

Chapter 2 – Planning Process, Public Participation, Collaboration and Next Steps

Planning Process and Public Participation

One of the goals throughout the entire KIPZ Forest Plan Revision process is to encourage participation and collaboration by providing numerous opportunities for public involvement. In order to better understand where, when and how the public is involved throughout the process, following is a brief discussion about the planning process as guided by NEPA regulations and the current 1982 planning regulations:

Notice of Intent

A Notice of Intent (NOI) formally initiates the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. The NOI for the KIPZ to begin Forest Plan Revision was published in the Federal Register on April 30, 2002. The NOI for these two forests described the proposed action, preliminary revision topics and issues with the 1987 Forest Plans; dates for filing the EIS; information concerning public participation; names and addresses of the agency officials who can provide additional information; and some possible preliminary proposed actions/strategies.

Scoping Comment Period

Public participation is encouraged throughout the entire revision process but is especially important and helpful at several points along the way. The first formal and important opportunity for the public to comment is during the scoping period, which began on April 30, 2002 and ends on March 21, 2003 (40 CFR 1501.7). During this time, the public is to review and provide their comments on the Preliminary Revision Topics/Issues that were identified in the NOI, are on the website www.fs.fed.us/kipz, were in our May 2002, issue of “KIPZ News”, and were also presented at the open houses held in June 2002. The AMS and this document are tools to provide more information to the public about the revision topics in order to provide comments during the scoping comment period.

The question that has been posed to the public, during the scoping period, through a wide variety of media is:

Are the Revision Topics/Issues that were identified accurate or is there an issue that is absent; and/or direction that needs to be changed from our 1987 Forest Plans, and should be addressed during Revision?

Content Analysis:

At the end of the scoping period, all of the comments received will be read and all issues will be identified and analyzed. This process is called content analysis, which is designed to extract concerns from each letter, track similar concerns from different responses, identify specific issues and provide a mailing list of respondents. As used during the scoping phase of a project, Content Analysis strives to identify all relevant issues, not just those represented by the majority of respondents. Breadth and depth of the comments are as important as quantity in this process.

Although this analysis attempts to capture the full range of public issues and concerns, it should be used with caution. The respondents are self-selected; therefore their comments do not necessarily represent the sentiments of the entire population. However, the analysis does attempt to provide fair representation of the wide range of views submitted. It's important to remember that the comment process and content analysis is **not** a vote count. The results from the content analysis will be a summary of public issues and concerns, by issue or topic area, that will be considered in the development of the DEIS and proposed revised Forest Plans.

Analysis of Management Situation (AMS)

During the scoping period, the KIPZ Team has developed the AMS and this document (AMS Technical Report), which is a collection and analysis of data describing monitoring and evaluation findings; historic and current condition and trends; and applicable information from current science and assessments. The information in the AMS, comments from the public and continued public participation (additional meetings and work groups) will be used to further define significant issues, identify desired future conditions for geographic areas, and design preliminary alternatives for the DEIS.

Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and Proposed Forest Plans

The 1982 Planning Regulations require the preparation of an EIS when a plan is revised. The EIS must be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the NEPA, and display information used to make the decision on which alternative to adopt as the revised Forest Plan.

Therefore, the next planning step will be to develop:

- One DEIS for both forests
- A proposed revised Forest Plan for each forest.

The KIPZ team will continue to develop and refine the possible proposed actions that were listed in the NOI. These actions are used to develop alternatives. Specific proposed actions are desirable to focus the analysis and public comment on the relevant topics and issues.

One of the alternatives that will be developed in detail in the DEIS, called the No Action Alternative, will look at the implications of continuing to follow current direction in the 1987 Forest Plans. Several other alternatives will be developed and analyzed with public input. The range of alternatives presented in the DEIS will address issues identified during scoping. It may also include other alternatives considered during collaborative planning. One of the alternatives will be selected as the Forest Service’s “preferred alternative” when the draft documents are made available for public comment.

DEIS Comment Period

The second formal and important opportunity for the public to comment is after the DEIS is completed. There will be a 90-day public comment period on the DEIS, which will begin from the date the EPA publishes the notice of availability in the Federal Register. To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the DEIS should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft statement. Comments may also address the adequacy of the DEIS or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statement. Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (CEQ) for implementing the procedural provisions of the NEPA at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and Proposed Revised Forest Plans

After the comment period on the DEIS ends, one of the important first steps during the preparation of the FEIS is reading, analyzing, considering, and then responding to all of the public comments by the Forest Service. These frequently lead to a number of changes that are made between the DEIS and FEIS.

Our current projection is that work on the FEIS will occur from fall 2004 to fall 2005. Documents that we will produce during this phase include:

- One FEIS for both forests
- A Record of Decision (ROD) for each forest
- A revised Forest Plan for each forest

The current estimated completion date for the FEIS is winter 2005. The public will be notified when the FEIS is completed and available.

Record of Decision (ROD)

The ROD documents the decision and the rationale for the decision.

The responsible official will consider the comments, responses, and environmental consequences discussed in the FEIS; and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making decisions regarding these revised Forest Plans. The responsible official will document the discussions and reasons for the decisions in the RODs for the revised Forest Plans. The decisions will be subject to appeal in accordance with 36 CFR 217 and the public will be notified upon completion of the FEIS.

If the revision outlines recommendations to Congress, the recommendations will be forwarded to the Forest Service Washington Office for their review.

Public Participation

Since the 1987 Forest Plans, there have been significant changes in public perception, social conditions, and how the public wants to be involved. A Social Science Assessment, which is one of our public involvement tools for determining how the public wants to be involved and what they value most, has been completed on each of the KIPZ forests (Impact Assessment, Inc. 1995 and Parker et al., 2002). In addition, included in this section is what we've heard so far from the public on the issues they feel need to be addressed during Forest Plans revision.

The majority of the people interviewed for the Social Science Assessments and those who attended public meetings and/or submitted comment letters indicated that they want to be more involved in actions that affect the NFS lands and their use of this land. They also feel that traditional public involvement, for example informational briefing meetings, has not been effective nor efficient. One of their suggested solutions is for the Forest Service to focus on ways to bring people with differing views, together to discuss an issue.

To organize the public involvement activities for the various stages of the KIPZ planning process, a Communication and Collaboration Plan was created. The purpose of this plan is to ensure that goals of public activities are clear, responsibilities are identified, contacts are known and timelines are set. The KIPZ has set up a Communication Team, comprised of public affairs specialists, planners, and line and staff officers from the two forests, to guide and support this process. This Communication and Collaboration Plan will be continuously updated to reflect changes in activities or personnel. The intent is to identify our public involvement responsibilities and implement them in a timely, effective manner.

Public Involvement Activities to Date

Several news releases have been published throughout the 3-state area and the first KIPZ News was distributed in May 2002. The KIPZ News was sent to approximately 2,500 people from existing forest mailing lists and was also posted on the KIPZ website. It summarized the preliminary revision topics, advertised the June 2002 open houses, and listed contact information.

During June of 2002, open houses were held on both forests to provide information and get feedback on the preliminary Revision Topics. Thirteen meetings were held in the following locations with over 250 people in attendance:

- **Idaho:** Bonners Ferry, Coeur d'Alene, Moscow, Priest Lake, Priest River, Sandpoint, Silverton, and St. Maries
- **Montana:** Eureka, Libby, Noxon, and Troy
- **Washington:** Spokane

These open houses provided an excellent opportunity to speak individually and collectively with interested members of the public. Many of these meetings had press coverage and newspaper articles in local papers. The concerns raised by the people who attended these meetings are summarized and available on the KIPZ website, and are presented both by community and by issue.

In addition to the open houses, the website, and the newsletter; the Forest Supervisors, District Rangers and individual KIPZ planning team members have been attending a variety of meetings with local interest groups, environmental organizations and other state and federal agencies, and have been talking with members of the public about the plan revision.

Summary of Public Comments to Date

The scoping comment period has been in effect since April 30, 2002. Following are some of the comments, by Revision Topic, heard to date. Please note that these comments have not been through the process of content analysis but are a compilation of what was heard at the open houses and a few additional issues read to date from the comment letters. These comments reflect what people think about public lands, the Forest Service, personal use of national forests and land management activities. One of the steps to content analysis is to determine which comments are applicable to the KIPZ revision process and which are outside of the control of the Forest Service. Other screens will be applied to the comments as well during the content analysis. Public comments not only influence the content of the draft planning documents, they help the Forest Service understand what issues are important and how to better communicate.

Public comments on the KIPZ revision and on other areas of concern include:
--

Vegetation:

- More management of the ecosystems to make and keep them healthy but don't lock us out – utilize our tools – fire and logging/thinning.
- Forests need to be thinned “properly” even where they've been logged. What's the hold-up on doing hands-on land management?
 - ◆ Need to get forests healthy and ready to log in future years.
 - ◆ Is tree planting occurring?
 - ◆ How are you going to replace the early seral tree species?
 - ◆ The health of the forest is the most important thing.
- What standards apply to restoration? To who's standards or what standards will the forests be restored?
- The Forest Service has no clue of historic conditions.
- If we don't address forest health issues now and clean up the forests, we “will” have real water quality issues because of catastrophic fires and other reasons.
- Difficulty in understanding the potassium deficiency issue and what does it mean to health of the vegetation.
- Weed program has been allowed to take backseat to timber management.
 - ◆ Noxious weeds have sky rocketed on federal lands.
 - ◆ Study needs to be done on damage to the resource by ATV's vs. horses. Which has more impact as far as weed spread?
 - ◆ Cumulative effects need to be addressed.

Wildlife:

- How will the Grizzly Bear amendment be affected by Forest Plans revision? How will the amendment affect decisions in the new Forest Plans?
- How will the Endangered Species Act affect decisions in the new Forest Plans?
- How are we going to address wildlife corridors in Forest Plans revision? How does the Grizzly, Lynx etc. amendments affect these wildlife corridors?

Wildlife Continued:

- How many bears can this forest support?
- Concerned about the effect of science on grizzly and lynx and it's affect on decision in the new Forest Plans.
- Impacts on wildlife.
 - ♦ Concentration of people causes impacts to wildlife (ie. the number of recreationists at some high mountain lakes in the Selkirk Mtns. driving away the caribou.)
- Regarding the Endangered Species Act, are the programs coordinated so that there isn't conflict between species for certain chunks of land?
- Who determines the best science that is available and what will we use in revision?
- ICBEMP – What's our plan to use the science from this project? Are we going to use the science from this Plan in its entirety?
- Concerns about using CRB science.
- Scientific studies are ambiguous (Grizzly bear, Lynx and UCRB)
- Skeptical of the new science – What is new science?

Watershed, Fisheries and Amphibians:

- How will the Endangered Species Act be dealt with in Forest Plans revision and how will it affect the decisions?
- What is Pacfish and how does it affect Forest Plans revision?
- What qualifies a stream to be impaired and who sets the standard?
- What causes a stream to be impaired?

Social and Economic:

- Concerned about local economy and our affect/contribution to it. If the community is diversifying their economy.
 - ♦ What's the Forest Service contribution to economic sustainability?
 - ♦ What reference will you be starting from for economic sustainability– scratch or ICEBMP?
 - ♦ When mills close, this affects the whole community (schools, roads and tax base etc.)
- Put the forests' Social Assessments on the website.
- Update the Kootenai's Social Assessment to reflect current attitudes, conditions etc.
- What are the substantial resource and social changes that have occurred since 1987?
- More small sales in the Forest Plans. More helicopter sales to get wood to the mills.
- Emphasize and provide more details on Social and Economics in the new Forest Plans.
- Need cumulative effects identified for all impacts to the economy.

Timber Production:

- What was the biggest obstacle to us achieving the direction that we came out with in the 1987 Forest Plans (ie. Timber production, ASQ)?
- Why haven't we ever met the ASQ target and the other targets in the 1987 Forest Plans?
- Guarantee for more timber outputs for stability of mills.
 - ♦ Plum Creek mill in Libby could close, creating a loss of 330 jobs.
 - ♦ Look hard at timber production predictions in new Forest Plans and explain what you mean by the numbers.
- Offer more small sales in the Forest Plan. More helicopter sales to get wood to the mills.
- Look at timber heritage in Forest Plans revision.
- Utilize 10 – 14" trees. What's the market for these small trees?
- Timber production helps reduce fire buildup/hazard. Why not use it as a tool for land management and it will also help sustain the economy of the communities?
- Where do the funds go that come from timber sales?
- We are getting more and more timber from Canada.

Fire Risk:

- When are we going to address the Wildlands Fire Policy?
- Reducing fire hazard/build-up needs to be addressed in Forest Plans revision.
- Fire risk is increasing so why can't we just estimate outputs related to reducing fire risk?
- Strong concern of the need to focus on fire because of the fuel build-up in the national forests.
- Use fire as a tool for land management, prescribed fire so we don't have these catastrophic fires.

Access and Recreation:

- People want more non-motorized opportunities.
 - ♦ Want more places to go for solitude.
 - ♦ Damage to the resource by motorized activities vs. horses.
 - ♦ Damage to the resource by motorized activities.
 - ♦ There are "some areas" where non-motorized and motorized are compatible (ie. snowmobile/cross country skiing). Doesn't have to be a conflict.
- People want more motorized opportunities.
 - ♦ Older Americans concern about their need to drive because they can't walk as far for personal use, huckleberry picking etc.
 - ♦ What about seasonal access?
 - ♦ Concern about roads and access for firewood cutting, recreation, hunting etc.
 - ♦ Study needs to be done on damage to the resource by ATV's vs. horses and which has more impact as far as weed spread.
 - ♦ Review opening closed roads to provide for disabled etc. access.
- Loss of access due to road obliteration.
 - ♦ Where's the scientific data to support obliteration of roads?
 - ♦ Decommissioning roads are used to keep people out. Where does the decision come from?
- Impacts on wildlife.
 - ♦ Concentration of people causes impacts to wildlife (ie. The number of recreationists at some high mountain lakes in the Selkirk Mtns. driving away the caribou.)
- Who makes the decision on what roads/trail are closed? What is the process?
- What percentage of the people that are using the forest is based on increases in the population base and what percentage is based on technology?
 - ♦ Is technology the only reason for more impact, broader spread, and more intense impact on the land?
- Strong concern of closing off access to National Forest System lands. For example, by Forest Service definition, first a road that is open for road vehicles is closed and changed to a motorized trail excluding road vehicles and then sometimes it's closed to ATV's and open to motorcycles. Forest Service needs to explain why.

Visual affects need to be addressed.

Need for airstrip designations – recreational air needs need to be addressed.

Inventoried Roadless Areas:

How are IRAs going to be addressed in the new Forest Plans?

- What happened to the IRA's proposed for wilderness in the 1987 Forest Plans and how are we going to address in the new Forest Plans?
- What's the next step with IRAs that were analyzed and not recommended for wilderness?

What's the definition of an IRA and what's the difference from unroaded areas and roadless areas?

Explain the different management options available in IRAs, unroaded etc.

Planning and Decision Making Process:

- How are decisions made and how do local interests weigh against national interests? Which takes priority in decision-making and how are they used in the decision-making process? This is not a voting process.
 - ♦ Not listening to locals and people are frustrated. Appearance of listening to out-of-staters, scientists, environmentalists etc.
 - ♦ Look more at local level for management strategies. Forest Plan will be made locally and decision-maker is local.
- What kinds of decisions are going to be made in Forest Plans revision?
 - ♦ When will site-specific decision be made and will there be public involvement?
 - ♦ Who makes the decision on what roads/trails are closed? What is the process?
- How do people and communities fit into the equation in the revision effort? Explain the balance of ecological and social and economic and which carries more weight.
 - ♦ Do resource issues/management take precedence over social issues/desires on any given area?
 - ♦ How does the Endangered Species Act affect decisions in Forest Plans revision?
- It's difficult to provide comments when I have site-specific issues/concerns when Forest Plans revision is broad in scope. How do I make comments about my special area during Forest Plans revision?
- More management of the ecosystems to make and keep them healthy but don't lock us out – utilize our tools – fire and logging/thinning.
 - ♦ Forests need to be thinned “properly” even where they've been logged. What's the hold-up on doing hands-on land management?
 - ♦ Need to get forests healthy and ready to log in future years.
 - ♦ Is tree planting occurring?
 - ♦ How are you going to replace the early seral tree species?
 - ♦ The health of the forest is the most important thing.
- What standards apply to restoration? To who's standards or what standards will the forests be restored?
- The Forest Service has no clue of historic conditions.
- If we don't address forest health issues now and clean up the forests, we “will” have real water quality issues because of catastrophic fires and other reasons.
- Difficulty in understanding the potassium deficiency issue and what does it mean to health of the vegetation.
- Need information about the Forest Plans process.
 - ♦ Frustration with the process.
 - ♦ Amendments to the Forest Plan seem to happen every year.
- Need to explain programmatic nature of Forest Plans vs. site-specific documents.
 - ♦ It's difficult to provide comments when I have site-specific issues/concerns when Forest Plans revision is broad in scope. How do I make comments about my special area during Forest Plans revision?
- What happens if Forest Plans revision is appealed and/or litigated?
- If the funding goes away for Forest Plans revision, what happens to the schedule?
- Which Planning Rule are you going to use, 1982 or the 2002?
- What happens if the new Planning Rule becomes final during our revision process? How does the decision-maker decide which planning regulations to use?
- What will happen with the changes that happen between now and 2005? How will they affect the new revised Forest Plans?
- Too much planning – planning to plan.
- Analysis paralysis.
 - ♦ Appeal process is so ambiguous. Concern about people who appeal forest management issues from out-of-state and don't know the area.
 - ♦ Why can anyone with their viewpoint, not necessarily substantiated, be able to stop or dictate how a project is done or appeal it, when the specialists are in the Forest Service? Let the professionals do their jobs.

Planning and Decision Making Process Continued:

- ♦ Misuse and abuse of the appeals/litigation system – needs to revise the appeals process.
- The Chief said 40% of the Forest Service budget is being spent on planning and conflicting mandates. Analysis process is based on judges’ decision.
- Accountability for our actions is a critical component to a new Forest Plan.
- How effective will the Forest Plans revision team be in covering such a big area, two forests?
- Appropriations not conducive to achieving all objectives, ie. aquatic restoration, weeds, etc.
- What happens if the 15 years expires and the revision is not completed?

Implementation and Monitoring:

- How does the FS ensure that we can implement and monitor the Forest Plan, financially? Will the Forest Service prioritize how and what we implement and use this based on the funding given by Congress?

Land Exchanges:

- How are we going to address in Forest Plans revision?

Laws and Policy:

- Which laws take precedence over other laws? The Forest Service has so many agencies/people telling them what to do and who or what law takes precedence?
- Does the Forest Service really have to comply with all the laws mandated by US Fish and Wildlife Service?
- Some of the laws that the Forest Service has to follow go against public viewpoints.
- Need to enforce the laws and regulations.

Public Involvement and Public Comment:

- Forest Service needs to establish focus groups throughout the Forest Plans revision process.
 - ♦ We need to find common ground. What can we agree on?
 - ♦ Set up study groups for specific areas ie. Tobacco Valley area.
 - ♦ Suggestion and agreement amongst the audience for the Forest Service to bring divergent groups together to work together and come up with solutions to issues. Encourages the Forest Service to proactively make this happen.
- How do we use public comment? Did you really listen to us? Look for a lot of ways to share with the public what the Forest Service heard.
- Look for other ways to engage and reach the public. How does the FS get more people involved and interested?
 - ♦ Different times for meetings and different methods of informing the public.
- Concern about the past public involvement with last Forest Plan and the result was not favorable. What will be different with this plan revision?
 - ♦ Does the Forest Service really want the public involved?
 - ♦ Want to see real public involvement.
- It’s difficult to provide comments when I have site-specific issues/concerns when Forest Plans revision is broad in scope. How do I make comments about my special area during Forest Plans revision?
- The Forest Service needs to share comments from both sides of the issue.
- How much weight does public comment have in decisions in the Forest Plan?
- Show how all resources integrate with one another and affect one another.
- Did you have a meeting in Missoula because there is a lot of people from there that recreate on the IPNFs?
- When is the best time for special interest groups to provide comment and suggest an alternative?

The information in the above list of public comments is also available on the KIPZ website presented in two ways: 1) what was heard in each community and, 2) what was heard collectively on each issue. This information is valuable in showing which issues are important in which communities and will be valuable

in identifying management options in the proposed revised Forest Plans that are responsive to local concerns, where possible.

Tribal Consultation

It is the responsibility of the Forest Service to recognize and honor the government-to-government relationship that exists between the United States government and tribal governments. The objective is to work effectively with the tribes in ways that they feel are meaningful government-to-government relations. All of the tribes that are within or adjacent to the KIPZ have been contacted by the appropriate Forest Supervisor regarding the Forest Plan Revision effort.

The KIPZ planning effort could potentially involve seven tribal governments. The following tribal groups requested a presentation and meetings were held by KIPZ planning team members and the Forest Supervisors: Coeur d'Alene Indian Nation, Kootenai Tribe of Idaho, Kalispell Indian Community of the Kalispell Reservation, and the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribe. The following tribes have been contacted, but they have not requested a meeting or presentation to discuss the KIPZ Forest Plan Revision process: Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho and the Spokane Tribe of the Spokane Reservation. The Confederated Tribe of the Colville Reservation was also contacted and there has been no expressed interest in consulting on the KIPZ Forest Plan Revision process.

The objectives of the initial meetings with these tribal groups was three fold: (1) to discuss how we can accomplish meaningful government-to-government relationships as defined by the tribes, (2) identify appropriate contact people, and (3) begin discussing and identifying issues important to the tribes. These discussions will continue throughout the Forest Plan Revision process and at any time requested by a tribal group.

Collaboration Activities

The success of any project depends heavily on the agencies ability to create an atmosphere for effective collaboration and to honestly listen, be open to what the public has to say and to allow true participation. Currently, a collaboration strategy is being developed and will be one of the many public involvement tools that we will use to inform and engage people in the Forest Plan Revision effort. We view collaborative planning not as consensual decision-making, but rather a shared understanding and learning process. We recognize we cannot eliminate the controversy inherent in some public land issues. However, collaboration promotes our ability to better understand each other and appreciate the choices and trade-offs that must be made. Collaboration also promotes learning from people who contribute new and creative ideas we may not have considered otherwise.

Public notice of dates, times, and locations for any upcoming meetings will be provided in local newspapers, posted on the KIPZ website <http://www.fs.fed.us/kipz>, and notices/newsletters to those on our email and hard mail Forest Plan Revision mailing lists.

Next Steps

The following is a list of ongoing and immediately upcoming public involvement activities, or activities involving public comment:

- **Availability of the AMS and the AMS Technical Report** - These two documents are posted on the KIPZ website <http://www.fs.fed.us/kipz>. They will also be distributed to tribal governments, elected officials, Forest Service offices, and libraries.
 - **Close of the scoping comment period** - Content analysis of public comments received through scoping will be done and used in the formulation of the DEIS and proposed revised Forest Plans.
 - **Collaboration Activities** - The next round of Collaboration activities and/or meetings will be posted on our website, in our next newsletter and local newspapers as soon as they are finalized.
-

Sources of Information

Website (www.fs.fed.us/kipz) – The KIPZ website is continuously being updated and kept current. Currently, open house public comments, the newsletter, news releases, this document and the AMS Technical Report, and other information are posted on the site. Content analysis results, an additional newsletter, and other information are expected to be posted in the next few months. For the most current information, the public should view our website.

Contact Information - If someone requires information via regular mail, they need to request to be on our mailing list by sending a note to:

USDA Forest Service
ATTN: KIPZ Revision Team
1101 U.S. Hwy. 2 West
Libby, MT 59923

or an email to r1_kipz_revision@fs.fed.us.

Chapter Three - Literature Citations

- Agee, J.K. 1993. Fire ecology of Pacific Northwest forests. Island Press, Suite 300, 1718 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, 20009. 493 pp.
- Attaran, M. 1986. Industrial diversity and economic performance in U.S. areas. *Annals of Regional Science*, Vol. 20, No. 2:44-55.
- Baker, W. L. 1994. Restoration of landscape structure altered by fire suppression. *Conservation Biology* 8:763-769.
- Bailey, R.G., P.E. Avers, T.King and W.H. McNabb (editors and compilers). 1994. Ecoregions and subregions of the U.S. prepared in cooperation with the ECOMAP Team of the USDA Forest Service and the US Geological Survey.
- Banci, V. 1994. Wolverine. *in* L. F. Ruggiero, K. B. Aubry, S. W. Buskirk, L. J. Lyon, and W. J. Zielinski tech. Eds. The scientific basis for conserving forest carnivores American marten, fisher, lynx, and wolverine in the western United States. USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experimental Research Station. Gen. Tech. Rpt. RM-254. Fort Collins CO. p.110-119.
- Barbour M.G. and W.D. Billings 2000. North American Terrestrial Vegetation (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom. 708 pp.
- Bell, Dana. 2000. OHV & Hunting Summit. Preliminary Report. Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks.
- Bosworth, D. 2001. Interim Directive no.1920-2001-1, Establishes a policy for consideration of proposed projects within inventoried roadless areas. December 14, 2001. USDA Forest Service, Washington, DC.
- Bosworth, D. 2001. Letter to Regional Foresters, Station Directors, and WO staff regarding delegation or authority/interim protection of roadless areas. June 7, 2001, Washington, DC: USDA, Forest Service. 2 pp.
- Bull, E. L. 1980. Resource partitioning among woodpeckers in northeastern Oregon. PhD. Dissertation. University of Idaho Moscow, ID. pp.3-8.
- Barbour, M.G. and W.D. Billings. 2000. North American terrestrial vegetation – second edition. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 708 pp.
- Byler, J.W. and S.K. Hagle. 2000. Successional functions of forest pathogens and insects; Ecosystems M332a and M333d in northern Idaho and western Montana – Volume 1. Summary. Missoula, MT: USDA, Forest Service, Northern Region. 33 pp.
- Campbell, P.R. 1996. Population Projections for States, by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1995 to 2050. Report PPL-47, US Bureau of Census, Population Division, Department of Commerce. <http://www.census.gov/prod/1/pop/p25-1130/>
- Cassirer, E. F., J. D. Reichel, R. L. Wallen, and E. C. Atkinson. 1996. Harlequin duck (*Histrionicus histrionicus*) conservation assessment and strategy for the U.S. Rocky Mountains. pp.9-11.
- Cassirer E. F., Groves, C.R. and Genter, D. L.1994. Coeur d'Alene Salamander Conservation Assessment. USDA Forest Service Northern Region, Idaho Dept Fish and Game, Montana Natural Heritage Program. Helena, MT 55 pp
- Chapin, F. S., M. S. Torn, and M. Tateno. 1996. Principles of ecosystem sustainability. *American Naturalist* 148:1016-1037.
- Chatters, J.C. and D.M. Leavell. 1994. Smeads Bench Fen: a 1500 year history of fire and succession in the hemlock forests of the lower Clark Fork Valley, northwestern Montana. Draft form only. USDA Forest Service, Kootenai National Forest, Libby, MT. 77 pp.
- Cole, D.W., S.P. Gessel, S.F. Dice. 1967. Distribution and cycling of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, and calcium in a second-growth Douglas-fir ecosystem *in* "Symposium on Primary Productivity and Mineral Cycling in Natural Ecosystems." Ecological Society of America, American Association for the Advancement of Science Annual Meeting, New York, NY.
- Cope, M.J., and W.G. Chaloner. 1985. Wildfire: An interaction of biological and physical processes *in* Tiffney, B.H. (ed.), Geological factors and the evolution of plants: pp. 257-277. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- Copeland, J. P. 1996. Biology of the wolverine in central Idaho. M.S. thesis, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID. 94-99.
- Cordell, Ken H. 1999. Outdoor Recreation in American Life. A National Assessment of Demand and Supply Trends. Sagamore Publishing.

- Costanza, R., R. d'Arge, R. de Groot, et al. 1997. The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature* 387:253-260.
- Daily, G. C. 1997. *Nature's Services: Societal Dependence on Natural Ecosystems*. Island Press, Washington, D. C.
- Davis, K.P. 1959. *Forest fire: Control and use*. McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- De Leo, G.A. and S. Levin. 1997. The multifaceted aspects of ecosystem integrity. *Conservation Ecology* [online] 1(1):3. www.consecol.org/vol1/iss1/art3. 20 pp.
- Dobkin, D. S. 1992. Neotropical migrant landbirds in the Northern Rockies and Great Plains. USDA Forest Service Northern Region. Pub. No. R1-93-34. Missoula, MT. B-42.
- Dolan, P. M. 1994. The common loon (*Gavia immer*) in the northern region: biology and management recommendations. USDA Forest Service, Northern Region, Missoula, MT. 19-27.
- Dombeck, M. 1998. News release and accompanying speech from Associated Press, 3/2/98. Washington, DC. www.fs.fed.us/news/agenda/sp30298.html, 9 pp.
- Dubois, K. and D. Becker. 1987. Identification of Montana's birds of prey. *Montana Outdoors*, MT Dept. Fish, Wildlife & Parks. Helena, MT. 20pp.
- Dumroese, D.S., M.F. Jurgensen, A.E. Harvey. 2002. Fire and fire suppression impacts on forest soil carbon (ch. 13) in *The potential of U.S. forest soils to sequester carbon and mitigate the greenhouse effect*, edited by J.M. Kimble. Lewis Publishers. 448 pp.
- Dunster, J.A. and K.J. Dunster. 1996. *Dictionary of natural resource management*. UBC Press, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC. 363 pp.
- Engstrom, R. T., S. Gilbert, M. Hunter, D. Merriweather [and others]. 1999. Practical applications of disturbance ecology to natural resource management. pp 313-342 in R. C. Szaro, N. C. Johnson, W. T. Sexton and A. J. Malk, eds. *Ecological Stewardship: A Common Reference for Ecosystem Management*. Elsevier Science, Oxford, U. K.
- Federal Register, 2002. Notice of Intent to revise Land Management Plans for Kootenai and Idaho Panhandle NFs. 4/30/2002 [FR Doc. 02-10548].
- Federal Register, 2001. Special Areas; Roadless Area Conservation; Final Rule. Vol. 66, No. 9, Jan, 12, 2001 FR Doc. 01-17249 pp. 3244-3273
- Federal Register, 2000. Unified Federal Policy for a Watershed Approach to Federal Land and Resource Management. Vol. 65, No. 202, October 18, 2000. FR Doc. 00-110 pp.62565-62572. www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/EPA-IMPACT/2000/October/Day-18/i26566.htm
- Finklin, A. I. and W.C. Fischer. 1987. *Climate of the Deception Creek Experimental Forest, Northern Idaho*: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, Ogden, UT. General Technical Report INT-226. 73 pp.
- Furniss, M. J., T. D. Roelofs, and C. S. Yee. 1991. Road construction and maintenance in Meehan, W.R., editor. *Influences of forest and rangeland management on salmonid fisheries and their habitat*. American Fisheries Society Special Publication 19, Bethesda, MD.
- Garrison, M.T. and J.A. Moore. 1998. Nutrient management: A summary and review. Intermountain Forest Tree Nutrition Cooperative Supplemental Report 98-5. 45 pp.
- Garrison-Johnston, M. T., J.A. Moore, G.J. Niehoff. 2001. Douglas-fir Beetle infestations are associated with certain rock and stand types in the inland northwestern United States. IFTNC/ USFS Douglas-fir Beetle and Geology Analysis Manuscript Draft (7/20/01). 42 pp.
- Genter, D. L. and K. A. Jurist. 1995. *Bats of Montana*. Montana Natural History Program, Helena, MT. 11pp.
- Glickstein, D. 1987. Twain's great Northwest tour. *Washington Magazine*. 2(2):45
- Goggans, R., R. D. Dixon, and L. C. Seminara. 1989. Habitat use by three-toed and black-backed woodpeckers Deschutes National Forest, Oregon. USDA Forest Service, Deschutes N.F. Tech. Rpt. 87-3-02. 43pp.
- Graham, R.T., A.E. Harvey, M.F. Jurgensen, T.B. Jain, J.R. Tonn, D.S. Page-Dumroese. 1994. Managing coarse woody debris in forests of the Rocky Mountains. Research Paper INT-RP-477, USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, Ogden, UT. 12 pp.
- Gregory, S.V., F.J. Swanson, W.A. McKee, and K.W. Cummins. 1991. An ecosystem perspective of riparian zones: Focus on links between land and water. *Bioscience* 41:540-551.

- Gucinski, Hermann, M. J. Furniss, R. R. Ziemer, M. H. Brookes. 2001. Forest roads: a synthesis of scientific information. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-509. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland OR. 103p.
- Hagle, S.K., J.W. Schwandt, T.L. Johnson, S.J. Kegley, C.S. Bell Randall, J.E. Taylor, I.B. Lockman, N.J. Sturdevant. 2000. Succession functions of forest pathogens and insects: Ecosections M332a and M333d in northern Idaho and western Montana. Volume 2: Results. USDA Forest Service, Cooperative Forestry-Forest Health Protection, Northern Region. FHP Report No. 00-11, Missoula, Montana. 101pp.
- Hansen, P.L., R.D. Pfister, K. Boggs, B.J. Cook, J.Joy, and D.K. Hinckley. 1995. Classification and management of Montana's riparian and wetland sites. Montana Forest and Conservation Experiment Station, School of Forestry, The University of Montana, Missoula, MT. Misc. Pub. #54. 646pp.
- Harp, A. 1996. Social issues in Boundary County, Idaho: Results of a community survey. University of Idaho, Moscow, ID.
- Harris, Justin, and Stephen McCool. 1994. Research Report 35. The Montana Trail Users Study. Institute for Tourism and Recreation Research.
- Heinemeyer, K. S. and J. L. Jones. 1994. Fisher biology and management: a literature review and adaptive management strategy. USDA Forest Service, Northern Region, Missoula, MT. pp.7-17.
- Hickman, G. R., B. G. Dixon, and J. Corn. 1999. Small Mammals. pp. 4.1-4.16 in G. Joslin and H. Youmans, coordinators. The effects of recreation on Rocky Mountain wildlife: A Review for Montana. Committee on Effects of Recreation on Wildlife, Montana Chapter of The Wildlife Society. 307 pp.
- Hoff, R. J., G.I. McDonald. 1994. Disease and insect resistance in conifers associated with the cedar/hemlock ecosystem. in Baumgartner, D. M.; J.E. Lotan, J.R. Tonn compilers. Interior cedar-hemlock-white pine forests: ecology and management: Symposium Proceedings: 1993, March 2-4. Pullman, WA: Washington State University, Dept. of Natural Resources: 151-155.
- Huston, M.A. 1994. Biological Diversity: the coexistence of species on changing landscapes. Cambridge University Press. London, U.K.
- Hutto, R. L. 1995. Composition of bird communities following stand-replacement fires in Northern Rocky Mountain (U.S.) conifer forests. *Conservation Biology*. 9(5): 1041-1058.
- Idaho's Strategic Plan for Managing Noxious Weeds. 1999. Idaho State Department of Agriculture. Boise, Idaho. 11pp.
- Intermountain Forest Tree Nutrition Cooperative Annual (IFTNC) Report. 1998 *update to Twelfth Annual report Part 1: Ponderosa pine response to nitrogen or nitrogen plus potassium fertilization*. IFTNC. 1992. Univ. of Idaho, Moscow, ID. 14 pp.
- Impact Assessment, Inc., 1995. Social Science Assessment for the Kootenai National Forest. *Contract for USDA Forest Service, Kootenai National Forest, Libby, MT*. 318 pp.
- Jones, J. L. and E. O. Garton. 1994. Selection of successional stages by fisher in North-Central Idaho in S. W. Buskirk, A. S. Harestad, M. G. Raphael, and R. A. Powell eds. Marten, Sable, and Fishers Biology and Conservation. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY. pp.377-387.
- Karr. 1991. Biological integrity: A long-neglected aspect of water resource management. *Ecological Application* 1:66-84.
- Leavell, D.M. 2000. Vegetation and process of the Kootenai National Forest. Dissertation Abstracts, catalog #9970-793, vol. 61-04B, starting on page 1744, Ann Arbor, MI. 508 pp.
- Lee, D.C., J.R. Sedell, B.E. Rieman, R.F. Thjurow, and J.E. Williams. 1997. Broadscale assessment of aquatic species and habitats in Quigley, T.M. and S.J. Arbelvide, technical editors, An assessment of ecosystem components in the Interior Columbia Basin and portions of the Klamath and Great Basins, volume 3. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-405.
- Leiberg, J.B. 1897. General report on a botanical survey of the Coeur d' Alene Mountains in Idaho during the summer of 1895. Contributions from the U.S. National Herbarium vol. 5, no. 1, 85 pp. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.
- Leopold, L.B., M.G. Wolman and J.P. Miller. 1964. Fluvial processes in geomorphology. W.H. Freeman and Co., San Francisco, CA. 522 pp
- Liknes, G.A. and P. J. Graham. 1988. Westslope cutthroat trout in Montana: Life history, status, and management in Gresswell, R. E., editor, Status and management of interior stocks of cutthroat trout. American Fisheries Society Symposium 4, pp 53-60

- Losensky, J.B. 1993. Historical vegetation in Region One by climatic section. Unpublished USDA Forest Service resource report. Region One, Missoula, MT.
- Lyle, C.R. 1990. Boundary County gem community attitude exercise. University of Idaho, Moscow, ID.
- McCallum, D. A. 1994. Review of technical knowledge: flammulated owls *in* Hayward, G. D. and J. Verner, tech. Eds. Flammulated, boreal, and great gray owls in the United States: A technical conservation assessment. General Technical Report, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fort Collins, CO.
- Monnig, E. and J. Byler. 1992. Forest health and ecological integrity in the Northern Rockies. USDA Forest Service Report FPM 92-7. 20 pp.
- Montana Dept. Fish, Wildlife & Parks. 1992. Statewide elk management plan of Montana. H. B. Youmans, compiler. MT Dept. Fish, Wildlife & Parks, Helena, MT. pp. 38-43 and 56-59.
- Montana Weed Management Plan. 2001. Weed Summit Steering Committee and Weed Management Task Force. Weed Management Services. Helena, MT 59624 57pp.
- Moore J.A., D.P. Hanley, H.N. Chappell, J.S. Shumway, S.B. Webster, J.M. Mandzak. 1998. Fertilizing eastern Washington coniferous forests, Washington State University Cooperative Extension Service, Extension. Bull. EB 1874, Pullman, WA. 18 pp.
- Moore, J.A., P. Mika, T. Shaw, M. Garrison-Johnston. 2001. Foliar nutrient characteristics of four conifer species in the Interior Northwest, USA, pages 12-18, 28, and 38. Department of Forest Resources, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID.
- Murphy, E. C. and W. A. Lehnhausen. 1998. Density and foraging ecology of woodpeckers following a stand-replacement fire. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 62(4):1359-1372.
- Mussehl, T. W. and F. W. Howell. 1971. Game management in Montana. MT Fish and Game Dept., Game Manage. Div., Fed. Aid Proj. W-3-C. Helena, MT. Pgs. 129-131.
- Nesser. 1997. Ecological units of the Northern Region: Subsections. General technical report INT-GTR-369. USDA Forest Service. Intermountain Research Station. Ogden UT. 88 pp.
- Neuenschwander, Leon F.; J.W. Byler, A.E. Harvey, G.I. McDonald, D.S. Ortiz, H.L. Osborne, G.C. Snyder, A.C. Zack. 1999. White pine in the American west: a vanishing species – can we save it. General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-35. USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fort Collins, CO. 20 pp.
- Northwest R C & D. 2002. Northwest Regional Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy. Northwest Resource Conservation & Development.
- Pang, P.C., H.J. Barclay, K. McCullough. 1987. Above-ground nutrient distribution within trees and stands in thinned and fertilized Douglas-fir. *Canadian Journal of Forestry Research*. 17:1379-1384.
- Parker, Julia, J.D. Wulforst and Jennifer Kamm. 2002. Social Assessment for the Idaho Panhandle National Forest. University of Idaho, Moscow, ID.
- Pearson, D. E. 1999. Small mammals of the Bitterroot National Forest: A literature review and annotated bibliography. General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-25. USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fort Collins, CO. 14-24.
- Poff, L.R., J.D. Allen, M.B. Bain, J.R. Karr, K.L. Prestegard, B.D. Richter, R.E. Sparks, and J.C. Stromberg. 1997. The natural flow regime. *Bioscience* 47:769-784.
- Postel, S., and S. Carpenter. 1997. Freshwater ecosystem services. pp. 195-214 *in* G. C. Daily, ed. *Nature's services: societal dependence on natural ecosystems*. Island Press, Washington, D. C.
- Pyne, S.J. 1982. *Fire in America: a cultural history of wildland and rural fire*. Princeton University Press. Princeton, NJ. 654 pp.
- Powers, R.F. 1982. Principles and concepts of forest soil fertility. USDA Forest Service, Pacific SW Experiment Station., Redding, CA.
- Reeves, G.H., K. M. Burnett, and J. R. Sedell. 1995. A disturbance-based ecosystem approach to maintaining and restoring freshwater habitats of evolutionarily significant units of anadromous salmonids in the Pacific Northwest *in* *Evolution and the Aquatic Ecosystem: Defining unique units in population conservation*. Nielson, J., ed. Symposium 17, American fisheries Society, Bethesda, MD. pp 334-349.

- Rieman, B. E. and K. A. Apperson, 1989. Status and analysis of salmonid fisheries: westslope cutthroat trout synopsis and analysis of fishery information. Job Performance Report, Project F-73-R-11, Subproject II, Study 1, Job 1. Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Boise, ID. 113 pp.
- Rockwell, F. I. 1917. Western white pine bulletin: January 10, 1917. USDA Forest Service, Northern Region, Office of Silviculture, Missoula, MT. 215 pp. + appendices, in two parts.
- Ruediger, W. et al. 2000. Canada Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy. USDA FS, USDI FWS, USDI BLM, USDI NPS.
- Samson, Fred. 2002 (DRAFT) Pre-intensive Settlement Observations of Wildlife in Northwestern Montana and Northern Most Idaho. 22 pp.
- Samson, F. B. 1994. Conserving biological diversity in sustainable ecosystems. Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources 57:308-320.
- Schumm, S.A. and D.A. Meyer. 1979. Morphology of alluvial rivers of the Great Plains. pp. 9-14. *In*: Proceedings of the 31st Annual Meeting of the Great Plains Agricultural Council, Great Plains Agricultural Council Publication # 91.
- Shannon, C.E. and W. Weaver. 1949. The mathematical theory of communication. The University of Illinois Press, Urbana, IL.
- Shaw, T.M., J.A. Moore, J.D. Marshall. 1998. Root chemistry of Douglas-fir seedlings grown under different nitrogen and potassium regimes. Canadian Journal of Forestry Research. 28 (1998) 1566-1573.
- Shore, T.L., S. Safranyik, W.G. Riel, M. Fertuson, J. Castonguy. 1999. Evaluation of factors affecting tree stand susceptibility to the Douglas-fir beetle (*Coleoptera:Scolytidae*), Canadian Entomology 131 (1999) 831-839.
- Smith and Fisher. 1997. Fire ecology of the forest habitat types of northern Idaho. USDA Forest Service General Technical Report INT-GTR-363. 142 pp.
- Thomas, J.W. 1996. Forest Perspective on ecosystem management. Ecological Applications. 6(3), 1996. pp. 703-705.
- Travel Montana. 2002. Report on the Montana Tourism Industry. <http://www.travelmontana.org/marketingplan/marketingplan2002.pdf>
- USDA Forest Service 2003. AMS Technical Report conducted for the Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS) for Revision of the Kootenai and Idaho Panhandle Forest Plans.
- USDA Forest Service. 2002a. Monitoring for Forest Management Unit Scale Sustainability: The Local Unit Criteria and Indicators Development (LUCID) Test.
- USDA Forest Service. 2002b. Forest plan monitoring and evaluation report fiscal year 2001. Kootenai National Forest. Libby, MT. 76 pp.
- USDA Forest Service, 2002c. Forest plan monitoring and evaluation report fiscal year 2001. Idaho Panhandle National Forest. Coeur d'Alene, ID. 123 pp.
- USDA Forest Service. 2002d. FEIS Forest Plan Amendments for Motorized Access Management within the Selkirk and Cabinet-Yaak Grizzly Bear Recovery Zones. USDA Forest Service. Kootenai, Lolo and Idaho Panhandle National Forests, www.fs.fed.us/r1/wildlife/igbc/scy/amendments.htm
- USDA Forest Service. 2002e. Upper Kootenai sub-basin review. Kootenai National Forest, Libby, MT 59923.
- USDA Forest Service. 2001a. 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy. A Collaborative Approach for Reducing Wildland Fire Risks to Communities and Environments. www.na.fs.fed.us/nfp/pa/major_reports/10yr_strat_plan/final_10yr_strategy.htm.
- USDA Forest Service 2001b. Road Management Policy Notice. http://www.fs.fed.us/eng/road_mgt/01_03_01_final_disk_road_mgmt_policy_notice.pdf
- USDA Forest Service. 2001c. Northern Region Off-Highway Vehicle Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Plan Amendment for Montana, North Dakota, and Portions of South Dakota.
- USDA Forest Service. 2001d. Forest plan monitoring and evaluation report fiscal year 2000. Kootenai National Forest. Libby, MT. 76 pp
- USDA Forest Service. 2000a. USDA Forest Service Strategic Plan (2000 Version). 73 pp.
- USDA Forest Service and USDI Bureau of Land Management. 2000b. Managing the Impact of Wildfires on Communities and the Environment: A Report to the President in Response to the Wildfires of 2000. USDA and USDI. Available on the web www.fireplan.gov/president.cfm/

- USDA Forest Service. 2000c. RPA Assessment of Forest and Rangelands. <http://svinet2.fs.fed.us/rl/rpa/rpaasses.pdf>
- USDA Forest Service. 2000d. R1/R4 Fire Planning Framework. USDA Forest Service, Northern Region. Missoula, MT.
- USDA Forest Service. 2000e. Forest Service Roadless Area Conservation, FEIS. November 2000. USDA Forest Service. Washington, DC.
- USDA Forest Service. 2000f. Protecting people and sustaining resources in fire-adapted ecosystems – a cohesive strategy. The Forest Service Management Response to the GAO report GAO/RCED-99-65. USDA Forest Service, Washington, DC. 89pp.
- USDA Forest Service. 2000g. Forest Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Report fiscal year 2000. Idaho Panhandle National Forest. Coeur d’Alene, ID.
- USDA, USDI. Undated. Unified Federal Policy for Ensuring a Watershed Approach to Federal Land and Resource Management Notice of proposed policy 3410-11-P
- USDA Forest Service Committee of Scientists. 1999a. Sustaining the people’s lands. 193 pp.
- USDA Forest Service. 1999b. Letter to Forest Supervisors in Region 1 updating the Northern Region’s sensitive species list. USDA Forest Service, Northern Region, Missoula, MT. 4 pp.
- USDA Forest Service and USDI Bureau of Land Management. 1999c. Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP). Supplemental DEIS, Volume 1, Resource Management, Chapter 2, pp 26+ Rev. June 24, 1999.
- USDA Forest Service. 1999d. Vegetation response unit characterizations and target landscape prescriptions. Kootenai National Forest. Libby, MT. 174 pp.
- USDA Forest Service. 1998a. Forest plan monitoring and evaluation report fiscal year 1997. August 1998. Kootenai National Forest. Libby, MT. 93 pp.
- USDA Forest Service. 1998b. Forest Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Report fiscal year 1998. Idaho Panhandle National Forest. Coeur d’Alene, ID. 163 pp.
- USDA Forest Service. 1998c. Northern Region Overview. USDA Forest Service, Northern Region, Missoula, MT. 192 pp.
- USDA Forest Service and USDI Bureau of Land Management. 1997a. Upper Columbia River Basin DEIS, Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project. UDSA Forest Service, Intermountain and Northern Regions; USDI Bureau of Land Management, ID, MT, NV, UT and WY.
- USDA Forest Service. 1997b. Great Lakes Ecological Assessment. www.ncrs.fs.fed.us/gla/elc/purpose.htm
- USDA Forest Service. 1997c. Integration of wildland fire management into land management planning, a desk guide. USDA Forest Service, Fire and Aviation Management, Washington, DC.
- USDA Forest Service. 1996. A framework for ecosystem management in the Interior Columbia Basin including portions of the Klamath and Great Basins. Haynes, Richard W.; Graham, Russell T.; Quigley, Thomas M., tech. eds. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-374. Pacific Northwest Research Station. Portland, OR. 66 pp
- USDA Forest Service. 1995a. Sustaining ecosystems: a conceptual approach. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region and Station, San Francisco, CA. R5-EM-TP-001. 212 pp.
- USDA Forest Service. 1995b. Kootenai National Forest Sensitive Plant Field Guide, 4th ed. Kootenai National Forest, Libby MT.
- USDA Forest Service and USDI Bureau of Land Management. 1995c. Federal wildland fire management, policy & program review – final report. National Interagency Fire Center, Boise, ID. 45 pp.
- USDA Forest Service. 1995d. Inland Native Fish Strategy (INFISH) Environmental Assessment Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact. Idaho Panhandle National Forest. Coeur d’Alene, ID.
- USDA Forest Service, 1994a. Ecological Subregions of the United States: Section Descriptions. USDA Forest Service. Washington, DC.
- USDA Forest Service, 1994b. Adaptive ecosystem management in the Pacific Northwest. Bormann, B.T., et al. GTR-341 94-162. Pacific Northwest Research Station. Portland, OR.

- USDA Forest Service, 1987a. Kootenai NF Forest Plan. Vol 1,2. USDA Forest Service. Kootenai National Forest. Libby, MT.
- USDA Forest Service, 1987b. Final EIS for the Kootenai NF Forest Plan. Volume 1, pp IV-6 thru IV-13. Libby, MT.
- USDA Forest Service. 1987c. Idaho Panhandle NFs Forest Plan. Vol 1,2. USDA Forest Service. Idaho Panhandle National Forests. Coeur d'Alene, ID. 65 FR 8834, Part IV. USDA, NOAA, DOD, USDI, EPA, TVA, COE. 2000. Unified Federal Policy for A Watershed Approach to Federal Land and Resource Management, pp. 62566-62572, October 18, 2000.
- UD Department of Commerce. BEARFACTS 1990-2000. US Dept. Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Accounts Data.
- USDI Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002. Update of Forest- and District-wide species list, Endangered, Threatened, Candidate and Species of Concern within the Idaho Panhandle National Forests. SP# 1-9-03-SP-002. October 2, 2002. Spokane, WA.
- USDI Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998. Grizzly update news on grizzly bear recovery activities in the states of Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, and Washington from the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee. 10pp.
- Weaver, H. 1974. Effects of fire on temperate forests: Western United States. *In*: Kozlowski, T.T. and C.E. Ahlgren. Fire and ecosystems (Chap 9). Academic Press, New York, NY.
- Weaver, H. 1943. Fire as an ecological and silvicultural factor in the ponderosa pine region of the Pacific slope. *J. For.* 41(1):7-15.
- Werner, J.K., and Reichel, J.D. 1994. Amphibian and reptile survey of the Kootenai National Forest, 1994. Montana Natural Heritage Program, Helena, MT 104 pp.
- White, Mark. 1998. Historical Wildlife Index (sorted by subject) Draft 11-12-98. USDA Forest Service, Kootenai National Forest. Libby, MT.
- Wu, J., and O. L. Loucks. 1995. From balance of nature to hierarchical patch dynamics: a paradigm shift in ecology. *The Quarterly Review of Biology* 70: 439-456.
- Zack, A. C. 1994. Early succession in western hemlock habitat types of northern Idaho. Dissertation. University of Idaho. Moscow, ID. 297 pp.
- Zack, A. C. and P. Morgan. 1994. Fire history on the Idaho Panhandle National Forest. Review draft on file at: Coeur d'Alene, ID: USDA, Forest Service, Idaho Panhandle National Forest, Coeur d'Alene, ID. 44 pp.

Chapter Four - Glossary and Acronyms

Active Management - Management approach in which humans actively manipulate ecosystems through timber harvesting and thinning to improve forest health and to reduce fire hazard.

Activity area - a land area affected by a management activity to which soil quality standards are applied. Activity areas must be feasible to monitor and include harvest units within timber sale areas, prescribed burn areas, grazing areas or pastures within range allotments, riparian areas, recreational areas, and alpine areas.

Appropriate Management Response – Specific actions taken in response to a wildland fire to implement protection and fire use objectives.

Aquatic Biota are living things dependent on water. In this document, the term refers to fish and amphibians.

Aquatic sustainability - The inherent capability or existing potential for a watershed system to provide water quality, water bodies (streams, lakes, wetlands, ponds, etc.), riparian environs (wetlands, flood plains, stream banks, lake shores, and other lands including terrestrial lands proximal to water bodies that can directly influence the water), and the biologic organisms that live in or are dependent on the water that are necessary to support the beneficial uses of the water.

Belt Super-group - comprised of a series of metasedimentary, geologic formations, including the Prichard, Burke, Revett, St. Regis, Upper Wallace, Lower Wallace, Striped Peak, Libby, Spokane, Helena, Empire, Snowslip, Shepard, Mount Shields, Bonner and McNamara.

Best Management Practices (BMPs) - A practice or usually a combination of practices that are determined by a State or a designated planning agency to be the most effective and practicable means (including technological, economic, and institutional considerations) of controlling point and nonpoint source pollutants at levels compatible with environmental quality goals.

Biological diversity (biodiversity) - The variety and abundance of species, their genetic composition, their communities, and the ecosystems and landscapes of which they are a part. As used in this document, biodiversity refers to native biological diversity; therefore, increases in species diversity resulting from

the introduction of nonnative species would not constitute an increase in biodiversity.

Collaboration – as used in this context means to work together in a cooperative relationship with Native American Tribes, agencies and the public in order to accomplish a desired goal.

Composition – The component tree, shrub, grass and forb classes in a stand or community.

Connectivity - The arrangements of habitats that allows organisms and ecological processes to move across the landscape; patches of similar habitats are either close together or linked by corridors of approved vegetation. The opposite of fragmentation.

Critical foliar nutrient levels - minimum concentration of a nutrient needed by a tree in order to function efficiently.

Current climatic period: The period of time since establishment of the modern major vegetation types, which typically encompasses the late Holocene Epoch (includes the present), and also including likely climatic conditions within the planning period. The current climatic period is typically centuries to millennia in length, a period of time that is long enough to encompass the variability that species and ecosystems have experienced. This period is considered to be prior to the 1880 and 1910 fire events and to approximately 2500 years ago.

Desired Future Condition - A portrayal of the land or resource conditions that are expected to result if goals and objectives are fully achieved.

Developed Recreation - Outdoor recreation requiring significant capital investment in facilities to handle a concentration of visitors on a relatively small area. Examples are ski areas, resorts, and campgrounds (OHV EIS)

Dispersed Recreation – Outdoor recreation in which visitors are diffused over relatively large areas. Where facilities or developments are provided, they are more for access and protection of the environment than for the comfort or convenience of the people. (OHV EIS)

Disturbance - Any relatively discrete event, either natural or human-induced, that causes a change in the existing condition of an ecological system.

Ecological integrity: Defined as the capability of supporting and maintaining a balanced, integrated, and adaptive community of organisms having species composition, diversity, and functional organization comparable to that of natural habitats of the region (Karr and Dudley 1981).

Ecological Process - The actions or events that link organisms and their environment, such as predation, mutualism, successional development, nutrient cycling, Carbon sequestration, primary productivity, and decay.

Ecosystem - An ecosystem is an interacting system of living organisms and their environment.

Ecosystem Diversity – The variety of ecological structures, communities, and processes across spatial scales such as regions, subregions, landscapes, and localities. Ecosystem diversity arises from variation in abiotic and biotic components and ecological processes over space and time.

Ecosystem management: This is a management practice and philosophy aimed at selecting, maintaining, and/or enhancing the ecological integrity of an ecosystem in order to ensure continued ecosystem health while providing resources, products, or non-consumptive values for humans. An integral part of ecosystem management is the maintenance of ecologically significant structure and processes within the ecosystem. The actions taken reflect the management goals and range from protection from human influence through to an increasing intensity of intervention to serve human needs.

Ecosystem Sustainability - The ability to maintain diversity, productivity, resilience to stress, health, and yields of desired values, resource uses, products, or services over time in an ecosystem while maintaining its integrity.

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) – EISs were authorized by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. Prepared with public participation, they assist decision makers by providing information, analysis and an array of action alternatives, allowing managers to see the probable effects of decisions on the environment. Generally, EISs are written for large-scale actions or geographical areas.

Endangered Species - a plant or animal species listed under the Endangered Species Act that is danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range

Environmental Assessment (EA) - EAs were authorized by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. They are concise, analytical documents prepared with public participation that determine if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed for a project or action. If an EA determines as EIS is not needed, the EA becomes the document allowing agency compliance with NEPA requirements.

Expected Weather Conditions - Those weather conditions indicated as common, likely, or highly probable based on current and expected trends and their comparison to historical weather records. These are the most probable weather conditions for this location and time. These conditions are used in making fire behavior forecasts for different scenarios (one necessary scenario involves fire behavior prediction under expected weather conditions).

Fire Exclusion - The disruption of a characteristic pattern of fire intensity and occurrence (primarily through fire suppression).

Fire Management Area (FMA) - A sub-geographic area within an FMU that represents a predefined ultimate acceptable management area for a fire managed for resource benefits. This predefined area can constitute a Maximum Manageable Area (MMA) and is useful for those units having light fuel types conducive to very rapid fire spread rates. Predefinition of these areas removes the timelag in defining an MMA after ignition and permits preplanning of the fire area; identification of threats to life, property, resources, and boundaries; and identification of initial actions.

Fire Management Plan (FMP) - A strategic plan that defines a program to manage wildland and prescribed fires and documents the fire management program in the approved land use plan. This plan is supplemented by operational procedures such as preparedness, preplanned dispatch, burn plans, and prevention. The fire implementation schedule that documents the fire management program in the approved forest plan alternative.

Fire Management Unit (FMU) - Any land management area definable by objectives, topographic features, access, values-to-be-protected, political boundaries, fuel types, or major fire regimes, etc, that set it apart from management characteristics of an adjacent unit, FMU's are delineated in FMP's. These units may have dominant management objectives and preselected strategies assigned to accomplish these objectives.

Fire Regime - The fire pattern across the landscape, characterized by occurrence interval and relative intensity. Fire regimes result from a unique combination of climate and vegetation. Fire regimes exist on a continuum from short-interval, low-intensity (stand maintenance) fires to long-interval, high-intensity (stand replacement) fires.

Fire Severity - The effects of fire on resources displayed in terms of benefit or loss.

Fire Suppression - The practice of controlling forest and rangeland fires in a safe, economical, and expedient fashion while meeting the natural resource objectives outlined in each forest's or grassland's land management plan.

Fire use - the combination of wildland fire use and prescribed fire application to meet resource objectives.

Fire-Adapted Ecosystem - An arrangement of populations that have made long-term genetic changes in response to the presence of fire in the environment.

Forest Health - The perceived condition of a forest derived from concerns about such factors as age, structure, composition, function, vigor, presence of unusual levels of insects or disease, and resilience to disturbance. Individual and cultural viewpoints, land management objectives, spatial and temporal scales, the relative health of the stands that make up the forest, and the appearance of the forest at a point which influences the perception and interpretation of forest health.

Forest Plan Direction - Allocation of areas to management prescriptions that consist of goals, objectives, standards and guidelines.

Forest Roads - As defined in Title 23, Section 101 of the United States Code (23 U.S.C. 101), any road wholly or partly within, or adjacent to, and serving the National Forest System and which is necessary for the protection, administration, and utilization of the National Forest System and the use and development of its resources. (FSM 7705)

Fuel Management - The practice of evaluating, planning, and executing the treatment of wildland fuel to control flammability and reduce the resistance to control through mechanical, chemical, biological, or manual means, or by wildland fire, in support of land management objectives.

Function – Includes energy flows of materials across and within the landscape and how one ecosystem influences another. Function also relates to energy

processes such as fire, hydrological processes (including floods), and matter and energy exchange throughout the food chain.

Functioning-At Risk (FAR) - Watersheds that are "functioning at risk" continue to have good physical, hydrologic and water quality integrity; however, present or ongoing adverse disturbances are likely to compromise that integrity if the present adverse disturbances are not modified or corrected. At Risk watersheds will have at least moderate physical, hydrologic, and water quality integrity even though they may have been substantially compromised by adverse disturbances.

Goal - A concise statement that describes a desired condition to be achieved sometime in the future. It is normally expressed in broad, general terms and is timeless in that it has no specific date by which it is to be completed. Goal statements form the principal basis from which objectives are developed.

Guideline - Preferable or advisable course of action.

Historic range of variability (HRV) - The variation in spatial, structural, compositional, and temporal characteristics of ecosystem elements as affected by minor climatic fluctuations and disturbances within the current climatic period. This range is measured during a reference period prior to intensive resource use and management. The range of historic variability is used as a baseline for comparison with current conditions to assess the degree of past change

IDT - Interdisciplinary Team. A team representing several disciplines to ensure coordinating planning of the various resources.

Integrity – The capacity to support and maintain a balanced, integrated, and adaptive biological system having the full range of elements and processes expected in a region's natural habitat.

Inventoried Roadless Areas – Undeveloped areas typically exceeding 5,000 acres that met the minimum criteria for wilderness consideration under the wilderness Act and that were inventoried during the Forest Service's Roadless Area Review and evaluation (RARE II) process, subsequent assessments, or forest planning. Those areas identified in a set of inventoried roadless area maps, contained in Forest Service Roadless Area Conservation, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Volume 2, dated November, 2000, which are held at the National Headquarters of the Forest Service, or any update, correction, or revision of those maps."

Landscape - An area composed of interacting, and interconnected patterns of habitats (ecosystems) that are repeated because of the geology, land form, soil, climate, biota, and human influences throughout, the areas. Landscape structure is formed by patches, connections, and the matrix. Landscape function is based on disturbance events, successional development of landscape structure, and flows of energy and nutrients through the structure of the landscape. A landscape is composed of watersheds and smaller ecosystems. It is the building block of biotic provinces and regions.

Management Area - An area with similar management objectives and a common management description.

Management Direction - A statement of multiple-use and other goals and objectives, the associated management prescriptions, and standards and guidelines for attaining them. Attainment Report

Management Prescription - Management practices and intensity (frequency and duration) selected and scheduled for application on a specific area to attain multiple-use and other goals and objectives.

Monitoring and Evaluation (of forest plan implementation) - Determine how well the objectives have been met and how closely management standards and guidelines have been applied. Can lead to recommendations for changes in management direction, amendments, or revisions to forest plans.

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) - is the basic national law for protection of the environment, passed by Congress in 1969. It sets policy and procedures for environmental protection, and authorizes Environmental Impact Statements and Environmental Assessments to be used as analytical tools to help managers make decisions.

National Forest System Road - A classified forest road under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service. The term “National Forest System roads” is synonymous with the term “forest development roads” as used in 23 U.S.C. 205. (FSM 7705)

Natural Ignition - A wildland fire ignited by a natural event such as lightning.

Nonnative invasive species - plant species that are introduced into an area in which they did not evolve, and in which they usually have few or no natural enemies to limit their reproduction and spread. These species can cause environmental harm by significantly changing the ecosystem composition, structure, or

processes, and can cause economic harm or harm to human health.

Not Properly Functioning (NPF) - Watersheds that are “**not properly functioning**” are operating and adjusting beyond that which can be considered to be in dynamic equilibrium; or the physical, hydrologic, or water quality integrity has been so compromised that restoration efforts may be futile without extraordinary funding and very long recovery time periods. Watershed systems that are Not PFC are essentially not capable of fully supporting beneficial uses without significant intervention and or extremely long recovery periods. They may contain aquatic resources that are seriously degraded or are not likely to sustain themselves over time

Noxious weeds - plant species designated as noxious weeds by the Secretary of Agriculture or by the responsible State official. These species are generally aggressive, difficult to manage, poisonous, toxic, parasitic, a carrier or host of serious insects or disease, and are nonnative, new, or uncommon to the United States.

Objective - A concise, time-specific statement of measurable, planned results that respond to preestablished goals. An objective forms the basis for further planning to define the precise steps to be taken and the resources to be used in achieving identified goals.

Off-Highway Vehicles or Off-Road Vehicles - Any motorized vehicle designed for or capable of cross-country travel on or immediately over land, water, sand, snow, ice, marsh, swampland, or other natural terrain; except that such term excludes (A) any registered motorboat, (B) any military, fire, emergency, or law enforcement vehicle when used for emergency purposes, and (C) any vehicle whose use is expressly authorized by the respective agency head under a permit, lease, license, or contract.

Old-growth forest - Old single story forest – single canopy layer consisting of large or old trees. Understory trees are often absent, or present in randomly spaced patches. It generally consists of widely spaced, shade – intolerant species, such as ponderosa pine and western larch, and high frequency fire regimes. Old multi-story forest – a forest stand with moderate to high canopy closure – a multi-leveled and multi-species canopy dominated by large overstory trees; high incidence of large trees, some with broken tops and other indications of old and decaying wood; numerous large snags; and heavy accumulations of wood, including large logs on the ground.

Open house - a variation of a public meeting that provides a more informal, one-on-one environment to disseminate information on an issue or process.

Planned Ignition - A wildland fire ignited by management actions to meet specific objectives.

Planning Area - The area of the National Forest System covered by a forest plan.

Proposed Species – Any species that is proposed by the Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service to be listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act.

Prescribed Fire - Any fire ignited by management actions to meet specific objectives. A written, approved prescribed fire plan must exist, and NEPA requirements must be met, prior to ignition. This term replaces management ignited prescribed fire.

Prescribed Fire Plan - A plan required for each fire application ignited by managers. It must be prepared by qualified personnel and approved by the appropriate agency administrator prior to implementation. Each plan will follow specific agency direction and must include critical elements described in agency manuals. Formats for plan development vary among agencies although content is the same.

Prescription - A set of measurable criteria that guides the selection of appropriate management strategies and actions. Prescription criteria may include safety, economic, public health, environmental, geographic, administrative, social or legal considerations.

Properly Function Condition (PFC) - Watersheds in "properly functioning condition" are essentially in good condition in terms of physical, hydrologic, and water quality characteristics and function. PFC watersheds have generally high integrity in terms of those same characteristics and processes. The streams are in dynamic equilibrium with their watersheds (i.e. they adjust appropriately to natural fluctuations of stream flow and sediment loading), and the watershed systems are fully functional, operating within their potential status. The systems are adjusting to disturbances within their apparent natural ranges of variability; and they are or can be expected to respond to disturbances with a trend toward a good condition within a reasonable time period.

Public Involvement - The use of appropriate procedures to inform the public, obtain early and continuing public participation, and consider the views of interested parties in planning and decision-making.

Public Issue - A subject or question of widespread public interest relating to management of the National Forest System.

RARE II Roadless area (Roadless Area Review and Evaluation) - Roadless areas of NF System lands that were inventoried by the Forest Service in 1979.

Recreational Opportunities - The combination of recreation settings, activities and experiences provided by the forest.

Rehabilitation - The activities necessary to repair damage or disturbance caused by wildland fires or the fire suppression activity.

Restricted Road - A National Forest Road or segment, which is restricted from a certain type of use of all uses during certain seasons of the year or yearlong. The use being restricted and the time period must be specified. The closure is legal when the Forest Supervisor has issued an Order and posted that Order in accordance with 36 CFR 261.

Riparian sustainability - A subset of Watershed Sustainability in this context. *Biotic sustainability* can be described generically as the ability to meet the needs of current generations without compromising the ability to meet the needs of future generations.

Risk - The probability of the occurrence of a hazard and/or the consequences of that hazard. (Hazards are undesirable events.)

Road - A motor vehicle travel way over 50 inches wide, unless designated and managed as a trail. A road may be classified, unclassified, or temporary (36 CFR 212.1).

a. Classified Roads. Roads wholly or partially within or adjacent to National Forest System lands that are determined to be needed for long-term motor vehicle access, including State roads, county roads, privately owned roads, National Forest System roads, and other roads authorized by the Forest Service (36 CFR 212.1).

b. Temporary Roads. Roads authorized by contract, permit, lease, other written authorization, or emergency operation, not intended to be a part of the forest transportation system and not necessary for long-term resource management (36 CFR 212.1).

c. Unclassified Roads. Roads on National Forest System lands that are not managed as part of the forest transportation system, such as unplanned roads, abandoned travel ways, and off-road vehicle tracks that have not been designated and managed as a trail; and those roads that were once under permit or other authorization and were not decommissioned upon the termination of the authorization.

Road analysis - an integrated ecological, social, and economic science-based approach to transportation planning that addresses existing and future road management options.

Road construction - activities that result in the addition of road miles to the forest transportation system.

Road Decommissioning - Activities that result in the stabilization and restoration of unneeded roads to a more natural state

Road Maintenance - The ongoing upkeep of a road necessary to retain or restore the road to the approved road management objective

Salvage - an intermediate cutting made to remove trees that are dead or in imminent danger of being killed by injurious agents.

Scoping - activities in the early stages of preparation of an environmental analysis to assess public opinion, receive comments and suggestions, and determine issues during the environmental analysis process.

Sense of place - the aesthetic, nostalgic, or spiritual effects of physical locations on humans based on personal, use-oriented or attached-oriented relationships between individuals and those locations. The meaning, values, and feelings that people associate with physical locations because of their experiences there.

Sensitive species - those plant and animal species in which a population viability is a concern, as evidenced by significant current or predicted downward trends in population numbers or density, or by significant current or predicted downward trends in habitat capability that would reduce a species' existing distribution.

Short Interval Fire-Adapted Ecosystem - Ecosystems experiencing low intensity surface fires with a frequent fire return interval. Examples include long-needle pine and fire-adapted ecosystems such as Ponderosa pine.

Socially important species - Wildlife species that the public desires to encounter when using the National Forests. Management levels of these species may be outside of the historic range based on public interest. Examples include: Big game, upland birds, waterfowl, and "watchable" wildlife. Threatened and Endangered species may also be socially important, but they are covered under the species-at-risk section.

Standard - Limitations on management activities that must be complied with.

Structure – The horizontal and vertical physical elements of forests and grasslands and the spatial interrelationships of ecosystems.

Suitability - The appropriateness of applying certain resource management practices to a particular area of land, as determined by an analysis of the economic and environmental consequences and the alternative uses foregone. A unit of land may be suitable for a variety of individual or combined management practices.

Suppression - A management action intended to extinguish a fire or alter its direction of spread.

Sustainable - The ability to maintain a desired ecological condition or flow of benefits over time.

Sustainability – Satisfying present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs.

Thinning - (a) The cutting down and/or removing of trees from a forest to lessen the chance of a ground fire becoming a crown fire; a method of preparing an area so that a prescribed fire can be more easily controlled. Thinning influences the available amount of fuel and fuel management, and it can indirectly affect fuel moisture content and surface wind speeds. (b) A culture treatment made to reduce stand density of trees primarily to improve growth, enhance forest health, or recover potential mortality.

Threatened species - any species that is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range and which the appropriate Secretary has designated as a threatened species.

Threshold - A place or point of beginning, the intensity below which a physical stimulus cannot be perceived and produces no response.

Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) - a calculation of the maximum amount of a pollutant that a water body can receive and still meet water quality standards, and an allocation of that amount to the pollutant's sources.

Values at Risk - To rate according to a relative estimate of worth when exposed to a chance of loss or damage.

Viability - the ability of a population of a plant or animal species to persist for some specified time into the future. Viable populations are populations that are regarded as having the estimated numbers and distribution of reproductive individuals to ensure that its continued existence is well distributed in a given area.

Watershed sustainability - Described as a “properly functioning” system in terms of slope stability, erosion, the delivery and fate of sediment and other pollutants, runoff and stream flows, and riparian and channel stability and conditions. Watershed systems in “properly functioning condition” are identified by streams in dynamic equilibrium with their watersheds and water quality that can fully support beneficial uses that are inherent to the watershed.

Wilderness – a designated area defined in the Wilderness Act of 1964 in the following way: A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which – (a) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man’s work substantially unnoticed; (b) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (c) has at least five thousand acres of land or is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (d) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value.

Wildland - Any area under fire management jurisdiction of a land management agency.

Wildland Fire - Any nonstructure fire, other than prescribed fire that occurs in the wildland. This term encompasses fires previously called *both* wildfires and prescribed natural fires.

Wildland Fire Implementation Plan (WFIP) - A progressively developed assessment and operational management plan that documents the analysis and

selection of strategies and describes the appropriate management response for a Wildland fire being managed for resource benefits. A full WFIP consists of three stages. Different levels of completion may occur for differing management strategies (i.e., fires managed for resource benefits will have two-three stages of the WFIP completed while some fires that receive a suppression response may only have a portion of Stage I completed).

Wildland Fire Management Program - The full range of activities and functions necessary for planning, preparedness, emergency suppression operations, and emergency rehabilitation of wildland fires, and prescribed fire operations, including nonactivity fuels management to reduce risks to public safety and to restore and sustain ecosystem health.

Wildland Fire Suppression - An appropriate management response to wildland fire that results in curtailment of fire spread and eliminates all identified threats from the particular fire. All wildland fire suppression activities provide for firefighter and public safety as the highest consideration, but minimize loss of resource values, economic expenditures, and/or the use of critical firefighting resources.

Wildland Fire Use - The management of naturally ignited wildland fires to accomplish specific pre-stated resource management objectives in predefined geographic areas outlined in FMP's. Operational management is described in the WFIP. Wildland fire use is not to be confused with fire use, which is a broader term encompassing more than just wildland fires.

Wildland-urban interface - the line, area, or zone where structures and other human development meet or intermingle with undeveloped wildland or vegetative fuels. Because of their location, these structures are extremely vulnerable to fire should an ignition occur in the surrounding area.

Acronyms

AMS	Analysis of the Management Situation	NFS	National Forest System (includes national forests and grasslands)
ARU	Aquatic Response Unit	NFMA	National Forest Management Act
ASQ	Allowable Sale Quantity	NFMAS	National Fire Management Analysis System
ATV	All Terrain Vehicle	NFP	National Fire Plan
BLM	Bureau of Land Management	NOI	Notice of Intent
BMP	Best Management Practices	NPF	Not Properly Functioning
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations	NRA	National Recreation Area
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement	NSA	National Scenic Area
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement	NWA	National Wilderness Area
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency	NWPS	National Wilderness Preservation System
ESA	Endangered Species Act	NWSR	National Wild and Scenic Rivers
FAR	Functioning-At Risk	OHV	Off-highway vehicle
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement	PCPI	Per Capita Personal Income
FIA	Forest Inventory and Analysis	PFC	Properly Functioning Condition
FMA	Fire Management Area	PILT	Payments in Lieu of Taxes
FMP	Fire Management Plan	RAPs	Roads Analysis Process
FMU	Fire Management Unit	RARE	Roadless Area Review and Evaluation
FSH	Forest Service Handbook	RHCA	Riparian Habitat Conservation Area
FSM	Forest Service Manual	RMO	Riparian Management Objective
FVS	Forest vegetation simulation	RNA	Research Natural Area
GA	Geographic Area	ROD	Record of Decision
GIS	Geographic Information System	ROS	Recreation Opportunity Spectrum
HRV	Historic Range of Variability	RPA	Resources Planning Act\
HTGs	Habitat Type Groups	SIA	Special Interest Area
HUC	Hydrologic Unit Code	SMS	Scenery Management System
ICBEMP	Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project	STL	Suitable timberlands
IDT	Interdisciplinary Team	TAMM	Timber Assessment Market Model
INFS	Inland Native Fish Strategy	T&E	Threatened and Endangered
INFISH	preferred variant of INFS, above	TES	Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive
IPNFs	Idaho Panhandle National Forests	TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
IRA	Inventoried Roadless Area	TSTL	Tentatively suitable timberlands
KIPZ	Kootenai Idaho Panhandle Plan Revision Zone	USC	United States Code
KNF	Kootenai National Forest	USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
LRMP	Land and Resource Management Plan	USDI	United States Department of the Interior
LTSY	Long-Term Sustained Yield	USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation	VRU	Vegetation Response Units
MA	Management Area	VQO	Visual Quality Objective
MIS	Management Indicator Species	WFIP	Wildland Fire Implementation Plan
MMA	Maximum Manageable Area	WFSA	Wildland Fire Situation Analysis
MMBF	Million Board Feet	WSA	Wilderness Study Area
MUSYA	Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act		
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act		
NF	National Forest		

List of AMS Major Preparers

KIPZ Team Leaders - Joe Krueger (KNF), Gary Ford (IPNFs)

Revision Topics:

Vegetation and Soils - Dan Leavell (KNF), Art Zack (IPNFs), Betty Charnon (KNF), Jerry Niehoff (IPNFs), Lou Kuennen (KNF)

Wildlife - Wayne Johnson and Steve Johnsen (KNF), Bob Ralphs (IPNFs)

Watershed – Rick Patten (IPNFs), Steve Johnson (KNF),

Aquatic Species - Shanda Dekome (IPNFs), John Carlson (KNF)

Social and Economics- Ellen Frament (KNF)

Timber Production – Ellen Frament (KNF), Tom Martin (IPNFs)

Fire Risk – Dan Leavell (KNF), Art Zack (IPNFs), Bill Widrig (KNF), Mark Grant (IPNFs)

Access and Recreation– Jack Zearfoss, Bill Fansler (KNF)

Inventoried Roadless Areas – Gary Ford, Greg Tensmeyer (IPNFs), Patty Johnson (KNF)

Work throughout the AMS and AMS Technical Report - Joe Krueger and Ellen Frament (KNF), Gary Ford, Jodi Kramer, and Carolyn Upton (IPNFs)

Writer Editor - Jodi Kramer (IPNFs), Patty Johnson (KNF)

GIS Support– Patty Johnson (KNF), Greg Tensmeyer (IPNFs)

The Steering Committee members who read and provided comments on the AMS – Greg Kujawa, Mark Romey, Ed Monnig, and Brian Avery (KNF); Brad Gilbert, Carolyn Upton, and Dick Kramer (IPNFs)

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, and persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (Voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Ave. SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410, or call 1-202-720-5964 voice or TDD. USDA is an equal employment opportunity provider and employer.