sam Houston NF (1,587 acres) Beech Ravines Scenic Area in the Sabine NF (1,020 acres) Upper Colorow Creek Scenic Area in the Sabine NF (230 acres)	Angelina, Davy Crockett, Sabine, Sam Houston	TX

<p>Mill Creek Cove Research Natural Area in the Sabine NF (301 acres) Bear Creek Special Bottomland Area in the Sabine NF (665 acres) Ayish Bayou Special Bottomland Area in the Angelina NF (3,500 acres) Attoyac Bayou Special Bottomland Area in the Angelina NF (3,500 acres) Upper Angelina River Special Bottomland Area in the Angelina NF (6,100 acres) Neches River Corridors, segments 1-4 on the Davy Crockett and Angelina NFs Turkey Creek Wilderness Area (152 acres adjacent to the east) Big Woods Area of the Sam Houston NF (1,250 acres south of F.R. 202 and east of F.R. 207). (Individual, Houston, TX - #A6735.45621)</p>		
<p>We want more Roadless Areas in the National Forests and Grasslands in Texas. Only 4,000 acres were proposed in the RPR for all four Texas National Forests. All 4,000 acres proposed were in Sam Houston National Forest. No Roadless Areas were proposed for Angelina, Davy Crockett, and Sabine National Forests. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Bellaire, TX - #A883.10150)</p>	<p>Angelina, Davy Crockett, Sabine, Sam Houston</p>	<p>TX</p>
<p>In Texas I urge to do include the following areas in the areas protected by the Roadless Area Conservation Rule: . . . Upper Coloran Creek Scenic Areas in the Sabine. (Individual, Austin, TX - #A21855.45611)</p>	<p>Angelina, Sabine, Sam Houston</p>	<p>TX</p>
<p>In Texas areas threatened by NOT going forward with the Rule are: 1. Five areas in the Angelina National Forest, more than 37,000 acres, additionally four different linear segments along the Neches River. 2. Five areas in the Sam Houston National forest, about 5,428 acres. 3. Four areas in the Sabine National Forest approximately 2,216 acres. (Individual, Dallas, TX - #A15520.45622)</p>	<p>Angelina, Sabine, Sam Houston</p>	<p>TX</p>
<p>Bankhead National Forest. (Individual, Westminster, MD - #A1254.65200)</p>	<p>Bankhead</p>	<p>AL</p>
<p>The Chattahoochee National Forest. (Individual, Decatur, GA - #A19228.91221)</p>	<p>Chattahoochee-Oconee</p>	<p>GA</p>
<p>On the Chattahoochee National Forest the following inventoried roadless areas should be permanently protected: Kelly Ridge, Mountaintown, Patterson Gap, Rabin Bald, Rock Gorge, Three Forks. (Individual, Atlanta, GA - #A11595.45622)</p>	<p>Chattahoochee-Oconee</p>	<p>GA</p>
<p>Roadless Areas in Georgia such as Kelly Ridge, Mountaintown, Patterson Gap, Sarah's Creek, and Rock Gorge. . . . Patterson Gap, headwaters of the Chattooga River. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Ellijay, GA - #A17692.54000)</p>	<p>Chattahoochee-Oconee</p>	<p>GA</p>
<p>Here in the Southern Appalachians, where only 15.4%, or 726,000 acres, of National Forest System lands still qualify as roadless, local forest planning has similarly failed to protect roadless areas. . . . Rabun Bald roadless areas on the Chattahoochee National Forest . . . including Rabun Bald which at 4,696 feet is the second highest peak in Georgia, and the famed Bartram National Recreation Trail. . . . in Tuckaluge Creek. . . . As little as 6,000 acres of Sarah's Creek, out of the original 16,000 acres Rabun Bald roadless area, is being considered for protective prescriptions Iron Mountain in the Cherokee National Forest of Tennessee provides another example of the rapid deterioration of the roadless resource in the Southern Appalachians. This large formerly roadless tract was inventoried at approximately 14,000 acres during RARE II. The Forest Service did not recommend wilderness for the area in RARE II, and shortly thereafter conducted road construction and logging operations in the area. As a result, only a tiny segment of the Iron Mountain roadless area remained. London Bridge, a 3,041 acre tract in the northern part of Iron Mountain, has retained its roadless character and was inventoried in the SAA. According to biologists who have studied the area, London Bridge is an area of critical importance to the ecology and wildlife of the area. It is perhaps the only viable corridor for black bear to travel between the Cherokee (TN) and the Jefferson (VA) National Forests. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Charlottesville, VA - #A15659.45624)</p>	<p>Chattahoochee-Oconee, Cherokee, Jefferson</p>	<p>GA, TN</p>

<p>George Washington and Jefferson National Forests The proposed Ernie Dickerman Wilderness Area along Shenandoah Mountain. This area of 65,000 acres, as proposed by the Forests of the Central Appalachians Project, includes the 6,519 acres of the Ramseys Draft Wilderness. . . . Radar Mountain, above Reddish Knob. . . . Seng Mountain area is home to Rowlands Creek Falls. . . . Raccoon Branch features Dickey Knob which overlooks the small community of Sugar Grove. It contains several hundred acres of potential old-growth and offers solitude with 95 percent of this area retaining unspoiled qualities. Portions of the popular Mt. Rogers NRA Crest Zone are potential additions to the Little Wilson Creek Wilderness. . . . The Crawfish Valley, also referred to as Bear Creek, contains several hiking trails, including the Appalachian Trail, and horseback riding trails. . . . Garden Mountain offers scenic views into the historic Burke’s Garden area. Twenty-four miles of the Appalachian Trail traverses the area. . . . Brush Mountain East maintains 90 percent of its scenic beauty. Nearby is the monument to Audie Murphy, a World War II hero whose plane crashed on the mountain.</p> <p>Cherokee National Forest London Bridge is an important water source for the residents of Sutherland. This 3,431 acres offer views of Doe Valley, Rogers Ridge, and Mount Rogers. Beaverdam Creek. . . . Rogers Ridge contains the Rogers Ridge Scenic Area in addition to areas north and south. . . . The Bald Mountain . . . The Appalachian Trail crosses through the area. . . . Bald River offers one 1,737 acres area as an extension to the existing Bald River Gorge Wilderness. . . .</p> <p>Pisgah and Nantahala National Forests Bald Mountains includes both Big Creek and Seng Ridge comprising 13,000 acres along the Tennessee and North Carolina border. . . . Linville Gorge Wilderness extension to the east contains the headwaters of Irish Creek and Russell Creek. The North Carolina Mountain-to-Sea Trail crosses along the western border. Upper Wilson Creek lies north of the proposed Lost Cover Wilderness. . . . Black Mountains contains several rare species and has been a top priority for wilderness designation. Jarrett Creek contains the headwaters to its namesake Jarrett Creek as well as Pritchard Creek. . . . Mackey Mountain offers black bear habitat and good trout fishing in Curtis Creek. Woods Mountain is 11,000 acres. . . . Cheoah Bald is an area of 13,000 acres containing the Appalachian Trail, Nantahala River, Nantahala Gorge, and Cheoah Bald. Wesser Bald contains the Appalachian Trail. . . . Snowbird is a top priority for wilderness designation and contains Snowbird Creek which is a wild and scenic river candidate.</p> <p>Francis Marion and Sumter National Forests Elliott Rock I and II potential Wilderness areas. These 2000 acres contain a critical watershed for the Chattooga River. . . . Rock Gorge is 11,000 acres (6,500 acres in South Carolina and 4,500 acres in Georgia) of virtually undisturbed, wild land. It contains several trails and waterfalls including an 80 foot waterfall along King Creek. . . . Hell Hole Bay Wilderness 890 acres extension to the south. Little Wambaw Swamp Wilderness 530 acres extension west to Wambaw Swamp Wilderness.</p>	<p>Chattahoochee, Cherokee, Francis Marion, George Washington, and Nantahala, Pisgah, Sumter, Jefferson</p>	<p>Multiple</p>
--	---	-----------------

<p>Chattahoochee National Forest Rock Gorge is 11,000 acres (6,500 acres in South Carolina and 4,500 acres in Georgia). . . . The Rabun Bald area. . . . Patterson Gap is a rugged area of many high peaks including Wolf Knob, 3,979 ft. elevation. Persimmon Creek and Howard Branch provide wild trout . . . Kelly Ridge-Moccasin Creek contains Moccasin Creek. . . . Springer Mountain is the main feature of this 12,000 acres. It serves as the southern terminus of the Appalachian Trail. Mountaintown. . . . (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Roanoke, VA - #A10565.45624)</p>		
<p>We note that, relative to total woodlands in Tennessee, roadless area of the Cherokee National Forest make up only one-half of one percent. We urge its protection from future fragmentation, and similar protection of all the now designated areas in all our national forests. (Civic Group, Mountain Home, TN - #A28695.45622)</p>	Cherokee	TN
<p>Devil’s backbone near the Hartford exit of I-40. (Individual, Knoxville, TN - #A2377.13212)</p>	Cherokee	TN
<p>Unroaded sections in the Cherokee and other national forests. (Civic Group, Nashville, TN - #A10552.10150)</p>	Cherokee	TN
<p>In the Cherokee and Jefferson National Forests. (Individual, No Address - #A1724.90310)</p>	Cherokee, Jefferson	VA, WV
<p>South Carolina . . . Frances Marion National Forest and Sumter National Forest. (Individual, Goose Creek, SC - #A5449.70000)</p>	Frances Marion-Sumter	SC
<p>George Washington National Forest, in places such as Mount Pleasant, Romsey’s Draft and Saint Mary’s.</p>	George Washington	VA
<p>These citizens value the roadless areas in the George Washington and Thomas Jefferson National Forests as a vital source of clean water for both consumption and the fisheries that are so much a part of our Virginia’s heritage as well as an opportunity to preserve pristine wildlife habitat. (James P. Moran, United States Representative, Virginia, Washington, DC - #A23396.45622)</p>	George Washington, Jefferson	VA
<p>Locally, a quarter of the total national forest is located in Virginia and as a resident of Virginia, the fate of these forests is of top concern to me. . . . Hone Quarry - part of the George Washington National Forest. (Individual, No Address - #A30370.45622)</p>	George Washington, Jefferson	
<p>Virginia’s National Forests. (Individual, Richmond, VA - #A888.10111)</p>	George Washington, Jefferson	VA, WV
<p>The Laurel Fork Area of the George Washington National Forest . . . The Devil’s Fork Area of the Jefferson National Forest. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Johnson City, TN - #A20341.90720)</p>	George Washington, Jefferson	VA, WV
<p>George Washington and Jefferson National Forest in Virginia. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Blacksburg, VA - #A13525.45622)</p>	George Washington, Jefferson	VA, WV
<p>Jefferson NF or the GWNF (e.g., Stony Point Ridge, Potts Mtn., and Wilson Mtn.). (Individual, Staunton, VA - #A29325.45420)</p>	George Washington, Jefferson	VA, WV
<p>These are inventoried roadless areas I recommend for protection under the RACR. North Fork of the Pound, Clinch RD, JNF. Devils Fork, Clinch RD, JNF. Lewis Fork Additions and Little Wilson Cr. Additions (all) Mt Rogers NRS, JNF. Song Mtn., Mt. Rogers NRA, JNF. Little Dry Run Additions (all), Mt. Rogers NRA. Horse Heaven, Mt Rogers NRA. Crawfish Valley (Bear Creek) New River RD. Beartown Mtn. Additions (all), New River RD. Garden Mtn., New River RD. Little Wolf Cr/Hunting Camp, New River RD, JNF. Long Spur, New River RD, JNF. Mtn. Lake Additions, New River RD, JNF. Peters Mtn., New River RD, JNF. Hickory Flats, New River RD, JNF. Brushy Mtn. I Audie Murphy, New River RD, JNF. Mottlesheard, New Castle RD, JNF. Shawvers Run Additions (all) New Castle RD, JNF. North Mtn., New Castle</p>	George Washington, Jefferson	VA, WV

RD, JNF. Broad Run, New Castle RD, JNF. Price Mtn. New Castle RD, JNF. Patterson Mtn. New Castle RD, JNF. Hoop Hole New Castle RD, JNF. James River Face Extension Glenwood RD, JNF. These are de facto roadless areas I recommend for protection under the RACR. Whitetop Mtn. Mt. Rogers NRA, JNF. Feathercamp Mt. Rogers NRA, JNF. Mt. Rogers South NRA, JNF. Erwing Mtn. Devils Den Mto Rogers NRA. Stone Mtn. of Cave Springs, Clinch RD, JNF. Roaring Branch, Clinch RD, JNF. Little Stony, Clinch RD, JNF. Lynn Camp Cr., New River RD, JNF. Dismal Creek, NEw River RD, JNF. Wilson Mountain, Glennwood RD, JNF. Terrapin Mountain, Glennwood RD, JNF. Sinking Creek Mountain, New Castle RD, JNF. George Washington NF. Jerkentight RA, Little Mtn. RA, Elliot Knob RA, Crawford Mtn. RA, Dolly Ann RA, Oliver Mtn. RA, Big Schloss RA, Ramseys Draft Additions. (Individual, Roanoke, VA - #A23081.45621)		
Also consider the 40,000 acres that Westvaco has for sale adjacent to the Jefferson National Forest between the cities of Lexington and Roanoke west of Interstate 81 and south of Interstate 64. (Individual, Haymarket, VA - #A4022.45621)	Jefferson	VA, WV
Areas in Jefferson National Forest. Broad Run (10959), North Mountain (8451), and the Wilderness addition to Barbour's Creek W.A. (732) . . . in the Newcastle Ranger District. (Individual, Salem, VA - #A15250.45622)	Jefferson	VA, WV
Terrapin Mountain in Virginia. (Individual, Danville, VA - #A1158.90520)	Jefferson	VA
Mark Twain National Forest here in Missouri. (Individual, No Address - #A12627.90523)	Mark Twain	MO
The Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia. (Individual, Webster Springs, WV - #A4005.60110)	Monongahela	WV
Roadless areas in the Pisgah/Nantahala National Forests in NC . . . like Laurel Mountain, South Mills River, Tusquittee, and the Black Mountains. Others like Mackey Mountain. (Individual, Cedar Mountain, NC - #A28624.10111)	Nantahala, Pisgah	NC
We have about 726,000 acres of roadless area in the Southern Appalachians. . . . Bald Mountain in Eastern Tennessee . . . the Clinch River in Virginia. (Individual, Asheville, NC - #A30306.45621)	Multiple	Multiple
Include the Ozark/St. Francis and Ouachita National Forests in Arkansas. (Individual, Seattle, WA - #A16860.45622)	Ouachita, Ozark-St. Francis	AR
Pisgah National Forest. (Individual, Wilmington, NC - #A22679.51300)	Pisgah	NC
The Talladega National Forest, which is part of my own Calhoun County. (Robert W. Downing, Commissioner, Calhoun County Board of County Commissioners, Aniston, AL - #A11835.45622)	Talladega	AL

Region 9 Eastern

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
Pennsylvania, West Virginia. (Individual, East Greenbush, NY - #A8821.90110)	Multiple	PA, WV
Southern West Virginia. (Individual, Welch, WV - #A1189.90110)	Multiple	WV
National Forest areas in New England. (Individual, Largo, Fl - #A16364.45100)	Multiple	Multiple
[Forests in] Massachusetts. (Individual, Jamaica Plain, MA - #A16807.45620)	No National Forests	MA
Protect all roadless areas of Northeast Forests . . . including within Great Lakes-Northwood's National forests). (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Buffalo, NY - #A10586.45320)	Multiple	Multiple
The White Mountains, the Long Trail and Appalachian Trail areas, Acadia National Park. (Individual, Vernon Rockville, CT - #A13252.10150)	Multiple	Multiple
Land bordering the Long and Appalachia Trails. (Individual, Norwich, VT - #A15153.45624)	Multiple	Multiple

National forests in New England and Eastern US. (Individual, Southold, NY - #A6562.90110)	Multiple	Multiple
We were pleased that the final rule included roadless areas identified in the Southern Appalachian Assessment in the definition of inventoried roadless areas. However, the definition still omits many roadless areas both in the Southern Appalachians and elsewhere that have never been inventoried for one reason or another. Some areas, such as Dolly Sods in West Virginia and Lamb Brook in Vermont, were acquired by the Forest Service after the 1979 RARE II inventory and have not been inventoried in a forest plan or regional assessment. In Washington State, omitted roadless lands include entire areas such as Lookout Mountain (12,000 acres), lands adjacent to inventoried roadless areas such as Granite Mountain (27,000 acres), and lands adjacent to designated wilderness such as the Alpine Lakes Wilderness (75,000 acres). While it may not be possible to evaluate such areas in the final EIS, we recommend that the final policy direct the Forest Service to accord them interim protection and to include them in the roadless area inventory through project or plan revision processes. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Missoula, MT - #A21359.45624)	Multiple	Multiple
Allegheny National Forest. (Individual, Aliquippa, PA - #A135.90520)	Allegheny	PA
Chippewa, Superior, and the Chequamegon-Nicolet. . . . National Forests east of the Mississippi will not be protected by the Roadless initiative. The Chippewa National Forest has NO roadless areas. The Superior, with 60,000 acres and the Chequamegon-Nicolet with 69,000 acres must have better protections not less protection. (Individual, Lake Tomahawk, WI - #A29653.45320)	Chequamegon-Nicolet, Chippewa, Superior	WI, MN
Roadless areas, here in Wisconsin. (Individual, Madison, WI - #A14290.65280)	Chequamegon-Nicolet	WI
The Leroy Creek area, adjacent to the Whisker Lake Wilderness, is considered to be the last big block of forest on the Nicolet National Forest. . . . Log Creek on the Great Divide district of the Chequamegon National Forest. (Individual, Lake Tomahawk, WI - #A29653.45100)	Chequamegon-Nicolet	WI
As for Wisconsin, there is very little left. Of the 69,000 acres of inventoried roadless area, all of it allows road construction. In fact, a recent timber sale, the Salvage Blowdown project, on the Eagle River-Florence District in the Tipler/Trout Springs area logged within one of the inventoried roadless areas. Comments raised were dismissed due to the fact logging in that area has gone on ever since RARE II came out. Wisconsin is a perfect example of why this area needs to be protected. Out of 1.5 million acres of National Forest land, only 43,000 acres is wilderness. (Individual, Lake Tomahawk, WI - #A29653.45620)	Chequamegon-Nicolet	WI
Wisconsin's Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Nevada City, CA - #A4941.45621)	Chequamegon-Nicolet	WI
The Leroy Creek area, adjacent to the Whisker Lake Wilderness, is considered to be the last big block of forest on the Nicolet National Forest. And yet logging can occur in this area at any time. Outstanding trout streams, such as Log Creek on the Great Divide district of the Chequamegon National Forest should be permanently protected so that this resource is not degraded by logging, road building, and attendant sedimentation. (Individual, Minneapolis, MN - #A10523.45622)	Chequamegon-Nicolet	WI
Minnesota . . . home to the Superior and Chippewa National Forests. (Individual, Minneapolis, MN - #A8000.10111)	Chippewa, Superior	MN
In the Laurel Fork Area of the George Washington National Forest. . . . The Devil's Fork Area of the Jefferson National Forest. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Johnson City, TN - #A20341.90720)	George Washington, Jefferson	VA, WV
60 million acres of wilderness around Glastonbury Mountain, Romance Mountain, and Lamb Brook. (Individual, Norwich, VT - #A15153.45624)	Green Mountain	NY, NY

Protect Taconic Mountain area in the Green Mountains National Forest in Vermont. (Individual, Waterbury, VT - #A15433.45430)	Green Mountain	VT
The Green Mountains of Vermont. (Individual, Charlotte, VT - #A12826.45621)	Green Mountain	NY, VT
Local Adirondack forestlands. (Individual, Postdam, NY - #A30466.45621)	Green Mountain and Finger Lakes	NY
Green Mountain and White Mountain National Forests. (Individual, Westfield, NJ - #A13257.10150)	Green Mountain, White Mountain	ME, NH, NY, VT
New England Green Mountains and White Mountain National Forests. (Individual, Concord, MA - #A8094.45622)	Green Mountain, White Mountain	ME, NH, NY, VT
East of the Mississippi . . . On the Hiawatha and Ottawa National Forests, the roadless areas, Fibre and Norwich Plains. (Individual, Marquette, MI - #A22634.45320)	Hiawatha, Ottawa	MI
The Trap Hills in the Ottawa National Forest and Scott's Marsh in the Hiawatha National Forest comprise some of the last remaining roadless areas in Michigan. . . . The Old M-64 Hardwoods timber sale will open access to one of the most sensitive areas in the Trap Hills. . . . Gogebic Ridge. . . . Sand Hill Creek. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Missoula, MT - #A17234.45622)	Hiawatha, Ottawa	MI
Mogan Ridge is the only inventoried roadless area in the Hoosier. (Individual, Bloomington, IN - #A5335.90520)	Hoosier	IN
Indiana's Hoosier National Forest Deserves Protection . . . All of the roadless areas in the HNF should receive permanent protection as part of the Forest Service roadless area protection initiative. These areas are: Morgan Ridge/Shircliff Hollow Nebo Ridge/Bad Hollow Porter Hollow Deckard Ridge Hickory Ridge Felknor Hollow/Lukes Knob Grodey Ridge/Gobblers Knob S. Fork Beaver Creek Tincher Hollow Tincher Pond Sam's Creek Lick Creek Danner Cemetery Mitchell Creek Jeffries Cemetery Happy Hollow Middle Fork Deer Creek Hemlock Cliffs (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Indianapolis, IN - #A30123.45622)	Hoosier	IN
Missouri . . . wild forest areas in the Mark Twain National Forest. (Individual, Saint Louis, MO - #A21291.45622)	Mark Twain	
Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia. . . . Dolly Sods North tract. . . . the White Mountain National Forest. . . . the Wild River roadless area. (Individual, Durham, NH - #A11683.45622)	Monongahela, White Mountain	NH, ME, WV
Illinois' beloved Shawnee National Forest. (Individual, Chicago, IL - #A5111.70310)	Shawnee	IL
Shawnee NF. (Individual, Aurora, IL - #A916045620)	Shawnee	IL
I urge you to protect Camp Hutchins, Burke Branch, and Ripple Hollow in the Shawnee National Forest as well as all other National Forests throughout our country. (Mike Quigley, Commissioner, Cook County Board of County	Shawnee	IL

Commissioners, Chicago, IL - #A4848.45621)		
Include all Wilderness areas in Illinois Shawnee Forest into the Roadless category, including adding Camp Hutchins. The Camp Hutchins Wilderness area, located in the Shawnee National Forest, currently does not have protection from the Rule. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Alton, IL - #A13847.45622)	Shawnee	IL
The Superior National Forest in Northern Minnesota. (Individual, Clear Lake, IA - #A8886.45622)	Superior	MN
Boundary Waters Canoe Area of northern Minnesota. (Individual, Nashville, TN - #A12704.10111)	Superior	MN
Boundary Waters (BWCAW) and Quetico Provincial Park. (Individual, Delaware, OH - #A6096.45621)	Superior	MN
Minnesota is threatened by the lifting of the roadless ban on certain forms of logging. On the LaCroix district, the district ranger implemented a timber sale adjacent to a roadless area. . . . The Mississippi Creek area on the Gunflint District . . . areas, such as Cabin Creek and Phantom Lake, are not even wanted for timber production. The Crescent Lake Timber sale, approved last year on the Tofte District, implemented logging in the Brule Lake-Eagle Mountain RARE II area. . . . Kawishiwi Lake area. . . . area around Baldpate Lake. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Minneapolis, MN - #A7116.45621)	Superior	MN
The value of protecting these special places is real. Here in Minnesota, for example, some of the inventoried roadless areas would, if kept roadless, provide important buffers to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. (Individual, Minneapolis, MN - #A30387.90110)	Superior	MN
New England. . . the WMNF [White Mountain National Forest]. . . land in the Wild River watershed. . . areas around the Caribou-Speckled Wilderness especially the unprotected portion of the valley of the West Branch of Pleasant River . . . the Pemigewasset Wilderness . . . the Sandwich Range Wilderness, the Presidential Range-Dry River Wilderness, the Great Gulf Wilderness, the Kilkenny area . . . Carr Mountain and Kinsman-Gordon Pond. (Individual, Lincoln, NH - #A5640.45624)	White Mountain	NH, ME
New Hampshire's White Mountains. (Individual, Keene, NH - #A5931.45621)	White Mountain	NH, ME
New England White Mts. (Individual, Weston, MA - #A4927.45622)	White Mountain	NH, ME
White Mountains National Forest in Maine and would like to see the Forest protected also. (Individual, Eclectic, AL - #A1390.45621)	White Mountain	NH, ME
I am familiar with the Wild River Roadless Area in the White Mountain Forest. I would like to see it protected under the Roadless Rule. (Individual, Salem, NH - #A8263.45621)	White Mountain	NH, ME
New Hampshire. (Individual, Rindge, NH - #A4812.90130)	White Mountain	NH, ME

Region 10 Alaska

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
Alaska. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Santa Fe, NM - #A18056.124400)	Multiple	AK
The Alaska National Wildlife Area and the Tongass National Forest. (Individual, Newtown, A - #A19257.45621)	Alaskan National Wildlife Area, Tongass	AK
The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. (Individual, Evergreen, CO - #A28071.45100)	Arctic National Wildlife Refuge	AK
Chugach National Forest in Alaska. . . . The Nellie Juan Wilderness Study Area, the College Fjord Wilderness Study Area, and especially the Copper River Delta. (Individual, Minneapolis, MN - #A8375.45624)	Chugach	AK
The Kenai Peninsula portion of the Chugach. (Conservation/Preservation	Chugach	AK

Organization, Anchorage, AK - #A17358.90130)		
The eastern Copper River delta. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Cordova, AK - #A23229.45622)	Chugach	AK
Alaska. (Individual, Anchorage, AK - #A6640.45620)	Chugach, Tongass	AK
Southeast Alaska. (Individual, Juneau, AK - #A17173.90520)	Chugach, Tongass	AK
Protection of the Arctic. (Individual, Lopez Island, WA - #A15240.12120)	Chugach, Tongass	AK
Tongass and Chugach National Forest. (Individual, Juneau, AK - #A11676.45623)	Chugach, Tongass	AK
The western portion of our Chugach National Forest, including all of the Forest located on the Kenai Peninsula. . . . the Prince William Sound portion of the Chugach National Forests and the Tongass National Forest. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Anchorage, AK - #A17358.45622)	Chugach, Tongass	AK
In the Tongass Forest, the Gravinas Forest, and the magnificent Chugach National Forests, or the beautiful Northwest Pacific Forests! (Individual, Melvindale, MI - #A30286.45622)	Chugach, Tongass	AK
An area in particular need of protection is the Tongass National Forest. . . . the Tracy Arm/Ford's Terror Wilderness Area. (Individual, No Address - #A2542845621)	Tongass	AK
Chugach and Tongass Nat. Forest. (Individual, Chugiak, AK - #A24467.45622)	Tongass	AK
In the Tongass National Forest, I urge roadless status for Berners Bay and other mainland areas north to the Chilkat Peninsula. (Individual, Anchorage, AK - #A30607.45621)	Tongass	AK
Protecting all roadless wildlands on the Tongass under the roadless policy would prevent costly and environmentally damaging state highway construction proposals. Instead of investing limited resources into construction of roads like those up the rugged Lynn Canal from Juneau to Skagway, from Sitka to Baranof Warm Springs, across the Cleveland Peninsula, or up the Bradfield Canal to Canada, devote those scarce funds to improving the most natural and cost-effective transportation route in Southeast Alaska-the Alaska Marine Highway System. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Juneau, AK - #A23091.90120)	Tongass	AK
Specific named areas in the Sitka Subsistence Use region are: Lisa Creek Watershed (adjacent to Katlion Native logging), Kvuzof Island compiles, Hoonah Sound watershed, Ushk Bay-poison Cove, and Northwest Baronof Planning Area. (Individual, Sitka, AK - #A1056.12440)	Tongass	AK
Areas like . . . Chicken Creek . . . Cowee Creek . (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Port Alexander, AK - #A17301.45100)	Tongass	AK
Inventoried roadless areas on the Tongass, including . . . Bostwick Inlet and Creek on Gravina Island next to Ketchikan. (Individual, Cambridge, MA - #A19185.90520)	Tongass	AK
The Tongass National Forest. (Individual, Juneau, AK - #A1159.10150)	Tongass	AK
Native University of Alaska, and Mental Health Trust land grants. (Individual, Sitka, AK - #A1056.90522)	Tongass	AK
The Taku River, and the Juneau-Skagway roads. (Individual, Juneau, AK - #A13516.45614)	Tongass	AK
Tongass National Forest areas: The entirety of Sweetwater-Honker Divide, and Upper Duncan Canal (these have had to wait for too long!), East Kuiu Island (including Reid, Alvin, and No Name Bays, and Seclusion Harbor), portions of Tenakee Inlet (including Little Seal Creek and Crab Bay and areas between Goose Flats and Long Bay as well as Saltery Bay), Saltery and Sunny Coves and Clover Bay on east Prince of Wales Island, Cape Fanshaw and Farragut Bay on the mainland near Petersburg, North Cholmondeley, Moira Sound on the east side of Prince of Wales Island, Little Seal Bay, Emerald Bay on the Cleveland Peninsula north of Ketchikan, Davies Creek, Upper Lynn Canal, St. James Bay south to Pt. Couverden on the	Tongass	AK

Chilkat Peninsula, Taku Inlet and Harbor (and Windham Head) near Juneau, the area around Port Alexander, Baby Bear Bay, Totem and Douglas Bays on Kupreanof Island, Woewodski Island in Wrangell Narrows, Crittenden Creek on the mainland near Wrangell, Virginia Lake and Creek near Wrangell. (Individual, Minneapolis, MN - #A8375.45623)		
[Footnote 1: Other areas of special interest protected in the final 1999 TLMP decision include Calder-Holbrook/Mt. Francis, East Saook Bay, Salmon Bay Lake watershed, Keete, Mabel, Kassa Inlets and Nutkwa, Southeast Mitkof, Sukkwan Island, Poison Cove, Deep Bay, Broad Finger and Broad Creeks, Crab Bay, Northwest Dall Island, East Port Camden, Southeast Rocky Pass and Kushneahin Creek.]. . . Cape Fanshaw and Farragut Bay near Petersburg; North Cholmondeley and Moira Sound areas on eastern Prince of Wales Island Little Seal Bay near Tenakee Springs; Emerald Bay on the Cleveland Peninsula; St. James Bay and Pt. Couverden near Juneau; Baby Bear Bay near Sitka; Woewodski Island near Petersburg; Canal and Hoya Creeks next to the Anan Bear Observatory; Whales Tail on Etolin Island; Virginia Lake and Mill Creek near Wrangell; Bostwick Bay and Creek on Gravina Island, and Neka Mountain near Hoonah. These areas should be protected under the roadless policy. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Juneau, AK - #A23091.45622)	Tongass	AK
Some of these areas include: Ushk Bay, Castle River, East Kuin, Poison Cove, Deep Bay, Port Houghton, NW Dall Island, Cleveland Peninsula, Upper Tenakee Inlet . . . I urge you to protect the following important community use areas, roadless areas, (and ALL roadless areas in forests across the U.S.) in the Tongass National Forest: Moira Sound, Canal and Hoya Creeks, Whale's Tail (Etolin Island), Crittenden Creek, Woewodski Island, Saltery Cover, Taku Inlet/Harbor, Windham Head, St. James Bay, Pt. Couverden, Upper Lynn Canal, along with the above-named areas in the Tongass Land Management Plan protected in 1999. (Individual, Douglas, AK - #A13359.45624)	Tongass	AK
The Alexander Archipelago (Tongass N.F. plus native corp. lands). (Individual, Klawock, AK- #A12005.45623)	Tongass	AK
Roadless areas, including St. John the Baptist Bay, Schulze Cove. (Individual, Sitka, AK - #A15506.45326)	Tongass	AK
The Tongass National Forest, Sky Lakes Wilderness . (Individual, Klamath Falls, OR - #A11704.45620)	Tongass	AK
Roadless Areas of the Tongass National Forest. . . Prince of Wales Island's remaining wild lands. . . Local Roadless Areas that would have been protected under the 1999 TLMP now at risk include: Salmon Bay Lake; Calder-Holbrook; Honker Divide; Moira Sound; Cholmondeley Sound; NW Dahl Sound; Sukkwan Island and; Kette Inlet, Hassia Inlet, Mabel Bay and Kassa Inlet. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Craig, AK - #A23228.45621)	Tongass	AK
Dall Island . . . Kuiu Island. (Individual, Haines, AK - #A6161.45621)	Tongass	AK
Saook Bay in Peril Strait. (Individual, Cambridge, MA - #A19185.10155)	Tongass	AK
Three-Mile on Kuiu Island Moira Sound and Cholmondeley on Prince of Wales Island Finger Mountain on Chichagof Island Cape Fanshaw on the mainland coast. Douglas on Kupreanof Island. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Sitka, AK - #A12003.45511)	Tongass	AK
Finger Mountain sale in Tenakee Inlet. . . The area in Goos River. (Individual,	Tongass	AK

Tenakee Springs, AK - #A5143.53100)		
Southeast Alaska. . . . Elfin Cove on the north end of Chichagof Island. (Individual, Kenmore, WA - #A6023.45621)	Tongass	AK
Inventoried roadless areas, including: #311 Chichagof, #321 Tenakee Ridge, #323 Game Creek, and #312 Trap Bay. (Vicki Wisenbaugh, City Council President, City of Tenakee Springs, Tenakee Springs, AK - #A3358.45621)	Tongass	AK
The Gravina Island Timber Sale. . . . the pristine 37,000-acre Gravina Roadless area. (Individual, San Diego, CA - #A1740.45620)	Tongass	AK
The Cleveland Peninsula . . . forest areas around Ketchikan. . . . It was extremely disturbing in the late '70s when a road was punched through from Rowan Bay on west-side of the island. This road removed Kadake Creek and the bay at its mouth which is directly across from Kake from roadless and wilderness consideration. Most of the West Side of Kuiu. . . . the Castle River on Kupreanoff Island. . . . the Peril Strait area. (Individual, Juneau, AK - #A10588.45621)	Tongass	AK
We request that all roadless areas of national forest land on Admiralty Island, including but not limited to the Mansfield Peninsula on the north end of the island, remain roadless under the Roadless Conservation Rule (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Auke Bay, AK - #A23611.45611)	Tongass	AK
Remote areas of Chichigof, Buranof and Admiralty Islands should remain roadless. (Individual, Juneau, AK - #A23200.45621)	Tongass	AK

Table F-2. Site-Specific Requests that Areas be Exempted from National Roadless Area Protection

Region 1 Northern

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
9 million Idaho acres. (Individual, Lewiston, ID - #A30037.45611)	Multiple	ID
Montana. (Individual, No Address - #A16310.90320)	Multiple	MT
Williston Basin is a natural gas transporter, operating storage fields and over 3000 mile of pipelines throughout its traditional service territory in Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota and South Dakota. Williston has operated a transmission pipeline crossing the Little Missouri National Grasslands in North Dakota since 1930. . . . reconsider implementing this rule or exempt pipeline transportation and oil and gas development from the Roadless Initiative. (Oil, Natural Gas, Coal, or Pipeline Industry, No Address - #A29748.45610)	Multiple	MT, ND, SD, WY
Lands in North Dakota. (Range/Grazing Organization, Denver, CO - #A21358.45618)	Multiple	ND
North Dakota . . . the National Grasslands . . . western and central North Dakota. (Range/Grazing Organization, Denver, CO - #A21358.10130)	Multiple	ND
The National Grasslands and North Dakota. (Dale Patten, Commissioner, McKenzie County Board of Commissioners, Watford City, ND - #A27737.45611)	Multiple	ND
Exempt Wyoming. (Timber or Wood Products Industry/Association, Cody, WY - #A19163.45611)	Multiple	WY
The areas I am referring to are in the Tobacco Root Range and Gravelly Range areas of the Beaverhead-Deerlodge forest. . . . the Tobacco Root mountains, the Wisconsin Creek, Indian Creek, and Mill Creek . . . the Gravelly Mountains. (Individual, Tustin, CA - #A20777.45512)	Beaverhead-Deerlodge	MT
The Flathead National Forest. (Individual, Kalispell, MT- #A29631.45612)	Flathead	MT
Forest Service lands within the Little Missouri National Grasslands. (Oil, Natural Gas, Coal, or Pipeline Industry, No Address - #A29748.45610)	Little Missouri National Grasslands	ND

We don't need or want any roadless areas on the Cheyenne Grasslands. (Individual, Sheldon, ID - #A22622.45611)	Cheyenne National Grasslands	ND
--	------------------------------	----

Region 2 Rocky Mountain

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
The National Forest lands within the State of Wyoming. . . . I will further state that at least on the Bridger-Teton National Forest, there are several supposed roadless areas which have roads in them that have been in place for 40 years or more. (Individual, Jackson, WY - #A29348.45611)	Multiple	WY
Reasons why public access to Flat Top Mountain area should be maintained at the present level. 1. FR 829 is utilized by ranchers for extensive grazing on their private lands and I suspect on leased public lands above. 2. The land has a silent beauty with vistas of the West Elk area, Fossil Ridge and Elk Mountains. The sunsets are spectacular. 3. The roads are well used, well maintained, free from erosion, unlittered, and controlled by gates and fences. 4. The area has moderate use by hunters and exclusion of this area would decrease Colorado Game Management Unit's size by about 50%, increasing pressure on other areas. 5. The area is primarily sage with some stands of conifers at higher elevations. The land is clean, free of erosion, shows no signs of scarring by illegal off road travel. 6. The area is relatively close to residential areas of Gunnison and is convenient for short visits decreasing pressure on more heavily traveled recreational areas. 7. FR 829 and FR 863 have been in use for many years, are well established and maintained, and are well marked on USFS maps. This area would not appear to fit the definition of roadless in various USDA Forest Service communications. 8. Arbitrary denial of access to this area would be a great loss to this group and to me personally as it is one of the few areas close to our home where participation in high country activities (camping, bird watching, game viewing) is possible for someone with mobility problems. (Individual, Littleton, CO - #A13845.91110)	Arapaho-Roosevelt	CO
The Flat Top Mountain area . . . FR 829 and FR 863. (Individual, Littleton, CO - #A13845.91110)	Arapaho-Roosevelt	CO
I believe that presently the Western Unites States, Colorado, and Larimer County has more than enough federal lands set aside in roadless parks and wilderness areas. (Tom Bender, Commissioner, Larimer County Board of Commissioners, No Address - #A19772.45341)	Arapaho-Roosevelt	CO
I feel that the Black Hills should be exempt from the roadless rule. (Individual, Moorcroft, WY - #A40541.45612)	Black Hills	SD, WY
During the forest plan revision process on the Black Hills National Forest, forest resources were carefully evaluated and no new areas were deemed qualified for roadless status. However, according to the roadless rule, the Inyan Kara and Sand Creek areas were designated as having roadless characteristics. We strongly support the local forest decision, and urge the removal of those two areas from roadless designation. (Mark Semlek, Chairperson, Crook County Board of Commissioners, Sundance, WY - #A15545.45611)	Black Hills	SD, WY
The Castle Peak area. (Individual, No Address - #A889.90320)	Gunnison	CO
Medicine Bow National Forest. (Business, Cheyenne, WY - #A20917.90000)	Medicine Bow-Rouff	CO, WY
The WRNF (White River) in Colorado. (Individual, Snowmass Village, CO - #A8329.90320)	White River	CO
An approximately 6,000 acre roadless area along the western boundary of the Vail (Mountain) Resort special use permit area known as South Game Creek.	White River	CO

(Special Use Permit Holder, Avon, CO - #A28852.45614)		
Inventoried roadless area in the WRNF in Eagle County, Colorado adjacent to the western boundary of the Beaver Creek Resort special use permit area known as McCoy Park. (Special Use Permit Holder, Avon, CO - #A28852.45617)	White River	CO

Region 3 Southwestern

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
Arizona State Trust lands located within and near the local forests. (Michael E. Anable, Commissioner, Arizona State Land Department, Phoenix, AZ - #A17678.91110)	Multiple	AZ
The Pecos area . . . areas of the high forest in New Mexico. (Individual, No Address - #A5360.90000)	Multiple	NM
Carson National Forest Plan concerning Sipapu Ski Area. . . . counties in northern New Mexico. (Special Use Permit Holder, Vadito, NM - #A28970.45624)	Carson	NM
Sipapu Ski Area. . . . Taos and Mora counties. (Special Use Permit Holder, Vadito, NM - #A28970.45624)	Carson	NM
The Roadless Area Initiative has been said to be insignificant on the Cibola and Gila national forests in terms of total acres to be withdrawn from multiple use. In fact the Forest Service proposed Roadless designations in Catron County are significant for several reasons. The national forest non-multiples use (Roadless, wilderness, protected threatened and endangered species) areas in Catron County already consume well over half of the national forests in the County. The net consequences could result in less than 20% of the National Forest remaining accessible to multiple use, the statutorily mandated land use for national forests. Catron County and southern New Mexico is a fast growing region of the southwest. People who live and move into this region utilize the multiple uses of the national forest-the very forests that are proposed to be withdrawn. The existing Cibola and Gila national forest roads provide a vital service to our citizens and visitors who travel through the national forest by vehicle. The number one recreation activity on these forests is vehicular driving through the forest on dirt roads. It provides the most important recreation activity, driving through the national forest. Families, sportsmen, and a growing retirement and elderly population can only fully enjoy the national forest through vehicle access. (see Forest Service report: <i>Gila National Forest Recreation Market Study</i> , by Dr. Alexander J. Thal, Western New Mexico University). Timber harvests (fuel wood gathering and timber operations) have been a vital part of Catron County’s customs, cultures, and economy. The impact of the Roadless Area Initiative has yet to be determined, but its impact on future fuel wood gathering and any timber production could be significant, because it could lock up more of the forests, resulting in less than 20% of the remaining non-wilderness areas left for multiple use and future timber production in Catron County. Many of the roads used by woodcutters in the national forest could be excluded from vehicle use. (Auggie Shellhorn, Chairperson, Catron County Board of Commissioners, Reserve, NM - #A15538.45611)	Cibola, Gila	NM
The Roadless Area Initiative has been said to be insignificant on the Gila National Forest in terms of total acres to be withdrawn from multiple use. In fact the Forest Service proposed Roadless designations in Sierra County are significant for several reasons. The national forest non-multiples use (Roadless, wilderness, protected threatened and endangered species) areas in Sierra County already consume well over half of the national forest in the County. The net consequences of this current roadless initiative could result in less than 20% of the national forest remaining accessible to multiple use, the statutorily mandated	Gila	NM

<p>land use for national forests. Sierra County and southern New Mexico is a fast growing region of the southwest. People who live and move into this region utilize the multiple uses of the national forest - the very forests that are proposed to be withdrawn. (Adam Polley, Manager, Sierra County, Truth or Consequences, NM - #A22059.45622)</p>		
--	--	--

Region 4 Intermountain

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
<p>Idaho. (Individual, Elk City, ID - #A4283.90320)</p>	<p>Multiple</p>	<p>ID</p>
<p>Forests in southwest central Idaho. (Individual, No Address - #A1036.91110)</p>	<p>Multiple</p>	<p>ID</p>
<p>Over 9 million Idaho acres into the Roadless classification. (Individual, Lewiston, ID - #A30037.45611)</p>	<p>Multiple</p>	<p>ID</p>
<p>The public lands of Nevada. (Individual, Gerlach, NV - #A1066.91110)</p>	<p>Multiple</p>	<p>NV</p>
<p>Forest Service lands in Nevada. (Mining Industry/Association, Reno, NV - #A15364.90710)</p>	<p>Multiple</p>	<p>NV</p>
<p>Lander County remains strongly opposed to roadless area designations on National Forest Lands in Nevada and throughout the County. (Mickey Yarbrow, Chairperson, Lander County Board of Commissioners, Battle Mountain, NV - #A27730.45611)</p>	<p>Multiple</p>	<p>NV</p>
<p>Rural Utah. (Individual, No Address - #A340.90100)</p>	<p>Multiple</p>	<p>UT</p>
<p>The State of Wyoming. (Timber or Wood Products Industry/Association, Cody, WY - #A19163.45611)</p>	<p>Multiple</p>	<p>WY</p>
<p>The Manti LaSal National Forest. (Individual, Manti, UT - #A20336.90320)</p>	<p>Manti-La Sal</p>	<p>UT</p>
<p>I believe the entire area immediately East of Ogden, Utah has been inaccurately inventoried as Roadless. There are a number of current and future roads that are now, or soon will need to be, located in this area. Even if boundary adjustments could be made to exclude these existing and future roads from what is being called the Burch Creek Roadless Area, I believe the resulting area, (sandwiched by private mountain land on the North, developed ski resort land on the East, Ogden City on the West, and Interstate 84 on the South,) is too small to have the characteristics that are desirable in a roadless area. With roads, mountain bike trails, ski runs, ski race buildings and mountain restaurants at the upper fringes of the Burch, Beus, Strongs, Malans and Taylor drainages and with city streets and homes less than 3 miles away on the lower fringes, a roadless designation seems to invite unnecessary conflicts with the adjoining high-density recreation and urban uses. To effectively administer this land, I believe the Ogden Ranger District should have at its disposal the full range of National Forest uses without the strictures imposed by a roadless designation. Current roads in the inventoried Burch Creek roadless area, as mapped on the FS website: 1) The road to the Mt. Ogden Telecommunications site in Section 6 of Township 5 North, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian 2) The road and ski run at the top of Burch Bowl between DeMoisy Peak and Strawberry Peak in Section 8 of Township 5 North, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian New road needed in the inventoried roadless area: 1) a skier trail from the top of Snowbasin Resort’s Strawberry Gondola north into Middle bowl. This skier road will improve skier egress from Strawberry Bowl at the end of the day, and when this road is built, it will allow the current, above ground high voltage electric line (from the top of the Mid Bowl Gondola to the top of the Strawberry Gondola) to be buried. This path is now used extensively by skiers taking the shortcut from Strawberry to Middle Bowl, resulting in a hazard as metal ski and snowboard edges cut through the insulation on the high-voltage line. A bigger hazard of not having this road (and accompanying</p>	<p>Wasatch-Cache</p>	<p>UT</p>

<p>underground power line) is that avalanche control charges are exploded in close proximity to the surface-power line. An unlucky avalanche charge could cut off power to the Strawberry Gondola for weeks if not months. Given the two existing roads in this “roadless” area, and the need for a third, I respectfully request that the Burch Creek Roadless area near Ogden, Utah be deleted from the map of inventoried roadless areas. (Individual, Ogden, UT - #A30540.45510)</p>		
---	--	--

Region 5 Pacific Southwest

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
<p>The Cascade-Siskiyou National monument in southern Oregon is of great concern to the citizens of Jackson County and affected adjacent areas. We support the Jackson County Commissioners and their recommendation to reduce the monument to include only federal land in solid block ownership of approximately 16,500 acres. Boundary description – East boundary of Wilderness Study Area; West boundary Hwy 99; South boundary Oregon/California state line; North boundary south of Soda Mountain (known as Alternative B Minus). There is broad base support to eliminate this monument to protect private property rights and maintain Multiple-Use and Management. (Individual, Watsonville, CA - #A20403.45621)</p>	<p>Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument</p>	<p>OR</p>
<p>Sage Road in Laguna Mountains, San Diego. (Individual, San Diego, CA - #A12279.91110)</p>	<p>Cleveland</p>	<p>CA</p>
<p>A further remedy would be to include in any action or decision an exemption excluding all lands in the National Forest system, and as to MMSA [Mammoth Mountain Ski Area], those areas within the INF, previously identified for resort or recreation site development or expansion from consideration in the Roadless Initiative. This would include all lands within the SUP boundaries of MMSA, those identified in master development plans, those lands designated in forest plans for potential ski area development, and Management Prescriptions 13 and 14 in the INF Forest Plan. (Special Use Permit Holder, Mammoth Lakes CA - #A21901.45620)</p>	<p>Inyo</p>	<p>CA</p>
<p>It appears that the following areas are proposed to be included and subjected to the Roadless Area rules: Section 8, Township 12 North, Range 19 East, Mt. Diablo Base & Meridian; The southern portion of Section 4, Township 12 North, Range 19 East; The northern portion of Section 9, Township 12 North, Range 19 East; and The eastern portion of Section 7, Township 12 North, Range 19 East. The lands proposed for inclusion lie immediately adjacent to the 4,500 acres of land presently under Term Special Use Permits to Heavenly (permits #4056/01 and #4056/02), or adjacent to private held lands which Heavenly owns or controls. In fact, the entire area of Section 7 is already within Heavenly’s Special Use Permit boundary and is used for downhill skiing. . . . Inclusion of these areas within Heavenly’s Special Use Permit boundary (i.e., not subject to the proposed Roadless Area rules) would allow a continuous connection to be developed between a potential base area at the bottom of the slopes near the Kingsbury Grade (Nevada State Route 207), on land which Heavenly controls, and the existing resort facilities located on the Nevada side. The ability for the public to access the resort in this manner ensures that the Forest Service and Heavenly will continue to provide a high-quality public outdoor recreational experience, and, that transportation impacts to the existing road network, particularly those on the Kingsbury Grade and in the Lake Tahoe Basin are minimized by providing public access at the bottom of the hill and then transporting visitors onto national forest lands using ropeway forms of transportation. (Special Use Permit Holder, Stateline, NV - #A21708.45617)</p>	<p>Humboldt-Toiyabe, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit</p>	<p>CA, NV</p>

<p>Changes to rules that affect forest plan directives should seek to maintain the environmental and economic balance.</p> <p>The local forest plans in Mono and Inyo counties include consideration of local general plans. These plans were not consulted last year in the development of the roadless rule. As an example, it appears that the roadless rule would preclude development of the Sherwin Bowl Ski Area, which is a major development component of the Town of Mammoth Lake General Plan. It also appears that the rule would preclude expansions of the June Mountain Ski Area, which is contrary to the June Lake Area Plan of Mono County. (Byng Hunt, Chairperson, Mono County Board of Supervisors, Bridgeport, CA - #A18107.13110)</p>	<p>Inyo</p>	<p>CA</p>
<p>I own several parcels of land located in the Raywood Flat Area shown on the San Bernardino National Forest Inventoried Roadless Map in the far east part of Area #62 known as Raywood Flat "B". I have several structures located on my land and lease Snow Peak, which is located on the southern highest point in Section 31 T1S R2E SBBM to a communication company known as Snow Peak Communication. They have installed substantial improvements and equipment on this site since the early 1960s and service over (30) government agencies, private companies and individuals. The access to my properties is through a road known as Forestry #2S01 or Banning Canyon Rd & Raywood Flat Rd. The road has existed in some form or another since the late 1800s when the area was settled. . . .</p> <p>Other problems stem from inaccurate site specific studies of the area, the description in the above mentioned book on page C-26 (Exhibit "A"), it does not describe the two diversion dams at South & East Fork of the Whitewater River providing water through a 7 1/4 mile flume and 2 1/2 mile penstock for the Banning Heights Water Company & the City of Banning Water Supply. Also missing is the Riverside Flood Control District's weather measuring equipment and a state seismic monitoring station located at Raywood Flat on Section 31 and additionally missing is two Radio Facilities one on Snow Peak in Section 31 the other in the southwestern area of Section 21 T1S R1E SBBM near Little San Gorgonio Peak.</p> <p>I am very concerned that creating this roadless area in an area with many improvements and so much private land is just wrong and bad planning. It is clear that the original Rare II studies missed a lot of improvement and it still concluded that it did not meet roadless area inventory criteria. I am requesting to have the entire Sections 36 T1S R1E SBBM & 30 T1S R2E SBBM & the southwestern portion of Section 19T1S R2E SBBM that is not in wilderness, removed from the proposed roadless area. Also to substantially buffer the roads, flumes and penstock in Sections 1, 2 & 3 T2S R1E SBBM by at least 1/8 mile on each side of the roads, flumes and penstock centerline from the proposed roadless area. (Individual, Encinitas, CA - #A20826.45614)</p>	<p>San Bernardino</p>	<p>CA</p>
<p>The economy on the Banning Bench has developed on the basis of the water provided by the water flume and depends on the continued availability of this water. The flume, in turn, depends on the Raywood Flat and Banning Canyon Roads for its continued existence. Designating Raywood Flat Area A & B (#61 and #62) of the San Bernardino National forest to be a Roadless Area would effectively lead to the termination of the Banning Bench water supply by blocking the vehicular necessary for the continued maintenance of the flume. . . . we urge the Secretary <u>not</u> to declare these areas to be Roadless. (Utility Group/Organization, Costa Mesa, CA - #A20854.45611)</p>	<p>San Bernardino</p>	<p>CA</p>
<p>The Raywood Flat Rd. & Banning Canyon Rd are shown on existing Forestry Maps to be partially cherry stemmed from the proposed Roadless Area, but this is not enough. All the roads along with the entire water conveyance system needs to be removed from the Roadless Area starting from Banning Heights Water Tank at Pine Powerhouse all the way up to the diversion Dam at East Fork of the whitewater River. (Individual, Banning, CA - #A17655.45611)</p>	<p>San Bernardino</p>	<p>CA</p>

<p>I am sending you this letter on behalf of the Company’s Board of Directors in order to address the proposed “Roadless” designation of the Raywood Flat Area A & B (#61 and #62) of the San Bernardino National Forest in Southern California. Such a designation would impact the Raywood Flat and Banning Canyon Roads, in the counties of Riverside and San Bernardino, roads that are essential for maintaining BHMWC’s [Banning Heights Mutual Water Company] water conveyance system that diverts water from the Whitewater River watershed to the Banning Bench area adjacent to the San Gorgonio River. The Raywood Flat and the Banning Canyon Roads are used to access and service the water conveyance system that provides water to Banning Bench, a community of some 600 residents served by BHMWC, and the City of Banning (the “City” [pop. 26,000]) and also provides the hydro power for the Southern California Edison (“SCE”) San Gorgonio #1 and #2 hydroelectric project. The system included two diversion dams, two power houses, water tanks, and an approximately 14 mile long water flume. . . .</p> <p>Designating Raywood Flat Area A and Area B as a Roadless Area would seriously impair these “key principles” by not allowing for road maintenance and repairs that are periodically needed in order to enable BHMWC, the City, and SCE to have access Project 344. (Utility Group/Organization, Orange, CA - #A20944.45614)</p>	<p>San Bernardino</p>	<p>CA</p>
<p>I am sending you this letter on behalf of the City of Banning in order to address the matter of the proposed ‘Roadless’ designation for Raywood Flat Area A and Area B (#61 and #62).</p> <p>The Raywood Flat and the Banning Canyon roads in the counties of Riverside and San Bernardino, California, are used to access and service an approximately 14 mile long water conveyance system that provides water to residents of Banning Bench and the City and also provides the hydro power for the Southern California Edison (“SCE”) San Gorgonio #1 and #2 hydroelectric project. The system includes two diversion dams, two powerhouses, water tanks, and a long water flume conveyance system. Historical records indicate that the original flume was constructed of wood around 1877 to provide water to the early settlers in the region, and that the current concrete flume was constructed around 1910 to provide water and generate hydroelectric power. The system is referred to by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) as “Project 344,” and SCE holds a FERC license to operate it for power generation.</p> <p>Some 75 years ago, the State of California adjudicated the right of the Banning Heights Mutual Water Company (“BHMWC”) and the City to divert and use the water that generates power for Project 344. The adjudicated right to divert water that BHMWC and the City hold to is very significant indeed: approximately 9,500 acre/feet per year from the whitewater River. Banning Bench, a community of some 600 residents served by BHMWC, has been almost entirely dependent on this water supply for nearly a century. Use of this water by the residents of the City (pop. 26,000) goes back at least that far. Moreover, for more than a century, the City, SCE, and BHMWC have used the roads in this area to operate, maintain and repair the flume system.</p> <p>Designating Raywood Flat Area A and Area B as a Roadless Area, would seriously endanger BHMWC’s and the City’s water supply by not allowing for the road maintenance and repairs that are periodically needed in order to enable BHMWC, the City, and SCE to have access to Project 344. Including these areas in the Roadless Area designation would only lead to inevitable problems, as the Forest Service will most likely maintain that special permission is thereafter required to repair and maintain the existing roads, and the City will out of necessity, respond by asserting its various rights to this essential right-of-way as were granted by 19th Century Federal Law. The upshot will be costly and potentially cause long delays for essential repairs to the diversion dams and water conveyance system that our community depends on.</p>	<p>San Bernardino</p>	<p>CA</p>

As to Raywood Flat B, the “Appendices” to the <i>San Bernardino National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan</i> acknowledged that further restrictive designation is not warranted. (Don Foster, City Manager, City of Banning, Banning, CA - #A20958.51210)		
The Raywood Flat Road and Banning Canyon Road are shown on existing Forestry maps to be partially excluded from the proposed Roadless Area, but this is not enough. All of the roads along with the entire water conveyance system need to be excluded from the Roadless Area, starting from the Banning Heights Water Tank at Pine Powerhouse all the way up to the Diversion Dam at the East Fork of the Whitewater River. The best approach is simply not to include in the Roadless Area any of the Sections of land that contain any roads or improvements on them or provide access to portions of the water conveyance system. (Don Foster, City Manager, City of Banning, Banning, CA - #A20958.45610)	San Bernardino	CA
Areas in the Tahoe National Forest . . . the American River Canyon. (Individual, No Address - #A16447.90510)	Tahoe	CA
The Pamamint Valley area of California. (Individual, Ratcliff, AR - #A8877.90100)	Unknown	CA

Region 6 Pacific Northwest

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
Lands within the Interior Columbia Basin project area. (Grant County Attorney’s Office, Grant County, Roseburg, OR - #A17667.45611)	Multiple	ID, OR, MT, NV, WA, WY
We recommend that all of Oregon be deleted from the proposal. (Grant County Attorney’s Office, Grant County, Roseburg, OR - #A17667.45611)	Multiple	OR
Under the interim rule that suspended road building, the agency exempted Northwest Forest Plan (NFP) forests because of the scientific input gathered during the ecosystem management assessment team process (begun in 1993). . . . exempt the forests covered by the NFP from any future roadless conservation rule. (Special Use Permit Holder, Hood River, OR - #A13230.45610)	Multiple	OR, WA
I do <u>NOT</u> agree with setting aside over 2 million acres in Washington State as roadless. (Individual, No Address - #A6768.45611)	Multiple	WA
Mt. Baker/Snoqualmie N.F. (Individual, Lake Stevens, WA - #A8688.45612)	Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie	WA
Pelican Butte. (Individual, Klamath Falls, OR - #A6931.90810)	Winema	OR

Region 8 Southern

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
We generally are opposed to any rule or regulation that will cause delays in the construction of highways in National Forest System land in West Virginia. Charleston, WV - #A18100.90120)	Multiple	WV
The Chattahoochee and Nantahala National Forests and Black Rock Mountain State Park (GA) . . . the Chattahoochee National Forest in northeast Georgia. (Individual, Crystal River, FL - #A6257.91110)	Chattahoochee-Oconee, Nantahala	GA, NC, TN
I find the current Roadless exercise in Wisconsin to be of little value since all 15 inventoried parcels were rejected for US Federal Wilderness in 1984. I also note that 9 of the 15 USFS parcels are zoned semi-primitive motorized since	Chequamegon-Nicolet	WI

important winter corridor snowmobile trails have been on these parcels from 20 to 30 years. (Individual, Thiensville, WI - #A28617.45611)		
Wisconsin’s Department of Natural Resources recommends that the rule not be implemented as drafted. The Department is in favor of protecting and managing roadless areas as a component of the National Forest system. There are sensitive and unique areas in Wisconsin that could benefit from more road exclusion or limited road access but they should be identified and managed based on current ecological, economic and social values specific to each site. (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Madison, WI - #A28775.45611)	Chequamegon-Nicolet	WI
Hiawatha National Forest. (Individual, Christmas, MI - #A6694.45611)	Hiawatha	MI
The Shawnee National Forest . . . old roads and trails in the Hoosier National Forest and the James D Wilderness in Indiana. (Individual, 22318.45611)	Hoosier, Shawnee	IL, IN
Our major concern lies with the decisions that affect the White Mountain National Forest that occupies approximately thirteen percent of the State of New Hampshire. We see an annual a loss of about twenty thousand acres of forest and field to development across the State. As this trend continues there is an ever increasing demand for outdoor recreational activities, including hunting and fishing on our public lands. There is a simultaneous effort on the part of some individuals and groups to reduce the opportunity for quality hunting or related wildlife enjoyment be removing the opportunity to manage vegetation in a way that enhances habitat quality for a majority of the game and non-game species found in New Hampshire and in the White Mountains. Over fifty percent of the White Mountain National Forest, under its current management plan, has been withdrawn from vegetative management. The roadless areas designation process has the potential to significantly increase that percentage as part of the current revision process. It is imperative that the ability to manage habitat through the use of commercial timber sales and through non-commercial applications be retained on these lands if the future needs of the wildlife enthusiasts in New Hampshire are to be met. (New Hampshire Department of Fish and Game, Concord, NH - #A28779.45612)	White Mountain	NH, ME

Region 9 Eastern

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
Central New York State and New England. (Individual, Syracuse, NY - #A345.91110)	Multiple	NY
Allegheny National Forest. (Individual, Warren, PA - #A8840.10112)	Allegheny	PA
In the Chequamegon or Nicolet National Forests in Wisconsin, Black Hills in South Dakota, Pike National. (Individual, Waupaca, WI - #A6712.90100)	Black Hills, Chequamegon-Nicolet, Pike	SD, WI
Chippewa and Superior National Forests. (Tom Saxhaug, Chairperson, Itasca County Board of Commissioners, Grand Rapids, MN - #A2561.90100)	Chippewa, Superior	MN
In Lake County, Minnesota, we have the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness that comprises 26% of our county’s land base. In addition, there are also many PRNAs, RNAs, SMCs, Rare II areas, SNAs, reserve areas and state parks. The roadless area designation for additional lands in Lake County and Northeastern Minnesota will create more problems, for now and in the future, by greatly limiting access to public lands for necessary land management activities by the Forest Service, state and county agencies and private landowners. (Thomas C. Martinson, Commissioner, Lake County Board of County Commissioners, Two Harbors, MN - #A15552.30100)	Chippewa, Superior	MN
On the Shawnee NF in Southern Illinois. (Multiple Use/Wise Use/Land Rights Organization, Three Rivers, CA - #A28739.90410)	Shawnee	IL
Southeastern Ohio. (Individual, Albany, OH - #A4442.45620)	Wayne	OH

White Mountain National Forest. (Timber or Wood Products Industry/Association, Farmington, ME - #A15463.90515)	White Mountain	NH, ME
Central New Hampshire . . . White Mountain National Forest. (Individual, Center Sandwich, NH - #A8347.90120)	White Mountains	NH, ME

Region 10 Alaska

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
Exempt Kenai Peninsula. (Individual, No Address - #A6800.30420)	Chugach	AK
Alaska. (Individual, Anchorage, AK - #A15680.45610)	Chugach, Tongass	AK
The Tongass and Chugach. (Individual, Juneau, AK- #A17238.45610)	Chugach, Tongass	AK

Table F-3. Site-Specific Requests that areas be Recommended/Designated as Wilderness

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
All roadless areas including those encompassed in the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act to and including, one thousands acres in size should be protected to preserve their wilderness character and eligibility for congressional Wilderness designation, rather than being deferred later to the forest planning process. (Individual, Elmhurst, IL - #A15290.45320)	Multiple	ID, MT, WY
I'm looking to you to <u>save</u> wilderness areas in the Yellowstone region. (Individual, Corte Madera, CA - #A10851.45621)	Multiple	ID, MT, WY
By law, new wilderness area recommendations must be proposed by the Forest Service to Congress during the forest plan revision process for possible new wilderness legislation. The 1.9 million acres of inventoried roadless areas in Oregon, plus the remaining 2.9 million acres of unprotected roadless areas on Forest Service and BLM lands should be designated as wilderness through a comprehensive statewide forest wilderness bill. (Individual, Blue Lake, CA - #A3671.25000)	Multiple	OR
Those areas adjacent to the existing High Uintas Wilderness and other wilderness areas should definitely be proposed for wilderness designation. (Individual, Dutch John, UT - #A25600.45622)	Ashley, Wasatch-Cache	UT
For instance, on the Carson National Forest significant roadless lands border the Pecos, Wheeler Peak and Cruces Basin Wilderness areas. Protecting these lands and recommending them as additional wilderness makes common sense. On the Santa Fe National Forest, inventoried roadless areas border the Pecos and Dome Wilderness areas and significant portions of the Jemez Mountains contain roadless areas. Protecting these roadless lands would bolster the integrity of the sensitive mountain ecosystems of New Mexico and would do much to provide wildlife movement corridors to ensure the long-term survival of the state's unique fauna. (Individual, Santa Fe, NM - #A22971.45622)	Carson, Santa Fe	NM
We urge you to provide Wilderness protection for much of Alaska's Chugach National Forest. Currently, there is none. Wilderness is good business. Wilderness is sustainable. Please insist that the plan revision include Wilderness protection for the existing Wilderness Study Area, the Big Islands of Prince William Sound (Knight, Montague, and Hinchinbrook), the Copper River Delta and the Kenai Peninsula. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Seward. AK - #A24021.25000)	Chugach	AK
The planning group of Cordova residents supports a 501(b) Recommended Wilderness-type designation for the eastern Copper River delta because of the	Chugach	AK

long term protection it offers, and because it limits the type of development that degrades fish and wildlife habitat. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Cordova, AK - #A23229.91110)		
These areas on the Clearwater National Forest and deserve fullest protection as a federally designated Wilderness area. They include: Weitas Creek, Mallard-Larkin Pioneer area, 5 Lakes Butte, Chamberlain Mtn./Vanderbuilt Mtn. area, Pot Mtn., Kelly Creek and the Great Burn area, Cayuse Creek area, Fish and Hungry Creek area, North Lochsa Face area, and Freeze-out Mtn. area (on the Panhandle National Forest). (Individual, Manhattan, KS - #A4598.45624)	Clearwater	ID
<p>Idaho Panhandle National Forests: (only portions in the Big Wild Ecosystem, mainly the upper St. Joe River drainage are listed—others outside the ecosystem should also be protected)</p> <p><u>Mallard-Larkins</u> (see Clearwater National Forest)</p> <p><u>Meadow Creek/Vanderbilt-Upper St. Joe</u> (see Clearwater National Forest)</p> <p><u>Mosquito Fly—1150.</u> This area is separated from Mallard-Larkins by a dirt road. It is crucial wildlife habitat and an important fishery. Terrain is diverse and elevation changes are rapid. A recent land exchange blocked up the area in public ownership.</p> <p><u>Midget Peak—1151.</u> This area borders the St. Joe River. It has steep canyons. Simmons Creek is a tributary to the fabled St. Joe River.</p> <p><u>Sheep Mountain/State Line (also Lolo National Forest)—1779.</u> This area includes high alpine. terrain near the headwaters of the St. Joe river. Historic fires have made an interesting mosaic and the rugged terrain is very scenic. Several alpine lakes are found near the state line on both sides of the border. Many higher peaks dot the landscape, on and off the Bitterroot Crest.</p> <p><u>Grandmother Mountain—1148.</u> This area is a popular high elevation recreation area. However, ORV use creates damage along the trails and meadows, especially around Widow Mountain. Much of the area is managed by the BLM and a corner of it drains into the St. Maries River. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.25200)</p>	Clearwater, Idaho Panhandle, Lolo	ID, MT, WA
I ask that you try to have these areas—including Baker-Snoqualmie and Gifford Pinchot—be designated wilderness areas to be regulated by Congress. (Individual, Bellingham, WA - #A21485.45622)	Gifford Pinchot, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie	WA
<p>ADDITIONS TO SELWAY-BITTERROOT WILDERNESS AREA</p> <p><u>Meadow Creek/Vanderbilt and Rawhide—1302 and 1313.</u> (also Idaho Panhandle and Lolo National Forests) This is wild headwaters of both the North Fork proper and the St. Joe Rivers with isolated mountain lakes like Trail, Oregon, and St. Joe Lakes. Closure of unneeded and deteriorating road 5428 was suggested to unite this area with the Rawhide Roadless Area in the Clearwater Forest Plan appendices (page C-224). This has been done and the two areas should be considered as one roadless area. Recent land exchanges have removed the private checkerboard land formerly found in the southern part of this area. The map that shows development in this area is not as extensive as what has occurred. For example, there is a corridor along the North Fork River. These are all logical additions to the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness and many were previously included in the old Selway Primitive Area. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.25200)</p>	Idaho Panhandle and Lolo	ID, MT, WA
<p><u>Upper Bear Creek.</u> This area, about 700 acres, has been in wilderness proposals though it was inadvertently neglected in the Nez Perce forest plan inventory. However, it appears to have been included in Bitterroot National Forest inventories as it is contiguous with the Selway Bitterroot additions on that forest (although it is in Idaho, on the Nez Perce National Forest). It is the headwaters of Bear Creek, contiguous to the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness and at the top of Lost Horse Canyon. It should be part of the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.25200)</p>	Nez Perce	ID

<p>Hells Canyon is the deepest gorge in North America. These areas should be added to the Hells Canyon Wilderness: <u>Klopton Creek/Corral Creek and Big Canyon A—1854 and 1853 (Hells Canyon NRA)</u>. These areas were recommended for further planning in the RARE II final EIS but were not included in the inventory in the Nez Perce forest plan due to the fact they are within the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area (HCNRA) managed by the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest. <u>Salmon Face—1855</u>. This area contains spectacular scenery adjacent to the Hells Canyon Wilderness. It also contains a significant, natural cave which has created recent management controversy. The agency must do a better job protecting this area. <u>Rapid River—1922</u>. (also Payette National Forest). The Rapid River is a wild and scenic river and contains crucial anadromous fish habitat for Chinook salmon. The area is unique in that it escaped fires early in this century. it is a very popular backcountry area and should be added to the Hells Canyon Wilderness. (Conservation/Preservation Organization, Moscow, ID - #A22654.25200)</p>	<p>Nez Perce, Payette</p>	<p>ID</p>
<p><u>Secesh, Needles, and Caton Lake Roadless Areas</u> These three areas should be considered the South Fork Salmon Wilderness in three units. . . . They include the Secesh (South Fork north) west of Zena Creek and along the South Fork of the Salmon; the Needles (South Fork west) along six mile ridge and beside the South Fork of the Salmon to the north and South of Blackmare Creek; and Caton Lake (South Fork east) along the South Fork of the Salmon and the East Fork of the South Fork Salmon River. The South Fork north area is, fortunately, little threatened. This area includes the lakes portion of Twentymile Lakes, Loon, Enos, and Jungle Lakes, part of the Secesh River and the South Fork. The only area that is threatened is Loon Lake which is popular with trail bicycles. Quartz Creek on the southeast of the area is another spectacular drainage. South Fork west is another subject. Sixmile Ridge, above Krassel, has been controversial for may years because of its timber potential. Include it in the proposed wilderness and go get your timber in another place. It is sensitive because of its place adjacent to the South Fork and Fitsum and Buckhorn Creeks. In addition, the Ponderosa pine habitat is increasingly uncommon and most of this I would say is not in serious jeopardy from fire. The rest of the South Fork west region from Cly Lakes and the Lake Fork watershed and Idler drainage to Nick, Buckhorn and Backmare lakes and the creeks that drain them are shoe-ins for wilderness designation. The Buckhorn drainage is a special case and one that has recently gone from worse to better. A few years ago the main stem Buckhorn Creek “blew out” sediment in a rain on snowstorm, carrying much of the road with it. Then the Forest Service chose to close about 6 miles of the road along with pulling out culverts; the “road” is now a trail. Please include this trail in the recommended wilderness. It is roadless at least. South Fork east (including the Boise NF portion of the Caton Lake Roadless Area) is the lesser known of the South Fork roadless areas and deserves to be wholly designated as wilderness. . . . The Thunderbolt Mountain timber sale illegally cut into this area on the south. (Individual, Boise, ID - #A21369.25200)</p>	<p>Payette</p>	<p>ID</p>
<p>I strongly support protecting the following potential new wilderness areas and potential additions to existing wilderness areas, as well as potential new wild and scenic rivers. These six potential wilderness areas are within the South Fork Trinity River Watershed. The six potential wilderness areas are: Chinquapin Potential Wilderness Underwood potential wilderness Pattison potential wilderness</p>	<p>Shasta-Trinity, Six Rivers</p>	<p>CA, OR</p>

South Fork potential wilderness Yolla Bolly Middle Eel potential wilderness addition Chanchellula potential wilderness addition Eligible and potential new Wild And Scenic River sections: Upper South Fork Trinity River above Forest Glen Lower Hayfork Creek, major tributary to the South Fork Trinity River. (Individual, Orleans, CA - #A27263.25200)		
Please consider wilderness recommendations for Shoshone National Forest's roadless areas. (Individual, Dallas, TX - #A143.45620)	Shoshone	WY
The Cascade Siskiyou area has the additional resources to be a Monument due to its unique beauty. (Individual, Ashland, OR - #A14573.45620)	Siskiyou	OR
I urge you to include the King Range Nat'l Conservation area and the LOST COAST as California wilderness areas. (Individual, Santa Rosa, CA - #A21284.25200)	Six Rivers	CA
The FS should place the Mansfield peninsula under the management of AINM [Admiralty Island National Monument] and suggest to Congress it be placed in Kootznoowoo Wilderness. (Individual, Juneau, AK - #A2319.45500)	Tongass	AK
By the time the Alaska Lands bill (ANILCA) had passed in 1980, many of the most important watersheds with the largest old growth spruce and Western Hemlock had been logged. Logging and roads were extensive on Prince of Wales Island; Baranoff, Kuiu, Chicagoff and those roads were causing problems for fish spawning streams and they still are. . . . The best use of what is left of the Tongass National forest is wilderness. (Individual, Juneau, AK - #A10588.45623)	Tongass	AK
On the east slopes of the Cascades, a few Roadless Areas in particular such as Nason Ridge of Tiffany Mountain are so spectacular they should have been included in the original Wilderness Act but were taken out by pressure from timber interests. (Individual, Peshastin, WA - #A20875.45624)	Wenatchee	WA
The Roadless Rule should stand as it was written, with NO exemption for Pelican Butte, which should be added to the Sky Lakes Wilderness Area, of which it was originally intended to be a part. (Individual, Klamath Falls, OR - #A1035.45622)	Winema	OR

Table F-4. Site-Specific Requests that Areas not be Recommended/Designated as Wilderness

Area	National Forest or Grassland	State
My state of Montana has an average yearly salary of approx \$22,000 per person. We have lost logging, mining, and ranching as industries and are told we need to depend on tourists who want to "view wilderness and more wilderness." They can view what we've got. That's enough! (Individual, Kalispell, MT - #A1076.75200)	Multiple	MT
We note that in the Central Idaho Wilderness Act of 1980 (Public Law 93-312), Congress specifically stated its intent that the wilderness legislation was a comprehensive land allocation decision relative to the roadless areas. The roadless areas were allocated by Congress. Similar land allocations were made in the Oregon Wilderness Act of 1984 wherein Congress specifically reviewed the roadless areas and in turn designated the roadless lands that need to be protected for their watershed, wildlife habitat, scenic and historic, and primitive recreation values as wilderness (see "Oregon Wilderness Act of 1983, Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, Reserved Water"). These are the same values that are now being re-evaluated. To	Multiple	OR

<p>avoid conflicts with these earlier congressional reviews and comprehensive lands allocations, we suggest that these Congressional designations be followed. (Joyce Morgan, Commissioner, Douglas County Board of Commissioners, Roseburg, OR - #A11811.25110)</p>		
<p>The advance notice of proposed rulemaking dated July 3, 2001 states “The Forest Service has been evaluating roadless areas for nearly 30 years”. While this may be true Service-wide, this effort was concluded in Wyoming with the passage of the Wyoming Wilderness Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-550). This public law states in Title II, the Congress has made its own review and examination of the National Forest Roadless Areas in Wyoming and the environmental impacts associated with alternative allocation of such areas. Section 401(b):”On the basis of such review, the Congress hereby determines and directs that - (2) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-588) to be an adequate consideration of the suitability of such lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System and the Department of Agriculture shall not be required to review the wilderness option prior to the revisions of the plan, but shall review the wilderness option when the plans are revised.” Section B (3): “Areas in the State of Wyoming reviewed. . . shall be managed for multiple use in accordance with the land management plan.” Section B (5): “Unless expressly authorized by Congress, the Department of Agriculture shall not conduct any further statewide roadless area review and evaluation of National Forest System lands in the State of Wyoming for the purpose of determining their suitability for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.” (Timber or Wood Products Industry/Association, Cody, WY - #A19163.25100)</p>	<p>Multiple</p>	<p>WY</p>
<p>I am against any more Wilderness Designation in the Jackson area, we actually need more Multiple Use. (Individual, No Address - #A9003.50200)</p>	<p>Bridger-Teton</p>	<p>WY</p>
<p>The Chugach is also subject to the No-More clause of ANILCA and, as with the Tongass, must have areas set aside for intensive forestry. This is the only way to insure that resource development interest can become established and remain viable on the Chugach. (Timber or Wood Products Industry/Association, Ketchikan, AK - #A20443.25100)</p>	<p>Chugach</p>	<p>AK</p>
<p>Given Section 708(b) (4) and Section 1326(b) of ANILCA, none of the roadless areas in the national forests in Alaska should be proposed to Congress for wilderness designation. (Individual, Sitka, AK - #A12821.25240)</p>	<p>Chugach, Tongass</p>	<p>AK</p>
<p>In the Olympic area, the National Forest surrounds nearly 1,000,000 acres of the primarily roadless, Olympic National Park. In the Park, the designation of roadless areas for wilderness use has clearly been met. Further dialogue occurred in the 1984 wilderness Hearings in Washington State that designated another one million acres for these purposes, including over 100,000 additional acres in the Olympic area. Elsewhere this may not be true and the merits of designating roadless areas would need to be debated locally, on a case-by-case basis in those areas. (Larry Doyle, Mayor, City of Port Angeles, Port Angeles, WA - #A22068.45100)</p>	<p>Olympic</p>	<p>WA</p>
<p>Congress has already designated vast areas of the Tongass as wilderness or LUD II lands where development is restricted. No more areas of the Tongass should be proposed as wilderness. Balanced multiple use should be provided through the local forest planning process, and the needs of the communities dependent on the Tongass must be genuinely considered and provided for in that process. Under the provisions of ANILCA, none of the roadless areas on the Tongass should be recommended to Congress for wilderness designation. (Ketchikan Gateway</p>	<p>Tongass</p>	<p>AK</p>

Borough, Ketchikan, AK - #A17476.25240)		
---	--	--

Appendix G

List of Preparers

The list includes the names of the individuals and area of contribution they made toward the completion of the analysis of public comment for the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

Content Analysis Team – Salt Lake City

Program Coordinators

Jody Sutton *Coordinator*
James MacMillen *Contracting*

Project Coordinators

Bob Dow *Project Manager*
Stan Underwood *Team Leader*

Writers

Amy Barker
Craig Broadhead
Jen Colby
Kimberly Davis
Susan Hickenlooper
Marianne Teerlink
Katie Sheen-Abbot
Elisha Wardle

Coders

Salt Lake City and Missoula Offices
The Shipley Group (Salt Lake City Office)

Information Systems

Cindy Underwood *Manager*
Frank Lamb *Computer Programming and Support Specialist*

Information Technicians

Salt Lake City and Missoula Offices