



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

Northern
Region



Analysis of Public Comment

Proposed Land Management Plans

Kootenai and Idaho Panhandle National Forests



March 2007

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) 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 to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Table of Contents

Introduction and Summary	1
Summary of Public Participation and Collaboration	1
Process Used to Analyze Public Comments	2
Summary of Public Comments.....	3
Plan Component Requests and Recommendations.....	3
Access and Recreation	4
Inventoried Roadless Areas, Recommended Wilderness, Wild Lands and Primitive Lands.....	4
Vegetation	4
Timber	4
Fire	4
Wildlife	5
Watersheds and Aquatic Species.....	5
Other Topics.....	5
Management Area Allocations.....	5
Other Comments	5
Public Concern Statements	6
Introduction.....	6
Public Concern Statements	7
Appendix A – Public Comment Log.....	117
Appendix B – Content Analysis Process and Coding Structure	159
Content Analysis Process.....	159
Coding Structure	162
Appendix C – Acronyms	171
Appendix D – Major Changes from Proposed to Final Land Management Plans	173
Appendix E – List of Preparers	174

Introduction and Summary

Collaboration and public involvement are important components of revising the Kootenai National Forest (KNF) and Idaho Panhandle National Forests (IPNF) Land Management Plans (hereinafter referred to as the “Plans” or “LMPs”). The Proposed LMPs (PLMPs) were released on May 12, 2006, which initiated the 90-day public comment period. The comment period was to end on August 10, 2006; however, the comment period was extended 30 days and ended September 11, 2006. The extension was a result of the Forest Supervisor’s decision to allow for additional public review, primarily because the PLMPs were released under the 2005 Planning Rule, which resulted in the new Plans looking substantially different than the 1987 Plans. The Forest Supervisor’s decision gave the public the opportunity to become more familiar with the new Plan format and context, in order to better prepare their comments.

Upon completion of the 120-day comment period, the Forests received 517 unique and substantially different comment letters. Of the 517 letters, there were 17 different form letters and three petitions. The form letters were primarily generated electronically, resulting in a significant number of emails (see Appendix B of this Report for details).

Copies of the PLMPs were mailed to over 4,500 individuals, elected officials, tribes, state and federal agencies, organizations, and special interest groups. The PLMPs, and other information such as maps and the Comprehensive Evaluation Report (CER), were available on the KIPZ web site.

This document, the *Analysis of Public Comment for the Kootenai and Idaho Panhandle National Forests*, is a synthesis and summary of the comments and concerns we heard during the comment period. It is organized into the following sections:

- **Introduction and Summary:** This section provides a broad overview of the collaboration and public involvement process; the process used to analyze comments; and a brief summary of the public comments.
- **Statements of Public Concern:** This section consists of the public concern (PC) statements by resource, which follows the coding structure displayed in Appendix B. The PC statements summarize key concerns received during the public comment period.
- **Appendices:** This section consists of: A) a list of communication numbers assigned to every comment letter, including the PC numbers that summarize the comments in each letter; B) information about the process used to analyze the comments and the coding structure; and C) a list of acronyms used throughout this document. An additional appendix will be added to this report upon release of the Final LMP and is expected to include a summary of changes to the Proposed LMP based on public comment.

Summary of Public Participation and Collaboration

Since April 2002, personnel on the Kootenai and Idaho Panhandle National Forests have been working and collaborating with the public on the revision of the 1987 Plans for both Forests. The five primary phases of public participation/collaboration include:

1. **Scoping comment period (4/30/02 – 5/1/04)**, which included open houses and public meetings identifying issues of concern and discussion about the Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS);
2. **Collaborative workgroup meetings (8/1/03 – 5/1/04)** to discuss desired conditions and other Plan components (8/1/03 - 5/1/04);
3. **Collaborative workgroup meetings (11/29/04 – 9/7/05)** to discuss Starting Option maps;

4. **Release of the Proposed Plan maps (10/2005)** via meetings, news releases, newsletter and the KIPZ web site; and
5. **Release of the Proposed LMPs (5/10/06 – 9/11/06)**, which included open houses and public meetings to share the Proposed LMPs, CER and other documents for the 120-day public comment period.

All of the information summarized above and results from the collaborative meetings can be found on the KIPZ web site at: www.fs.fed.us/kipz/documents/plmp/public_involvement. In addition to efforts that were designed to involve the public, agencies, partners, etc., measures were also implemented to engage employees (see planning record for details).

Process Used to Analyze Public Comments

Analysis of the public comments was completed by a contractor who used a systematic approach of compiling and categorizing all viewpoints and concerns that were submitted. The comments that were most helpful were those that were unique, substantive, and provided specifics about the Proposed LMPs. In addition to capturing unique and substantive comments, this report attempts to reflect the emotion and strength of public sentiment in order to represent the public's values and concerns as fairly as possible.

Once the unique and substantive comments were coded, they were summarized and captured as the Public Concern (PC) statements found in this report. It is important to keep in mind that even though the PC statements attempt to capture the full range of public issues and concerns, they should be reviewed with the understanding that there is no limitation on who submits comments. Therefore, the comments received do not necessarily represent the sentiments of the public as a whole. This report attempts to provide fair representation of the wide range of views submitted. Every comment has the same value, whether expressed by many, or by one respondent. Analyzing the comments was not a vote-counting process. The outcome, which will result in changes to the PLMPs, was not determined by majority opinion. The content analysis process we used ensured that every comment was read, analyzed, and considered during the decision process.

Following is the systematic process used in analyzing the public comments that were received on the PLMPs (see Appendix B for more details). Note that a substantive comment is a comment that is specific to the PLMP.

Step 1: All comment letters (hereinafter, comment letters includes hard copy and emails) were assigned a communication number to allow for tracking the unique and substantive comments within the letter to the PC statements (see Appendix A for communication numbers assigned to each letter). Name and address information were entered into a database.

Step 2: Every comment letter and/or petition was read by members of the planning team, and/or a Forest Supervisor. In addition, a Forest Service contractor (TEAMS Enterprise) read and coded all the unique and substantive comments to help ensure that an unbiased approach was utilized to code each letter (see Appendix B for coding structure).

Each unique and substantive comment within a letter was assigned a comment number, subject code, and category code to enable grouping of similar comments for the report in Step 5. The coding of each comment letter can be found in the Planning Record. For example, a comment regarding the desired condition for access and recreation for summer, motorized use would be coded as:

Comment Number: 1 (1st comment coded in the letter)
Subject Code: ACC (access and recreation)
Category Code: 2100 (desired condition for summer, motorized use)

Step 3: Form letters and petitions were identified and filed in the planning record (see Appendix B for details). Regardless of the number of copies received or the number of signatures, one copy of each form letter and/or petition was analyzed for unique and substantive comments and that one letter followed Step 2 of this process.

Step 4: Each of the more than 3,000 unique and substantive comments that were coded were entered into a database, verbatim.

Step 5: Reports were produced from the database that contained the coded comments, and a report was generated that grouped similar comments. TEAMS then drafted PC statements that summarized what was being said in each group of like comments. These PC statements were reviewed and revised by the planning team and approximately 700 of these PC statements are contained in this report.

Step 6: The Forest Leadership Teams (Forest Supervisors, District Rangers, and Staff Officers) and Planning Team were provided a report of the PC statements to assist them in discussing changes to the PLMPs. In addition, both Teams received copies of all 3,000 substantive comments, as well as the original comment letters and petitions.

Step 7: After reviewing the PC statements and comments, the Forest Leadership Teams (FLTs) met with the Planning Team to clarify questions and discuss comments. The FLTs will instruct the Planning Team regarding the changes to be made for the Final Land Management Plans.

Summary of Public Comments

The public comments received on the PLMPs included a wide range of concerns with a number of the respondents addressing multiple topics in their comment letter. The following summary is not intended to provide an exhaustive account of all the public concerns but to provide the broad topic areas that capture the main concerns. This Summary is organized in three parts: 1) Plan Component Requests and Recommendations, 2) Management Area Allocations, and 3) Other Comments.

Plan Component Requests and Recommendations

A large number of respondents requested specific Plan component changes, which included changes to the desired conditions, objectives, and guidelines. In addition, comments were received on the monitoring questions and program, which are useful in the development of the Monitoring Guide. These types of specific comments were requested during the comment period and are very useful; however, they don't lend themselves to a brief summarization and may not be included in the following summary. However, the Planning Team is considering each of these specific comment suggestions while making modifications to the PLMPs.

Most comments focused on the following areas, which are identified in our Plans as sustainability topics:

Access and Recreation

Access to and recreation on public lands is very important to many people. Most comments were general in nature and requested Forests to increase, decrease, or maintain access for the following opportunities: summer and winter motorized use; summer and winter nonmotorized use; mountain bike use; horseback use; and dispersed and developed camping. In addition, there were many comments asking for specific roads, trails, and areas to be open or closed to motorized or nonmotorized use (see Other Comments section below).

Inventoried Roadless Areas, Recommended Wilderness, Wild Lands and Primitive Lands

A significant number of respondents were interested in lands identified as inventoried roadless areas (IRAs), recommended wilderness, wild lands, and primitive lands. Some of the comments included: all roadless areas should be designated recommended wilderness (RW), while others commented there is enough RW; the wild lands on the KNF should be RW as proposed in the starting option, while others felt the roadless areas should remain wild lands; and specific areas that should be designated RW include, but are not limited to, Scotchman Peaks, Northwest Peaks, Cabinet additions, Ten Lakes, and Mallard Larkins, while others believed these areas should be managed for motorized activities.

In addition, comments on the management of recommended wilderness, wild lands, and primitive lands included: these roadless lands should be managed as wilderness, while others believed that some of the roadless lands should be managed for multiple use including motorized recreation and vegetation management; mountain biking is or is not a suitable use in these lands; and snowmobiling is or is not a suitable use in these lands.

Vegetation

Many comments focused on the desired condition of the Forest vegetation and the amount and type of management that should be used to achieve that desired condition. These comments ranged from no management to active management and using tools such as prescribed fire and timber harvest. In addition, management within old growth and management of noxious weeds were of high concern.

Timber

Comments on timber production included: the need to reduce fire risk and improve forest health, the TSPQ (total sale program quantity) is too high or too low; logging should be used as a tool to improve forest health or logging is not an appropriate tool and natural processes should occur; and concerns about the effect of decreased timber production on the local infrastructure, jobs, and income on the communities in the zone.

Fire

Comments received for fire focused on: the concern of allowing wildland fire use across the Forests, including in the wildland urban interface (WUI); how the WUI boundaries were defined; use of prescribed fire versus timber harvest; fuel treatment within or outside the WUI; and that prescribed fire is or is not a tool to be used to improve forest health.

Wildlife

Comments on wildlife management included the importance of: unique, diverse and secure habitats, including old growth, to ensure thriving, viable native fish and wildlife populations; balancing the effects of human interaction with management of habitat for all species, including grizzly bears, caribou, and mountain goats; security for big game and big game winter range; and linkage and connectivity corridors for wildlife movement.

Watersheds and Aquatic Species

Comments for watersheds and aquatic species included comments on watersheds, aquatic species, soils, and riparian areas. Specifically, the concern that the commitment to restore impaired watersheds is not apparent; the resource needs to be well protected from damage by management and other human uses; the direction in INFISH (Inland Native Fish Strategy), such as the standards, have been weakened or lost under the 2005 Planning Rule; and soil productivity needs to be improved.

Other Topics

Comments for other topics included comments on grazing, heritage, lands, special uses, minerals, other forest products, social and economics, and tribal concerns. However, the majority of comments on these “other topics” focused on the social and economic implications of forest management activities or opportunities for the local communities. Examples include: loss of jobs and income with lower timber harvest levels; loss of motorized opportunities, both summer and winter and its effect on the communities; and loss of opportunities for other forest products, such as huckleberries, firewood, and mushrooms.

Management Area Allocations

Comments were received regarding management area (MA) allocations, with most of the comments focusing on changing or not changing Wild Lands (MA1e) and/or Primitive Lands (MA1d) to Recommended Wilderness (MA1b). In addition, there were respondents requesting the Forests to change or not to change the management area Backcountry (MA5's) to Recommended Wilderness (MA1b).

Other Comments

Comments were also received that are not directly applicable to making changes to the Proposed LMPs. Some of these included comments about: the success or breakdown of the collaborative and public involvement process; the use of best science; the regulatory considerations under the 2005 Planning Rule, such as an EIS is not required under the new Rule; the closure or opening of a specific road, trail or area; the need to understand the Comprehensive Evaluation Report and how it relates to the PLMP; what the monitoring program consists of; and questions about the integration between the Plans and the Environmental Management System (EMS).

Public Concern Statements

Introduction

This section includes the Public Concern (PC) Statements, which were developed by grouping similar comments and then writing a statement that characterized the group of comments. Respondents will find that their complete letter is not reproduced in the PC statements. Several of the comment letters contained very specific suggestions, which in most cases, are not incorporated into the PC statements; however, these comments have been reviewed by the team as they revise the PLMPs.

The PC statements were written to capture a main idea and are followed by more specific comments related to that main idea. The specific comments are either delineated by a semi-colon or by bullets. If there are quotation marks within a PC statement, these are comments taken verbatim from the letters and/or petitions. Acronyms and their definitions can be found in Appendix C.

The PC statements are organized by Subject, and then by Category because in many cases, at least one other party expressed a similar or the same concern and the PC statement summarize these like comments. Some PC statements fit under more than one Subject. In order to find your PC statement in this report, look at the table in Appendix A. The PC# has an identifier at the beginning of the PC# and this matches the Subject Code in the PC Statement portion of this report (i.e., PC# is ACC0041 and the “ACC” indicates that that PC statement is under the Subject “Access and Recreation.”

A list of the communication numbers is identified with each PC statement, enabling respondents to see which PC statements summarize their comments (see Appendix A for communication numbers). Following is an example of the organization for each PC statement:

Subject: Access and Recreation
--

Category: **Access & Recreation Forestwide Desired Condition – Dispersed Recreation**

PC#: ACC0041

PC Statement: The FS should expand developed and dispersed recreation opportunities by:

- adding campsites, trails, and recreation facilities;
- converting old and decommissioned roads into motorized/mechanized trail systems;
- installing trailheads near urban areas.

Letter #s: 73, 355, 401

Public Concern Statements

Subject: ACCESS and RECREATION (PC #s starting with ACC)

Category: Access & Recreation Coeur d'Alene GA Desired Condition (IPNF)

PC# ACC0074

The FS should include the high level of public access and motorized recreation opportunities in the list of unique features for the Coeur d'Alene GA.

(Letter #s: 7)

Category: Access & Recreation Comprehensive Evaluation Report (CER)

PC# ACC0109

The LMPs should accurately reflect the results of the National Visitor Use Monitoring Project (for motorized and mechanized access) in the Desired Condition by:

- measuring use based on the actual number of visitors rather than a percentage of the total population;
- consolidating motorized use data that is hidden and dispersed among a number of categories.

(Letter #s: 355, 434)

Category: Access & Recreation Forestwide Desired Condition -- Developed Recreation

PC# ACC0058

The FS should include campgrounds in the Desired Condition for all Geographic Areas.

(Letter #s: 94)

Category: Access & Recreation Forestwide Desired Condition -- Dispersed recreation

PC# ACC0041

The FS should expand developed and dispersed recreation opportunities by:

- adding campsites, trails, and recreation facilities;
- converting old and decommissioned roads into motorized/mechanized trail systems;
- installing trailheads near urban areas.

(Letter #s: 73, 355, 401)

Category: Access & Recreation Forestwide Desired Condition -- Mechanized

PC# ACC0026

The FS should use additional data in the analysis and mitigation of impacts from mountain bikes.

(Letter #s: 216)

PC# ACC0027

The FS should categorize mountain bikes as nonmotorized rather than mechanized to remain consistent with the CFR definitions.

(Letter #s: 373)

PC# ACC0028

The FS should manage mountain bike use as distinct from motorized use in accordance with the International Mountain Bicycling Association and the Forest Service Memorandum of Understanding.

(Letter #s: 373)

PC# ACC0029

The FS should include mountain bike use in the Access and Recreation Desired Condition by:

- including a goal to provide a primitive recreation experience for mountain bikers in roadless areas, and a family recreation experience closer to roads;
- modifying the language for the KNF PLMP on Page 1-2, paragraph five, sentences 2 and 4 to ensure the future prospects of mountain biking on the forest: "Organized [recreation] events are planned and managed and, where appropriate, existing trails are redesigned to accommodate OHV [stock, or mountain bike] use." and "Trail maintenance is performed to provide adequate corridors for the given users ([mountain bikers], saddle stock, snowmobiles, OHV users, hikers, etc)."

(Letter #: 409, 64)

PC# ACC0094

The FS should categorize mountain bikes as motorized for pedestrian safety reasons.

(Letter #: 365)

Category: Access & Recreation Forestwide Desired Condition -- Motorized (summer)

PC# ACC0001

The FS should maintain or increase summer and winter motorized access:

- to accommodate people with mobility problems;
- to accommodate increasing motorized use;
- to reduce user conflicts, wildlife conflicts, and environmental effects by spreading uses across the landscape;
- to provide wider access to remote interpretive destinations, such as historic mines and cabins;
- to maintain traditional uses including firewood cutting, hunting, fishing, riding and snowmobiling;
- to provide economic returns to local economies;
- by maintaining or increasing the number of airstrips;
- by opening 1/2 the currently gated roads year-round in alternate years;
- by providing an equivalent number, type, and quality of opportunity as nonmotorized users;
- by designating winter ATV areas;
- in grizzly bear core areas.

(Letter #: 440, 38, 387, 40, 413, 417, 425, 427, 357, 433, 441, 46, 109, 480, 486, 490, 494, 67, 73, 429, 223, 132, 136, 146, 154, 158, 207, 208, 355, 469, 234, 238, 25, 275, 280, 299, 304, 326, 331, 213)

PC# ACC0002

The FS should have in place a comprehensive plan prior to any motorized closures or decommissioning including an evaluation of fire suppression, resource management, multi-owner access, and cost share agreements.

(Letter #: 336, 355, 154)

PC# ACC0004

The FS should maintain summer and winter motorized access at existing (historical) levels to:

- ensure adequate funding to enforce closures;
- ensure administrative access for trail maintenance;
- limit resource damage.

(Letter #: 251, 355, 485, 119)

PC# ACC0006

The FS should evaluate and mitigate the cumulative effects of past management activities on traditional motorized access by:

- analyzing roads and trails developed that were associated with timber harvest;
- analyzing the environmental and human consequences on concentrating motorized recreation;
- accounting for all motorized closures since the Wilderness Act;
- creating a Motorized Access and Recreation Mitigation Bank.

(Letter #s: 355)

PC# ACC0007

The FS should emulate other successful recreation programs by developing a network of motorized National Recreation Trails such as the Idaho Trail Ranger Program.

(Letter #s: 355)

PC# ACC0009

The FS should use tools other than closures to manage roads and trails, such as:

- public education;
- maintenance;
- permit hunting and seasonal travel restrictions to accomplish wildlife objectives.

(Letter #s: 355, 411, 412, 427, 64)

PC# ACC0010

The FS should limit motorized off-road use:

- to decrease resource damage, wildlife disturbance, introduction of invasives, and potential to start fires;
- to increase enforceability by restricting motorized access to existing roads;
- where it endangers the safety and security of adjacent private landowners.

(Letter #s: 145, 308, 197)

PC# ACC0011

The FS should address management of the different types of winter and summer motorized recreation separately because there are differences in:

- effects - snowmobiles have no effect on the ground and summer ATV use has little effect on available forage;
- use - snowmobiles are not confined to designated routes.

(Letter #s: 454, 7, 446, 393, 390, 110, 109)

PC# ACC0020

The FS should more clearly describe the relationship between degree of development and challenge offered for motorized recreation.

(Letter #s: 146, 7)

PC# ACC0056

The FS should maintain motorized routes by:

- using local volunteers;
- using funds from RTP and gas taxes;
- using funds for road decommissioning;
- charging a recreation use fee.

(Letter #s: 404, 355, 308, 444)

PC# ACC0063

The FS should take into consideration the differences in land use between motorized and nonmotorized recreation because motorized use is confined to designated routes and nonmotorized use is not confined to designated routes.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# ACC0087

The FS should honor the National OHV policy and OHV decision for Montana, North Dakota and portions of South Dakota (3-State OHV decision) by:

- including a comprehensive inventory of historic mining routes and existing routes meeting the 3-State OHV definitions;
- allowing use of existing motorized roads and trails;
- addressing any proposed closure in the transportation management plan rather than the LMP.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# ACC0090

The FS should recognize that increasing motorized use in areas formerly recommended for Wilderness, Wilderness Study Areas, and other roadless areas will degrade wilderness values, causing irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources.

(Letter #: 339)

PC# ACC0093

The FS should adequately evaluate and consider the type and quality of experiences desired by motorized visitors including:

- loop trails;
- challenging motorized routes;
- primitive roads and trails.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# ACC0096

The FS should develop an equitable recreation resource allocation strategy:

- between motorized and nonmotorized activities based on acres and miles per visit;
- by applying the same issues and restrictions to nonmotorized and motorized users.

(Letter #: 355, 58)

PC# ACC0111

The FS should create motorized loop routes by permitting OHVs that are not licensed for street use to travel roads linking OHV trails.

(Letter #: 168 ,355)

PC# ACC0115

The FS should amend the Access and Recreation Desired Condition language to include:

- a clearly stated desired condition for access and recreation;
- less restrictive language regarding under what circumstances goals will be accomplished for access and recreation;
- uses with higher-access requirements such as logging and mineral exploration;
- a clear statement of the limits of the Forest's obligation to accommodate different forms and levels of recreation;
- a desired condition that emphasizes non-motorized opportunities;
- addressing the desired conditions to be attained rather than the existing conditions;

- language that has greater emphasis on human-powered recreation. See (Letter #434 for specific edits;
- language that focuses on providing OHV opportunities that maximizes economic opportunity for adjacent gateway communities while minimizing the impact to overall forest health. See (Letter #427 for specific edits.)

(Letter #s: 427, 434, 420, 325, 444)

PC# ACC0119

The FS should list all motorized routes as handicapped accessible between August 30 and December 23.

(Letter #s: 30)

PC# ACC0125

The LMPs should include a strategy for managing ATV use.

(Letter #s: 197)

Category: Access & Recreation Forestwide Desired Condition -- Motorized (winter)

PC# ACC0015

The FS should regulate snowmobile season closures by:

- instituting an April 15th snowmobile closure in grizzly bear habitat and to reduce erosion;
- snow pack rather than fixed date to accommodate changing weather and hibernation patterns associated with global warming;
- using standardized closure dates to minimize confusion.

(Letter #s: 110, 112, 114, 293, 355)

PC# ACC0022

The FS should use a different term than 'play area' in describing snowmobile destinations.

(Letter #s: 444)

Category: Access & Recreation Forestwide Desired Condition -- Roads

PC# ACC0035

The FS should include a desired condition to work with cooperating landowners through cost share agreements and the Federal Road and Trails Act rather than by issuing easements under Federal Lands Policy and Management Act.

(Letter #s: 336)

PC# ACC0036

The FS should close, decommission and obliterate roads and culverts:

- to restore habitat;
- to restore water quality limited stream (WQLS) watersheds;
- to reduce road densities to no more than 1.5 miles per section;
- to reduce smuggling traffic from Canada;
- that cannot be adequately maintained within agency budgets and capabilities, and are causing resource damage;
- that are redundant.

(Letter #s: 460, 64, 475, 426, 267, 257, 197, 465)

PC# ACC0037

The Forest Service should maintain the existing road infrastructure:

- rather than build new roads in order to put road dollars to the best use;
- to access timber stands for treatment;
- for fire suppression;
- for public use;
- by maintaining level 3, 4 and 5 roads annually and level 2 roads as needed;
- by securing funds from Congress for the maintenance backlog;
- by prioritizing roads accessing adjacent landowners.

(Letter #s: 384, 468, 421, 332, 297, 218, 466)

PC# ACC0039

The LMPs should include guidance on reducing road densities.

(Letter #s: 197, 456)

PC# ACC0040

The FS should more clearly address the relationship between an 'efficiently maintained' and 'environmentally compatible' transportation system, and a well maintained transportation system with minimal water quality and fisheries effects by including:

- a desired condition for road densities protective of water quality, bull trout, and westslope cutthroat;
- in the LMP, transportation system language similar to the Lolo NF LMP.

(Letter #s: 257, 197)

PC# ACC0045

The LMPs should include a desired condition and guideline for all roads to meet forestry Best Management Practices (BMPs).

(Letter #s: 336)

PC# ACC0046

The FS should focus on active management in areas with existing roads in order to meet desired conditions.

(Letter #s: 73)

PC# ACC0049

The FS should address the negative effects of road obliteration.

(Letter #s: 355)

PC# ACC0051

The Desired Condition for road and trail maintenance in the LMPs should include language clarifying the adequacy of the existing network for recreation access and sustainable wildlife and fisheries for the life of the LMP.

(Letter #s: 197, 285)

PC# ACC0121

For each GA, the LMPs should include road mile density, how the density affects aquatic resources, and the goals for road density.

(Letter #s: 197)

PC# ACC0126

The LMPs need to include more detail on how travel on the Forests will be managed to reduce impacts to sensitive resources including:

- vision and objectives for road decommissioning to restore riparian areas and improve water quality;
- measurable goals for reducing road density to benefit sensitive resources;
- clear goals for reducing the effects of cross-country travel on riparian areas and wetlands.

(Letter #: 197)

Category: Access & Recreation Forestwide Desired Condition -- Trails

PC# ACC0053

The FS should consider trails as part of the natural landscape.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# ACC0054

The FS should limit vehicle width on roads converted to single-track trails.

(Letter #: 355, 64)

PC# ACC0122

The FS should articulate the criteria used to determine the type of access allowed on specific trails.

(Letter #: 430)

Category: Access & Recreation Forestwide Desired Condition-- Non-Motorized (summer and winter)

PC# ACC0016

The FS should increase nonmotorized summer and winter recreation opportunities to meet the desired condition of solitude in backcountry settings by:

- improving access;
- designating more areas as nonmotorized.

(Letter #: 339, 78, 416, 482)

PC# ACC0057

The FS should separate motorized and pedestrian uses.

(Letter #: 115, 296, 365, 453)

Category: Access & Recreation Forestwide Suitability

PC# ACC0013

The FS should allow winter motorized access in the following areas:

- goat habitat because snowmobiles have had no effect on goat populations;
- Scotchman Peaks IRA, to match the permitted uses between the KNF and IPNF;
- Selkirk Crest and Long Canyon/Parker area on the IPNF;
- Bull GA, Ten Lakes Scenic Area, and Northwest Peaks Scenic Area on the KNF;
- MA3, MA1c, and MA1e.

(Letter #: 35, 444, 57, 59, 34)

PC# ACC0014

The FS should limit winter motorized access:

- to designated areas;
- in order to protect caribou;
- in order to protect mountain goats;
- by prohibiting snowmobiles on Hughes Ridge along the boundary of the Salmo-Priest IRA in order to protect wildlife habitat;
- by prohibiting snowmobiles in the Scotchman Peaks IRA of the IPNF.

(Letter #: 352, 424, 339, 71)

PC# ACC0024

The FS should allow mechanized access to areas other than recommended wilderness.

(Letter #: 122)

PC# ACC0025

The FS should permit wheeled equipment such as mountain bikes and game carts:

- in wild areas;
- in semi-primitive nonmotorized Recreation Opportunity Spectrum areas;
- in primitive areas outside wilderness;
- on trails where they are currently proposed as banned.

(Letter #: 216, 354, 373, 417, 64)

PC# ACC0032

The FS should limit nonmotorized access for horses because of terrain damage.

(Letter #: 347)

PC# ACC0033

The FS should maintain traditional nonmotorized backcountry uses including horses, hiking and backpacking.

(Letter #: 125,307)

PC# ACC0034

The FS should justify additional access restrictions:

- by providing data supporting restrictions or closures for habitat connectivity or endangered species;
- in light of the imminent delisting of some endangered species.

(Letter #: 237, 490, 355, 486)

PC# ACC0050

The FS should limit new road construction to areas:

- where it makes sense economically and ecologically;
- outside IRAs, non-inventoried roadless areas, recommended wilderness, and backcountry management areas.

(Letter #: 297, 94)

PC# ACC0085

The FS should use different measures, other than use, to assess the value of motorized routes, such as remoteness, solitude, and challenge.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# ACC0086

The FS should manage access as a secondary priority to:

- wildlife, vegetation, soil, and water quality issues for both motorized and nonmotorized recreation;
- wilderness habitat;
- minimize habitat fragmentation and degradation.

(Letter #: 257, 339, 419, 99)

PC# ACC0092

The FS should limit motorized access:

- by prohibiting all OHVs;
- in the Tobacco and Kooacanusa GAs on the KNF;
- in the Yaak GA on the KNF to protect grizzly bears;
- in the St. Joe GA on the IPNF to protect elk;
- in the Cabinets and Scotchman Peaks of the KNF to protect species and habitat.

(Letter #: 493, 495, 475, 426, 392, 173)

PC# ACC0128

The FS should designate low elevation "front country" winter nonmotorized areas that are accessible directly off plowed roads because the current nonmotorized winter designations are far in the backcountry.

(Letter #: 419)

PC# ACC0129

The FS should broaden suitability to include motorized uses:

- near urban areas to conserve energy;
- on the Idaho/Montana divide in the Coeur d'Alene GA of the IPNF.

(Letter #: 355, 7)

Category: Access & Recreation Guidelines

PC# ACC0043

The FS should use gates or self-closure rather than obliteration for closing roads and/or trails.

(Letter #: 208)

PC# ACC0044

The FS should make new roads non-system roads.

(Letter #: 116)

PC# ACC0047

The FS should ensure that historic user created, mining, and logging tracks are given legitimacy in the planning process including:

- routes in existence before 1976 considered under RS2477;
- non-system (unclassified or 'ghost') roads.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# ACC0048

The LMPs should include direction regarding maintenance of roads and bridges that lie in Recommended Wilderness and Wild River designated areas.

(Letter #: 377)

PC# ACC0091

The FS should include an analysis and discussion of motorized use in the Strategy and Guideline sections of the LMPs:

- including a baseline analysis with maps to provide information on existing recreational opportunity and need, and an explanation of how the LMPs could affect future site-specific recreation activity plans;
- allowing evaluation of current or future access routes and/or issues;
- explaining how site-specific plans will be developed and approved;
- using the FS-643 Roads Analysis Manual;
- using additional data in the analysis of OHV opportunities;
- using more current data regarding past and present snowmobile use and technology.

(Letter #: 444, 456, 427, 355, 465)

PC# ACC0101

The FS should consider the following additional guidelines for access and recreation:

- Road planning, design, operation, and maintenance should be completed to assure that the road system is inventoried and evaluated, which will assist in identifying roads adversely affecting water quality and aquatic habitat, and the needed maintenance work to correct the problems; and to assure that roads are protective of watershed conditions;
- "Implement seasonal closures, where required, with input and review by OHV recreationists that will: provide the maximum amount of OHV recreational opportunity during the summer recreation season in order to disperse all forms of trail use and thus minimize impacts to trail users; provide winter OHV recreation opportunities in low-elevation areas that are not critical winter game range; provide OHV recreation and access during hunting season by keeping major roads and OHV loops open while closing spur roads and trails necessary to provide reasonable protection of game populations and a reasonable hunting experience; and provide OHV recreation opportunities during spring months in all areas where erosion and wildlife calving conditions reasonably allow.";
- "An adequately funded and effective road maintenance program and policing and enforcement program is needed to assure that roads avoid adverse effects to water quality and fisheries, and that motorized access occurs only on designated routes, and does not occur in restricted areas.";
- "Roads analysis (36 CFR Part 212) shall be used for road management decisions, including upgrading to address water quality degradation, construction, reconstruction, closure and decommissioning of roads.";
- "Minimize road and landing locations in RCAs, and carry out watershed analysis to assure roads and landings in RCAs are protective of watersheds.";
- "Avoid constructing roads on unstable landtypes or landslide or mass failure prone areas. Such areas should be identified for avoidance prior to road design and construction.";
- "Minimize or avoid disruption of natural hydrologic flow paths by roads, including diversion of streamflow and interception of surface and subsurface flow.";
- "Minimize and avoid sediment transport and delivery from roads to streams with appropriate techniques such as: * outsloping road surfaces, * routing road drainage away from erosive areas or where they may discharge directly into streams, * providing adequate numbers of waterbars, rolling dips and ditch relief culverts to avoid drainage running on or along roads * installing

cross-drainage above stream crossings to prevent ditch sediments from entering streams where possible, * minimizing road use during spring thaw periods that causes rutting and channeling of snowmelt and runoff and during wet periods that may erode road surfaces.";

- "Stream crossings should simulate natural stream grade and substrate as much as possible in fish-bearing streams (use bridges, arches and open bottom culverts wherever possible).";
- "Road stream crossings should be assessed to see if they adequately provide for fish passage, floodflows, and bedload and woody debris transport.";
- "Construction of stream crossings should occur during periods of low stream flow (usually in late summer or early Fall) and preferably in the dry. Special care should be taken to avoid or minimize impacts to the stream channel and to riparian vegetation during construction. Stream banks disturbed during construction should be revegetated. Operation of equipment within the channels of creeks and rivers only occurs absolutely necessary and with proper permits and authorizations (e.g., Clean Water Act 404 permits, Montana DEQ 318 authorizations and Montana DFW&P 124 authorizations)";
- "Close and stabilize or obliterate (decommission) roads not needed for future management or recreation.";
- "Roads scheduled for decommissioning should be analyzed with site-specific analysis to determine decommissioning and/or closure methods (such as stabilization, revegetation, with natural drainage restored) that best protects aquatic and terrestrial resources. Culverts or other crossing structures should be left on closed or decommissioned roads, only when they can be maintained on a regular basis to minimize or prevent the risk of failure and associated resource damage.";
- "Road maintenance (e.g., blading) and handling of road waste material (e.g., slough, rocks) should only be conducted: * when the road surface becomes too rough for the designated vehicle use; * when the surface becomes a safety hazard; or * when it is needed to improve road drainage by reducing road surface erosion and sediment delivery from roads to area streams. Avoid blading of road surfaces, including soils and snow, into surface waters or into areas that could result in transport of sediment to surface waters, including wetlands. Avoid routine general blading of ditch lines on insloped roads to maintain vegetative cover for sediment filtering. Where necessary blade only the ditch segments where blockage problems occur.";
- "Inventory for condition then prioritize, plan, and implement rehabilitation, remediation, relocation, or de-commissioning projects for all roads adversely affecting water quality and aquatic habitat during the planning period. Implementation of road maintenance and reconstruction projects will follow identified priorities, based on the availability of funding."

(Letter #: 197, 355, 517)

PC# ACC0103

The FS should standardize signage within and across all agencies.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# ACC0105

The FS should permit travel off designated routes up to 300 feet for game retrieval, woodcutting, and dispersed campsite access.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# ACC0106

The FS should follow the direction provided in the appeal to the Stanislaus NF Travel Management Plan regarding area closure.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# ACC0107

The FS should require that routes and areas damaged by recreation be closed for restoration.
(Letter #: 339)

Category: Access & Recreation Koocanusa/Tobacco GA Desired Condition (KNF)

PC# ACC0065

The FS should improve and maintain existing hiking trails in the Tobacco and Koocanusa Geographic Areas.
(Letter #: 22)

Category: Access & Recreation Libby GA Desired Condition (KNF)

PC# ACC0068

The FS should widen all designated motorized trails in the Libby GA.
(Letter #: 129)

PC# ACC0120

The KNF should consider cross-country ski trails rather than a downhill ski area on Treasure Mountain in the Libby GA.
(Letter #: 22)

Category: Access & Recreation Lower Kootenai GA Desired Condition (IPNF)

PC# ACC0075

The FS should include snowmobile trails, play areas, and high elevation snowmobiling opportunities in the list of unique features for the Lower Kootenai GA.
(Letter #: 146, 7)

Category: Access & Recreation Monitoring

PC# ACC0080

The FS should monitor closures and obliterations in order to demonstrate measurable improvement to the affected resource. If a closure produces no improvement, then the road/trail/campsite should be reopened.
(Letter #: 306, 355)

PC# ACC0082

The FS should establish a monitoring system to assess the impacts of snowmobiles, OHVs, and other motorized recreation, and provide guidance for protecting affected resources.
(Letter #: 339, 365)

PC# ACC0083

The FS should consider the following additional Access and Recreation Monitoring Questions for in order to address the level of user satisfaction and the adequacy of facilities:

- "What improvements (facilities and opportunities) can be made to enhance or increase access and recreation?";
- "What partnerships for maintenance and construction of facilities can be created or enhanced?";
- "At what point are enough "solitude" opportunities enough?";
- "What public input could help improve access and recreation?";
- "Is the road network well maintained with adequate BMPs to avoid road impacts to water quality and fisheries, including impacts associated with off-road motorized vehicle use?";

- "Does the transportation system and motorized access minimize wildlife fragmentation and adverse impacts to wildlife, and contribute to recovery of listed species?";
- "Are unauthorized trails being created?";
- "Are there impacts (unintended or otherwise) to other resources (i.e. snowmobiles topping tree leaders in upper elevation planting units or operating in critical winter range) from unauthorized motorized uses?";
- "Is law enforcement adequate to the task?";
- "Are you meeting demand?";
- "Is demand going up or down for specific activities?";
- "Are activity specific users satisfied with their experience and what would they like to see changed?";
- "Are the roads, trails, use areas and facilities adequate in quantity and quality?"
- "What are the changes within the various uses and what are the trends?";
- "What do you need to do to be responsive to the needs and desires of your customers, summer and winter-motorized and nonmotorized?";
- "What are the impacts of the various uses on the lands and resources?";
- "Are you protecting the wilderness resource in Designated Wilderness?";
- "Have appropriate management actions been taken on trails, recreation sites and/or areas where use is at or near capacity and/or where there are (resource) concerns for the health and sustainability of the lands.";
- "To what level have Forest trails been established and maintained to provide recreation and access for nonmotorized users? Roads and trails for off-road vehicles?";
- "To what level have Forest roads been maintained to provide sightseers and pleasure drivers an enjoyable experience as well as access for all recreational users to trailheads and developed recreation sites.";
- "What human-powered and motorized (and nonmotorized winter) recreation opportunities have been provided for summer and other snowless periods? For winter and other periods of snow cover?";
- "Has off-trail road use been restricted sufficiently to assure no damage to desirable tree/plant growth, meadows, streams, hillsides, etc.?"

(Letter #: 424, 7, 434, 444, 257, 197, 146, 387)

PC# ACC0084

The FS should employ comparable self-reporting visitor use monitoring data collection methods for multiple-use and for wilderness visitors.

(Letter #: 355)

Category: Access & Recreation Objectives

PC# ACC0059

The FS should maintain dispersed recreation sites on a regular basis.

(Letter #: 394)

PC# ACC0060

The FS should evaluate and provide for facilities at OHV trailheads comparable to those at wilderness trailheads.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# ACC0062

The FS should maintain the existing level of dispersed campsites:

- along water courses;
- by creating a new dispersed campsite for each campsite closed.

(Letter #: 444, 355)

PC# ACC0095

The FS should consider revising the access and recreation objectives for road maintenance to:

- address maintenance of Level 1 roads;
- include miles of road by maintenance level category;
- commit maintenance to those roads causing the most resource damage;
- assure that roads contributing sediment will be improved adequately to address water quality effects;
- include how the agency will address the maintenance backlog;
- include how maintenance will be achieved for different resources (recreation vs. timber production).

(Letter #: 197, 257, 387)

PC# ACC0097

The FS should consider the following additional access and recreation objectives:

- "To meet the needs of the public for a functional network of motorized roads and trails for access and recreation with practical and reasonable consideration of the environment";
- to improve or decommission roads where causing resource damage;
- to move the Forests toward a minimum transportation system protective of watersheds and aquatic habitat and species.

(Letter #: 336, 355, 197, 257)

PC# ACC0098

The LMPs should include a clearer connection between the objectives describing measurable, time-specific outcomes and attainment of the desired condition for a resource for general road management and road maintenance.

(Letter #: 257)

Category: Access & Recreation Other

PC# ACC0018

The LMP should include law enforcement planning in access management to address illegal incursions into, and abuse of, roadless and recommended wilderness areas.

(Letter #: 322, 465, 430, 62, 394, 293, 257, 115, 423, 309)

PC# ACC0052

The FS should evaluate the visual appearance and environmental effects of motorized and nonmotorized recreation as nearly equal.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# ACC0104

The FS should clarify how it will utilize the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) in:

- the LMP;
- site-specific planning.

(Letter #: 427)

PC# ACC0110

The IPNF and KNF should better coordinate travel plans in order to ensure consistent management across jurisdictional boundaries.

(Letter #s: 355)

PC# ACC0112

The FS should evaluate issues associated with access and recreation as equal to other resource issues.

(Letter #s: 355, 57, 59)

PC# ACC0113

The FS should consider changing the manner in which motorized and nonmotorized opportunities are measured by adding the miles of road closed to miles of nonmotorized trails.

(Letter #s: 355)

PC# ACC0116

The FS should place the same restrictions on geocachers, with respect to heritage resources, as they place on other low to no-impact uses.

(Letter #s: 387, 448)

PC# ACC0117

The FS should allow comment on the impending Travel Management Plans during the Land Management Plan revision process.

(Letter #s: 145)

PC# ACC0123

The FS should determine motorized and nonmotorized allocations on a site-specific basis only, during travel management planning.

(Letter #s: 110)

PC# ACC0127

The FS should place more emphasis on view corridors from roadways and trails.

(Letter #s: 173)

Category: Access & Recreation Other sources of design criteria

PC# ACC0108

The FS should include additional references in the Other Sources of Design Criteria for Access and Recreation including:

- Roads Policy and subsequent directive (66 FR 3250, 66 FR 3219);
- Forestry BMPs Logan, R. 2001. Water Quality BMPs for Montana Forests. EB 158,2001. MSU Extension Publications, Bozeman MT 59717.

(Letter #s: 336, 422)

Category: Access & Recreation St. Joe GA Desired Condition (IPNF)

PC# ACC0079

The FS should include winter motorized recreation in the Vision Statement for the St. Joe GA.

(Letter #s: 146)

Category: Access & Recreation Yaak GA Desired Condition (KNF)

PC# ACC0069

The FS should consider the Seventeen mile snowmobile loop and the 20 mile off-highway vehicle loop described in the Desired Condition for the Yaak GA during the travel planning process rather than in the PLMP.

(Letter #s: 293, 50, 453, 322, 419)

Category: Project Level

PC# ACC0005

The FS should consider site-specific access planning in:

- the Fourth of July area;
- Upper Priest River and Priest Lake;
- Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs) #132, 139, 141-147, 152, 155, and Big Creek #701.

(Letter #s: 360, 49, 470, 24, 155, 132, 129, 118, 477)

Category: Wildlife Coeur d'Alene GA Desired Condition (IPNF)

PC# ACC0073

The FS should restate the Wildlife Desired Condition for the Coeur d'Alene GA because it is unnecessarily restrictive to motorized uses.

(Letter #s: 7)

Category: Wildlife Objectives

PC# ACC0023

The FS should be conservative in designating motorized access in anticipation of currently unknown effects to sensitive species.

(Letter #s: 293)

Subject: AIR QUALITY (PC #s starting with AIR)

Category: Air Quality Guidelines

PC# AIR0001

The FS should disclose methods for meeting the Regional Haze Rule and National and Montana Ambient Air Quality Standards.

(Letter #s: 197, 257)

PC# AIR0002

The FS should consider revising the Air Quality guidelines to:

- include coordination with tribes in recognition of tribal jurisdiction;
- cooperate with States in conforming with the State Implementation and Smoke Management Plans.

(Letter #s: 339, 456)

PC# AIR0003

The FS should provide additional air and visual effects analysis and desired conditions to address particulate matter and resulting impacts on visibility.

(Letter #s: 269)

Subject: COLLABORATION (PC #s starting with COL)

Category: Access & Recreation Clark GA Desired Condition (KNF)

PC# COL0003

The FS should show how the input from the Clark Fork workgroup (retaining current use levels) was used to determine the proposed desired condition for Scotchman Peaks.

(Letter #s: 300)

Category: Collaboration/Public Involvement concerns

PC# COL0002

The FS should consider extending the comment period.

(Letter #s: 101, 444)

PC# COL0004

The FS should consider the following regarding collaborating with people that desire wilderness:

- if multiple use is the goal, then people who desire wilderness areas are being left out of the collaborative process.;
- it has placed the values of timber interests and motorized recreationists above those that value wilderness.;
- to have true collaboration, the desires of the public for Wilderness recommendation must be represented in the LMP alongside other desires expressed by other parties.

(Letter #s: 215, 68, 72)

PC# COL0005

The FS should consider in its collaborative efforts:

- all comments, regardless of how they are submitted;
- continuing public comment on FS actions and not bypassing the public involvement process;
- comments relating to laws and policies (if a commenter is questioning the legality of a Plan component).

(Letter #s: 326, 480, 481)

PC# COL0006

The FS should recognize the following regarding the collaborative process as it relates to the Kootenai PLMP:

- the good collaborative efforts of conservation groups with snowmobile and motorized access groups that occurred to provide input to the Kootenai PLMP;
- the need and desire for the allocation of Recommended Wilderness in capable roadless areas as repeatedly expressed by the conservation community and other parties is not represented;
- the feelings that further polarization of this issue has been created with the change of Recommended Wilderness to Wild Lands;
- that participants feel their desires for Wilderness recommendation were ignored.

(Letter #s: 436, 66, 507, 48, 46, 338, 322, 298, 262, 37, 293)

PC# COL0009

The FS should involve more motorized recreationists in the collaborative process and consider:

- using a variety of methods such as interviews at club meetings and at trailheads, use of news(Letter, posting information at trailheads, and not just through written comments;

- that the level and effectiveness of participation should not influence decisions about the types of recreational opportunities that can occur on public lands.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# COL0010

The FS should recognize the following with regards to the collaborative process that:

- the Plan does not reflect the many meetings, long evenings and miles traveled by citizens that participated in "collaboration";
- it is not too late to achieve effective collaboration bringing together diverse interests to find common ground;
- the efforts of the Beaverhead-Deerlodge NF where environmental groups like the Montana Wilderness Association and timber interests have come together to develop a LMP that is rational and balanced;
- the resulting LMP does not reflect the desires of all parties;
- many people believe public input is not being evaluated and integrated into the LMP;
- people who work 40 hours a week cannot dedicate the time required to keep up with all the current travel planning processes;
- the process is inordinately demanding of participation and has unreasonable expectations for the involvement of individuals and families;
- the adoption of the "new rule" took away much of what was previously achieved in the GA workgroups;
- these lands serve a national purpose and managers need to listen to comments from people in addition to the local residents;
- managers need to listen to the interests of local communities in managing the National Forests;
- the process resulted in dissention and polarization;
- there was a lot of good discussion and progress towards agreement at the workgroup meetings but trust was lost due to the decisions made by the KNF Forest Supervisor concerning Recommended Wilderness.

(Letter #: 422, 427, 430, 445, 452, 453, 506, 64, 398, 48, 347, 325, 306, 279, 263, 186, 185, 159, 17, 355)

PC# COL0011

The FS should evaluate whether it is using public involvement in a discriminatory way by:

- asking the motorized recreationists to provide a comprehensive inventory of roads and trails (to establish which motorized routes remain open) when they don't have the resources and expertise to do it;
- creating a lack of understanding brought on by inadequate communication in the form of maps, documents and on-the-trail public involvement.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# COL0012

The FS should consider a collaborative approach that produces a reasonable multiple-use alternative that includes more motorized recreation opportunities.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# COL0014

The FS should provide the collaboration that is required by the 2005 NFMA rules.

(Letter #: 422)

PC# COL0015

The FS should consider having in-depth discussions with interest groups about specific issues, such as:

- the mountain biking community regarding decisions about prohibiting mountain biking;
- those interested in travel management, especially for Recommended Wilderness and roadless areas.

(Letter #s: 202, 220, 308, 64)

Subject: COOPERATION (PC #s starting with CCI)

Category: Cooperation Forestwide Desired Condition

PC# CCI0001

The FS should continue to incorporate public involvement and input during the Plan revision process.

(Letter #s: 145)

PC# CCI0002

The FS should consider the following additional Cooperation and Community Involvement Monitoring Questions:

- addressing how many restoration-related partnerships exist;
- disclosing FS endorsed/funded projects related to threatened and endangered species recovery efforts.

(Letter #s: 293)

Subject: EDITORIAL (PC #s starting with EDT)

Category: Access & Recreation Forestwide Desired Condition -- Motorized (summer)

PC# EDT0076

The IPNF should consider removing the reference in the motorized recreation section that says routes are shown on Forest Visitor maps because the only map that is accurate is the Coeur d'Alene map and all the other maps are full of errors.

(Letter #s: 146, 70)

Category: Access & Recreation Guidelines

PC# EDT0072

The FS should consider the following because the LMP mentions Scenic Integrity Objectives on page 1-2:

- including Scenic Integrity Objective maps in the document;
- Scenic Integrity Objectives have never been mentioned or discussed throughout the entire planning process.

(Letter #s: 465, 387)

Category: Access & Recreation Lower Kootenai GA Desired Condition (IPNF)

PC# EDT0005

The IPNF should consider adding the following four additional bullets to the list found on Page 1-45 Chapter 1 Vision, Geographic Areas Desired Conditions, Lower Kootenai Geographic Area, General Location, Description, and Unique Features: * Snowmobile Trails and Off-Trail Riding, * ATV and Motorized Trails and Access, * Hunting and Fishing Opportunities, and * Long Canyon/Parker Area.

(Letter #s: 444)

PC# EDT0078

The IPNF should include for the Lower Kootenai GA on page 1-45 under the Unique Features, the availability of high elevation snowmobile use.

(Letter #: 168)

Category: Access & Recreation Objectives

PC# EDT0073

The FS should consider clarifying whether the objective that states "provide access on" should be rewritten to mean "maintenance" (in relation to snowmobiling and grooming trails).

(Letter #: 146)

Category: Access & Recreation Pend Oreille GA Desired Condition (IPNF)

PC# EDT0006

The IPNF should consider the following changes to the LMP:

- Page 1-51. Chapter 1 Vision, Geographic Areas Desired Conditions, Pend Oreille Geographic Area, General Location, Description, and Unique Features: Three additional bullet points should be added to the list: Snowmobile Trails and Off-Trail Riding; ATV and Motorized Trails and Access; and Hunting And Fishing Opportunities;
- Page 1-51. Chapter 1 Vision, Geographic Areas Desired Conditions, Pend Oreille Geographic Area, Geographic Area Desired Condition, Access and Recreation: The last two sentences should be revised as follows: "On trail and off trail winter snowmobiling is popular across the entire GA and connects to neighboring GAs. The most popular areas include the Pack River and Trestle Creek areas, as well as the southeast end of the GA. Groomed trails and off trail riding are essential components of these activities";
- Pages 1-51 to 1-52. Chapter I Vision, Geographic Areas Desired conditions, Pend Oreille Geographic Area, Geographic Area Desired Condition, Access and Recreation, Access and Recreation Desired Condition: First, if the topic is to address the desired condition for Access and Recreation, it is unnecessary and confusing to add a sub-topic heading. Second, the sentence that begins with "Nonmotorized opportunities are emphasized . . ." is an inaccurate statement. Both motorized and nonmotorized opportunities are emphasized. That statement should be revised.

(Letter #: 444)

Category: Access & Recreation Priest GA Desired Condition (IPNF)

PC# EDT0024

The IPNF should consider the following regarding discussion of Priest Lake trails:

- the Priest Lake Winter Recreation Trails Map you refer to is incomplete, inaccurate and misleading;
- in the Strategy section on page 2-2 - the mileage for winter and summer trails is way off. Priest Lake alone has 400 miles of groomed trails.

(Letter #: 110)

PC# EDT0077

The IPNF should consider making the following change on page 1-58, paragraph 1, the 5th sentence: "an extensive snowmobile trail system that attracts" should be changed to read "an extensive snowmobile trail system and off-trail opportunities that attract..."

(Letter #: 146)

Category: Editorial comment to the Plan.**PC# EDT0001**

The FS should consider the following to improve the readability and understandability of the PLMP:

- on pages 1-1 to 1-34. Chapter 1 Vision, Forestwide Desired Conditions by Sustainability Topics, it is very difficult to separate out the topics, subtopics, paragraphs, and subparagraphs to ascertain statements from a general level to a more specific level. No hierarchy is established, and the use of different size fonts and boldness are not easy to ascertain or relate to one another;
- certain "Forest Wide" Topics have Desired Conditions set forth while others do not, or the statement(s) provided are not even close to being something designated as a Desired Condition;
- the last sentence on page 1-23 under Old Growth Desired Condition is a good example of how one has to jump around in the rest of the document to get context. Examples or summaries should be included where appropriate;
- in working through the document, it was very difficult to create a context because there were ubiquitous references to previous works, underlying documents or other sources. There are numerous places in the PLMP that should have maps, tables, or sidebars which accompany the text that would provide basic background or description of the underlying "classes" or "conditions" etc (many of these classes and conditions are groupings or homogenizations of earlier work, and have lost meaning in the process). In some cases it was necessary to wade through three documents to get to an underlying description i.e. the Vegetation Response Units (VRUs);
- consider writing and providing information for the average lay person to understand the document.

(Letter #: 158, 384, 444)

PC# EDT0002

The IPNF should consider the following in the Introduction on page x, About the Idaho Panhandle National Forests:

- in the last full paragraph, it is good to see the reference to recreational opportunities, but the paragraph should be revised to make it clear that people from across the nation and those that live in this area equally undertake the activities;
- the activities should not be separated into fishing and boating versus the other activities listed;
- reference should be made to the Purcell Mountains in the first full paragraph.

(Letter #: 444)

PC# EDT0003

The FS should consider the following changes to their maps:

- include detail in mapping to identify streams, road numbers, trail numbers, landmarks, and key topographic features in a manner that all citizens can easily interpret so they can adequately evaluate the proposal;
- changing the color groupings as they were similar looking at the scale presented. This is a recurring problem with .pdf maps and web-based distribution for many agencies;
- show the Coeur d'Alene Reservation boundary on the maps in the LMP, include a map of the Tribe's ceded or aboriginal territory in the Plan, (please contact Mr. Frank Roberts, Tribal GIS Manager, to obtain the maps), review the Coeur d'Alene Tribe's Integrated Resource Management Plan Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for consistency with the draft IPNF Land Management Plan;
- provide maps showing WUIs.

(Letter #: 482, 465, 355, 384, 456)

PC# EDT0007

The FS should consider the following changes to Chapter 2:

- Pages 2-25 to 2-27, Chapter 2 Strategy, MA5 - Backcountry: The third sentence under the heading Description should be revised, because motorized winter opportunities and activities are not even primarily on trails. Snowmobile use is primarily off trails. The description needs to be accurate. Table 28 should not use a * and footnote for motorized (summer and winter) suitability. Those columns should each include Yes, and leave the site-specific analysis (travel management) to that process;
- Page 2-28, Chapter 2 Strategy, MA6 - General Forest: The third sentence under the heading Description here should also be revised, because motorized winter opportunities and activities are not even primarily on trails. Snowmobile use is primarily off trails. The description needs to be accurate. Under the heading Desired Condition, off trail opportunities need included as well for the same reasons as just stated.

(Letter #: 444)

PC# EDT0008

The FS should consider the following change on page A-2, Appendix A - Plant and Animal Diversity: the five-step approach should probably be numbered 1 through 5, not 8 through 12.

(Letter #: 444)

PC# EDT0010

The FS should consider the bullets on page 1-4 provide descriptions using the words "increase" or "decrease." Those terms and terms like them including but not limited to "enhance," "maintain," "improve," "expand," "enlarge," "augment," "add to," "extend," "reduce," "lower," "abate," "sustain," "preserve," "continue," "strengthen," and "provide," should be in the vocabulary for writing and stating all desired conditions, and particularly for actually making Desired Condition statements for access and recreation and for roadless areas and recommended wilderness.

(Letter #: 444)

PC# EDT0011

The FS should consider in Appendix B including maps with Tables B-3, B-4 and B-5.

(Letter #: 456)

PC# EDT0012

The FS should consider enclosing all lake boundaries on maps.

(Letter #: 17)

PC# EDT0013

The FS should consider making the following changes to the Introduction to the LMP regarding Tribes:

- Page x, third paragraph: Please add discussion on the tribes in the area and briefly describe their lifeways (in addition to mentioning ranchers, loggers and miners);
- Page xi, top of the page in the Wildland Urban Interface subsection: If the USFS partners with tribes, please add references to tribes here;
- Page xi, under Wildlife and Fisheries subsection: If the USFS cooperates with tribes in wildlife and fisheries management, please add references to tribes here;
- Page xi, under Roadless State Petition Process subsection: If IPNF is working with tribes on this issue, please add references to tribes as these roadless areas are part of the tribes' ceded areas.

(Letter #: 456)

PC# EDT0014

The FS should consider correcting the following typos:

- on page 1-21 "reminant" to "remnant";
- in the Down Woody Debris paragraph "sic" instead of "six";
- page 2-8 under 'Special Forest Products & Firewood,' Line 3, change "bows" to "boughs";
- in discussion of recreational opportunities correct "sight-seeing" with "sightseeing";
- correct the spelling of Mullan Park Campground (should be spelled with an "a") in Table B-4 of the IPNF Proposed Plan Appendix B.

(Letter #s: 480, 50, 456, 21)

PC# EDT0015

The FS should consider that every planning action "re-invents" the line weights, color, and line styles for the different motorized and nonmotorized road and trail designations. This is very confusing to the public and, once again, puts motorized recreationists at a disadvantage. A national mapping standard for travel planning actions must be developed starting with proposed action in order to address this inadequacy.

(Letter #s: 355)

PC# EDT0016

The FS should consider providing a map and name key for wildlife linkage areas on the National Forest.

(Letter #s: 343)

PC# EDT0019

The FS should consider that a reasonable definition for "significant conflict" be developed and used as part of this action. Whether there is a "user conflict" or not depends primarily on user attitudes. Just because someone says it is a conflict does not mean that it is a "reasonable" or "significant" conflict.

(Letter #s: 355)

PC# EDT0021

The KNF should consider including camping as one of the recreational opportunities enjoyed by visitors to the KNF on Page x, Paragraph 3. This will better reflect the number and diversity of people camping on the KNF, in both developed campgrounds and dispersed sites.

(Letter #s: 394)

PC# EDT0022

The FS should be illustrating acreage changes in the various Management Areas throughout the Plan in a way that allows the reader to make comparisons between existing management and the changes being proposed, which will also be helpful in assessing the direction of the LMP.

(Letter #s: 465)

PC# EDT0023

The FS should consider that there are a lot of supporting documents one would have to review to gain more in-depth knowledge of related topics.

(Letter #s: 416)

PC# EDT0025

The FS should consider that the writing of the Desired Conditions in the present tense is a bit confusing. It seems if they were written in a more forward looking manner, they would have more impact when reading the Plan. I found myself thinking that most of the desired conditions were already met, but I doubt that is the case.

(Letter #s: 416)

PC# EDT0026

The FS should consider including a literature cited section that describes the documents or information on where to locate documents referenced in the LMP, particularly in Chapter 3.

(Letter #: 465)

PC# EDT0027

The IPNF should consider the following changes to the Plan:

- The LMP covers an area that encompasses a designated National Natural Landmark (NNL), the Hobo Cedar Grove Botanical Area. While the Hobo Cedar Grove Botanical Area is listed in the LMP as a botanical Special Interest Area (SIA), there is no identification of Hobo Cedar Grove Botanical Area as a designated NNL (see Chapter 2, page 20, Table 21: Management Area Direction For Special Interest Areas (SIAs)). In order to fully capture the significance of the Hobo Cedar Grove Botanical Area as both an SIA and an NNL, the Department recommends that the words "National Natural Landmark" be included within the "SIA Name" column so that the LMP would read: "Hobo Cedar Grove Botanical Area/National Natural Landmark."
- The Department also recommends that the "Acronyms and Glossary" section should include the following definition of an NNL: "a nationally significant natural area that has been designated by the Secretary of the Interior" (see the National Natural Landmarks Program web site: <http://www.nature.nps.gov/nnl/>).

(Letter #: 271)

PC# EDT0028

The KNF should consider reviewing the acreage difference in the KNF PLMP briefing paper that indicates the total acreage associated with wild, scenic and recreational rivers is 59,300 acres. According to the LMP, the total acreage associated with wild rivers is 15,649; scenic rivers is 1,450; and recreational rivers is 39,320 for a total of 56,429 acres.

(Letter #: 254)

PC# EDT0031

The KNF should consider reviewing the following acreage discrepancies between the KNF PLMP Briefing Paper and the Proposed LMP:

- For Timber lands: The KNF PLMP Briefing Paper identified 1,707,800 acres of the KNF as lands generally suitable for timber harvest. Of which, 817,200 acres is determined to be suitable for timber production. Page 2-6 of the KNF PLMP states that "The Forest has 1,584,700 acres where timber harvest could be used as a tool to achieve desired conditions. This represents approximately 72% of the KNF. Of those lands, approximately 817,200 acres are generally suitable for timber production. This represents 37% of the KNF.";
- Table 1.1 on this same page depicts an additional 777,500 other acres where harvest may be used as a tool to achieve other multiple-use objectives. The timber production acres and the timber harvest acres do not add up to what is reported in the Briefing Paper.
- Additionally, the acres in Management Areas 2b, 5a, 5b, 5c, and 6 - in each geographic area - is again different. As shown below, total acres identified in MA6 is 1,422,800, not 1,422,900 and when one adds the MA6 acres to the MA2b, 5a, 5b, and 5c acres the total is 1,882,380 acres where timber harvest could occur - not 1,707,800.

(Letter #: 254)

PC# EDT0032

The KNF should consider the following changes to the LMP in the:

- Introduction, Page IX, Paragraph 3: Most sources show Lincoln County as 78% National Forest. "Use the actual percentage and not the lower 70% estimate which has the quality of truthiness, but is less than the actual amount";
- Introduction, Page X, Paragraph 2: Kalispell, Montana should be listed as an urban area which is providing many of the goods and services formerly provided by Spokane, Washington;
- Introduction, Page 3, Paragraph 3: Include firewood cutting as a major recreational activity. Chapter 1, Page 1-2, Paragraph 8: Delete "A minimum transportation system," and replace it with " A transportation system is in place. Fourth sentence, delete "other forest management," and replace it with "vegetative management";
- Chapter 1, Page 1-3, Paragraph 3: Include a sentence which states, "Forest roads which provide access to multiple non-industrial private landholdings have jurisdiction transferred to County Governments";
- Chapter 1, Page 1-3, Inventoried Roadless, Paragraph 1, 2nd sentence: "Include vegetative condition in evaluation. As a statement, I believe the first sentence lacks truthiness. I do not believe the existing vegetative condition of land was evaluated";
- Chapter 1, Pages 1-5 through 1-15: Simplify the graphs or eliminate them all together. As presented, the graphs could be used to just about mean anything someone wanted them to mean. These graphs have the maximum fog index;
- Chapter 1, Page 1-6, Paragraph 3: Under Forest Diseases, include a statement that planting of genetically improved resistant stock and pruning saplings is the reason for increasing numbers of western white pine.

(Letter #: 218)

PC# EDT0059

The FS should consider the definitions for "public highway" for the following reasons:

- The handicapped vehicle hunting permit allows certain persons to shoot from a motorized vehicle, an activity that is normally illegal. This permit does not allow the holder to shoot from or across public highways. This important distinction described at 1C 36-202 (x) states: "Public highway" means the traveled portion of, and the shoulders on each side of, any road maintained by any governmental entity for public travel, and includes all bridges, culverts, overpasses, fills, and other structures within the limits of the right-of-way of any such road. The above definition means that any road, be it FS, BLM, city, county, or state, that can be legally driven on, is probably a public highway. It is not legal to shoot from these roadways.;
- Roads installed and maintained by private entities, such as Potlatch Lumber, Stimson Lumber, Inland Paper, etc. are not public roads. Many of these roads are open to the public, but your tax dollars do not maintain them. While not considered safe, it would be legal to shoot from these roadways.;
- In most cases, as can be seen in the above definition, a public highway is much more than simply the portion that vehicles drive on. There is no requirement to be any set distance off the public highway for legal shooting, as long as you are not shooting from any portion mentioned in the above definition.

(Letter #: 30)

PC# EDT0060

The FS should consider the proposed LMPs for the Western Montana Planning Zone Forests (Lolo, Bitterroot, and Flathead National Forests) which provided background discussions of status or major issues regarding each resource topic along with the Desired Conditions. The PLMP for the KNF does not

include this type of background information. We found this background information to be helpful in providing understanding of existing conditions and major issues, and setting the context for clearer understanding of the proposed desired conditions for the Lolo, Flathead and Bitterroot Forests. We encourage the KNF to consider adding similar brief background discussions preceding the identification of the Desired Conditions for the individual resource topics.

(Letter #: 257)

PC# EDT0062

The FS should consider adding a section that describes the trends in activities that are taking place on the Forest. For example, the section could discuss whether recreational activities are becoming a more popular use of the forest compared to other uses, and if so, the type of recreational uses that are increasing. Consequently, the forest may be experiencing an increasing or decreasing amount of logging, mining, etc. Having an understanding of the trends, however unpredictable they may be, would give the reader a larger context for the vision for the forest as well as an understanding of the FS's strategy for managing the resources.

(Letter #: 197)

PC# EDT0063

The FS should note that the IPNF Proposed LMP does not include specific language found in the new final rules, in particular the rules that pertain to best available science, 219.11, environmental management systems (EMS), 219.5, and evaluations and monitoring, 219.6.

(Letter #: 386)

PC# EDT0065

The FS should consider that seven topics were identified in the AMS as issues in need of analysis and change, but in the Proposed Land Management Plan, Chapter 2, Strategy pages 2-1 through 2-4, only six of the seven are discussed and developed (Inventoried Roadless Areas and Recommended Wilderness are listed under Other Topics including American Indian Rights and Interests, grazing objectives, heritage resources, RNAs, Social and Economic Objectives, and bringing up the rear end is Wilderness objectives. Inventoried Roadless and Recommended Wilderness were originally identified as AMS issues).

(Letter #: 387)

PC# EDT0066

The FS should consider the following wording in Chapter 2, Strategy (page 2-4 of both PLMPs):

- Objectives 1 and 2 contain estimates such as, ". . .approximately 15 to 20 percent.. .". This could mean from 10 to 25% or more. It might be more meaningful to drop either the range of numbers or the word "approximately";
- Include the term "HUC" in Objective 1 so a reader can find the definition of "6th code" in the glossary;
- Reference the definition of RCA so the reader can find the definition for Class II and III watersheds;
- Change Objective 4 to read, ". . .three miles of fragmented stream habitat.. ." if this is the intent.

(Letter #: 6)

PC# EDT0068

The FS [IPNF] should explain why there is a difference in Wilderness acreage numbers displayed on page 2-10 (9,900 acres in table) and page 2-11 (11,949 acres in text).

(Letter #: 146)

PC# EDT0069

The FS should explain why there is a difference between the acres of Congressionally Designated Wilderness in table 12 on page 2-10 and the total acres of Congressionally Designated Wilderness shown in the tables for each geographic area.

(Letter #s: 250)

PC# EDT0070

The FS should consider that the Plan demonstrates a perceptible bias against production while stressing conservation. Our recommendation is to remove the qualifiers. For example, here's a solution for page 1-59: "Summer and winter motorized and nonmotorized opportunities are maintained and expanded." Note the deletion of "where feasible."

(Letter #s: 168)

PC# EDT0071

The FS should apply more precise use of the terms "ATV", "motorized", and "snowmobile" to avoid misleading and confusing information.

(Letter #s: 110)

PC# EDT0074

The IPNF should consider changing in Chapter 2 Strategy, the statement that motorized winter travel is only suitable in "designated areas" because the current travel plan for winter recreation on the 2004 Kaniksu map is "open, unless posted closed".

(Letter #s: 444)

PC# EDT0075

The IPNF should change the reference to the "Sandpoint and Bonners Ferry Area Snowmobile Trails map" to the revised "Lake Pend Oreille Region Idaho Winter Recreation Trails map produced by the Winter Riders, Inc."

(Letter #s: 444)

PC# EDT0079

The FS should note that on page 2-27, Table 28 there is no listing for mechanized use.

(Letter #s: 416, 7)

PC# EDT0080

The FS should reconsider the use of the word "values" when referring to Wilderness and Backcountry, and use the word "attributes" with definitions of what the attributes are.

(Letter #s: 146)

PC# EDT0081

The FS should consider on page 1-3, it is stated that 63% of Inventoried Roadless Area is allocated to backcountry, 19% to wildlands, and roughly 18% (this figure is not used, but I did the math) to mostly wilderness and undeveloped areas. The terms wildlands and wilderness are somewhat explained in the rest of the text, but there is no definitive If/Then statement regarding these terms. For example, ..If wilderness, Then no motorized traffic ever, or words and meanings such as that. And, if wildlands then motorized traffic only in approved areas, or words and meanings such as that.

(Letter #s: 250)

PC# EDT0082

The FS should revise the "Leasable and Mineral Materials" language to "Leasable, Locatable, and Mineral Materials" and include locatable mineral language in the document and tables as appropriate.

(Letter #s: 218, 420)

PC# EDT0084

The FS should apply more precise use of the terms "ATV", "motorized", and "snowmobile" in the PLMP because use of the terms could be misleading and result in lawsuits.

(Letter #: 110)

Category: Social/Economics Forestwide Desired Condition

PC# EDT0004

The FS should make the following changes to the LMP on page 1-33, Chapter 1 Vision, Other Topics, Social and Economic Systems Desired Condition:

- The second full paragraph on page 1-33 provides that "Some values are a result of the natural environment, such as opportunities for solitude, and spiritual and scenic values." That sentence should be revised to more accurately describe the situation and written as : "Some outputs and values are a result of the natural environment and forest lands, such as opportunities for access, recreation, solitude, and spiritual and scenic values";
- The third full paragraph on page 1-33, in introducing the bullet list, uses the word "perceived." That word should be removed from the sentence, and revised as: "The IPNF provides a range of benefits to local communities ";
- Likewise on page 1-33, the word "perceived" should be removed from the first sentence of the first bullet point, with the sentence revised as "Recreation opportunities and access are an important benefit of the Forest";
- Again on 1-33, the first sentence of the fifth bullet point should be revised. The example of "existence benefits" should not be defined by using just wilderness and roadless areas. It is an unfortunate fact that the vast majority of people in our nation do not understand that the word "wilderness" has legal consequences;
- The fifth bullet point on page 1-33 needs to be revised to make the examples be "recreation, access, scenic beauty, backcountry, primitive lands, roadless areas, and wilderness." That is more accurate and not misleading or implying that people want more legally defined and restrictive wilderness designations.

(Letter #: 444)

Category: Vegetation Comprehensive Evaluation Report (CER)

PC# EDT0017

The FS should consider that there is supposed to be a map of the VRUs in the Comprehensive Evaluation Report (CER) which could never be located (map of the Three Biophysical Settings, paragraph 5, page 1-10), and to get at least the basic grouping of VRUs, the Analysis of Management Situation (AMS) report had to be visited. And that did not actually supply the individual Habitat Types included in the original VRUs.

(Letter #: 384)

Category: Vegetation Forestwide Desired Condition

PC# EDT0018

The FS should consider that the graphs on pages 1-5, 1-7, 1-11, 1-13, and 1-15 are confusing and recommend you find another way to illustrate the vegetation desired condition.

(Letter #: 362)

PC# EDT0029

The FS should consider providing on page 1-14 size class (DBH) definitions for the Class A, B, C variations and should carry these definitions through to other tables and discussions. Also, the glossary reference should read "(see Vegetative Condition Class in glossary)."

(Letter #s: 465)

Category: Vegetation Objectives

PC# EDT0083

The FS should include in language for noxious weed objectives, "Noxious weed infestations will be treated and reduced with integrated weed management techniques and new noxious weed invasions will be contained after discovery within the discovered site."

(Letter #s: 257)

Category: Watershed Forestwide Desired Condition -- IPNF Watersheds

PC# EDT0020

The FS should consider the following changes in Watersheds (Water, Soil and Riparian) and Aquatic Species Desired Condition section page (1-27):

- The first sentence in this section uses the phrase "natural potential condition". We recommend that this phrase be defined or a reference added;
- The last sentence should read, "Water quality meets or exceeds applicable State Ambient Surface Water Quality Standards" for the designated use of the stream.

(Letter #s: 197)

Category: Watershed Guidelines – Watersheds (general)

PC# EDT0067

The FS should consider using the term "approved" TMDL in the Watershed Guidelines (#2) instead of "adopted" TMDL.

(Letter #s: 6)

Category: Wildlife Forestwide Desired Condition -- Habitat (general)

PC# EDT0058

The FS should consider defining on page 1-20 "Large Continuous Habitat Blocks." Are these 40 acres or 40,000 acres? It isn't essential to be exact (i.e. 40 acres); however, some measure of the order of magnitude is needed. (This holds for other terms in the report as well, for example, more natural, historic, high integrity landscape). There must be some benchmark definitions to measure against in order to evaluate/monitor progress toward the Desired Condition statements. Knowing what the target is will provide a higher level of certainty in what to aim for, and a better feel for whether efforts are successful.

(Letter #s: 465)

Subject: Environmental Management System (EMS) (PC #s starting with EMS)

Category: EMS

PC# EMS0001

The FS should consider whether Environmental Management System (EMS):

- is really applicable to public lands management;
- can provide accountability for whether the standards are maintained;

- has measurable criteria for improving water quality, preserving ancient forests, wildlife habitat or other important conditions.

(Letter #: 506, 145, 206, 294)

PC# EMS0002

The FS must address how the PLMP can meet the planning regulations when the EMS is not done yet.

(Letter #: 145, 506)

PC# EMS0003

The FS should consider whether any human activity would align with the EMS because they all impact, rather than "continually improve" the environment.

(Letter #: 480)

PC# EMS0004

The FS should make all employees accountable for implementation of the LMP and the organization as a whole should audit the effectiveness of their actions.

(Letter #: 297)

PC# EMS0005

The FS's EMS process should evaluate all acres on the forest, not just those having treatment.

(Letter #: 331)

PC# EMS0006

The FS should provide more detailed explanation of EMS in the Plan:

- and how complying with it will integrate into the rest of the LMP;
- by providing high quality information that describes the documents that are expected to be produced during the first year after the final Plan has been approved;
- by providing explanations of how the EMS will change everyday work to reduce impacts and how it will guide decisions.

(Letter #: 197, 384, 386, 389, 402)

PC# EMS0007

The FS should describe what will qualify for audits and management reviews, who will conduct them, and what will be their availability for public participation and review.

(Letter #: 387)

PC# EMS0008

The FS should explain whether an EMS relating to old growth issues separate from the land management process has been established or will be established on the IPNF.

(Letter #: 449)

Subject: FIRE (PC #s starting with FRE)

Category: Fire Forestwide Desired Condition -- Wildland Fire Use

PC# FRE0001

The FS should incorporate a fire management plan into the LMPs specifically for roadless and wilderness areas:

- based on the 1980 Cabinet Mountains Wilderness Interim Fire Management plan, which was widely agreed upon as an appropriate fire management tool;
- that allows wildland fire use as a tool to restore the natural fire regime;

- to help control future fires and enhance habitat;
 - because there is no proposed fire management plan for these areas other than suppression.
- (Letter #s: 430, 309, 332, 38, 387, 398, 426, 168)

PC# FRE0002

The FS should prohibit wildland fire use during the active fire season because of high fuel loading.
(Letter #s: 379, 362)

PC# FRE0004

The FS should consider the comparative costs of thinning as opposed to firefighting in any given location in its "budget restraint" argument.
(Letter #s: 269)

PC# FRE0006

The FS should use fire as a primary management tool:

- allowing wildfire to burn whenever possible, and using prescribed fire for fuel reduction in place of grapple piling;
- with jackpot burning to create islands and pockets of vegetation;
- in the backcountry of the Yaak on the KNF to return the natural fire regime;
- to restore the benefits of this disturbance process;
- in areas where there is minimal threat to private property;
- with appropriate timing and intensity in fire-dependent ecosystems using summer/fall burns where conditions allow.

(Letter #s: 293, 453, 465)

PC# FRE0007

The FS should use mechanical treatments as a primary tool for fuel reduction and discontinue using fire as a primary fuel reduction tool because:

- fuels should be used for biomass heating facilities and commercial wood fiber products;
- analysis has shown biomass accumulation is significantly outpacing its removal;
- in MA6 (general forest) prescribed fire is incompatible with timber production objectives;
- with the existing high fuel loads and poor forest health, there are better tools than lighting fires.

(Letter #s: 316, 467, 413, 321, 269, 223, 382)

PC# FRE0010

The FS should develop a fuel management plan:

- in at-risk lands, including Backcountry (MA5), using all the tools available;
- that takes advantage of local small-log processors;
- that increases timber harvest ;
- that gives appropriate consideration to mechanical harvest as mandated in the 2004 Interior Appropriations bill;
- that utilizes small wood for biofuel or wood fiber;
- that meets the goals of the Organic Act to provide a sustainable supply of renewable resources.

(Letter #s: 306, 467, 445, 307, 295, 254, 212, 2, 197, 419)

PC# FRE0011

The FS should reexamine the proposal to manage dense forests with prescribed fire because it is difficult to predict the effects of prescribed fire on stocking with any certainty.

(Letter #s: 466)

PC# FRE0012

The FS should provide additional direction on Wildland Urban Interface treatments:

- as building continues on the forest edge, limiting additional structures that increase the WUI;
- including provisions for local employment;
- making habitat connectivity part of the WUI desired condition.

(Letter #: 199, 343, 348, 430, 434)

PC# FRE0017

The FS should reassess the WUI boundary:

- to ensure the boundaries are large enough to protect adjacent communities;
- to incorporate additional fire science in determining the boundaries;
- using terrain, soil, and aspect to determine the depth of WUI corridors;
- with updated GIS to more clearly define the WUI.

(Letter #: 465, 506, 445,398)

PC# FRE0019

The FS should manage the Forest for protection from wildfires because of dense forests and ongoing drought.

(Letter #: 417)

PC# FRE0020

The FS should coordinate with local agencies in fuel and fire management:

- regarding fire mitigation plans and forest health problems in mixed ownership both within and outside the WUI;
- in community water supply areas where WUI plans conflict with local agency management direction;
- to establish common treatment parameters, goals and time frames;
- to clarify fire control policies regarding wildland fire use on mixed ownership lands where state and local government have primary fire protection.

(Letter #: 185, 336, 403, 467, 514)

PC# FRE0021

The FS should consider the following Fire Monitoring Questions:

- Is the Administration and Congress funding fire management activities adequately and what / where/how is the KNF prioritizing what funding it may receive?
- Has small diameter, overstocked wood fiber been given an appropriate emphasis in management to reduce the fire risk to communities?
- Are opportunities to restore wildfire to the landscape being pursued whenever possible?

(Letter #: 293, 387)

PC# FRE0023

The FS should develop a forest-wide suitability area specifically for the Wildland Urban Interface that includes goals for reducing fuels and reducing NFS land ownership in the WUI.

(Letter #: 199)

PC# FRE0025

The LMPs should include vegetation and fire models that forecast expected forest growth and fire growth and severity in order to better understand fuel management needs.

(Letter #: 387)

PC# FRE0026

The FS should take into consideration the effects of global warming on fuel management by:

- burning in open winters and early dry springs;
- acknowledging the probability of increasing numbers and severity of fires due to climate change.

(Letter #s: 387, 61)

Category: Fire Guidelines**PC# FRE0024**

The FS should consider the following additional guidelines for fire management to protect water quality and riparian areas:

- Bladed firelines, for prescribed fire and wildfire, need to be stabilized with water bars and/or other appropriate techniques to control excessive sedimentation or erosion, and firelines should be rehabilitated to reduce erosion and sediment transport risk following the fire;
- Avoid delivery of chemical retardant, foam, or other fire chemicals and petroleum products to surface waters, following appropriate protocols and BMPs;
- Locate incident bases, camps, helibases, staging areas, helispots and other centers for incident activities outside of Riparian Conservation Areas (RCAs). If the only suitable location for such activities is within the RCAs, an exemption may be granted following a review and recommendation by a resource advisor. The advisor would prescribe the location, use conditions, and rehabilitation requirements, with avoidance of adverse effects to water quality and aquatic species as a primary goal. Use an interdisciplinary team, including a fishery biologist, to predetermine incident base and helibase locations during pre-suppression planning.

(Letter #s: 197)

Category: Fire Objectives**PC# FRE0009**

The FS should address and explain the discrepancy between the number of acres proposed for fuel treatment and the number of acres needing treatment:

- to meet the desired condition;
- because proposed treatment acres are inadequate to begin treating the most at-risk category 2 and 3 lands;
- because prescribed fire treatment acres are unrealistic, which presents too great an expense and risk.

(Letter #s: 502, 467, 418, 466, 445, 425, 362, 342, 304, 128, 207, 413)

PC# FRE0013

The FS should adopt a Plan to treat forest lands in the WUI:

- including all forest lands in condition class 2 and 3 within ten years;
- before other forest lands;
- that prohibits the use of wildland fire, which is an inappropriate tool in the WUI.

(Letter #s: 336, 5, 4, 3, 2, 138, 496, 306)

PC# FRE0014

The FS should prioritize WUI fire protection by:

- excluding low population rural areas from the WUI;
- prioritizing protection for populated areas over isolated residences.

(Letter #s: 301, 328, 416, 473)

PC# FRE0015

The FS should adopt a fuel treatment Plan for NFS lands outside the WUI that will treat all condition class 2 and 3 lands within 25 years.

(Letter #s: 2, 3, 4, 5)

PC# FRE0022

The FS should consider adding to Fire Objectives "Establish shaded fuel breaks on major ridges throughout the Forest."

(Letter #s: 218)

Subject: GLOSSARY (PC #s starting with GLO)

Category: Glossary

PC# GLO0003

The FS should consider the following changes or additions to the glossary:

- recognize in the definitions for summer and winter recreation that in any given year, weather patterns or conditions on the ground could modify the dates specified. Adding the word "generally" before the dates would help avoid illogical application of the dates;
- define high priority restoration watersheds in the glossary.

(Letter #s: 257, 444, 197)

PC# GLO0004

Define "sustained yield".

(Letter #s: 331)

PC# GLO0005

Reference where the term "properly functioning condition" is defined.

(Letter #s: 197)

Subject: GRAZING (PC #s starting with GRZ)

Category: Grazing Forestwide Desired Condition

PC# GRZ0001

The FS should consider revising the Grazing Desired Condition to:

- limit suitable grazing lands;
- keep grazing from degrading habitat for other species;
- prevent sedimentation;
- include the language - "Over the life of the Plan and into the future, foliage is sustainable and not degraded, with no watershed damage. Grazing is also sustainable;"
- include the language - "Grazing occurs where soil and vegetation conditions are not degraded, and at a level that is sustainable and protective of riparian area integrity, wetlands, streambank and channel stability, and water quality."

(Letter #s: 197, 257, 434)

PC# GRZ0002

The FS should restrict livestock in riparian areas and wetlands:

- and provide alternative drinking sources;
- to prevent sediment contribution to streams;
- to protect stream bank and channel stability;

- to protect water quality;
- to prevent soil and vegetation degradation.

(Letter #: 426, 465, 257)

PC# GRZ0003

The FS should consider revising the Grazing Desired Condition to include:

- no net increase of Animal Unit Months (AUMs);
- closing abandoned allotments unless grazing will help achieve a desired condition.

(Letter #: 465)

PC# GRZ0004

The FS should consider revising the Grazing Objectives:

- to ensure that grazing management moves allotments toward the desired condition for grazing and for watersheds and aquatic species;
- including the language "Sustainable grazing opportunities will be provided consistent with the protection of other resources, including riparian area integrity, streambank and channel stability and water quality. "

(Letter #: 257)

PC# GRZ0005

The FS should identify the number of grazing allotments needing revision to meet desired conditions for other resources.

(Letter #: 257)

PC# GRZ0006

The FS should report grazing figures in animal unit months (AUMs) in lieu of Head Months (HMs).

(Letter #: 197)

PC# GRZ0007

The FS should consider the following additions to Grazing Guidelines:

- provide sustainable grazing management protective of other resources;
- protect riparian areas and water quality;
- provide water development restrictions;
- restrict livestock salting;
- address future permit (re-)issuance and problematic allotments;
- include - "Maximum utilization of 40% and maintenance of a 6-inch stubble height in RCAs, as delineated by INFS; No more than 40% utilization of upland vegetation with a minimum 4-inch stubble height; New water developments or other livestock facilities shall not be permitted in RCAs;
- Livestock salting should be prohibited in RCAs; Only annual, once-over sheep grazing should be permitted; and New, reconstructed, or replaced livestock water developments must provide access and escapement from water for all types of wildlife."

(Letter #: 339)

Subject: HERITAGE (PC #s starting with HRT)

Category: Heritage Forestwide Desired Condition

PC# HRT0001

The FS should consider an addition to the Heritage Objectives that would emphasize the importance of cultural resource properties as well as historic properties.

(Letter #s: 456)

PC# HRT0002

The FS should incorporate geocaching as a tool for interpretation of the heritage resource program.

(Letter #s: 448)

PC# HRT0003

The FS should amend the following Heritage Resources Guidelines:

- "Leave historic human remains undisturbed unless there is an urgent reason (e.g., human health and safety, natural event, etc) for their disinterment." Leave the word "historic" out of this sentence. [justification] - From an anthropological standpoint, this could imply that protohistoric and prehistoric human remains could be disturbed. The elimination of "historic" would simply say no human remains should be disturbed unless there is a very good reason.

(Letter #s: 457, 319)

Subject: INVENTORIED ROADLESS (PC #s starting with IRA)

Category: Inventoried Roadless Areas Sources of Design Criteria

PC# IRA0001

The FS should use the information in the Wilderness Needs Assessment for determining which IRAs should be recommended for Wilderness to achieve the objectives for under-represented habitat types on both forests and to benefit native plant species.

(Letter #s: 423, 339, 293)

PC# IRA0002

The FS should manage Inventoried Roadless Areas for protection of natural resources:

- including wilderness characteristics, wildlife, clean water and old-growth;
- which will improve local economic growth;
- in IRAs near the Bitterroot Crest, which serve as a corridor for the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness, the Cabinet-Yaak ecosystem, and the Northern Continental Divide ecosystem;
- in all IRAs;
- close to cities;
- in the Cabinet/Yaak ecosystems.

(Letter #s: 481, 398, 400, 419, 401, 434, 475, 485, 506, 64, 66, 72, 356, 468, 256, 340, 107, 138, 140, 143, 182, 293, 301, 308, 322, 421, 328, 339, 153)

PC# IRA0006

The KNF should reconsider the following statement regarding management direction for IRAs as it appears decisional: On page 1-1, "Upon Plan approval, management direction of IRAs is determined by the Land Management Plan".

(Letter #s: 387)

PC# IRA0007

The FS should broaden IRA suitability in:

- some IRAs to include timber management, motorized recreation, and commercial resort development;
- all IRAs to include multiple use.

(Letter #: 336, 418, 354, 38)

PC# IRA0009

The FS should consider the following MA allocation changes for IRAs:

- in the Long Canyon IRA of the IPNF, the MA allocation should allow fire, insect and disease management on an as-needed basis without administrative review;
- change de-facto wilderness allocations to multiple use;
- in the Sheep Mountain IRA, the MA allocation should maintain the current roadless and unmotorized condition;
- on the KNF and IPNF, change portions of Scotchman Peaks to MA1e;
- for IRAs not currently designated as Recommended Wilderness, change to MA5;
- in the Revett Lake area, revise to ensure maximum protection;
- in Beauty Creek Canyon, revise to prohibit roading and logging;
- in the east and west branches of Bug Creek in Gold Hill, change to MA6 so the mature lodgepole pine stands can be harvested rather than burn;
- in the roadless areas surrounding the Cabinet Mountain Wilderness on the KNF, change to MA1d to protect productive middle and lower elevation wildlife habitat;
- Flagstaff Mountain IRA #690 should be allocated to MA5a or roadless/ nonmotorized as bighorn sheep winter range to a recovering herd, and because it is adjacent to the Kootenai Falls Wildlife Management Area;
- the east face of the Cabinet Mountain Wilderness and the areas to the south should be allocated to MA1b or MA5a as critical to grizzly bear recovery;
- the West Fork Elk IRA #692, Lone Cliff West #674, Devil's Gap #698, and McNeely #675 should be allocated to MA5a or roadless/nonmotorized because of their elk habitat security value;
- the Northwest Peaks, Buckhorn Ridge, Grizzly Peak, Roderick mountain, and Gold Mountain should be designated MA1b or roadless/nonmotorized due to their value for big game, grizzly bear, and furbearer habitat security in the FWP Purcell Mountain Elk Management Unit (EMU);
- the Alexander/Canoe Gulch IRA #696 should be allocated to MA5a or roadless/nonmotorized for big game winter range security;
- SEE ALSO Public Concern Statements: MGA0021, MGA0024, MGA0025.

(Letter #: 34, 460, 85, 59, 517, 514, 378, 35, 339, 26, 401, 355)

PC# IRA0010

The FS should reconcile its definition for a "road" for the purposes of identifying roadless areas, with the definition provided by Congress.

(Letter #: 506)

PC# IRA0011

The FS should limit the suitability of IRAs:

- for some management activities, including road construction, timber production and harvest, and mining;
- by prohibiting mechanized equipment in IRAs as incompatible with wilderness values and because they spread noxious weeds;

- by prohibiting motorized use in IRAs: * including snowmobiling in the Selkirk Crest, Northwest Peaks and Ten Lakes roadless areas, *in all IRAs, in those IRAs that are Recommended Wilderness, * in non-inventoried roadless areas, * including ATVs because the transportation system should be limited to single-track trails, *to protect grizzly bears;
- by maintaining existing nonmotorized designations;
- by prohibiting timber harvest, roadbuilding, and vegetation manipulation, because the ICBEMP science shows roadless areas are healthiest.

(Letter #s: 182, 277, 294, 339, 460, 473, 64, 94, 267, 66, 122, 222, 116, 131, 153, 173, 203, 185, 112, 114)

PC# IRA0012

The FS should reinventory roadless areas in compliance with NEPA, NFMA and the Wilderness Act.

(Letter #s: 153, 339, 506)

PC# IRA0013

The FS should allow natural processes to determine the future condition of roadless areas.

(Letter #s: 506)

PC# IRA0014

The FS should allocate large non-inventoried roadless areas and those adjacent to existing IRAs to MA5 and MA1b.

(Letter #s: 60, 94, 460, 114)

PC# IRA0016

The FS should explain how the new Roadless Rule guidelines for State input into IRA management will affect the uses and activities in different MAs.

(Letter #s: 257, 339, 197)

PC# IRA0020

The FS should consider the potential for skewed results in the roadless inventory and evaluation process due to lack of monitoring over the past Planning period.

(Letter #s: 153, 339)

PC# IRA0022

The FS should use a comprehensible rating system that generates consistent determinations of Wilderness Availability, Capability and Need in the Wilderness Needs Assessment in order to avoid appearing arbitrary.

(Letter #s: 339, 506, 153)

PC# IRA0024

The FS should reevaluate the Wilderness ratings in the Wilderness Needs Assessment:

- as they are contradictory to administrative and legislative direction;
- to take into consideration the mix of lands that best meet public needs;
- where the rating was based on presence of bull and westslope cutthroat trout, which conflicts with current inventories and best available science;
- for all criteria because the needs analysis fails to adequately consider the importance of large contiguous blocks of wildland and roadless areas;
- for availability, which fails to consider availability nationwide;
- for capability, where increased development and commercial activity occur;
- for suitability and capability, which are not clearly separated in the assessment;

- for all criteria to improve comprehensibility and more clearly connect the recommendations with the ratings;
- for all criteria for the Mallard-Larkins, Mosquito Fly, Sheep Mountain/State Line, Midget Peak, Pinchot Butte and Grandmother Mountain IRAs.

(Letter #: 339, 506, 64, 153)

PC# IRA0027

The FS should revise the Inventoried Roadless Areas Desired Condition and Wilderness, Wilderness Study Areas, and Wild Lands Desired Condition to emphasize active management of these areas within the constraints of the Wilderness Act.

(Letter #: 146)

PC# IRA0028

The FS should substantiate the scientific basis on which guidance for roadless area management is promulgated in compliance with NEPA.

(Letter #: 468)

PC# IRA0030

The IPNF should suspend new road construction in IRAs until the State has completed their petition for roadless area assessments.

(Letter #: 458)

Category: MA 1b - Recommended Wilderness

PC# IRA0008

The FS should allocate the following IRAs for Recommended Wilderness (MA1b):

- all IRAs;
- Gold Hill in the Yaak as the lowest elevation wilderness in Montana;
- all IRAs on the KNF;
- all IRAs in the Yaak ;
- IRAs adjacent to the Cabinet Wilderness for mid and lower elevation habitat;
- Northwest Peaks and southern Buckhorn Ridge on both the IPNF and KNF;
- Scotchman Peaks on the KNF and IPNF;
- those IRAs with the highest ranking in the Wilderness Needs Assessment;
- all roadless areas recommended under the Rockies Prosperity Act;
- to protect roadless areas from salvage sales;
- SEE ALSO Public Concern Statements: MGA0021 AND MGA0024.

(Letter #: 506, 419, 436, 450, 459, 460, 468, 493, 374, 517, 66, 68, 94, 392, 48, 277, 42, 37, 156, 171, 203, 26, 293, 294, 310, 322, 323, 334, 339, 153, 222)

PC# IRA0018

The FS should reevaluate Saddle Mountain, Buckhorn Ridge, and Grizzly Peak for Wilderness recommendation because the assertion of unmanageability due to road proximity is unsustainable.

(Letter #: 48)

PC# RA0019

The FS should reconsider the rationale for excluding the Grandmother Mountain IRA from Recommended Wilderness because neither the Wilderness Act or the Idaho/Arkansas Land Exchange include language restricting consideration based on past funding sources for trails, or reconsidering land management designations in forest Planning.

(Letter #: 339)

Subject: LANDS/SPECIAL USES (PC #s starting with LND)

Category: Lands Forestwide Desired Condition

PC# LND0001

The FS should ensure public access is maintained on all land exchanges between private and public entities.

(Letter #: 355, 280)

PC# LND0002

The FS should consider revising the Lands Desired Condition to include:

- On page 1-32, "The public's forest lands will not be sold to increase federal income and help alleviate budget problems. Land ownership is adjusted (acquired or conveyed) only to provide reasonable access."

(Letter #: 434)

PC# LND0003

The FS should include additional special use permit standards to:

- restrict locations for utility and communication corridors and access roads;
- prohibit right-of-ways in recommended wilderness, inventoried roadless areas, proposed wild and scenic river corridors, or in the habitat for threatened, endangered, or candidate species;
- require proposals for new special use permits to utilize existing corridors.

(Letter #: 339)

PC# LND0005

The FS should disclose impacts of the Energy Corridor Environmental Impact Statement on the PLMP.

(Letter #: 456)

PC# LND0006

The FS should maintain existing mountaintop communication towers/sites in order to serve the increasingly important wireless communication network.

(Letter #: 280)

PC# LND0007

The FS should address the need for consolidation and reduction of NFS lands in the Wildland Urban Interface.

(Letter #: 199)

PC# LND0008

The FS should consider adding monitoring questions for lands to:

- address miles of forest boundary reduced;
- address acres removed from the wildland urban interface;
- address acquired and conveyed acres.

(Letter #: 199)

PC# LND0009

The FS should disclose foreseeable actions for the land adjustment program:

- to include consideration of the benefits isolated parcels provide;
- because land base and ownership pattern are important considerations for all management activities over the life of the LMP.

(Letter #: 199, 465)

PC# LND0010

The FS should recognize the special use permit agreements between the FS and the Flathead Lutheran Bible Camp.

(Letter #: 499)

PC# LND0011

The FS should prohibit the sale of public lands, including lands in the Fisher GA.

(Letter #: 210, 280, 209)

PC# LND0012

The FS should acquire Plum Creek lands to:

- protect open space values;
- allow for timber production;
- prohibit development;
- maintain traditional public recreation use.

(Letter #: 280)

PC# LND0013

The FS should consider the following additions to Land Objectives:

- time limits for responding to easement requests;
- a quantifiable objective for reducing National Forest System land inholdings.

(Letter #: 336)

PC# LND0014

The KNF should address the increasing conflicts between outfitter use and allocation and non-outfitted users, which may indicate that outfitter use is compromising outstandingly remarkable fisheries values.

(Letter #: 517)

Subject: MANAGEMENT AREA (PC #s. starting with MGA)

Category: Access & Recreation Other

PC# MGA0096

The FS should take no action within 10 miles of the Canadian Border that would limit or interfere in any way with the ability of our Homeland Security Agencies or military agencies to patrol and protect our border. In this vein, we urge opening of the "Bog Creek" Road to enhance the national security interest and allow public enjoyment of that route from Bonners Ferry to Priest River.

(Letter #: 514)

Category: MA - 1a Wilderness

PC# MGA0001

The FS should allow natural processes to determine the future condition of Wilderness areas.

(Letter #: 153, 410)

PC# MGA0002

The FS should limit Wilderness to existing designations:

- so that the remainder of the forest can be managed for forest health;
- because the areas now under consideration for Recommended Wilderness are only marginally qualified.

(Letter #s: 132, 405, 500, 98, 491, 439, 408, 326, 307, 299, 289, 208, 252)

PC# MGA0003

The management direction in the PLMPs regarding Wilderness suitability should adhere more closely to the Wilderness Act with:

- regards to agency-ignited fire, structures such as bridges and repeaters, gathering firewood and special forest products ,which are considered generally unsuitable;
- an emphasis on maintenance of wilderness character as the overriding mandate for Wilderness.

(Letter #s: 153, 294, 506)

PC# MGA0004

The FS should consider revising the Wilderness, Wilderness Study Areas, and Wild Lands Desired Condition to include that future congressional designation could allow motorized and mechanized uses.

(Letter #s: 444)

PC# MGA0007

The FS should consider the following additional objectives for Wilderness (MA1a):

- the number of sites needing restoration and the percentage being addressed;
- targeting real achievements such as restoring natural fire, managing outfitters, trail maintenance, and measuring human impact.

(Letter #s: 146, 456)

PC# MGA0008

The IPNF should work to ensure uniform and coordinated management of Wilderness for those areas that cross jurisdictions by consolidating management of:

- Scotchman Peaks under one Forest;
- Grandmother Mountain under one agency.

(Letter #s: 378)

Category: MA - 1b Recommended Wilderness

PC# MGA0005

The FS should manage Recommended Wilderness (MA1b):

- for both public and administrative uses while protecting wilderness values;
- ensuring the management criteria are less restrictive than those for MA1a;
- in order to avoid managing these areas as de-facto wilderness.

(Letter #s: 146, 7, 110, 355, 327)

PC# MGA0013

The FS should increase the amount of Recommended Wilderness (MA1b) beyond what was proposed in the Starting Option:

- to balance use by motorized and pedestrian recreation users while protecting the capability of the land to provide clean water, productive trout streams, big game and endangered species habitat;
- to 10% of the KNF land base;
- by designating all IRAs as Recommended Wilderness;

- by proposing an IPNF Wilderness of 2,742,312 acres;
- to include all alpine, forest, and mountain areas;
- by increasing the acres of Recommended Wilderness within the Scotchman Peaks IRA on the IPNF to improve access to the underserved nonmotorized users;
- for the Cabinet Mountains Wilderness "All 5a and 4a recommendations contiguous with or within any MA1a and/or MA1b proposals. All of the Rock Creek drainage above the gate on Road 150A in Section 2 of T26N, R32W. The MA6b designation adjacent to Orr Creek Road 2285 in Sections 11 and 12 of T26N, R32W. The MA6b designation south of Engle Lakes in Section 19 of T26N, R31 W. All of Sections 6 and 7, at Green Mountain, in T25N, R31 W. All of Section 17 and all MA5b in Section 18, south of Green Mountain, in T25N, R31W. All MA5a, MA5b and MA2 designations in the Galena, Allen Peak, and Barren Peak Inventoried Roadless Areas. All MA5b lands contiguous with the east front and the north end of the Cabinet Mountains Wilderness (CMW) with the following exceptions: * Existing primitive road or trail access to patented mining claims. It is recommended, in the event such patented mining claims become part of the public domain, and if such acquisitions should take place before any anticipated official Wilderness additions, that the forest Planning language be written to anticipate such occurrence, so that such parcels might be automatically designated as MA1b, Recommended Wilderness. *Road access to the Leigh Lake and Granite Lake Trailheads. It is recommended that all other roads in the aforementioned MA5b lands, contiguous with the east front and the north end of the CMW, be allowed to revegetate or be maintained as wilderness trails. We further ask that the USFS recommend, as Wilderness, the MA6b lands found along the east front of the CMW in Sections 6,7,18, 19 and 30, and portions of Sections 29 and 32 in T29N, R3 1 W."

(Letter #s: 252, 424, 66, 475, 471, 436, 103, 173, 157, 143, 105, 324, 332)

PC# MGA0014

The FS should permit motorized use in Recommended Wilderness (MA1b):

- to the extent wilderness values are not compromised and to maintain traditional opportunities;
- because there is no legal mandate to prohibit these uses in MA1b or MA1c;
- because prohibiting snowmobiles is contrary to the 2005 OHV rule;
- because managing these areas as de-facto wilderness is contrary to law and congressional intent.

(Letter #s: 446, 454, 474, 480, 491, 494, 64, 109, 444, 500, 439, 431, 427, 393, 391, 390, 312, 110, 306)

PC# MGA0016

The FS should prohibit motorized and mechanized uses in Recommended Wilderness (MA1b) for administrative purposes.

(Letter #s: 107, 153, 359, 401)

PC# MGA0018

The FS should reexamine the LMP Wilderness recommendations to ensure that only areas without roads are being recommended.

(Letter #s: 377, 233)

PC# MGA0019

The FS should consider revising the Desired Condition for Recommended Wilderness (MA1b) and base it on ground conditions rather than number of acres.

(Letter #s: 444)

PC# MGA0020

The FS should use non-commodity, long-term benefit values rather than resource needs and income-based values in the Wilderness Needs Assessment.

(Letter #: 434)

PC# MGA0021

The KNF should allocate the following areas to Recommended Wilderness (MA1b):

- as originally described in the Starting Option;
- where the allocation has been changed from MA1b to accommodate motorized use;
- all IRAs on the Forest;
- Tuchuck, Galena, Upper East Blue Creek, Zulu, Allen Peak, Chippewa, Willard-Estelle, Roberts, Mt. Henry, Mt. Robinson, Pink Mountain, Thompson Seton, Mount Hefty, and Cataract areas;
- Roderick/Saddle/Grizzly Complex, Buckhorn Peaks, Scotchman Peaks, and Northwest Peaks and Gold Hill of the Yaak for grizzly and furbearer habitat, as low elevation wilderness, and as a transition zone to the Fisher River;
- Cabinet Face East and West, McKay Creek, Trout Creek, East and West Forks of Elk Creek, to protect grizzly;
- all IRAs adjacent to the Cabinet Wilderness for mid and low elevation habitat;
- Buckhorn Ridge and Northwest Peaks for remote alpine scenery;
- Savage Mountain area in Scotchman Peaks as critical goat habitat;
- Winton Weydemeyer as part of a wildlife corridor to Canada;
- all IRAs and the unique ecosystems in the Yaak;
- the area south and east of Billiard Table because this change is not justified in the LMP or the CER;
- in areas that are readily accessible from nearby cities and towns;
- SEE ALSO Public Concern Statement MGA0099.

(Letter #: 396, 372, 99, 374, 314, 375, 376, 381, 385, 39, 55, 397, 398, 399, 400, 404, 407, 41, 414, 419, 42, 387, 335, 422, 317, 318, 32, 322, 324, 328, 329, 33, 315, 334, 37, 338, 341, 345, 349, 351, 358, 360, 361, 363, 366, 333, 77, 53, 63, 65, 66, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 56, 76, 54, 80, 83, 84, 86, 9, 90, 91, 93, 26, 313, 75, 455, 424, 426, 428, 43, 434, 435, 436, 438, 443, 62, 452, 423, 46, 475, 48, 495, 507, 51, 510, 511, 517, 52, 450, 184, 159, 16, 161, 164, 165, 166, 169, 173, 177, 206, 183, 147, 19, 195, 196, 198, 20, 201, 203, 204, 205, 18, 12, 261, 311, 10, 100, 102, 103, 104, 106, 112, 150, 114, 15, 120, 122, 126, 127, 13, 131, 137, 139, 144, 143, 113, 293, 276, 310, 31, 281, 283, 285, 286, 288, 29, 273, 291, 277, 297, 298, 301, 302, 303, 308, 309, 215, 138, 290, 232, 217, 220, 221, 222, 224, 225, 226, 28, 231, 270, 233, 239, 262, 245, 246, 251, 253, 259, 260, 241, 228, 268, 265)

PC# MGA0022

The FS should refrain from recommending Wilderness (MA1b) in the following areas:

- the Winton Weydemeyer area;
- anywhere on the KNF or IPNF;
- Roderick IRA, the Cabinet Additions, and the Yaak;
- Scotchman Peaks on the IPNF because it would be too restrictive to the majority of current users;

(Letter #: 484, 486, 490, 492, 57, 67, 252, 483, 59, 446, 433, 429, 427, 354, 242, 129, 470, 411)

PC# MGA0024

The IPNF should allocate the following areas to Recommended Wilderness (MA1b):

- as recommended in the 1987 Forest Plan;

- as described in the Starting Option to balance motorized and nonmotorized recreation, and maintain critical wildlife habitat;
- as proposed in HR 1204;
- where the allocation has been changed from MA1b to accommodate motorized use;
- IRAs in the northwest corner of the IPNF that are currently allocated to MA3 or MA5;
- Northwest Peaks and southern Buckhorn Ridge on both Forests;
- Yankee Peak, Snow Peak/Canyon Creek, Foehl Creek, and Little North Fork;
- Sheep Mountain, Midget Peak and Mosquito-Fly Creek to protect clean water and habitat;
- roadless portions of Bad Bear and Spotted Lewis Creeks as home to one of Idaho's largest goat herds;
- Grandmother Mountain, Marble Creek and Lost Lake complex for their mountain hemlock forests, wolves, high lakes, and pristine trout stream;
- Selkirks, Continental Mountain, Saddle Mountain, Willard-Estelle and Salmo-Priest Inventoried Roadless Areas as "backyard" wilderness;
- Upper North Fork as critical bull trout habitat;
- headwaters of the St. Joe River with ecologically unique St. Joe Lake with its native fish;
- part of Scotchman Peaks surrounding Lightning Peak where lower elevation passes are vital wildlife corridors and microclimates for native Plant communities;
- Scotchman Peaks IRA on both Forests to protect caribou, mountain goat, grizzly bear, and wolverine;
- Pinchot Butte to protect rare bogs with unique Plant species.

(Letter #s: 475, 481, 479, 478, 424, 476, 485, 473, 464, 462, 487, 447, 80, 42, 410, 452, 82, 96, 402, 95, 103, 93, 92, 513, 83, 493, 81, 65, 512, 506, 501, 497, 88, 147, 179, 178, 175, 153, 401, 200, 148, 174, 145, 134, 117, 115, 108, 111, 149, 365, 378, 150, 367, 229, 36, 359, 346, 337, 255, 244, 236, 235, 230, 341, 371)

PC# MGA0025

The FS should change the following Recommended Wilderness (MA1b) allocations:

- Salmo-Priest and the Selkirk Crest IRAs to MA1e or MA5 to permit existing snowmobile access;
- all MA1b designations to MA1e to allow motorized summer and winter use without detracting from future inclusion as Wilderness;
- Selkirk Crest to MA1e, MA3 or MA7 because it is too narrow for effective wilderness and should continue to serve the public in its current capacity;
- Scotchman Peaks to MA6, MA5, or MA3 because it is too small to be effective wilderness;
- Parker Canyon to MA6;
- Salmo-Priest area to MA6;
- IRAs currently allocated to 'Backcountry' allocations in order to meet the requirements of the federal habitat conservation strategy for grizzly bear, such as the East Cabinets, because in the multi-agency enumeration of NCDE grizzly bear populations and monitoring strategies for future potential delisting, it is assumed that management of these critical grizzly habitat areas will not change;
- SEE ALSO Public Concern Statement MGA0099.

(Letter #s: 110, 60, 514, 470, 444, 418, 336, 35)

PC# MGA0028

The IPNF should allocate the area around the Selkirk crest to General Forest (MA6) or Backcountry (MA5).

(Letter #: 470)

PC# MGA0032

The IPNF should move the boundary of the Long Canyon area to the historic line of ridgetop to ridgetop.

(Letter #: 514)

PC# MGA0093

The FS should not propose any management changes in the Long Canyon area that would jeopardize the core grizzly bear habitat.

(Letter #: 60)

PC# MGA0094

The FS should extend the Wilderness boundary of Long Canyon, Parker Canyon, and the roadless portion of Fisher Canyon to the West Side Road, to encompass an entire drainage.

(Letter #: 473)

PC# MGA0099

The FS should recommend areas with wilderness characteristics for Wilderness designation:

- to focus management of some areas on preservation and education in lieu of recreation and access;
- to benefit habitat and rare Plant species;
- because of benefits to local economies through hunting, fishing and tourism;
- because eliminating Recommended Wilderness eliminates multiple use;
- to protect clean water;
- because "manageability" is an invalid reason for alternative allocations;
- to protect these areas from development;
- to protect existing and potential old-growth;
- to protect the few remaining areas embodying the values outlined in the LMPs;
- because Congress only designates Wilderness from areas recommended for Wilderness by the FS;
- because other allocations are vulnerable to pressure from special interests;
- because they have been assessed for capability, suitability, and need in the Wilderness Needs.

(Letter #: 27, 424, 274, 87, 257, 247, 226, 151, 423, 267)

PC# MGA0101

The FS should make recommendations for Wilderness designation on a site- specific rather than programmatic basis.

(Letter #: 444)

PC# MGA0105

The FS should consider the following guideline across Region One for travel management in MA1b: "Travel is strictly nonmotorized, except for administrative or permitted uses" which complies with FSM 1923.03 by preserving wilderness values in these areas.

(Letter #: 444, 216)

Category: MA - 1c Wilderness Study Area

PC# MGA0035

The FS should prohibit motorized use in the following Wilderness Study Areas (MA1c) in:

- all WSAs;
- the Ten Lakes WSA because according to law, WSAs are to be managed as wilderness;
- the Grandmother Mountain area because it's incompatible with maintaining an untrammelled condition.

(Letter #s: 339, 394, 506)

PC# MGA0037

The FS should eliminate the Wilderness Study Area (MA1c) allocation.

(Letter #s: 132)

Category: MA - 1d Wild Lands

PC# MGA0023

The FS should use management area designations that have clearly defined legal meaning, such as the "backcountry" and "wildlands" designations are descriptive phrases for a current condition rather than legally grounded terms.

(Letter #s: 250, 88, 45)

PC# MGA0039

The FS should change the following Wild Lands (MA1d) allocations:

- To MA1b - the Ten Lakes area because of its importance as a wildlife corridor and caribou habitat; the Scotchman Peaks so management is consistent with the IPNF, and to protect it from winter motorized recreation; the Cabinet Mountains Addition, Roderick Mountain, Scotchman Peaks, and the Whitefish Divide to provide for long-term stability, productivity, biological diversity, and protect population strongholds; Swamp/Goat/McKay Creeks adjacent to the Cabinet Wilderness; the Selkirks to protect caribou; and Five Lake Butte on the IPNF because it meets all the wilderness criteria;
- To MA1c - the Ten Lakes Area;
- To MA1e - in the Ten Lakes Area to permit winter motorized use; for all MA1d to reflect community suggestions;
- To MA3 - in the Ten Lakes Area because it is too small for Wilderness eligibility;
- To MA5b or MA5c - in the Dry Creek area to permit snowmobiling; to MA5b in the Roderick IRA to permit use of existing motorized routes; in the Cabinet Mountain Additions to keep them open for recreation;
- To MA6 - or change the boundaries in the Scenery Mountain area to reduce fire danger in the urban interface; for the Cabinet Mountain Additions because of enforcement problems with MA1d.

(Letter #s: 46, 381, 394, 418, 436, 374, 453, 387, 517, 57, 59, 60, 69, 444, 137, 417, 129, 35, 167, 21, 218, 23, 304, 305, 327, 334, 34, 344, 285, 108)

PC# MGA0040

The KNF should eliminate the Wild Lands (MA1d) allocation because:

- management is identical to MA1b;
- it prohibits winter motorized and mechanized uses;
- it is unnecessary and should be replaced with pure multiple use.

(Letter #s: 136, 354, 353, 327, 252, 216, 237)

PC# MGA0041

The FS should consider revising the Wild Lands (MA1d) suitability to:

- include winter motorized use;
- include mountain biking in the Cabinet Peaks addition, Roderick, Scotchman Peaks, Whitefish Divide, and Grandmother Mountain area;
- permit mountain bikes per the IMBA Memorandum of Understanding;
- include Wild Lands (MA1d) in the timber base.

(Letter #: 353, 181, 208, 294, 373, 425, 427, 444, 57, 59, 326)

Category: MA - 1e Primitive Lands

PC# MGA0045

The IPNF should monitor and analyze recreational uses in Primitive Lands (MA1e) in order to ensure the primitive values and resources are not overwhelmed by allowed uses, and in order to impose appropriate restrictions.

(Letter #: 339)

PC# MGA0047

The IPNF should clearly define "backcountry values".

(Letter #: 110)

PC# MGA0048

The IPNF should change the following Primitive Lands (MA1e) allocations to:

- MA1b or MA5a in vital wildlife habitat;
- MA1b in the Selkirk Crest for wilderness qualities, to protect the integrity of wildlife habitat and corridors in relationship to the entire roadless complex, and to protect rare low elevation coastal forest;
- MA5 east of Pack River and west of Roman Nose Divide.

(Letter #: 339, 82, 83, 296)

Category: MA - 2a /2b Wild and Scenic Rivers

PC# MGA0049

The FS should recommend the following rivers for Wild and Scenic designation:

- all eligible rivers, with full protection until congressionally designated;
- Upper Priest, Coeur d'Alene, North Fork Coeur d'Alene, Little North Fork Clearwater, Yaak River, Kootenai River, Bull River, Vermilion River, Pack River; and the Yaak River as a blue ribbon trout stream;
- additional stretches on the main stem of the Bull River;
- all those deemed eligible in the Starting Option unless there are documented circumstances that have changed their eligibility criteria.

(Letter #: 257, 476, 475, 436, 339, 206, 398)

PC# MGA0050

The FS should propose 'wild' river designation only for those rivers that lie within wilderness and are within their historic fire regime.

(Letter #: 152, 170, 223)

PC# MGA0051

The FS should broaden Wild and Scenic Rivers (MA2) suitability to permit:

- motorized and mechanized use in all three categories (wild, scenic, and recreational);
- vegetation management in areas outside the historic range of variation for fire in order to prevent losses to catastrophic fire.

(Letter #s: 110, 254, 331)

PC# MGA0052

The FS should limit Wild and Scenic River (MA2) suitability to prohibit logging, mining, development, and nonconforming special uses.

(Letter #s: 506)

PC# MGA0053

The FS should remove some rivers from Wild and Scenic (MA2) consideration including:

- the main stem of Bull River because it lacks community support;
- creeks, small tributaries and intermittent streams because these areas should be managed as buffers to decrease the probability of catastrophic fire.

(Letter #s: 218, 413, 417)

PC# MGA0055

The FS should determine Wild and Scenic River (MA2) classifications by getting in the field on a boat on the river rather than in the office looking at a map.

(Letter #s: 398)

PC# MGA0056

The KNF should include a Wild and Scenic Rivers Objective to develop a management Plan for any eligible designated rivers.

(Letter #s: 257)

PC# MGA0057

The FS should articulate the decision making process used to alter the Wild and Scenic River (MA2) designations from the Starting Option and describe the management strategies for these areas that will maintain their Outstandingly Remarkable Values."

(Letter #s: 339)

PC# MGA0058

The FS should make a distinction in the Wild and Scenic River (MA2b) allocation between those rivers that are 'wild' versus those which are 'scenic'.

(Letter #s: 374)

PC# MGA0059

The IPNF should actively manage wild and scenic rivers to protect them from recreation abuse.

(Letter #s: 142)

PC# MGA0102

The FS should recommend eligible rivers for Wild and Scenic designation to protect them from development.

(Letter #s: 229, 512)

PC# MGA0103

The IPNF should change the MA2 designation of the upper segment of the Little North Fork inside the Grandmother Mountain roadless area from recreational to wild.

(Letter #: 506)

Category: MA - 3 Special Interest Areas

PC# MGA0060

The FS should maintain historical and existing uses in Special Interest Areas (MA3) areas including winter motorized uses in:

- aquatic, botanical, ecological and zoological SIAs;
- geologic, recreation and scenic SIAs;
- areas with written grooming agreements including Spread Creek, Keeler Creek, Graves Creek, East Fork, Purcell, Pete Creek, Whitetail, Rainbow Lake, and Big Creek;
- in the MA3 scenic area in the Ten Lakes area.

(Letter #: 304, 411, 57)

PC# MGA0061

The FS should consider revising the following Special Interest Areas (MA3) allocations:

- MA3 acreage surrounding the Ten Lakes WSA should be allocated to MA1d to consolidate a large roadless block for ease of management and ecological integrity;
- MA3 area surrounding the Ten Lakes WSA should be MA1e and permit winter motorized use;
- Pioneer area of the Mallard Larkins should be MA1b because it rates "high" in all criteria for wilderness classification, and because an MA1b allocation will ensure management consistency with the adjacent Clearwater/Nez Recommended Wilderness.

(Letter #: 203, 380)

PC# MGA0062

The FS should define Special Interest Areas as per 36 CFR 219.7(a)(2)(v).

(Letter #: 480)

Category: MA - 4a Research Natural Areas

PC# MGA0063

The FS should broaden the suitable uses for Research Natural Areas (MA4a) to allow traditional winter motorized use to continue.

(Letter #: 304, 57)

PC# MGA0064

The FS should consider the following additional Research Natural Areas (MA4a):

- Lost Lake in the Little North Fork Clearwater for comparable management to the adjacent BLM lands;
- streams entering the St Joe River to provide research and monitoring opportunities;
- in the Upper St Joe drainage allocate undisturbed sites as examples of pristine ecosystems;
- Black Prince Creek for its pristine characteristics;
- the entire Mosquito-Fly Creek complex because of beaver activity .

(Letter #: 141, 504)

PC# MGA0065

The KNF should consider revising the following Research Natural Areas (MA4a) allocations to:

- MA6 for the Norman/Parmenter area to enable fuel treatments near the urban interface;
- MA3 for Parmenter Flats to allow multiple use recreation area to reflect existing uses.

(Letter #s: 129)

Category: MA - 5 Backcountry

PC# MGA0066

The FS should broaden the suitability of Backcountry (MA5) to:

- avoid the perception of managing MA5 as de facto wilderness;
- effectively manage hazardous fuels;
- allow facilities that enhance or preserve the backcountry experience;
- include timber harvest;
- manage fuels in the urban interface.

(Letter #s: 413, 418, 110, 336)

PC# MGA0067

The FS should provide additional direction regarding recreation management in MA5 to address the increasing impacts associated with increasing use.

(Letter #s: 339)

PC# MGA0068

The FS should designate Backcountry (MA5) motorized and nonmotorized suitability, with a clear differentiation between winter and summer motorized use in the PLMP:

- because the Planning team has the best access to objective data;
- because the Desired Condition statement includes motorized opportunities;

(Letter #s: 7, 110, 146, 359, 378)

PC# MGA0069

The FS should limit Backcountry (MA5) suitability:

- for motorized use by clearly defining what is meant by "density of motorized routes remain significantly less than MA6";
- prohibiting logging, motorized use and other development;
- allowing natural ecological processes to manage the land.

(Letter #s: 96, 506, 497, 493, 428, 410, 148, 153)

PC# MGA0070

The FS should convert closed roads to trails in Backcountry (MA5) for motorized or nonmotorized use.

(Letter #s: 146, 7)

PC# MGA0071

The FS should reconsider the Backcountry (MA5) designation because:

- backcountry is a misleading, confusing, and undefined term;
- it provides no protection from logging, ATV use, and for areas previously designated as Recommended Wilderness.

(Letter #s: 81, 145)

PC# MGA0072

The FS should more clearly distinguish between the Desired Condition for Backcountry (MA5) and that of MA1 areas because MA5 offers an opportunity for true multiple use adaptive management that MA1 allocations do not.

(Letter #: 146)

PC# MGA0073

The FS should consider changing the following Backcountry (MA5) allocations:

- Packsaddle Mountain should have a more restrictive allocation;
- the area north of Upper Priest IRA to Upper Priest/Hughes should be MA2b;
- returning to the areas designated MA5 in the Starting Option;
- Blacktail Roadless Area should be MA1b;
- Trout Creek Backcountry area should be MA1b;
- Trout Creek Backcountry area should be MA1d including Minton Peak and the middle and lower reaches of White Pine Creek;
- all MA5 should be MA1d to preserve their wilderness characteristics;
- all MA5 IRAs should be allocated MA6;
- the MA5a Scotchman Peaks allocation south of Spar Lake on the KNF should be MA1b because the mineral claim has been abandoned by ASARCO;
- roadless areas on the IPNF Wildland Urban Interface to MA6 in order to effectively manage fuels and fire.

(Letter #: 424, 59, 428, 374, 339, 227, 203, 153, 467)

PC# MGA0075

The FS should modify the Backcountry (MA5) Desired Condition for road construction to include roads needed in conjunction with any mineral lease, license, permit, or approval issued for mineral leasing or locatable mineral operations.

(Letter #: 420)

PC# MGA0078

The KNF should combine all Backcountry (MA5a, 5b, and 5c) allocations into one MA5, similar to the IPNF:

- to allow for consideration of timber production, access and recreation;
- because it is too fine a degree of management direction for this level of Planning.

(Letter #: 444, 57)

PC# MGA0082

The FS should add an MA5.2 in the residential and forest intermix to represent the WUI and prohibit wildland fire use.

(Letter #: 336)

PC# MGA0097

The FS should provide additional guidance for MA5 and MA6 to match the level of guidance for other MAs.

(Letter #: 416)

PC# MGA0104

The FS should broaden Backcountry (MA5) suitability on Lightning Mountain adjacent to Scotchman Peaks to include traditional snowmobile use.

(Letter #: 59)

Category: MA - 5a Backcountry - Nonmotorized summer and winter

PC# MGA0077

- The KNF should change the following Backcountry (MA5a) allocations:
- in the Benning Mountain area, from the Kootenai River south to Twin Peaks, the Scotchman Peaks, Cheer Creek, Glad Creek, Cliff Creek, Spruce Lakes/Drift Peak, West Fork Yaak, in and around Northwest Peaks, Roberts IRA and Lost Creek to MA5c to reflect current use;
- to MA5c south of road 322 in the Clark GA;
- to MA5c in all non-big game winter range currently open to snowmobiles;
- in the Scotchman Peaks, MA5a allocation should be changed to MA1d for management consistency with the IPNF;
- in the Scotchman Peaks, MA5a allocation should be changed to MA1b to prevent snowmobile use in these sensitive habitats;
- all MA5a should be MA5b or MA5c.

(Letter #: 252, 35, 59, 57, 489, 444, 353, 34, 327, 326, 304, 237, 203, 312)

Category: MA - 5b Backcountry - Motorized summer and winter

PC# MGA0076

The FS should expand Backcountry (MA5b) allocations to increase the amount of areas open to motorized summer use.

(Letter #: 418)

PC# MGA0080

The FS should retain the Backcountry (MA5b) allocation:

- next to the Northwest Peaks SIA as one of the few areas open to OHVs;
- on the east face of the Cabinets Mountains to access mining claims.

(Letter #: 57, 516)

PC# MGA0081

The KNF should change the following Backcountry (MA5b) allocations:

- all MA5b allocations on the Bonners Ferry Ranger District should be MA6 because they will never qualify as wilderness candidates;
- in the unroaded area encompassing Marmot Mountain and Cooney Mountain to a more restrictive allocation because motorized use would significantly degrade this wet subalpine meadow ecosystem;
- all MA5b allocations should be eliminated, MA5a areas increased, and MA5c areas decreased.

(Letter #: 514, 426, 293, 322)

Category: MA - 5c Backcountry - Nonmotorized summer, motorized winter

PC# MGA0083

The KNF should change the following Backcountry (MA5c) allocations:

- the Silver Butte-Fisher River drainage should have a more restrictive roadless/non-motorized to better reflect reality;
- Scotchman Peaks, including east of Savage Peak should be MA1b as it is the biological heart of the Scotchman Peaks area, and because there is no rationale or documentation to justify the MA5c allocation;

- on Buckhorn Ridge, Gold Hill West, and Zulu to restrict snowmobile access in late spring when animals are coming out of hibernation;
- Berray Mountain should be MA5a to protect critical fall/winter/spring habitat;
- Buckhorn Ridge IRA #661 to Spread Creek road immediately south of Northwest Peaks should be MA5a as crucial secure grizzly bear, lynx, wolverine, elk, mule deer, moose and whitetail habitat.

(Letter #s: 318, 517, 436, 42, 398, 374, 317, 293, 283, 169, 387)

Category: MA - 6 General Forest

PC# MGA0084

The FS should make all timberlands in General Forest (MA6) available for either timber harvest or timber production.

(Letter #s: 223)

PC# MGA0085

The FS should create sub-allocations for General Forest (MA6):

- that address the range of issues and resource conditions on the Forests including long-term direction by creating management prescription categories like those on the Boise NF to provide direction for active management and to better inform the public;
- for areas around Murphy and Dickey Lakes as General Forest 'Low' because of the value of the area as whitetail deer winter range.

(Letter #s: 517, 423, 300, 339)

PC# MGA0086

The FS should reconsider the General Forest (MA6) allocation because it will result in the proliferation of illegal and damaging ATV use, which the Forests will find difficult to control.

(Letter #s: 329)

PC# MGA0087

The FS should expand the Desired Condition for General Forest (MA6) to include standards to limit introduction of noxious weeds and reduce those present.

(Letter #s: 423)

PC# MGA0098

The FS should consider changing General Forest (MA6) allocations to:

- MA5 for the McArthur Lake wildlife corridor; for the area east of the town of Clark Fork, which links Scotchman Peaks to MA5 lands to the south;
- MA5c for the Elk Creek IRA because it is too steep to be suitable for general timber production;
- more restrictive MA allocations in IRAs.

(Letter #s: 322, 332)

Category: MA - 7 Primary Recreation Areas

PC# MGA0088

The FS should allocate the following areas to Primary Recreation Areas (MA7): Bull Lake, the Yaak valley, East Face of the Cabinets, Cabinet Mountain Wilderness, the Whitefish Range, McGregor Lake, and the Thompson Chain of lakes because of the heavy recreation use they receive.

(Letter #s: 394)

Category: MA Allocation change - general

PC# MGA0091

The FS should consider the following MA allocation changes:

- all non-wilderness areas should be designated MA6;
- all suitable timber production and harvest acres also suitable for other multiple-uses should be allocated to MA6;
- the WUI in the Bull River corridor and Elk Creek area should be allocated to MA5a for minimal treatment by helicopter;
- the Galena and Cataract areas on the KNF should be allocated to MA1d as valuable wildlife corridors.

(Letter #: 129, 223, 398, 47, 481, 505)

PC# MGA0092

The FS should create additional Management Areas to:

- address the range of issues and resource conditions present;
- address the scientific needs and diversity of ecological zones;
- identify and manage wildlife movement corridors;
- identify and manage critical riparian areas with requirements that mirror those of INFS;
- double the timber cut and keep all roads open;
- identify and manage bull trout priority watersheds.

(Letter #: 421, 47, 343, 339, 87)

PC# MGA0108

The KNF and IPNF should use the same MA designations in order to facilitate effective commentary on the allocations, especially across Forest boundaries.

(Letter #: 517)

Category: MA Suitability and Desired Conditions - general

PC# MGA0010

The FS should consider the following additional Wilderness Monitoring Questions for (MA1a), Recommended Wilderness (MA1b), Wilderness Study Areas (MA1c), and Wild Lands (MA1d):

- for MA1a, MA1c, and MA1d - "Is the Forest maintaining wilderness character in its existing Wilderness areas and minimizing recreational impacts to Wilderness areas?";
- "Has the KNF increased its contribution to the National Wilderness Preservation System by allocating Recommended Wilderness?";
- "Has the wild character of backcountry areas/IRAs been preserved such that they may be considered for wilderness designation in the future?";
- "Has illegal motorized use been prevented in Wilderness Areas or Recommended Wilderness Areas?";
- "Has wilderness character been preserved and has wilderness been untrammled?";
- for MA1b and MA1c - the degree to which wilderness attributes may be protected or compromised by activities, including management.

(Letter #: 153, 293, 146, 506)

PC# MGA0089

The FS should broaden the suitability of the following areas:

- all roaded areas, to permit thinning and prescribed burns;
- MA1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 2, 3, and 5 on the IPNF, to permit motorized uses;
- MAs 2b, 5, 5a, 5b, 5c and 6 on the KNF, to permit timber production and harvest;
- the lower part of the Mount Henry area to permit traditional winter motorized use.

(Letter #s: 116, 146, 223, 304, 418)

PC# MGA0090

The FS should limit suitability in the following areas:

- the Pack River should be nonmotorized;
- Roderick Mountain, Saddle Mountain, Grizzly Peak, Northwest Peaks, Buckhorn Ridge, Mt. Henry, West Fork Yaak, Robinson Mountain, Gold Hill West, Ten Lakes, Whitefish Divide, Zulu Creek, and Scotchman Peaks should prohibit snowmobiles to protect grizzly bears;
- Smith Creek to protect the delicate wildlife balance.

(Letter #s: 66, 108, 99, 249, 255)

PC# MGA0095

The FS should manage the forest for protection and preservation, with emphasis on roadless areas, wilderness, and alpine areas that protect Plant and animal habitat.

(Letter #s: 495, 22, 513, 479, 478, 463, 335, 300, 297, 12, 173, 117, 122, 15, 159, 162, 17, 172)

Subject: MINERALS (PC #s starting with MIN)

Category: Editorial comment to the Plan.

PC# MIN0005

The FS should continue to provide multiple use management:

- to provide for sustainability of the environment and communities;
- to provide mining opportunities;
- to provide an adequate allocation of a suitable timber base;
- including a balance of uses as desired by user groups.

(Letter #s: 152, 306, 355)

Category: Minerals Forestwide Desired Condition

PC# MIN0001

The FS should consider the type of mineral activity in lieu of withdrawing particular lands from all mineral entry in recognition that hardrock underground mining does not impact surface recreational activities.

(Letter #s: 480)

PC# MIN0002

The FS should consider the following additional Mineral Objectives to:

- better assure that the Minerals Desired Condition for mineral development includes: "Compatibility with ecosystem capabilities and other resource values" is attained. "Mineral

commodities will be developed in a manner consistent with national direction and protection of ecosystem capabilities and other resources;"

- minimize placer mining and other mining activities' impacts on other resources.

(Letter #: 257)

PC# MIN0003

The FS should consider revising the Minerals Desired Condition:

- to clarify what is meant by the phrase "compatible with ecosystem capabilities and other resource values"
- by adding the language "Locatable and leasable mineral exploration and development is compatible with ecosystem capabilities and other resource values, including consistence with desired conditions for other resources. "

(Letter #: 197, 257)

PC# MIN0004

The FS should coordinate with the Environmental Protection Agency and incorporate National Academies of Science recommendations to address concerns related to mineral activities.

(Letter #: 488)

PC# MIN0006

The FS should reclaim abandoned mines:

- that are negatively impacting aquatic and other resources;
- prioritizing the reclamation of vertical shaft mines for public and wildlife safety.

(Letter #: 197)

PC# MIN0007

The FS should define and describe mining reclamation activities.

(Letter #: 465)

PC# MIN0010

The FS should include an analysis of recreational dredge mining to identify potential impacts on water quality and fish habitat.

(Letter #: 465)

PC# MIN0011

The FS should consider the addition of Mineral Guidelines to:

- require reclamation of placer-mined areas to pre-mining conditions;
- require reclamation bonding for recreational as well as industrial mining;
- require surveys for bat roosts prior to activities that obstruct mine openings;
- require mining operators to comply with State water quality standards and TMDLs;
- prohibit suction dredging in bull trout priority watersheds;
- require hazardous materials Plans;
- require mining operators to obtain Army Corps of Engineer permits.

(Letter #: 197, 465, 339)

Subject: MONITORING (PC #s starting with MON)

Category: Monitoring comments not specific to a resource

PC# MON0001

The FS should consider the following for the monitoring guide:

- having the Plan set of documents that contain information on monitoring, evaluation and environmental management, available for review at the same time as the LMP, and include a summary of the monitoring and adaptive management program presented in the LMP;
- including the monitoring and evaluation guide as an appendix to the LMP.

(Letter #s: 257, 394, 456)

PC# MON0002

The FS should explain the following regarding monitoring and how it is funded:

- discuss in the LMP and the monitoring guide how future budget decisions may affect monitoring and evaluation;
- explain how limited monitoring appropriations will affect implementation of the LMP;
- make a strong commitment to funding monitoring activities, such as watershed/water quality monitoring, like the R6 Monitoring and Evaluation Guide (USDA FS 1993) states "All programs and projects should contain appropriate levels of monitoring funds in their costs--or they should not be undertaken".

(Letter #s: 257, 293, 387, 449, 453, 473)

PC# MON0003

The FS should describe benchmarks or data collection for monitoring in the document, or reference a separate document in which these items are defined or described.

(Letter #s: 465)

PC# MON0004

The FS should identify in the monitoring guide:

- criteria to effectively gauge success in management;
- questions that seek to evaluate the effectiveness of management activities to achieve the goals outlined in the desired future conditions.

(Letter #s: 293, 416)

PC# MON0005

The FS should commit to using reliable, valid, and verified models and assessment procedures while implementing the LMP; commit to a meaningful and informative monitoring program as required by NFMA; and should answer each of the Monitoring Questions as if they are being asked of the original 1987 Forest Plan's implementation.

(Letter #s: 294, 422)

PC# MON0006

The FS should provide enforceable requirements to monitor the effects of Plan implementation on water quality, wildlife and forests.

(Letter #s: 153)

PC# MON0007

The FS should include a section that clearly indicates the public will be able to engage in the monitoring activities relating to fisheries, watershed, and old growth issues and it should clearly describe the procedures by which the public can be engaged.

(Letter #s: 386, 389)

Subject: OTHER PRODUCTS (PC #s starting with OFP)

Category: Other Products Forestwide Desired Condition

PC# OFP0001

The FS should provide further analysis, discussion, and regulation on non-timber forest products to:

- assess the need for a stand-alone budget;
- recognize contributions of such products to local communities and economies;
- outline strategies that address and incorporate management strategies for non-timber forest products in conjunction with other forest management Planning in order to effectively protect and manage for these other products;
- include peer-reviewed scientific information.

(Letter #s: 422, 293, 294, 388)

PC# OFP0002

The FS should employ a non-timber forest product specialist to survey, manage, and develop non-timber forest products.

(Letter #s: 422, 388)

PC# OFP0003

The FS should revise the cost-benefit or economic analyses to account for the dollar value contributions of non-timber forest products.

(Letter #s: 422, 293, 294)

PC# OFP0004

The FS should provide additional opportunities for firewood gathering.

(Letter #s: 214, 208, 212)

Subject: PROCESS (PC #s starting with PRO)

Category: Access & Recreation Forestwide Desired Condition -- Mechanized

PC# PRO0029

The FS should base the travel Plan on the assumption that all system trails and roads are open to mountain bikes as they are to other nonmotorized travel forms. Do not limit mountain bikes to specified routes only.

(Letter #s: 64)

Category: Access & Recreation Forestwide Desired Condition -- Trails

PC# PRO0027

The FS should develop management options to deal with conflicts between users on trails by developing select strategies that resolve the problem while preserving high quality experiences. There are many management options short of separating or eliminating uses such as education, peer patrolling or alternating days, which can work to manage diverse uses compatibly.

(Letter #s: 64)

Category: Collaboration Public involvement concerns

PC# PRO0022

The FS should give equal consideration to those supporting Recommended Wilderness as those supporting motorized recreation and timber.

(Letter #s: 277)

Category: Decisionmaking and Planning process and methods

PC# PRO0001

The Forests should rely on the regional office to conduct forest-level Planning since the PLMP is so broad and reliant on Region 1 standards and guidelines.

(Letter #s: 339)

PC# PRO0002

The FS should establish clear standards for decision making within the FS.

(Letter #s: 297)

PC# PRO0003

The FS should do what the national headquarters are advocating to:

- take risks and make sure that the "right thing" gets done on the ground;
- take advantage of this opportunity to accomplish goals and move towards a desired future condition of improved forest health and public approval.

(Letter #s: 299)

PC# PRO0005

The FS should explain how it gets the power to make Wilderness out of non-wilderness land when Congress is supposed to be the only one to create Wilderness.

(Letter #s: 327, 432, 390, 429)

PC# PRO0008

The FS should use its budget to manage forest health and not pay for lawsuits.

(Letter #s: 306)

PC# PRO0012

The Forest Supervisors of the two Forests should work in coordination to manage areas of common interests such as the Scotchman Peaks.

(Letter #s: 192, 193, 231, 65, 88, 92, 93)

PC# PRO0014

The FS should consider in its decisionmaking:

- a way to balance protection of ESA species with all other uses;
- the needs and opinions of the public for multiple-use opportunities;
- creating a multiple-use review board to ensure the decision making reflects the multiple-use management goals and needs of the public;
- the needs of both the human and natural environment, not just the desires of large groups that have a lot of money and legal support;
- the needs of citizens who rely on the forest for their recreation and livelihoods.

(Letter #s: 355, 331, 154, 109)

PC# PRO0015

The FS should consider that motorized trail projects are not occurring because travel management Planning is underfunded and locked up in NEPA processes.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# PRO0016

The FS should address whether the use of Categorical Exclusions will prevent site-specific NEPA from occurring.

(Letter #: 506)

PC# PRO0018

The FS should consider that the [Montana] Congressional delegation has made it clear that:

- they will not support Wilderness designation without a broad base of support from surrounding communities;
- the current "Wild Lands" classification in the PLMP is an acceptable alternative.

(Letter #: 413)

PC# PRO0020

The FS should consider training their employees to ride OHVs so they can ride with OHV users and better understand their needs.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# PRO0024

The FS should recognize that people are in favor of sound management and have a strong desire to maintain the health of these forests to achieve many benefits such as clean water, abundant wildlife and recreational opportunities; however, this is not accomplished in the PLMP.

(Letter #: 445)

PC# PRO0026

The FS should address how the Wild and Scenic Rivers classification recommendations for 15 streams in North Idaho are taken outside the context of the 1991 Memorandum of Understanding between the State and Federal agencies.

(Letter #: 176)

Category: Editorial comment to the Plan.

PC# PRO0004

The FS should address in the Strategy section in Chapter 2, clear objectives and spending Plans for timber, recreation and road maintenance (like there is for fisheries, watersheds, wildlife habitat, and fuels treatments), which currently have disclaimers that allow too much flexibility in achieving goals-- these resource management considerations should be priorities and there should be stronger language in the final Plans.

(Letter #: 299)

PC# PRO0007

The FS must address what the biological potential of the forest is or how desired conditions will be met in the LMP.

(Letter #: 331)

PC# PRO0031

The FS should terminate all timber harvest, mining, and oil-gas activities.

(Letter #: 475)

Category: MA - 1b Recommended Wilderness

PC# PRO0006

The FS should consider the following regarding changing the designation of Recommended Wilderness to Wild Lands that:

- changing the terminology of Recommended Wilderness to Wild Lands leads participants to think that none of their efforts really matter;
- changing the terminology is not acceptable to people that have been involved in the collaborative process or those that want Wilderness;
- the former Forest Supervisor was catering to a select group of individuals;
- the FS said the Starting Option for Recommended Wilderness would not change without further public involvement and that did not occur in the PLMP.

(Letter #s: 424, 300, 84, 302, 297, 322, 369, 375, 414, 452, 51, 55, 63, 66, 72, 37, 274, 69, 182, 270, 127, 144, 18, 183, 184, 19, 196, 205, 206, 114, 233, 258, 265, 26, 150, 261, 264, 387)

PC# PRO0011

The FS should respect the desires of the:

- larger public regarding Wilderness, not just opinions of Lincoln County;
- desires of Sanders County, which supports the Recommended Wilderness areas and believes its input was disregarded.

(Letter #s: 334, 320)

Category: MA - 5b Backcountry - Motorized summer and winter

PC# PRO0017

The KNF should reconsider the MA5b allocations because the chairperson of the ATV club said his members do not want to use these areas.

(Letter #s: 426)

Category: MA - 5c Backcountry - Nonmotorized summer, motorized winter

PC# PRO0023

The KNF should reconsider the addition of MA5c and the movement of 40,000 acres of MA5a into MA5c.

(Letter #s: 227)

Category: Project Level

PC# PRO0030

The FS should consider giving the analysis of roadless and unroaded areas equal priority as recommendations for wilderness because unroaded areas may be equally effective at preserving ecosystems yet may allow more diverse recreation opportunities.

(Letter #s: 159, 185, 427, 64)

PC# PRO0032

The travel management process should be initiated with the scoping process and a full and adequate evaluation of all viable alternatives. All existing roads and trails available to motorized recreationists should be used as the starting alternative for all analyses and impact determinations. We request that the process be restarted and that all existing roads and trails, which are available for use by motorized recreationists, be adequately identified as the baseline alternative.

(Letter #s: 355)

PC# PRO0033

Why are the extreme motorized closure alternatives presented and a middle of the road alternative based on existing routes plus new motorized routes needed to meet the public's need not presented? We are concerned that this demonstrates a significant predisposition in the current process.

(Letter #: 355)

Category: Wildlife Forestwide Desired Condition -- Habitat (general)

PC# PRO0021

The FS should be a leader on wildlife-related issues, by protecting the Cabinet-Yaak ecosystem.

(Letter #: 243)

Subject: PROJECT LEVEL (PC #s starting with PRL)

Category: Access & Recreation Other

PC# PRL0010

The FS should consider limiting all recreation access to designated routes only in some areas of high use or sensitive habitat.

(Letter #: 64)

Category: Project Level

PC# PRL0001

The FS should provide site-specific analysis and mapping for every road and trail so that the benefits of keeping each motorized travelway is adequately addressed and accounted for in the decision.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# PRL0002

The FS should consider the following regarding travel management in the Coeur d'Alene River Ranger District:

- make an effort to better explain road closures--there are many areas that are NOT designated nor expected to become roadless areas, however, many roads in these areas have been closed lately to all motorized use, without any opportunity for comment (For example, in the Elk Mountain, and Beauty Saddle areas);
- consider expansion of the Fourth of July Park & Ski Area along Forest Road 614 to at least RoseCreek Saddle, and the Panhandle Nordic Club's proposal to develop skate ski, additional cross-country ski, and snowshoe opportunities in this expansion. The proposed expansion will create opportunities for backcountry skiing in the area to the south and west of Rose Creek Saddle and the exclusion of motorized winter travel will foster this use;
- exclude motorized recreation on all but Forest Road 614 during the snow free months. This area has been managed during winter months for cross-country skier use for sixteen years. Due to the exclusion of motorized traffic and the maintenance of the thoroughfares, the area also attracts hikers, mountain bikers and equestrians who wish to avoid motorized uses during the summer months; *consider late spring, summer and fall motorized use of only Forest Roads 614, 459 (Beauty Creek - Coeur d'Alene Mountain), 438 (Beauty Saddle Road) and 539 (Rose Creek Road) and closure of all other roads and trails to motorized use to create an area emphasizing hiking, mountain biking and equestrian pursuits.

(Letter #: 123, 24, 49)

PC# PRL0008

The FS should consider preventing the Rock Creek Mine mining in and under the Wilderness. If it can not be avoided, the FS should consider the Montanore Mine on the Libby side as the less destructive alternative.

(Letter #: 308)

PC# PRL0009

The FS should consider retaining the parcel of land in T30N, R31 W, Sec 2 and making it a Special Interest Area for multi-use recreation.

(Letter #: 515)

PC# PRL0011

The FS should address the live stream crossing on Lightning Creek on the Sandpoint District that allows hundreds of cars a week to cross it, which impacts bull trout habitat.

(Letter #: 153)

PC# PRL0012

The FS should consider permitting motorized use on the following roads and trails:

- Cemetery Ridge Road #226;
- Dot Creek Trail #111;
- St. Joe Divide trail #16 from Slate Creek Saddle to Kellogg Saddle;
- Moonshine Gulch trail #140 to Granite Peak;
- Trail #137 from Humbolt Gulch to Substation - Cooper Pass Road;
- Bronson Meadows Trail #44;
- Silver Hill Trail #16;
- Red Oak Gulch to Stevens Peak.

(Letter #: 109, 160, 355)

Subject: REGULATORY (PC #s starting with REG)

Category: 2005 Planning Rule

PC# REG0001

The FS should consider providing enforceable, measurable, protective standards and guidelines in the LMP:

- and state that no standard may ever be exceeded;
- for components of the forest ecosystem such as streamside habitat, old forests, and water quality;
- to protect trails from logging and other vegetation management activities;
- because there is a lack of standards and guidelines which leaves management specialists in the position of interpreting the document and design criteria;

(Letter #: 460, 415, 419, 428, 430, 44, 447, 453, 468, 493, 497, 506, 58, 64, 81, 96, 389, 87, 148, 410, 395, 134, 149, 153, 200, 206, 270, 292, 293, 294, 309, 339, 386, 387, 288, 117)

PC# REG0004

The FS should consider that meaningful cumulative effects should not be done on the project level alone, it needs to be done on a forestwide basis.

(Letter #: 339)

PC# REG0005

The FS should consider that it must consult with the USFWS regarding the effects of LMPs on listed species.

(Letter #s: 339, 468, 44, 415, 428)

PC# REG0006

The FS should conduct NEPA analysis or produce an EIS on the LMP:

- for MA designations that change the amount of timber harvest or changes harvest from regulated to nonregulated;
- for changes to the use of motor vehicles on roads or trails;
- to develop a No Action Alternative so that the public and decision makers may reasonably compare and contrast other management alternatives;
- because the revision of a LMP can not be categorically excluded from NEPA analysis;
- because the LMP may have significant effects on the environment by weakening and eliminating substantive environmental protections, by containing controversial decisions, by potentially impacting T&E species, and by setting precedent for future actions with significant effects;
- because case law (California v. Block) is violated by having no alternatives to the wilderness recommendations;
- in areas where proposed management changes could affect populations of endangered species;
- because guidelines for managing threatened and endangered species are major land management decisions requiring a NEPA document;
- for lands suitable for timber production and suitable for timber harvest because the proposed actions significantly affect the human environment;
- to justify moving acres from production and/or harvest lands to some other designation;
- for areas that were previously recommended as Wilderness in the 1987 Plan because the original recommendations were made under NEPA analysis.

(Letter #s: 355, 468, 467, 44, 428, 418, 506, 394, 110, 339, 415, 151, 153, 254, 282, 294, 331)

PC# REG0007

The FS should consider and explain that if identifying Suitability of Areas sets forth that an activity should be consistent with the LMP and if the LMP predetermines the "suitability" of an activity, then isn't the decision predetermined through the LMP.

(Letter #s: 444)

PC# REG0012

The FS should consider revising Chapter 2, Objectives to include:

- objectives that should provide minimum targets rather than a fixed range (e.g., rehabilitate or restore a minimum of 30 acres of 303(d)-listed water bodies) to provide clearer direction on the expected accomplishment level, yet provide flexibility to capitalize on additional opportunities (as presented, the high end of the range appears to be a cap that may limit opportunities for greater accomplishments);
- describing the estimated yearly funding requirements that will be needed to measure the objectives associated with vegetation restoration, old growth, wildlife, and watersheds conditions that include fisheries habitat and habitat connectivity;
- the strategy for forest health to treat 250,000 acres over the life of the Plan is not enough treatment;

- showing the optimal level of objectives required to meet the Desired Condition for each resource area and provide an estimate of how long it will take to reach the desired conditions based on the proposed budget-based objectives.

(Letter #: 38, 386, 168, 336)

PC# REG0014

The FS should consider that the 2005 NFMA regulations:

- will undermine natural resource conservation, ecosystem protection and wildlife safeguards;
- represent a significant departure from how the FS has developed and modified Plans since 1982, which is likely to result in inadequate protection for the natural features and resources on public lands.

(Letter #: 339, 355)

PC# REG0017

The FS should emphasize that the desired condition should not be an endpoint, but a process, where natural forces define the character of wilderness and other undeveloped areas.

(Letter #: 96)

PC# REG0018

The FS should consider whether technical guidance for project and activity decision making will be easily distilled from all the additional sources of design criteria under Chapter 3, Guidelines.

(Letter #: 322)

PC# REG0022

The FS should address how standards have been abandoned under the new Planning rule, how many responsibilities (formerly components of the Forest Plan) have been subsumed into the FSM and FSH, and at what point (when & where) the public gets to comment on this aspect of USFS management policy.

(Letter #: 387)

PC# REG0023

The FS should be including long-range Planning (not just short range up to 50 years) for protection of habitats, and for predicting sustainability.

(Letter #: 173, 328, 473)

PC# REG0024

The FS should manage all Recommended and Designated Wildernesses under the 1964 Wilderness Act.

(Letter #: 151, 153, 339)

PC# REG0025

The FS should consider the following regarding the LMP's proposed management of species under the Endangered Species Act:

- that protections for ESA-listed species are inadequate;
- the ESA specifically requires jeopardy opinions [from USFWS] to be issued based upon a proposed project's potential impacts on the entirety of a listed species--they should not incorporate on-listed subpopulations in jeopardy determinations.

(Letter #: 219, 339)

PC# REG0026

The FS should consider that the LMP's reliance on regional or national guidance to provide management direction (i.e., FS Manual and FS Handbook) is misleading, imprudent, and contrary to federal laws.

(Letter #: 339)

PC# REG0027

The FS should consider that the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act:

- requires the protection of the Outstandingly Remarkable Values of eligible river and stream segments until suitability has been determined;
- absence of an adequate analysis for eligible rivers fails to abide by the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

(Letter #: 339)

PC# REG0028

The FS must explain in the LMP whether INFS and PACFISH will be dropped. If so, the Forests will have to assess the potential impacts of negative effects cumulatively, or will only be able to authorize projects if they are necessary to accelerate recovery--the replacement of INFS with Riparian Area Guidelines is insufficient to meet NEPA and ESA requirements.

(Letter #: 294, 339, 506)

PC# REG0029

The FS should recognize that the 2005 Planning rule does not comply with NFMA or NEPA.

(Letter #: 503, 506)

PC# REG0030

The FS should consider that the NFMA requires the FS to consider the following in Forest Planning:

- rotation age is set forth as the culmination of mean annual increment, also known as biological maturity;
- NFMA requires you to set the Allowable Sales Quantity;
- NFMA directs the Secretary of Agriculture to submit annual budget requests for the Forests at the level needed to fully implement the LMP;
- NFMA defines several limits on harvest levels--not included among these limits is the roaded or unroaded nature of the particular area of the Forest;
- NFMA requires that LMPs include a Plan for how the FS will return lands that are unsuitable for timber production to a condition where these lands are suitable for timber production.

(Letter #: 503)

PC# REG0031

The FS's PLMP lists income as a major goal for the IPNF. The FS should recognize that none of the laws state that income generation should be a goal of National Forest management.

(Letter #: 153, 447)

PC# REG0035

The FS should follow the proper interpretation of the 2001 Roadless Area policy which:

- did not close any roads or off-highway vehicle trails;
- does not ban motorized use from existing roads or trail.

(Letter #: 251, 355)

PC# REG0039

The FS should consider that federal environmental justice compliance requirements as initiated by Executive Order 12898 (U.S. FS Departmental Regulation 5600-2 (<http://www.usda.gov/da/5600-2.pdf>)) should be applied immediately to correct the disproportionately significant and adverse impacts that motorized recreationists have been subjected to.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# REG0040

The FS states that the enactment of various other laws, including the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act "reinforce ecological sustainability as the first priority of National Forest system management"; this is incorrect - none of these statutes in any way change the mandates for the management of National Forests.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# REG0041

The FS should reconsider revision topic #6 from the AMS, which says absolutely nothing about "Wild Lands", but clearly identifies Recommended Wilderness Areas; it also states that documentation recommending or not recommending further additions will be made.

(Letter #: 387)

PC# REG0042

The FS should ensure that Desired Condition recommendations are not interpreted in site-specific management as standards:

- for the desired motorized/non-motorized condition;
- to avoid being seen as predetermined and predisposed.

(Letter #: 355, 444)

Category: Access & Recreation Forestwide Desired Condition -- Motorized (summer)

PC# REG0037

The FS should recognize that policy direction from the FS's Washington Office calls for the FS to better manage the increasing demand for motorized recreation opportunities on our public lands. Better management should mean increasing not decreasing opportunities for these popular uses of the National Forests.

(Letter #: 429)

Category: Editorial comment to the Plan.

PC# REG0008

The FS should include in the LMP definitions for "Desired Conditions", "Objectives", "Suitability of Areas", "Special Areas", and "Guidelines" as clearly defined at 36 CFR 219 7(a)(2).

(Letter #: 480)

PC# REG0009

The FS should explain why guidelines are not commitments (Chapter3, page 3-1).

(Letter #: 456)

PC# REG0010

The FS should include in an appendix for each category that is covered in the Plan, all laws, policies, and regulations that guide the FS.

(Letter #: 456)

PC# REG0011

The FS should consider that the statement, "While both Forestwide and management area descriptions are used to identify areas that are generally suitable for different types of management and use, they do not determine what uses will actually take place at any given time or location", is a very broad disclaimer that allows managers too much flexibility to change management on-the-ground.

(Letter #s: 456)

PC# REG0019

The FS should include in the Final LMP a section that describes how scientific specifications will be incorporated into the guidelines that apply to vegetation, old growth, watersheds, and fisheries.

(Letter #s: 386)

PC# REG0033

The FS should include under Page viii. Introduction, Relationship to Other Strategic Guidance, a reference to the statutory multiple use directives, and be consistent.

(Letter #s: 444)

Category: MA - 1b Recommended Wilderness

PC# REG0021

The FS should place greater emphasis on conservation and trusteeship for the future, especially with regards to recommendations for wilderness.

(Letter #s: 258)

PC# REG0036

The FS should permit mechanized use in MA1b because:

- mountain bikes do not impair wilderness values;
- banning mountain bikes from MA1b contradicts FSM 1923.03.

(Letter #s: 373, 64, 216)

Subject: SCIENCE (PC #s starting with SCI)

Category: 2005 Planning Rule

PC# SCI0012

The FS should emphasize in the document that cumulative effects will be fully addressed at the project level with an outcome that ensures projects will meet Desired Forest Conditions at the landscape level.

(Letter #s: 465)

Category: Access & Recreation Forestwide Desired Condition -- Roads

PC# SCI0024

The FS should consider the impacts that proposed motorized road and trail closures will have on fire management, firewood cutting, and timber management.

(Letter #s: 355)

Category: Access & Recreation Forestwide Suitability

PC# SCI0010

The FS should base suitability of areas and trails for motorized use:

- on data rather than perceived social desires;

- considering factors such as wildlife habitat, water quality, fisheries and nonmotorized recreation.
(Letter #: 460)

Category: Adaptive Management

PC# SCI0033

The FS should use an adaptive management approach to make needed adjustments over time in both a biologically and socially defensible manner, with detailed monitoring that describes benchmarks for measuring success and improving on projects.

(Letter #: 465, 453)

PC# SCI0034

The FS should avoid endpoint conditions such as desired condition and consider a more ecological approach to allow natural processes to shape the future of the IPNF, especially the wilderness, roadless and less developed areas.

(Letter #: 153, 506)

PC# SCI0037

The FS should consider the following regarding recreational needs:

- managers should be adaptive to recreational needs as vegetation conditions change on the ground;
- managers should avoid overly restrictive management prescriptions that could limit the ability to respond to changing recreational patterns.

(Letter #: 304, 355)

Category: Decisionmaking and Planning Process and Methods

PC# SCI0011

The FS should provide an estimated annual budget for meeting NFMA biological requirements.

(Letter #: 389)

PC# SCI0016

The FS should provide strong language in the LMP to guide active management for the next two decades.

(Letter #: 299)

Category: Editorial comment to the Plan.

PC# SCI0022

The FS should clearly disclose on maps, tables and summaries:

- all existing areas, roads and trails proposed to be closed or opened to motorized access and motorized recreationists;
- current status of roads and trails closed or open to motorized and nonmotorized recreation.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# SCI0023

The FS should reevaluate how sustainability is defined whether:

- "sustained yield" mandates of MUSYA and NFMA require "sustainability";
- all sustainability must be predicated upon ecological sustainability;
- ecological sustainability, as the primary focus of forest Planning, best meets the needs of the American people.

(Letter #: 355, 128)

PC# SCI0026

The FS should consider allowing flexibility with protective guidelines on a site-specific basis.
(Letter #: 413)

PC# SCI0036

The FS should maintain the ability to engage in active management:

- including mechanical vegetative treatments, prescribed fire, logging and other human manipulation in the effort to restore a more natural ecosystem;
- to reduce trends in deteriorating forest conditions.

(Letter #: 384, 427)

Category: MA - 1d Wild Lands

PC# SCI0027

The FS should explain why the acreages of Wild Lands (MA1d) in the PLMP do not match the acreages in the CER table found on page 1-1.
(Letter #: 374)

Category: MA Suitability and Desired Conditions - general

PC# SCI0019

The FS should use Plan amendments if proposed changes in acreages for MAs are analyzed through NEPA and ESA separately.
(Letter #: 465)

Category: Use of best science/ Adequacy of Analysis

PC# SCI0001

The FS should consider additional science cited in the Scientific Assessment for the ICBEMP regarding:

- vegetation and fuels;
- effects of climate on fires;
- effects of logging, roading and vegetation manipulation on roadless areas.

(Letter #: 153)

PC# SCI0002

The FS should consider additional science from Sierra Nevada Framework, ICBEMP, DellaSala et al (1995 and 1995a), and Henjum et al. (1994) regarding the effects of logging on fuels.
(Letter #: 506)

PC# SCI0003

The FS should consider studies on trail use:

- including impacts of various types of trail use on erosion prior to prohibiting trail use to specific uses;
- regarding the safety of mountain bike use on trails and trail users.

(Letter #: 64)

PC# SCI0005

The FS should consider the science in the final EIS for Roadless Area Conservation:

- regarding the importance of large contiguous blocks of wildland and roadless areas;
- as they relate to conservation Planning for important wildlife species.

(Letter #: 153, 422)

PC# SCI0008

The FS should consider the best available science regarding:

- the effects to ecosystem diversity, wildlife and wildlife habitat from logging old growth trees;
- the amount of old growth and old growth characteristics needed on the IPNF to sustain viable populations of old growth dependent flora and fauna;
- logging in stands that contain old growth trees (Lesica, Peter, 1996. "Using Fire History Models to Estimate Proportions of Old Growth Forest In Northwest Montana, USA", Biological Conservation 77, p. 33-39).

(Letter #s: 386, 449)

PC# SCI0009

The FS should include information comparing historic human-caused impacts with human-caused impacts today.

(Letter #s: 355)

PC# SCI0013

The FS should describe how the best available science applies in the guidelines for all resources.

(Letter #s: 468)

PC# SCI0014

The FS should allow scientific discussion in the public involvement process.

(Letter #s: 87)

PC# SCI0015

The FS should consider what "best available science" is and should include information from independent, credible scientists whose opinions diverge from the FS.

(Letter #s: 326, 389, 355, 294, 386)

PC# SCI0017

The FS should consider other science that examines:

- different timeframes to determine desired conditions (see Walder 1995 and Johnson et al. 1994);
- whether ecological conditions must be within the range of those prior to European settlement in order to achieve ecological sustainability (legitimate multiple use activities such as timber harvest and mining rarely occurred on a large scale prior to European settlement);
- whether it's truly feasible to base Planning and management around a range of variability which can never be definitely determined.

(Letter #s: 355, 506)

PC# SCI0020

The FS needs more data to assess whether needs of motorized recreationists are being met.

(Letter #s: 355)

PC# SCI0021

The FS needs to provide information on how values such as "high social, cultural, and economic values" and "desired" levels were established. For example, a particular species may have a high social value to a particular segment of the population, but a low social value to another.

(Letter #s: 355)

PC# SCI0025

The FS should explain how the science from ICBEMP was used in the development of the PLMP; the 2002 MOU requires the FS to incorporate the science from ICBEMP and consult with USFWS.

(Letter #: 428, 468)

PC# SCI0028

The FS should provide the science that verifies the effects of:

- motorized recreation on wildlife before closing roads, trails, and snowmobiling areas for those reasons;
- various nonmotorized recreation activities on wildlife.

(Letter #: 64, 355, 234)

PC# SCI0029

The FS should emphasize use of actual visitor data to establish public need and multiple use recreation resource allocations.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# SCI0030

The FS should consider the National Academy Science recommendations for the Coeur d'Alene River Basin.

(Letter #: 421)

PC# SCI0031

The FS's impact analysis in all resource areas should compare the relative magnitude of man-caused impacts to the background level of naturally occurring impacts or management actions such as the "let it burn" policy.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# SCI0032

The FS should not use public opinion to discount the resource capability assessments conducted by specialists that identify areas demonstrating a need for wilderness protection.

(Letter #: 37)

Category: Wildlife Forestwide Desired Condition -- Habitat (general)

PC# SCI0004

The FS should consider technical assistance from USFWS or the regional office to develop a consistent approach to identifying wildlife linkage areas and corridors. Also consider information from the wildlife linkage conference at <http://www.cfc.umt.edu/linkage>.

(Letter #: 1)

Subject: SOCIAL/ECONOMICSPC #s starting with SOE)

Category: Access & Recreation Priest GA Desired Condition (IPNF)

PC# SOE0013

The FS should address off-trail riding experiences in the Priest Lake GA.

(Letter #: 110)

Category: Decisionmaking and Planning Process and Methods

PC# SOE0001

The FS should disclose actual budgets in comparison to the necessary budget needed to fully implement the LMP.

(Letter #: 456)

PC# SOE0008

The FS should resist pressure from big business, local interests, or the current administration in Washington to:

- avoid catering to interests at the detriment of forest resources;
- prevent the sale of NFS lands and resources.

(Letter #: 185, 471)

Category: Social/Economics Forestwide Desired Condition

PC# SOE0002

The FS should manage the Forests to maximize benefits to the FS, surrounding communities, and the entire country to:

- return revenues from resource sales to the public and FS;
- promote and sustain State and local communities and governments;
- protect communities, jobs, and timberlands.

(Letter #: 502, 404, 305)

PC# SOE0005

The FS should consider revising the Social and Economic Systems Desired Conditions to include:

- recognizing economic benefits of ecosystem services;
- considering the economic benefits of and impacts on tourism and recreation;
- considering the economic benefits of wilderness;
- the following language for the IPNF - on page 1-33, "2nd paragraph: Some outputs and values are a result of the natural environment, such as opportunities for quiet solitude, experiencing and studying nature in its historical condition, and (spiritual) and scenic values.. .. The IPNF contributes to the local economy through the generation of jobs and income provided by maintaining a forest environment that will bring tourists and recreation seekers from afar, as well as industries/business hunting proximity to nature, while creating products for use, both nationally and locally.; On page 1-33, 3rd paragraph: The IPNF protects the public's land for succeeding generations. The outputs and values provided (by the IPNF) contribute to the quality of lifestyles in the Plan area and healthy (stable) communities. Open space is a significant.. ..contributes to the rural character of communities. It is an important consideration for industrial/commercial site seekers who can provide new, good-income jobs. Economic value exists in the scenic, amenity, and recreational resources that attract visitors, and in the resources that can be extracted from NPS lands (e.g. minerals, timber, and other Plant material)."

(Letter #: 64, 68, 55, 492, 436, 434, 345, 187, 339, 110, 188, 189, 190, 226, 294)

PC# SOE0006

The FS should provide additional social and economic effects analysis and objectives to:

- assign economic benefits to natural amenities and unlogged forests;
- reflect present conditions;
- incorporate data missing for Lincoln County;
- assess potential economic impacts to Lincoln and Sanders Counties;

- include non-monetary objectives;
 - clarify vague language in the objectives;
 - remove qualifiers that negate meeting objectives;
 - address how the PLMP benefits communities and local government;
 - disclose timber values gained and lost annually, to assess the economic feasibility and sustainability of the LMP;
 - consider FS employee participation in local communities;
 - explain FS contributions to the timber economy and resulting contributions to the social and economic systems;
 - address social and economic issues related to recreation and motorized access;
 - provide equal consideration as that given to the ecological analysis;
 - address potential negative impacts on other resources resulting from increased logging;
 - directly correlate mill closures and board feet harvested to rural economic impacts;
 - include a timber supply and demand trends analysis;
 - disclose timber resource impacts on the wood products industry;
 - explain how IRAs, Wilderness and Wild Lands benefit the local culture and economy.
- (Letter #: 456, 223, 331, 387, 379, 355, 339, 433, 322, 284, 152, 254, 170, 168, 282)

PC# SOE0007

The FS should prioritize and disclose methods for maintaining and preserving forest health, visuals, wildlife, headwaters, and flora in consideration of the economic benefits of maintaining these resources and the resulting tourism.

(Letter #: 161, 191)

PC# SOE0009

The FS should address the socio-economic issue of closing areas to motorized use:

- based on wildlife corridor concerns;
- including the economic cost of reduced motorized opportunities on motorized users, and the cumulative effects of travel management decisions contributing to social and economic impacts on motorized recreationists.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# SOE0011

The FS should implement a more aggressive timber sale program to:

- reverse downward social and economic trends for employment, personal income, and school enrollment;
- allow timber harvesting/thinning to provide local employment and economic opportunities.

(Letter #: 413, 5, 4, 3, 2)

PC# SOE0012

The FS should prohibit the use of taxpayer dollars to subsidize timber sale program activities and require logging companies to build their own roads, restore and replant logged areas, and compensate fisheries for logging-generated pollution.

(Letter #: 185)

PC# SOE0014

The FS should consider the following additional Social and Economic Systems Monitoring Questions:

- to determine the number of stewardship contracting opportunities;

- to determine the social and economic benefits of inventoried roadless areas, wilderness, and other wildlands;
- to evaluate all major forest resources as related to each social and economic question;
- to quantify or qualify non-monetary aspects of social and economic benefits;
- "How many stewardship contracting opportunities have been pursued that will directly contribute to local employment and local allocation of resources?";
- "How much do IRAs, Wilderness areas, and other wildlands on the forest benefit the social and economic aspects of the area?"

(Letter #: 293, 444, 456)

Subject: TIMBER (PC #s starting with TBR)

Category: Editorial comment to the Plan.

PC# TBR0038

The FS should propose more active forest management to:

- provide for maintenance of road systems;
- maintain visual resources;
- enhance grizzly bear habitat;
- prevent the decline of forest health and resulting insect and disease outbreaks;
- account for high mortality levels;
- sustain the current stands of old growth;
- sustain local economies;
- maintain access;
- reduce fuel loads;
- increase forest health;
- reduce the risk of catastrophic fire in the WUI and areas of high recreational use.

(Letter #: 289, 299, 321, 350, 413, 418, 425, 466, 502)

PC# TBR0046

The FS should define "long-term."

(Letter #: 434)

Category: Timber Forestwide Desired Condition

PC# TBR0002

The FS should continue to provide or should increase timber harvesting to:

- address forest health problems;
- enhance habitat for wildlife;
- reduce fire risks;
- provide for recreation uses;
- include heavy clearcutting and logging;
- address public desires for additional logging;
- support local industry and economy;
- be consistent with forest health improvement objectives;
- ensure local government viability;
- sustain the forest products industry;
- recognize the importance of timber harvesting to the FS as an agency and to Idaho communities;

- to utilize stewardship contracting or the green-slip program to achieve harvest levels;
- include increased timber production opportunities in the Libby GA.

(Letter #s: 467, 406, 411, 413, 73, 418, 223, 466, 485, 496, 387, 445, 208, 280, 336, 168, 211, 213, 240, 284, 306, 307, 125)

PC# TBR0003

The FS should practice restoration forestry to:

- provide healthy forests;
- mandate the removal of trees in overstocked forest stands;
- meet wood products needs through an aggressive harvesting program;
- reduce the risk of catastrophic fire.

(Letter #s: 403)

PC# TBR0017

The FS should modify the timber supply analysis to correct conservative calculations and ambitious targets.

(Letter #s: 384)

PC# TBR0024

The FS should report long-term sustained yield timber harvest volumes and related timber projections in board feet instead of cubic feet to:

- align with industry standards;
- clarify the conversion factor;
- provide consistent and comparable measurements throughout the document;
- clarify if annual timber sales have been well below the long-term sustained yield capacity.

(Letter #s: 336, 465, 434, 362, 254, 197, 379)

PC# TBR0025

The FS should remove constraints from long-term sustained yield calculations for the suitable timber base:

- to display how volume is reduced due to budgetary and other constraints;
- because long-term sustained yield should be based on biological capacity without budgetary constraints;
- to base the LMP on sound, sustainable forestry;
- to increase harvest levels and avoid declining forest conditions and increased wildfire and wildfire suppression costs;
- to quantify what constraints are costing the public in terms of lost resources.

(Letter #s: 254, 413, 408, 384, 336, 282, 223, 170, 331)

PC# TBR0032

The FS should disclose the deficiencies associated with using timber harvesting as a tool to replicate forest fires and disclose the inadequacies and impacts of regeneration and salvage cuts.

(Letter #s: 419)

PC# TBR0034

The FS should consider revising the Timber Desired Condition to include:

- emphasizing treatments, such as small diameter harvests and wood fiber production, in the wildland urban interface;
- limiting the use of even-aged management;

- successfully managing the existing timber base before proposing additions to the Wilderness System;
- addressing how timber harvesting levels can be achieved while meeting the goal to maintain the productive capacity of forest and range ecosystems;
- mandating progressive, ecologically sensitive ways of harvesting and utilizing timber products;
- clarifying that where sustainability is not assured that timber harvest should only be conducted to restore forest health;
- considering sustainability and public opinions in lieu of harvesting timber exclusively for economic reasons;
- prohibiting timber harvesting in the St. Joe Geographic Area.

(Letter #: 338, 299, 66, 423, 322, 302, 288, 267, 185, 254, 469, 222, 293)

PC# TBR0035

The FS should consider the following regarding long-term sustained yield calculations (LTSYC):

- provide information regarding the allowable sale quantity;
- calculate long-term sustained yield on a drainage basis (or other smaller unit), rather than a forestwide basis;
- disclose if the calculations considered current forest inventory, growth, yield, and mortality;
- disclose standing sawtimber volume, annual growth rates, and annual mortality;
- specify if calculations reflect limitations based on reduced harvests from Riparian Conservation Areas and protection for endangered species;
- keep volume yields separate in order to disclose the true sawlog Timber Sale Program Quantity (TSPQ) and long-range sustained yield capacity;
- do not remove budgetary constraints when calculating long-term sustained yield;
- revise timber targets according to general forest allocations;
- address impacts of the Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act on the timber sale program and long-term sustained yield calculations.

(Letter #: 218, 465, 418, 386, 384, 254, 197, 331)

PC# TBR0051

The FS should correctly identify all acres where timber harvest could occur within identified geographic areas since the TSPQ and LTSYC are based on acres available for harvest.

(Letter #: 254)

PC# TBR0060

The FS should consider logging salvage trees from wildfire areas.

(Letter #: 306, 110)

PC# TBR0062

The FS LMP should look at projects that pay for themselves by:

- providing products from the forest to the industry infrastructure that remains in the area;
- considering stewardship contracts and timber sales to help achieve goals and provide the necessary funding to do the work.

(Letter #: 269, 348)

Category: Timber Forestwide Suitability

PC# TBR0005

The FS should prohibit post-fire salvage sales in the backcountry or inventoried roadless areas.
(Letter #: 293)

PC# TBR0037

The FS should differentiate areas suitable for commercial timber production from areas suitable for timber harvest and:

- meet other resource objectives;
- remove "unsuitable" and "not suitable" references from the final document;
- follow requirements in the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act and National Forest Management Act;
- remove the term "generally" from suitability discussions;
- reclassify lands where "responsible officials determine harvest is appropriate as a tool" as "suitable" timberlands;
- clarify the total acres available for timber harvests;
- allow more active management where guidelines can be used to protect resources.

(Letter #: 254, 467, 418, 384, 336, 282, 170, 331)

PC# TBR0045

The FS should limit or prohibit leaving cut timber on site in areas suitable for timber harvest or in recreation areas.

(Letter #: 470)

PC# TBR0047

The FS should remove inventoried roadless areas from potential timber harvest or production because even salvage harvesting can be detrimental to forest regeneration.

(Letter #: 436)

PC# TBR0050

The FS should classify lands previously logged as suitable for commercial timber production.

(Letter #: 308)

Category: Timber Guidelines

PC# TBR0014

The FS should provide additional timber management standards and guidelines above regional and FS handbook direction to tailor management to specific resource conditions.

(Letter #: 339, 470)

PC# TBR0043

The FS should include information on CMAI (culmination of mean annual increment) and clarify if areas that have not reached CMAI will be logged.

(Letter #: 506, 386)

PC# TBR0044

The FS should disclose and further address opening sizes.

(Letter #: 506)

Category: Timber Monitoring

PC# TBR0054

The FS should require more precise monitoring during timber harvesting activities in lieu of discovering problems upon harvest completion.

(Letter #s: 322)

PC# TBR0055

The FS should consider revising the Timber Monitoring Questions to:

- address if mortality has been harvested in a timely manner;
- disclose if ecosystems are fully functional at specified harvest levels;
- explore available markets for forest products;
- determine if the timber program is conducted in a manner that reduces conflict.

(Letter #s: 218, 293)

Category: Timber Objectives (harvest levels, Total Sale Program Quantity - TSPQ)

PC# TBR0009

The FS should consider the following regarding the timber sale program quantity (TSPQ):

- clarify the management objective for harvest volumes;
- disclose rationale for the reduction in the allowable sale quantity or acres deemed suitable for timber production since the 1987 Plan;
- specify a TSPQ for the first three decades;
- include a biomass section or clarify that a diameter limit was imposed on the biomass component in lieu of a green ton measurement;
- clarify if harvesting above the sustainable level is permitted;
- consider the unsustainability of past logging programs when developing commitments to timber production levels;
- establish individual targets for green tree harvest and mortality salvage for economic and forest health benefits;
- provide information to identify and address ASQ issues as related to FS directives;
- designate minimum harvesting levels to commit to local communities;
- display the TSPQ without budget constraints.

(Letter #s: 152, 382, 456, 389, 336, 294, 168, 254)

PC# TBR0023

The FS should revise the annual volume of timber harvested and Timber Sale Program Quantity (TSPQ):

- to better align the suitable timber base acreage with the board feet it could support;
- because annual board feet lost to mortality and resulting biomass accumulation is unacceptable;
- because timber outputs are grossly understated due to Management Area designations;
- to provide more active forest management and resulting forest health improvements;
- because the TSPQ is unrealistic and will raise false expectations and increase hostility;
- to base the TSPQ on desired conditions not past performance or budget constraints.

(Letter #s: 362, 336, 73, 470, 467, 152, 321, 223, 218, 413)

PC# TBR0026

The FS should clarify how many years it will take to meet Desired (future) Conditions based on annual harvest rates to consider how healthy forest conditions will be met without harvesting growth and mortality.

(Letter #: 306, 331)

PC# TBR0031

The FS should consider eliminating qualifiers that would prevent achieving a sustainable supply of forest products:

- to ensure sustainability over the long-term; such as "The estimated volumes may change due to project-level data, unforeseen events, or modified conditions";
- because such qualifiers are not used for other resources desired conditions in the LMP.

(Letter #: 168, 325)

PC# TBR0042

The FS should provide for additional pre-commercial thinning of existing Planted stands to remove production pressure from less suitable lands and Inventoried Roadless Areas.

(Letter #: 332)

Category: Watershed Guidelines – Watersheds (general)

PC# TBR0041

The FS should consider revising the guidelines for Riparian Conservation Areas to:

- limit operations to those needed for safety needs or to attain/maintain riparian and aquatic habitat;
- prohibit regeneration harvest because it can result in mass wasting;
- include direction for mandatory annual inventory and maintenance of culverts, including culvert removal on roads that are not annually maintained;
- include direction for lower standard crossing structures that are free of fill and pose no risk to riparian habitat for ATVs and snowmobiles.

(Letter #: 517, 197)

Subject: TRIBAL (PC #s starting with TBL)

Category: Tribal Forestwide Desired Condition

PC# TBL0001

The FS should include the Coeur d'Alene Tribe in the list of "Legal and Political Relationships."

(Letter #: 319)

PC# TBL0002

The FS should prohibit special treatment for cultural and sacred tribal activities because there is no basis in law for this treatment.

(Letter #: 480)

PC# TBL0003

The FS should include a Desired Condition for tribes.

(Letter #: 456)

PC# TBL0004

The KNF should disclose that the Bull and Yaak Geographic Areas include Coeur d'Alene Tribe aboriginal territory.

(Letter #: 456)

PC# TBL0005

The FS should consider an objective to develop individual cultural use policies and tribal treaty rights for each tribe within their respective aboriginal territories.

(Letter #: 457, 60)

PC# TBL0006

The FS should revise the Heritage Resource Objectives to allow for more management flexibility.

(Letter #: 319)

PC# TBL0007

The FS should continue to provide tribal access and hunting and fishing rights.

(Letter #: 60)

PC# TBL0008

The FS should include the following guideline for Tribal relations:

- "Work towards a Memorandum of Understanding with the Coeur d'Alene Tribe."

(Letter #: 456)

Subject: VEGETATION (PC #s starting with VEG)

Category: Editorial comment to the Plan.

PC# VEG0004

The FS should conduct ecological or restoration forestry.

(Letter #: 157)

PC# VEG0047

The FS should re-title Chapter 1, Table 3 to "Snag and snag recruitment levels."

(Letter #: 218)

Category: Fire Forestwide Desired Condition -- Wildland Fire Use

PC# VEG0030

The FS should quantify stand-replacing fire prevention assumptions.

(Letter #: 506)

Category: Timber Forestwide Desired Condition

PC# VEG0014

The FS should provide further analysis for the timber and vegetation resource to:

- provide rationale for reducing timber harvest levels;
- include empirical evidence that harvest treatments reduce insect and disease damage;
- disclose impacts from past logging activities;
- compare desired future conditions with current conditions;
- include a scientific analysis of present and future desired conditions;
- determine timber management suitability based on an unbiased study;
- address the appropriateness of modeled estimates in determining logging levels;

- address the assumptions and potential shortcomings of the timber models.
(Letter #s: 339, 418, 506, 197)

PC# VEG0038

The FS should quantify how timber harvesting and other methods Plan to improve forest health.
(Letter #s: 482)

Category: Use of best science, Adequacy of Analysis

PC# VEG0005

The FS should have all silvicultural discussions peer reviewed by professional foresters and incorporate science in timber production estimates.
(Letter #s: 218, 430)

PC# VEG0011

The FS should consult the following researchers and report findings related to the importance of forests for carbon dioxide sequestration: Ron Nelson, USFS, Corvallis, OR; Steve McNulty, USFS, Raliegh, NC; and Mike Apps, Victoria, B.C., email mapps@nrcan.gc.can.
(Letter #s: 501)

PC# VEG0013

The FS should address the issue of global climate change to:

- address the impacts on insects, wildlife, trees, and forest fires;
- clarify how desired conditions will be maintained during climate change;
- account for global warming impacts on indigenous flora;
- assess potential impacts of climate change on viable species of trees for timber.

(Letter #s: 506, 501, 430, 309)

PC# VEG0081

The FS should incorporate best available science (Graham et al.) into coarse woody debris requirements.
(Letter #s: 339)

Category: Vegetation Forestwide Desired Condition

PC# VEG0006

The FS should consider the following with regards to Vegetation Desired Condition:

- revise wording to clarify that there "will be" occasions where it is desirable or necessary to depart from vegetative desired conditions" (instead of "may be");
- avoid tendencies to create "park-like" conditions that remove too much undergrowth;
- disclose historical data used to determine desired conditions to identify natural structural conditions baseline data and to identify how disturbance factors are accounted for in historic range analyses;
- calculate the total number of acres requiring forest health and fuels reduction treatments before considering historical and current funding levels;
- provide a non-managed category for desired conditions to allow natural processes to occur;
- thin overstocked stands to protect resources and communities;
- reduce understory vegetation;
- disclose additional information regarding understory vegetation in the vegetation analysis;
- consider recruitment of over- and under-represented size classes when calculating composition changes;

- align desired conditions with budget and resource constraints;
- provide evidence that current insect and disease levels are at an all-time high;
- address insect and disease concerns in the vegetation desired condition for warm/moist settings (VRU 4-6);
- reduce desired percentages of Lodgepole pine;
- enhance the health of the forest ecosystem through thinning, scarification, and approved canopy adjustment methods;
- revise direction that leaves mature white pine in stands partially harvested because this does not result in white pine resistance to disease and insects;
- categorize Western White Pine and Douglas-fir as intermediate in tolerance;
- clarify intended actions and budget requirements needed to address forest health restoration and fire mitigation issues.

(Letter #: 434, 212, 467, 506, 465, 456, 447, 426, 342, 293, 254, 218, 248)

PC# VEG0008

The FS should maximize timber volume harvested to:

- improve condition class;
- restore ecosystems;
- bring biological functions under a regime of sustainability.

(Letter #: 254)

PC# VEG0009

The FS should revise the old growth definition to:

- align with the North Idaho Zone definitions in Green et al.;
- disclose that restoration activities reduce rather than increase old growth.

(Letter #: 339, 434)

PC# VEG0016

The FS should require logging companies to replant areas following harvest activities to maintain forest contributions to global carbon cycles.

(Letter #: 185)

PC# VEG0017

The FS should provide further analysis on noxious weeds to:

- provide closures on transport mechanisms other than motorized recreationists;
- recognize that noxious weeds are in non-motorized areas;
- address how wildlife and natural processes spread noxious weeds;
- apply mitigation measures impartially to all forest visitors;
- disclose motorized recreation impacts on spreading noxious weeds;
- address potential impacts from authorized and unauthorized trails in inventoried roadless areas;
- disclose noxious weed goals and progress in achieving those goals.

(Letter #: 387, 413, 385, 355, 482)

PC# VEG0018

The FS should revise terminology used to evaluate forest fragmentation because developed areas should not include forested landscapes with harvest units and typical NFS roads.

(Letter #: 418)

PC# VEG0020

The FS should ensure it will achieve its vision for vegetation management:

- to avoid bending to administrative politics;
- to focus on caring for the land and not profit generation;
- because personnel have lost common sense and contact with the land.

(Letter #s: 387)

PC# VEG0021

The FS should prohibit the use of Vegetation Response Units (VRUs) because VRUs do not correlate with agency studies on habitat and fire types.

(Letter #s: 506)

PC# VEG0022

The FS should revise Chapter 1, Table 1 to clarify that the table does not apply to lands in the wildland urban interface.

(Letter #s: 218)

PC# VEG0024

The FS should consider revising the Rare Plant Species Desired Condition to:

- preserve all native Plant habitats likely to contain rare, sensitive, and disjunctive species;
- preserve all peat lands in their native state;
- include a botanical assessment of the Priest Lake Basin;
- select more appropriate desirable species;
- provide sufficient habitat for sustainable populations of rare and threatened native Plant species.

(Letter #s: 423, 362, 419)

PC# VEG0026

The FS should consider the following regarding openings:

- provide more openings to prevent Douglas-fir monoculture;
- provide more openings to regenerate Western Larch and Ponderosa Pine;
- provide more openings to promote seral tree recruitment;
- disclose intended size and frequency of clearcuts and the resulting impacts of such activities.

(Letter #s: 434, 168, 38)

PC# VEG0027

The FS should revise and disclose methods for achieving desired future age class conditions to:

- recognize that twenty percent is more adequate and appropriate for old growth;
- provide for wildlife habitat needs;
- reduce the amount of forest as representative of old growth.

(Letter #s: 152, 254, 379, 418)

PC# VEG0040

The FS should emphasize protection of mature forests in roadless areas and waterways.

(Letter #s: 173)

PC# VEG0043

The FS should provide additional discussion and effects analysis on old growth stands to:

- identify the location and distribution of stands to be managed for old growth;
- indicate old growth areas that have a high priority for logging activities;

- identify how old growth targets were established;
- provide evidence that logging benefits old growth habitat;
- disclose the effects of old growth manipulation on dependant wildlife;
- describe how a one percent increase in old growth will be accomplished;
- include a goal for maintaining old growth with forest management prescriptions.

(Letter #: 386, 428, 456, 465, 468, 506, 336)

PC# VEG0046

The FS should prioritize fire protection over woody debris retention in Chapter 1, page 1-9, paragraph 3, change the last half of the last sentence to read "fire risk reduction in the Wildland Urban Interface will require reducing the recommended coarse woody debris to lower levels."

(Letter #: 218)

PC# VEG0053

The FS should provide improved noxious weed management direction to:

- provide access for weed control;
- educate the public;
- eliminate introduction, intensification, and spread, not just reduce these things;
- protect pristine backcountry areas;
- prioritize weed prevention during management activities;
- reduce existing infestations;
- explore the use of biological control methods;
- ensure water contamination from herbicide use is fully evaluated and avoided;
- provide guidance and additional analysis on the use of herbicides and pesticides and consider preventing the use of untested poisonous sprays or aerial spraying of herbicides to protect wildlife, watersheds, and humans.

(Letter #: 419, 465, 453, 436, 426, 420, 401, 339, 322, 185, 423, 171, 294, 197, 211, 212, 213, 214, 257, 293)

PC# VEG0057

The FS should consider the following with regards to fire regime condition classes:

- disclose methods for achieving historic fire regimes conditions while only treating minimal acreage annually;
- implement a progressive action Plan to treat fire regime condition classes;
- treat condition class 3 lands within 10 years and remaining condition class 2 lands within 25 years;
- establish threshold values, target basal areas, trees per acre by species, and size class composition for each fire regime condition class.

(Letter #: 331, 342, 470, 254)

PC# VEG0063

The FS should maintain shrub fields to provide wildlife forage.

(Letter #: 465)

PC# VEG0083

The FS should disclose mitigation measures to address the increased threat of large scale fires and address how measures will compete with available resources.

(Letter #: 384)

PC# VEG0084

The FS should include harvest prescriptions that mimic the frequency and severity effects of natural fire regimes.

(Letter #: 170)

Category: Vegetation Guidelines – Old Growth

PC# VEG0035

The FS should provide additional management direction for old growth to:

- mimics natural disturbance events and increases/protects old growth and large size classes;
- reduce fragmentation and edge effects;
- protect what little old growth remains;
- allow activities once old growth stands are moved out of "suitable" or "generally suitable" timber production categories;
- prevent reduction in the acreage of old growth;
- eliminate or minimize road-related impacts on old growth;
- retain old growth management units;
- reduce the diameter guideline of retaining live trees over 54 inches in diameter because few trees are that large;
- include a guideline that addresses recruitment of additional old growth to replace old growth lost through management activities or natural causes;
- prohibit timber harvesting of old growth forests;
- allow timber harvest in old growth stands identified as Condition Class 1, 2, or 3.

(Letter #: 512, 423, 434, 436, 453, 475, 476, 229, 487, 422, 513, 66, 482, 138, 293, 133, 419, 168, 254, 331, 338, 339, 38, 384, 389, 332)

PC# VEG0076

The FS should consider the following guidelines for ancient cedar groves:

- reclassify ancient cedar grove guidelines as standards and protect those that meet old growth standards from logging, road construction, or other forms of disturbance;
- define "ancient cedar grove" and include ancient cedar grove discussions in the old growth analysis.

(Letter #: 339, 384)

PC# VEG0077

The FS should reclassify selected guidelines as standards to ensure the:

- "no new roads in old growth habitat" guideline is a standard;
- "ten percent minimum old growth habitat" guideline is a standard.

(Letter #: 339)

PC# VEG0080

The FS should include the following guidelines to prevent noxious weeds:

- reseed and replant sites where soil disturbance has occurred;
- limit ground cover removal in logging projects to 10-15 percent to inhibit the spread of noxious weeds, including limitations on excavator piling and increasing hand piling, jackpot burning, and lop and scatter;
- require contractor equipment to be inspected and washed prior to entering the Forest;
- prohibit stock grazing in areas containing weeds;

- enforce weed-free livestock feed objectives;
- prohibit ORVs from trails that contain weeds;
- require all administrative sites and campgrounds be made weed-free within five years;
- quarantine stock animals prior to entering the Forest;
- prioritize treatment methods for noxious weed infestations and include evaluation and mitigation measures;
- clarify that chemicals will be used as a last resort for treatment.

(Letter #: 339, 419, 506)

PC# VEG0082

The FS should adopt the "Forest Restoration Assessment Principles" (DellaSala et al. 2003) as an integral part of design criteria.

(Letter #: 294)

PC# VEG0087

The FS should consider adding to the guidelines for plant species of concern, and species of interest "Activities should protect documented populations of species of concern and species of interest"

(Letter #: 387)

Category: Vegetation Monitoring

PC# VEG0042

The FS should consider the following regarding monitoring of old growth:

- provide additional monitoring programs to determine the effectiveness of activities intended to increase or improve old growth;
- indicate if the public will be able to review old growth surveys associated with new stands that will be managed for old growth.

(Letter #: 449)

PC# VEG0065

The FS should consider the following additional Vegetation Monitoring Questions:

- Have management activities salvaged tree mortality in a timely manner?
- Have management activities taken into account any annual changes in rare/sensitive plant classification made by the Idaho Conservation Data Center?
- Are the BMPs used to control noxious weeds/invasive species effectively keeping the levels of noxious weeds at or below the current levels within the forest?
- Is the spread of noxious weeds contained or are they spreading to new areas, since adoption of the Forest Plan?

(Letter #: 384, 423, 218, 197, 293)

Category: Vegetation Objectives

PC# VEG0067

The FS should consider revising the Vegetation Objectives, Timber Objectives and Fire Objectives to:

- increase restoration targets;
- increase old growth targets;
- include prevention of noxious weeds;
- include continual monitoring regarding the effectiveness of thin/burn treatments.

(Letter #: 384, 434)

PC# VEG0068

The FS should require surveys for threatened, endangered, and proposed plant species prior to ground-disturbing activities.

(Letter #: 339)

PC# VEG0071

The FS should clarify the differences between Forest Health and Vegetation Restoration Objectives by:

- correcting apparent discrepancies between Forest Health Objectives, Vegetation Restoration, increases in the size of old growth timber stands, and improved condition classes;
- clarifying if forest health treatment acreage is in addition to the Vegetation Restoration objectives' acreage.

(Letter #: 467, 336)

Category: Vegetation Yaak GA Desired Condition (KNF)

PC# VEG0062

The KNF should maintain or recover a full range of vegetative and backcountry diversity in the Yaak GA to include old growth spruce.

(Letter #: 48)

Category: Watershed Forestwide Desired Condition -- IPNF Watersheds

PC# VEG0059

The FS should manage for natural evolving ecosystems in lieu of perpetuating artificial ecosystems to prevent soil erosion and degradation.

(Letter #: 506)

Category: Wildlife Forestwide Desired Condition -- Habitat (general)

PC# VEG0023

The FS should consider revising Wildlife Desired Condition to:

- reflect realistic and practical conditions in warm/moist settings;
- allow natural processes to shape the landscape.

(Letter #: 218)

PC# VEG0036

The FS should continue management direction that increases and protects habitat for cavity dwellers, Canadian lynx, and wolverines.

(Letter #: 338, 436, 138)

Category: Wildlife Yaak GA Desired Condition (KNF)

PC# VEG0061

The KNF should address the loss of porcupines in the Yaak Geographic Area.

(Letter #: 48)

Subject: WATERSHED (PC #s starting with WAT)

Category: EMS

PC# WAT0052

The KNF should establish an independent EMS for riparian environmental conditions as a replacement for INFS.

(Letter #s: 266)

Category: Watershed Coeur d'Alene GA Desired Condition (IPNF)

PC# WAT0008

The IPNF should acknowledge and act on the National Academy of Science study of the relationships between forest management and downstream flooding by:

- analyzing past and proposed timber sales and forest cover removal, and updating watershed modeling tools;
- protecting and restoring the damaged forested watersheds of the Spokane River-Lake Coeur d'Alene system;
- coordinating management activities and funding with the EPA.

(Letter #s: 421, 422, 488)

PC# WAT0020

The FS should coordinate with the EPA on the issue of uplands management and the effects it has on Superfund cleanup efforts in the Coeur d'Alene Basin.

(Letter #s: 197, 421)

Category: Watershed Forestwide Desired Condition -- IPNF Watersheds

PC# WAT0001

The IPNF should consider the following additions to the Watersheds Desired Conditions:

- that management actions would include activities to establish recovery trends in 303(d) listed segments and water bodies that are consistent with approved TMDLs. For 303(d) listed streams without approved TMDLs, management actions would lead to improvement in parameters (pollutants) that resulted in the listing;
- the methodology that will be used to determine which watersheds will receive restoration, hydrologic improvements, native fish passage removals, or sediment source reductions;
- a goal to meet Tribal water quality standards.

(Letter #s: 197, 257, 430, 456, 468)

PC# WAT0002

The IPNF should include measures to protect water quality and native fish by:

- taking steps to protect and restore watershed forests in order to limit toxic runoff;
- requiring management buffers of 200 to 300 feet to protect rivers, streams, lakes and sensitive areas.

(Letter #s: 229, 513, 512, 485, 278, 173, 463)

PC# WAT0003

The IPNF should ensure land management practices maintain the water quality standards of the State of Idaho without limiting public land access under the guise of protecting water quality.

(Letter #s: 480)

PC# WAT0006

The KNF should consider revising the Watersheds Desired Condition to:

- address the cooperative agency processes described in the State of Montana's Nonpoint Source Management Plan - "Watershed and instream conditions, such as pool frequency, residual pool depth, pebble counts, stream temperature, large woody material, bank stability, lower bank angles, and bankfull width/depth ratios, are within hydrologic reference conditions for resilient channels. Management actions include restoration activities supporting recovery trends achieving reference conditions in Class II and III watersheds within the life of this Plan. For all 303(d) listed waters without watershed plans or approved TMDLs, management actions support recovery trends that substantially achieve Class I watershed conditions within the life of this Plan";
- encourage cost-sharing partnerships to accomplish fishery and water way restoration and rehabilitation;
- address road effects to water quality, watersheds, and aquatic habitat and species and that it is included somewhere in the LMP;
- be congruent with Clean Water Act requirements for water quality, by replacing the harm-avoidance language with an affirmative desired water quality condition plan - "Water quality meets or exceeds applicable state standards, sustains stream channel reference conditions, and supports native amphibians and diverse invertebrate communities";
- minimize the impact of legacy roads and trails through BMPs and decommissioning;
- include a reference the Montana Water Quality Standards Administrative Rules.

(Letter #: 257, 266, 293, 336)

PC# WAT0007

The FS should explain how the LMP will realistically improve watershed conditions without commitments and guarantees, when past management under strict operating standards failed to do so.

(Letter #: 387)

PC# WAT0009

The FS should develop a more realistic goal for effects to soil productivity for only minor and non-significant adverse effects, rather than "no sustained adverse effects".

(Letter #: 336)

PC# WAT0010

The FS should consider revising the Soil Desired Condition to:

- address the existing and potential cumulative effects of management on soil productivity and loss, particularly with regard to the effects of logging activities;
- include "reduction of earth slippage and downstream flooding outside the forest";
- include in the hydrologic functions in soil "living tree roots are in place to hold the soil and moisture to forestall erosion and flooding";
- include in the physical, biological and chemical properties "No sustained adverse effects on soil productivity or soil-hydrologic function are evident in IPNF watersheds, including loss of soil and water holding tree roots".

(Letter #: 506, 294, 434)

PC# WAT0011

The FS should consider revising the Watersheds (Water, Soil, and Riparian) and Aquatic Species Desired Condition for riparian habitat to:

- emphasize a goal of restoring and maintaining riparian habitat and stream conditions within the expected range of natural conditions;

- include a meso-scale watershed restoration element that says "In riparian conservation areas and active restoration watersheds, road densities are at a level that is favorable to water quality, bull trout, and westslope cutthroat trout. Roads within riparian conservation areas are designed, located, constructed and maintained to effectively trap and store sediment so that natural levels of sediment reach waterways".

(Letter #: 266, 336)

PC# WAT0012

The FS should consider revising the Aquatic Habitat Desired Condition to:

- include: "Stream banks are at least 90 percent stable in 80 percent of any stream reach. There is an absence of silt from timber harvest activity";
- disclose what methodology will be used to determine which watersheds will receive restoration, hydrologic improvements, native fish passage removals, or sediment source reductions;
- include wetlands as aquatic habitat and comply with Executive Order 11990;
- place additional emphasis on alpine and mountain wetland buffers;
- amend the language for large pools within streams to include "in reaches that have geomorphologic types where such conditions are expected";
- include more quantifiable estimates of desired condition levels as targets;
- identify watersheds that are population strongholds for listed, proposed, or endemic species, and to manage for the long-term stability, productivity and biological diversity of these areas per the Interior Columbia Basin strategy.

(Letter #: 173, 197, 257, 336, 428, 434)

PC# WAT0016

The FS should include additional species - westslope cutthroat and burbot - in Aquatic Species Desired Conditions.

(Letter #: 465)

PC# WAT0017

The FS should establish an ecologically sound Aquatic Conservation Strategy establishing broad scale goals and standards to ensure the level of planning is commensurate with the high degree of sensitivity of aquatic resources to human disturbance.

(Letter #: 422)

PC# WAT0018

The FS should consider the following additions to Watersheds Desired Conditions for each GA:

- describe road densities, their effects on ecosystem condition and objectives for road density reduction;
- identification of source water protection areas;
- descriptions and lists of conservation and restoration watersheds;
- list streams and stream miles with 303(d) listings, the pollution parameters causing exceedences, and measures for improvement;
- list TMDL streams and describe the objectives of the TMDL and how they are being implemented;
- a discussion and description of stream functionality, which includes classification factors, measures for improvement, and a description of watersheds and subwatersheds with restoration needs and those targeted for conservation of resources.

(Letter #: 197, 257, 458)

PC# WAT0035

The FS should consider restoring beaver to historic population levels as a possible key in restoring damaged watersheds by restoring their historic ability to capture, store and release water.

(Letter #s: 422)

PC# WAT0053

The KNF should write an 'Aquatic Restoration Strategy' that:

- incorporates elements from the LMP strategy, design criteria and other LMP documents;
- adopts a multiple use strategy for restoration by involving all uses that contributed to the existing condition.

(Letter #s: 266)

PC# WAT0055

The IPNF should create an MA for bull trout priority watersheds to help the forest meet its obligations with respect to the Endangered Species Act (ESA) for conservation and recovery.

(Letter #s: 339)

PC# WAT0056

The FS should use benchmark analysis for watersheds.

(Letter #s: 386)

PC# WAT0060

The FS should manage aquatic habitats where there are pure or potentially pure native fish populations for:

- riparian habitat protection for westslope cutthroat, interior redband, and white sturgeon by allocating these habitats to MA3 or lower;
- all bull trout core and nodal habitats, the MA allocation should be MA3 or lower, and encompass the entire watershed to the stream mouth.

(Letter #s: 517)

PC# WAT0061

The FS should maintain high quality habitat for nonnative fisheries with high recreational values.

(Letter #s: 517)

Category: Watershed Forestwide Desired Condition -- Riparian

PC# WAT0014

The FS should reconsider active management in Streamside Management Zones (SMZs) to reduce fuel loading and the risk of catastrophic fire.

(Letter #s: 168, 38)

Category: Watershed Forestwide Desired Condition -- Soil

PC# WAT0047

The FS should emphasize soil as one of the fundamental building blocks of forest ecosystems, deserving of additional discussion in the LMP, including specific standards and requirements addressing detrimental disturbance erosion and other soil processes.

(Letter #s: 339)

Category: Watershed Guidelines – Watersheds (general)

PC# WAT0013

The FS should consider revising the Riparian Areas Guidelines to include:

- criteria for the definition of "intact and functioning";
- Riparian Management Objectives in order to determine watershed condition and need.

(Letter #: 257, 468)

PC# WAT0015

The FS should explain how the LMP will manage aquatic habitat and species without the requirements in INFS.

(Letter #: 257, 468)

PC# WAT0042

The FS should analyze and address the potential for forestwide cumulative effects on aquatic resources from permitting 'short term' degradation through management activities.

(Letter #: 468, 428)

PC# WAT0043

The IPNF should consider revising Watersheds (Soil, Water, and Riparian Areas) and Aquatic Species Guidelines:

- Guideline 2 should provide different guidelines for 303(d) listed watersheds where TMDLs and water quality restoration plans have been adopted versus watersheds where TMDLs and water quality restoration plans have not been adopted in accordance with Idaho State law;
- Guideline 4 should require intergovernment coordination of activities within municipal watersheds in order to ensure local government and Idaho DEQ water quality requirements are met, and to ensure the requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act are met;
- Guideline 4 for riparian areas should read "soil or snow mixed with soil";
- to ensure projects are conducted in a manner consistent with Idaho's Antidegradation Policy;
- to include a standard for ECA to minimize the effects of peak flows at the 4th HUC scale;
- to provide more comprehensive water quality and riparian protection;
- to include "Vegetation management practices such as timber harvest, salvage logging, and fuels treatments may be used in RCAs only to restore or enhance physical and biological characteristics of the RCA including watershed, riparian and aquatic habitat and aquatic species desired conditions";
- to include "Minimum impact fire suppression tactics should be used within RCAs";
- to include "Allow fuelwood cutting in RCAs only where it would not prevent or retard attainment of watershed, riparian and aquatic habitat and aquatic species desired conditions";
- to include "Prohibit storage of fuels and other toxicants within RCAs. Prohibit refueling within RCAs unless there are no other alternatives. Refueling sites within an RCA must be approved by the FS and have an approved spill containment plan";
- to include "Wetlands should be flagged and marked on the ground and on maps to facilitate avoidance of disturbance to wetlands ."

(Letter #: 197, 339)

PC# WAT0044

The KNF should consider revising the Watersheds (Soil, Water, and Riparian Areas) and Aquatic Species Guidelines:

- to include direction that maintains and protects existing high quality waters, and promotes restoration of impaired waters;

- with stronger language that promotes outcomes that are more likely to achieve the desired condition;
- to describe how the guidelines will be implemented;
- to include a guideline for ground-disturbing activities in unimpaired watersheds;
- to include "Ground disturbing activities in Class I or Class II watersheds will maintain water quality conditions providing full support for beneficial uses during the life of the Plan. Short-term or incidental water quality departures may occur where there is no threat or impairment of the watershed beneficial uses or where the activities support long-term benefits to aquatic resources";
- Guideline 2 should ensure consistency with approved TMDLs and associated water quality restoration plans with "Ground-disturbing activities in watersheds of 303(d) listed waterbodies with an adopted Water Quality Restoration Plan/TMDL will be consistent with water quality restoration measures and targets in the adopted TMDL and associated water quality restoration plans, including measures to restore full support of beneficial uses.";
- to include "Ground-disturbing activities in watersheds of 303(d) listed waterbodies without an adopted Water Quality Restoration Plan/TMDL will be consistent with achieving Class I watershed conditions within the life of the proposed ground-disturbing action or within the life of this Plan."

(Letter #: 257, 266, 309, 422)

PC# WAT0045

The FS should consider revising the Watersheds (Soil, Water, and Riparian Areas) and Aquatic Species Guidelines to include:

- stronger language that promotes outcomes that are more likely to achieve the desired condition;
- "When watershed and riparian conservation areas (RCAs) are intact and functioning at desired condition, then management activities will maintain or improve that condition";
- " When watersheds and RCAs are not intact and functioning at desired condition, then management activities will include restoration components that promote a substantial trend toward desired conditions";
- "Management activities in RCAs will not result in long-term degradation to aquatic conditions. Limited short-term effects from activities in the RCAs may be acceptable when they support long-term benefits to the RCAs and aquatic resources."

(Letter #: 266)

PC# WAT0046

The FS should consider revising the Soils Guidelines to:

- include greater retention of tops, limbs and down woody debris for soil improvement;
- avoid logging in areas with moderate to high mass failure potential (greater than 35 percent) by buffering;
- prohibit any ground-based skidding on slopes greater than 35 percent;
- quantify 'long' in the phrase "long tractor skids";
- include a limit of 5 percent compaction on logging units.

(Letter #: 146, 50, 293, 339)

PC# WAT0048

The FS should consider revising the Aquatic Species Guidelines to:

- include BMPs and stream crossing permits on the KNF to ensure the framework for RCA management consists of the Montana SMZ law;
- include protections equivalent to those of INFS such as pool frequency, water temperature, large woody debris, bank stability, bank angle, and sediment;

- say that stream crossing improvements should be prioritized by habitat value, status of the species, and species' genetics and be coordinated with other efforts within the watershed;
- clarify that suppression tactics refer to fire suppression;
- clarify and define "intact and functioning at desired conditions" with a criteria for a functioning and non-functioning determination;
- include temporary crossing structures with lower design standards;
- prohibit activities within a range of dates;
- to prohibit timber harvest in riparian areas that provides habitat security, diversity, stability, and long-term woody debris recruitment in bull trout core and nodal habitats.

(Letter #: 254, 517, 460, 428, 336, 223, 339)

PC# WAT0049

The FS should consider the additional 'Sources of Other Design Criteria' and/or references:

- "Steps to Take to Incorporate Source Water Protection into Your Plans and Projects";
- Logan, R. 2001. Water Quality BMPs for Montana Forests. EB158, 2001. MSU Extension Publications, Bozeman MT 59717;
- compliance with Idaho Water Quality Standards be added to Guideline 1 under the "Watersheds and Aquatic Species" heading;
- Clean Water Act Water Quality Standards and State of Idaho Water Quality Standards and Regulation;
- draft document on EPA's Regional drinking water website, EPA Region 10 Source Water Protection Best Management Practices for USFS, BLM.

(Letter #: 197, 336, 6)

PC# WAT0054

The FS should avoid excessive soil disturbance and compaction by limiting the use of excavators after harvest.

(Letter #: 293)

PC# WAT0059

The FS should consider whether mitigation plans for at-risk watersheds:

- are working well enough to permit logging in at-risk areas;
- can be adequately funded.

(Letter #: 482)

Category: Watershed Libby GA Desired Condition (KNF)

PC# WAT0019

The KNF should protect the Flower Creek municipal watershed, which is the public water supply for the city of Libby.

(Letter #: 257)

Category: Watershed Monitoring – IPNF Watersheds

PC# WAT0022

The IPNF should coordinate their aquatic monitoring program with the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality and the EPA to promote consistency in monitoring and assessment methodologies and the indicators used for evaluation of beneficial use support; reference material is listed in comment letter #197.

(Letter #: 197)

PC# WAT0033

The FS should describe the treatments used to restore proper functioning condition.
(Letter #: 384)

Category: Watershed Monitoring – KNF Watersheds

PC# WAT0023

The KNF should coordinate their aquatic monitoring program with the Montana Department of Environmental Quality and the EPA to promote consistency in monitoring and assessment methodologies and the indicators used for evaluation of beneficial use support, including multiple indicators to account for complexity of chemical, physical and biological processes.
(Letter #: 257, 266)

PC# WAT0024

The KNF should make an explicit commitment to implement watershed monitoring:

- providing sufficient funding to assess both project outcomes and ecosystem benefits;
- including a detailed discussion of required elements and reporting timeframes;
- by providing the monitoring implementation guide as part of the LMP.

(Letter #: 330, 266)

PC# WAT0025

The KNF should consider the following additional Watersheds and Aquatic Species Monitoring Questions:

- Have management areas focused on the decommissioning of roads to improve watersheds, followed by stream restoration?
- How many watersheds have been restored and could this number be increased?
- Have management activities avoided impact to riparian areas?
- How many partnerships are being established with private groups interested in watershed rehabilitation?
- Has habitat for bull trout, native interior redband and westslope cutthroat trout increased as well as the populations of each species?

(Letter #: 293, 475)

Category: Watershed Monitoring –Watersheds (general)

PC# WAT0026

The FS should monitor all aquatic habitat.
(Letter #: 173)

PC# WAT0027

The FS should ensure that monitoring of TMDLs, sediment production and associated negative effects are not overestimated to the disadvantage of public use and motorized recreation.
(Letter #: 355)

PC# WAT0028

The FS should amend the objectives and include the 1987 Forest Plan commitment to specific water quality objectives for streams.
(Letter #: 200)

PC# WAT0029

The FS should include a soil monitoring component for plots in treated and untreated areas to provide data for the EMS and adaptive management.

(Letter #: 254)

PC# WAT0030

The FS should include accountability for fisheries protection and restoration at least equal to that in the existing Forest Plan by providing a framework for the INFS regulations or standards that require quantitative monitoring of high value fisheries streams.

(Letter #: 197, 266, 422, 465)

Category: Watershed Objectives – IPNF Watersheds

PC# WAT0031

The IPNF should consider revising the Watersheds (Soil, Water, and Riparian Areas) and Aquatic Species Objectives to include:

- Objective 2 for consistency with both existing and future TMDLs;
- combining functioning at risk (FAR) and not properly functioning (NPF) watershed objectives with the 303(d) objectives;
- describing the extent to which the proposed levels of watershed restoration will restore and delist 303(d) waters;
- a third bullet under Watershed Condition to ensure that habitat features identified in the desired conditions are more than 'aspirations';
- to define the 'risk factors'.

(Letter #: 197, 6)

Category: Watershed Objectives – KNF Watersheds

PC# WAT0034

The KNF should consider revising the Watersheds (Soil, Water, and Riparian Areas) and Aquatic Species Objectives to include:

- meeting the protocol under the new planning rule for 'measurable, time-specific outcomes';
- a comprehensive set of objectives based on budget realities, with those actions that are actually needed to attain desired conditions (especially those that are legally mandated);
- the concept of moving impaired waters towards full support of beneficial uses;
- maintaining the 11 percent of properly functioning watersheds, most of which lie in IRAs allocated to MA5;
- stronger language that promotes outcomes that are more likely to achieve the desired condition;
- showing substantial and sustained trends toward achieving reference conditions in Class II and III watersheds within the life of the Plan by indicating the percentage of Class II and III that would have impaired conditions mitigated or restored in five year intervals;
- prioritizing actions to achieve watershed desired conditions;
- minimizing the effects of legacy roads with mileage targets;
- riparian management objectives - "Support TMDL and water quality restoration plan development by working cooperatively with the State/EPA and local watershed groups to assess the causes and sources of conditions contributing to Class II and Class III watersheds, and within 1 year, prioritize all Class III and II KNF watersheds to substantially achieve watershed restoration during the life of this Plan";

- "Implement restoration and monitoring activities for the prioritized 303(d) listed waters to promote restoration of full support of beneficial uses, allowing removal of these waters from the 303(d) list during the life of this Plan. Approximately one third of the listed waters will have watershed restoration plan/TMDLs implemented within five years of forest Plan implementation, and approximately two thirds of the watershed's restoration plans will be substantially implemented within 10 years of KNF Plan implementation. All parameters of an impaired water may not be fully restored during the life of this Plan, but all waters will be making substantial progress to achieve full beneficial use support within the life of this Plan";
- "Work cooperatively with the State/EPA and local watershed groups to support TMDL and water quality restoration plan development. Assess and validate listings of impaired waters and prioritize all impaired waters on the KNF for restoration within the first 5 years of the planning period";
- "Implement restoration and monitoring activities to address the prioritized KNF restoration needs for 303(d) listed waters to promote restoration of full support of beneficial uses, thereby, removing waterbodies from the State 303(d) list during the planning period. It is recognized that all listed waters may not be fully restored during the planning period, but all KNF waters should be prioritized for restoration and put on a path toward long-term restoration of full support for beneficial uses".

(Letter #: 387, 336, 266, 257, 6)

PC# WAT0036

The KNF should reassess the objectives for achieving the desired conditions for 303(d) watersheds because quantifying the proposed mitigation and restoration shows that it will address the impairments of a limited percentage of watersheds that are not properly functioning or functioning at risk.

(Letter #: 266, 387)

Category: Watershed Objectives – Watersheds

PC# WAT0005

The FS should manage valuable water sources and their unique ecosystems for protection by:

- recommending these areas for Wilderness designation;
- recognizing and treating healthy ecosystems as irreplaceable ecological treasures;
- prohibiting any degrading management activities or uses.

(Letter #: 173, 422, 394, 339, 277)

PC# WAT0037

The FS should explain what is meant by 'treatment' for 303(d) watersheds, including miles and number of streams, and types of upland management that would benefit impaired water bodies.

(Letter #: 6)

PC# WAT0038

The FS should explain under Objective 1 for watersheds and aquatic species what the risk factors are that contribute to watershed impairment.

(Letter #: 6)

PC# WAT0039

The FS should identify the acreage objectives in different watershed objectives that are potentially redundant, particularly for objectives 1 and 2.

(Letter #: 6)

PC# WAT0040

The FS should explain how it determined that 400 acres was an appropriate treatment area for restoring soil quality and productivity.

(Letter #: 197)

PC# WAT0041

The FS should consider revising the Watersheds (Soil, Water, and Riparian Areas) and Aquatic Species Objectives to include:

- strengthening the objectives language for riparian conservation areas to ensure they are as binding and protective as those of INFS;
- using a more useful metric for habitat connectivity such as a number of projects that reestablish connectivity to high value habitats or species;
- making improvements such as bank stabilization, riparian planting, or placement of woody material on a specified quantity of riparian habitat;
- "activities over the life of the Plan will promote maintenance and attainment of watershed, riparian and aquatic habitat and aquatic species desired conditions" to verify that activities promote maintenance or attainment of watershed, riparian and aquatic habitat and aquatic species desired conditions.

(Letter #: 197, 257, 336, 421)

Category: Watershed St. Joe GA Desired Condition (IPNF)

PC# WAT0021

The IPNF should consider amending the Desired Condition for the St. Joe GA to include a:

- discussion of the bull trout Critical Habitat Rule;
- condition that mimics historic fire patterns in terms of providing different vegetation stages, while allowing for watershed recovery and maintenance.

(Letter #: 456, 465)

Subject: WILDLIFE (PC #s starting with WLF)

Category: Access & Recreation Forestwide Suitability

PC# WLF0020

The FS should provide data supporting motorized closures to improve habitat connectivity.

(Letter #: 355)

Category: Cooperation Forestwide Desired Condition

PC# WLF0005

The FS should consider partnerships to address wildlife management concerns with clubs in the Swede/McMillan area.

(Letter #: 129)

Category: Editorial comment to the Plan.

PC# WLF0009

The FS should include in the Desired Condition a framework describing the characteristics of ecosystem diversity in the LMP because:

- the characteristics are undefined and vague;

- it fails to provide for the diversity of plant and animal communities within the meaning of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA).

(Letter #: 460)

Category: MA - 1b Recommended Wilderness

PC# WLF0033

The KNF should protect mountain goats in the Scotchman Peaks by:

- prohibiting snowmobiles in goat habitat;
- abiding by the MOU between the FS and Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks;
- returning the MA5c area east of Savage Peak to MA1b.

(Letter #: 283, 305, 387, 424, 46, 460)

Category: Project Level

PC# WLF0041

The FS should consider interpretive signs along the St. Joe River and Hiawatha Trail for wildlife.

(Letter #: 465)

Category: Vegetation Forestwide Desired Condition

PC# WLF0004

The FS should consider the following for management of old-growth habitat:

- improve the current shortfall in old-growth habitat with scientifically sound old-growth protection and restoration policies;
- provide adequate inventory of its forestwide old-growth habitat;
- provide enforceable standards sufficient to insure old-growth associated species viability;
- provide information and issues relating to the viability of species that are dependent in whole or in part on adequate levels of old-growth habitat, well distributed across the Forest;
- consider relevant concerns from wildlife experts, including FS experts, and adopt wildlife protection "guidelines" with scientific support.

(Letter #: 294)

Category: Wildlife Coeur d'Alene GA Desired Condition (IPNF)

PC# WLF0038

The IPNF should amend the language in the Wildlife Desired Condition for the Coeur d'Alene GA:

- to read "Motorized summer use occurs on managed routes; motorized winter use occurs on managed routes and use areas. Both are managed in a manner that does not have significant adverse impacts on wildlife";
- deleting the last paragraph on page 1-41 as unrealistic;
- to distinguish between the effects of summer and winter motorized activities;
- to identify connectivity in the Lookout Pass area as a desired condition "The Idaho/Montana Divide [will] provide [secure] habitat (with minimal human-caused disturbance and development) [or would provide effective connectivity] for wildlife movement between the Salmon and Selway/Bitterroot Wilderness areas and Canada's potential source populations."

(Letter #: 146, 395)

Category: Wildlife Forestwide Desired Condition -- Habitat (general)

PC# WLF0001

The FS should protect critical components of wildlife habitat such as:

- security cover;
- connective corridors from motorized use.

(Letter #: 479, 478, 387, 171, 283)

PC# WLF0002

The FS should protect habitat through Wilderness recommendation:

- of the Scotchman Peaks for black bear, bull trout, deer, elk, grizzly and mountain goats;
- of the eastern, western, and southern areas of the Selkirks for caribou and grizzly;
- of Cabinet Face East and West, Grizzly Peak, Whitefish Divide (Thompson Seton-Marston-Tuchuck), Portions of the Ten Lakes and Robinson Mt, for core grizzly bear habitat and strongholds of occupied historic habitat for either bull trout, or the westslope cutthroat trout and the interior redband trout;
- of the Northwest Peaks, Roderick Mountain, Saddle Mountain, Gold Hill West, Mount Henry, Buckhorn Ridge, Pink Mountain, the West Fork and Mount Robinson for grizzly bear, wolverine, lynx, wolves, bighorn sheep, moose, elk, mountain goats, trout and occasional woodland caribou;
- in the area as far south as Jeru Peak for protection of an intact ecosystem from motorized vehicles;
- of all the IRAs on the KNF, which include underrepresented habitats;
- to protect habitat corridors, including those between the USA and Canada;
- to buffer species' adjustments to climate change.

(Letter #: 517, 79, 31, 511, 475, 424, 42, 37, 368, 296, 293, 28, 277, 26, 253, 228, 226, 192, 161, 92)

PC# WLF0003

The FS should change the Wildlife Desired Condition to place more emphasis on maintaining and improving habitat while allowing nonmotorized recreation.

(Letter #: 22, 8)

PC# WLF0006

The FS should protect and enhance habitat:

- by minimizing development and limiting intrusions;
- by providing stewardship logging contracts for big game and upland bird habitat;
- as a top priority;
- for lynx, grizzly, and wolverine;
- by increasing uninterrupted blocks of habitat managed for wilderness characteristics to address the habitat loss described in the Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS);
- by limiting motorized access in roadless and other currently nonmotorized areas for big game security, in order to ensure continuation of the traditional five-week hunting season in Montana.

(Letter #: 291, 295, 309, 339, 430, 453, 517)

PC# WLF0007

The FS should manage for native wildlife:

- in lieu of managing for game species to the detriment of rare species;
- including the small creatures that contribute to the ecological fabric.

(Letter #: 447, 419, 434)

PC# WLF0008

The FS should reconsider management of groomed snowmobiles in lynx habitat because:

- the Northern Rockies Lynx Amendment does not require a "no net increase" in groomed snowmobile trails as stated in the desired conditions for Canada lynx;
- groomed snowmobile trails should be allowed where they will not affect lynx.

(Letter #: 444)

PC# WLF0014

The FS should increase snag recruitment:

- as habitat for cavity dwellers;
- by avoiding hazardous snags during timber harvest.

(Letter #: 66, 322, 419)

PC# WLF0015

The FS should eliminate special protection for grizzly bears because the population is healthy.

(Letter #: 442)

PC# WLF0016

The FS should prioritize the needs of wildlife over other resources:

- by using habitat security effectiveness as the unit of measure;
- in MA5c areas where spring snowmobiling disturbs animals emerging from dens.

(Letter #: 460, 453)

PC# WLF0018

The FS should protect and enhance habitat connectivity:

- by developing a new MA designation specifically for wildlife linkage corridors especially for wide-ranging animals such as elk and grizzly bear;
- with a desired condition for wildlife movement based on low density roads, wildlife habitat restoration, natural appearing environments and coexistence with adjacent private landowners. (The area would be suitable for nonmotorized recreation settings and experiences, not suitable for scheduled timber production, suitable for wildland fire use, prescribed burning and fire suppression, not suitable for the development of new sites or utility corridors, and suitable for other uses that are consistent with the designated purpose for that area. The area would also be especially suitable for restoration, collaborative work with wildlife linkage stakeholders (Dept. of Transportation, landowners, USFWS, etc), and wildlife coexistence efforts such as Bear Aware education programming, sanitation and education);
- by expanding the protected north-south corridor along Lake Koocanusa for wildlife movement;
- in a management plan for connecting wildlife corridors to maintain wildlife populations;
- including direction to consistently address connectivity across administrative boundaries;
- by developing a comprehensive linkage corridor program;
- by incorporating a wildlife connectivity map, an overlay, or other forest-wide spatial analysis of connectivity into the PLMPs;
- in the WUI;
- by tiering the design criteria for connectivity to a desired future condition and objective;
- for grizzly bear;
- by reducing disruptive management practices and permitted uses in these areas;
- in the Galena and Cataract areas which provide valuable habitat connectivity by designating them as MA1d;

- for the Mallard Larkins, the Upper St. Joe and other inventoried roadless areas near the Bitterroot Crest which serve as a vital linkage area for wildlife moving between the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness, the Cabinet-Yaak Ecosystem, and the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem;
- because project level analysis may fail to recognize forest-wide effects to this resource (connectivity).

(Letter #s: 392, 338, 343, 378, 387, 395, 436, 1, 66, 332, 475, 301, 293, 277, 272, 267, 222, 203, 138, 198, 328)

PC# WLF0021

The FS should provide adequate habitat goals for woodland caribou and grizzly bear, as species with special habitat needs, in compliance with Departmental Regulation 9500-4.

(Letter #s: 339)

PC# WLF0023

The FS should outline in the Desired Condition the limiting conditions for the gray wolf within the context of caribou recovery.

(Letter #s: 110)

PC# WLF0024

The FS should reassess blanket management prohibitions for individual endangered species in relation to other resources, which would develop some management flexibility to meet additional resource needs such as forest health and caribou habitat.

(Letter #s: 168, 38, 382, 110)

PC# WLF0025

The FS should protect grizzly bears by:

- providing linkages between grizzly bear recovery zones;
- linking the IRAs in the Selkirks with the Salmo-Priest areas, and the Cabinet-Yaak through the Northwest Peaks IRA with the Canadian Purcells through Wilderness recommendations;
- providing functional linkages between the Cabinet and Yaak ecosystems;
- extending the active bear year by 2-4 weeks in the spring and fall to limit disturbance;
- restricting snowmobiles to winter only;
- reducing open and overall road densities;
- implementing on the KNF the Amendment 19 management standards developed by the Flathead National Forest;
- improving bear education to limit habituated and problem bears;
- protecting the IRAs on the KNF.

(Letter #s: 14, 453, 419, 339, 322, 293, 94, 283, 17, 163, 135, 131, 120, 114, 11, 251)

PC# WLF0026

The FS should articulate the scientific basis for the Grizzly Bear Desired Condition with regard to:

- bear management unit core block size and effects of activities on sows during spring emergence;
- existing bear distribution and population.

(Letter #s: 468, 428, 154, 307)

PC# WLF0031

The FS should clarify the language in the Caribou Desired Condition statement to:

- correctly state the range of lichen in the southerly Selkirk Mountains;
- recommend habituating caribou to human contact in order to reduce negative effects;

- restrict snowmobile access and seasons.
(Letter #: 473, 444, 451, 465)

PC# WLF0032

The FS should include additional guidelines for Species of Interest and Species of Concern from the Statewide Wildlife Conservation Strategy for bird species of concern and habitat management projects.
(Letter #: 465)

PC# WLF0034

The IPNF should coordinate wildlife management with the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG):

- to facilitate achieving the IPNF goals and objectives;
- in order to meet the requirements of the IDFG/USFS MOU.

(Letter #: 465)

PC# WLF0035

The FS should include in the Bats Desired Condition surveys for possible roost habitat forest-wide. Some unoccupied mines that are thought to be suitable should be gated and left as available habitat for night roost and seasonal roost use (hibernaculum and maternity roosts).

(Letter #: 465)

PC# WLF0036

The FS should manage now for species likely to be listed in the foreseeable future:

- including post-fire habitat dependent species such as the black-backed woodpecker;
- in order to avoid future litigation under the ESA.

(Letter #: 419)

PC# WLF0060

The FS should include additional language in the Wildlife Desired Condition that conforms with the Conservation Recommendations in the Forest Plan Amendment for Motorized Access as follows:

- The Forests should work cooperatively with the USFWS to identify linkage areas that may be important in providing landscape connectivity within and between geographic areas, across all land ownerships for grizzly bears and Canada lynx;
- Within linkage areas, the Forests should provide for landscape connectivity by participating in the development and implementation of a management plan to protect and restore habitat connectivity within these areas on federal land;
- The Forests should plan for recreational development, and manage recreational and operational uses to provide for grizzly bear and Canada lynx movement, and to maintain effectiveness of grizzly bear and Canada lynx habitat.

(Letter #: 293)

PC# WLF0061

The FS should cooperate and coordinate with the Tribes regarding wildlife management.

(Letter #: 456)

PC# WLF0063

The FS should include in the Wildlife Desired Condition more discussion of total biodiversity including understory habitats.

(Letter #: 456)

PC# WLF0064

The FS should meet the goal of no net change in herd numbers for big game with a goal of no net change in hunter numbers, which justifies the existing level of motorized roads and trails.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# WLF0065

The FS should define wildlife priorities and funding to provide a clear picture of what can be accomplished and where there are opportunities to partner with IDFG for mutual benefit.

(Letter #: 465)

PC# WLF0066

The FS standards for wildlife should focus on the maintenance of viable wildlife populations and the ability of wildlife populations to move around their habitats.

(Letter #: 297, 157, 173)

Category: Wildlife Guidelines

PC# WLF0049

The FS should use additional sources of design criteria for the grizzly bear because the:

- Forest Plan Amendments for Motorized Access Management within the Selkirk and Cabinet/Yaak grizzly bear Recovery Zones, adopted by the Kootenai, Idaho Panhandle and Lolo National Forests in 2004 and the conclusions in the 2004 Biological Opinion were not based on the best available science, as required by the ESA;
- guidelines will fail to recover the Cabinet-Yaak grizzly bear population.

(Letter #: 428, 468)

PC# WLF0050

The FS should ensure that the guidelines for grizzly bear will achieve the time frame requirements stipulated in the 2004 USFWS Biological Opinion for the Amendments with regards to road densities and core habitat.

(Letter #: 468)

PC# WLF0051

The FS should amend guidelines for caribou:

- to include that if any caribou are located on the IPNF, that efforts to habituate the animals to snowmobile or other use should be undertaken, to avoid negative "disturbance";
- Guidelines 3 & 4 should each add the word "negative" to describe disturbance, as not all contacts or disturbances are negative to the species.

(Letter #: 444)

PC# WLF0052

The FS should reconsider the non-binding guidelines for wildlife, because with no-compliance criteria there is a probable effect to listed and unlisted species.

(Letter #: 339, 468, 422)

PC# WLF0053

The FS should amend Guideline 6 for Species of Concern to address all sources of effect, rather than single out one use.

(Letter #: 444)

PC# WLF0054

The FS guidelines should require evaluation of caves and mines for Townsend's big eared bats prior to any closure.

(Letter #: 329)

PC# WLF0055

The FS should reassess Guideline 2 for big game because studies have shown that elk habituated to human activity and not hunted are more alarmed by pedestrians than motorized vehicles.

(Letter #: 355)

PC# WLF0056

The FS should include guidelines for elk management to improve high quality winter range forage.

(Letter #: 425, 465)

PC# WLF0057

The FS should continue to follow the sensitive species direction in the FSM.

(Letter #: 387)

PC# WLF0062

The FS should include design criteria (guidelines) targets for forage, cover, and security, maintaining a minimum of 60 percent canopy cover on big game winter range for whitetail deer and elk.

(Letter #: 517)

Category: Wildlife Lower Kootenai GA Desired Condition (IPNF)

PC# WLF0039

The IPNF should amend the language in the Wildlife Desired Condition for the Lower Kootenai GA to emphasize the importance of McArthur Lake as an important part of the corridor between the Selkirks and Cabinet/Yaak such as "The IPNF will work with other agencies and local citizens to restore wildlife linkage in the McArthur Lake wildlife corridor."

(Letter #: 339, 395)

Category: Wildlife Monitoring

PC# WLF0012

The FS should clarify in the Snags [and Down Wood] Design Criteria how monitoring of snags in old growth and for wildlife will be accomplished.

(Letter #: 329)

PC# WLF0013

The FS should clarify the Wildlife Design Criteria, specifying how monitoring the effects of open road density on wildlife will be done when there are no standards for open road densities.

(Letter #: 329)

PC# WLF0043

The FS should conduct additional monitoring for wildlife of:

- human encroachment and usage in designated Wilderness;
- human/animal relationships in order to identify areas needing protection for wildlife;
- motorized and non-motorized recreation to assess effects on wildlife;
- mule deer habitat for food, cover and winter yards.

(Letter #: 322, 173)

PC# WLF0044

The FS should consider the following additional Wildlife Monitoring Questions:

- Have management activities served to recover threatened species on the Kootenai National Forest, if not why?;
- Have management activities served to prevent further listings of threatened and endangered species?;
- Have management activities improved connectivity and linkage across the landscape and not only at the project or district level?;
- Have management activities allowed for large blocks of contiguous habitat to provide for safety of threatened and endangered species and their prey?;
- Have management activities increased the number of large snags available to cavity nesters?;
- Have management activities or the absence thereof met Plan objectives?;
- Has the forest identified key connectivity corridors?;
- How are private activities on adjacent lands affecting connectivity areas and Plan objectives?;

Are the Wildlife Desired Conditions realistic and achievable?

(Letter #s: 218, 293, 387, 434)

Category: Wildlife Objectives

PC# WLF0045

The FS should change the Snags objective (in Wildlife Objectives) because it is unclear how it would be implemented, and it is unnecessary--instead establish project level snag retention requirements (as in the Snag-associated Species Guidelines) and leave green trees as snag recruits in the harvest units that do not meet the targets.

(Letter #s: 336)

PC# WLF0046

The FS should consider the following additional Wildlife Objectives:

- TES objectives for wolf and lynx; for Species of Concern, especially goat and wolverine populations in the Cabinet Mountain Wilderness and the Scotchman Peaks;
- recovery goals for listed species.

(Letter #s: 294, 456, 387, 394)

Category: Wildlife Pend Oreille GA Desired Condition (IPNF)

PC# WLF0040

The IPNF should amend the language in the Wildlife Desired Condition for the Pend Oreille GA to further specify the importance of the Clark Fork area for wildlife connectivity such as "The Clark Fork area along the Montana/Idaho border would provide effective connectivity for wide ranging wildlife species."

(Letter #s: 395)

Category: Wildlife St. Joe GA Desired Condition (IPNF)

PC# WLF0042

The IPNF should recognize Snow Peak Cooperative Wildlife Management Area as a unique feature in the St. Joe GA, and provide additional protection to the security and habitat effectiveness of the area by designating it a Special Interest Area (MA3) prohibiting road construction and motorized use.

(Letter #s: 465)

Appendices

Appendix A – Public Comment Log

The following tables contain: the communication number assigned to each comment letter; the names of the persons who responded to the PLMPs during the comment period; the organizational affiliation of the respondent (if applicable); and the Public Concern (PC) statement numbers that are applicable to the comments in that specific letter. Note that the complexity of assigning comments to multiple PC statements has resulted in a list of PC numbers (i.e., ACC0115) that may not capture all the PC statements that address your comments.

If there are no PC statement numbers associated with a letter, it doesn't mean that a letter wasn't read and/or analyzed; it only means that there were no unique and/or substantially different comments within that letter. If you do not find your name in the following tables, it most likely means that it was a form letter that didn't contain unique and/or substantially different comments or you signed a petition (see Appendix B for explanation).

The following tables are designed to assist the respondent in locating the PC statements that summarize their comments and are provided in the following two formats:

- **Table A:** Organized in numerical order – for use when the letter number is known.
- **Table B:** Organized in alphabetical order - with form letters, petitions, and organizations displayed at the end of the table.
 - Form letters that contained unique and substantially different comments were assigned a communication number and are found at the end of Table B and are identified by (F#). Petitions are identified at the end of Table B by (P#).
 - In Appendix B provides a description of how each of the form letters and petitions were processed.

Table A: Comment letters in numerical order

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
1	Predator Conservation Alliance	Gaillard	David	SCI0004, WLF0018
2	Kootenai County Commissioners	Johnson Currie Brodie	Gus Elmer Katie	FRE0010, FRE0013, FRE0015, SOE0011
3	Bonner County Commissioners	Young Phillips Dye	Joseph Marcia Karl	FRE0013, FRE0015, SOE0011
4	Boundary County Commissioners	Smith Dinning Kirby	Ronald Dan Walt	FRE0013, FRE0015, SOE0011
5	Shoshone County Commissioners	Cantamessa Vergobbi	Jon Jim	FRE0013, FRE0015, SOE0011
6	Dept. of Environmental Quality	Bergquist	June	EDT0066, EDT0067, WAT0031, WAT0034, WAT0037, WAT0038, WAT0039, WAT0049
7	Northwest Access Alliance	Bratlie	Norm	ACC0011, ACC0020, ACC0073, ACC0074, ACC0075, ACC0083, ACC0129, EDT0076, EDT0079, MGA0005, MGA0068, MGA0070
8		Hannon	Beverly	WLF0003
9		Cottrell	Dan	MGA0021

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
10		Cottrell	Marcella Ray	MGA0021
11	Lester School		Emily	WLF0025
12		Garvey	Lydia	MGA0021, MGA0095
13		Corn	Stewart	MGA0021
14	Lester School		Sidney	WLF0025
15		Peterson	Lorne	MGA0021, MGA0095
16		Shively	Daniel	MGA0021
17		Eovaldi	Suzanne	COL0010, EDT0012, MGA0095, WLF0025
18		Beasley	Peggy & Andy	MGA0021, PRO0006
19		Beasley	Peggy & Andy	MGA0021, PRO0006
20		Samy	Shar	MGA0021
21		Leimbach	Paul	EDT0014, EDT0054, MGA0039
22		Hannon	Beverly	ACC0065, ACC0120, MGA0095, WLF0003
23		Sherman	Susan & Michael	MGA0039
24		Harvey	Geoffrey & Donna	ACC0005, PRL0002
25		Billi	Keith	ACC0001
26	Montana Wilderness Association (F5)	Hadden	David	IRA0008, IRA0009, MGA0021, PRO0006, WLF0002
27	(F5)	Sherman	Sue	MGA0099
28	(F5)	Gargas	Matt & Meridith	MGA0021, WLF0002
29	Friends of the Scotchman Peaks and Idaho Conservation League (F1)	Drumheller	Susan	MGA0021
30		Good	Richard	ACC0119, EDT0059
31	Yaak Valley Forest Council (F2)	King	Robyn	MGA0021, WLF0002
32	(F5)	Rockwell	David	MGA0021
33		Mondal	Kenneth	MGA0021
34	Troy & Libby Snowmobile Clubs (F3)	Wandler	Jerry	ACC0013, IRA0009, MGA0039, MGA0077
35	Troy & Libby Snowmobile Clubs (F4)	Wandler	Jerry	ACC0013, IRA0009, MGA0025, MGA0039, MGA0077
36		Mondal	Kenneth	MGA0024
37	Yaak Valley Forest Council	Canepa	Sarah	COL0006, IRA0008, MGA0021, PRO0006, SCI0032, WLF0002
38		Seidel	Bob	ACC0001, FRE0001, IRA0007, REG0012, VEG0026, VEG0035, WAT0014, WLF0024
39		Prebble	Lynn	MGA0021
40		Bond	Pete	ACC0001
41		Sturgeon	Sally	MGA0021
42		Newsham	Beverly	IRA0008, MGA0021, MGA0024, MGA0083, WLF0002
43		Wedel	Jeffery	MGA0021

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
44	FSEEE	Fink	Marc	EDT0052, REG0001, REG0005, REG0006
45	USDI	Stewart	Robert	MGA0023
46		Scherzer	Ernest	ACC0001, COL0006, MGA0021, MGA0039, WLF0033
47		Fredericksen	Harvey	MGA0091, MGA0092
48	Yaak Valley Forest Council	Bass	Rick	COL0006, COL0010, IRA0008, IRA0018, MGA0021, VEG0061, VEG0062
49		Callen	Janet	ACC0005, PRL0002
50		Wilson	William	ACC0069, EDT0014, WAT0046
51		Wolff	Edward & Marilyn	MGA0021, PRO0006
52		Deveny	Christine	MGA0021
53		Dunne	Loretta	MGA0021
54		Snyder	Elaine	MGA0021
55		Zwisler	Steven	MGA0021, PRO0006, SOE0005
56		Hancock	John & Lynn	MGA0021
57	Troy & Libby Snowmobile Clubs	Wandler	Jerry	ACC0013, ACC0112, EDT0037, EDT0038, MGA0022, MGA0039, MGA0041, MGA0060, MGA0063, MGA0077, MGA0078, MGA0080
58	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	Gordon	Don	ACC0096, REG0001
59	Troy & Libby Snowmobile Clubs	Wandler	Jerry	ACC0013, ACC0112, EDT0034, IRA0009, MGA0022, MGA0039, MGA0041, MGA0073, MGA0077, MGA0104
60	Kootenai Tribe of Idaho	Porter	Jennifer	IRA0014, MGA0025, MGA0039, MGA0093, TBL0005, TBL0007
61		Stavenow	Richard	FRE0026
62		Baugh	Kathryn	ACC0018, MGA0021
63		Snow	Donald	MGA0021, PRO0006
64	International Mountain Bicycling Association	Cook	Christopher	ACC0009, ACC0025, ACC0029, ACC0036, ACC0054, COL0010, COL0015, EDT0051, IRA0002, IRA0011, IRA0024, MGA0014, PRL0010, PRO0027, PRO0029, PRO0030, REG0001, REG0036, SCI0003, SCI0028, SOE0005
65	(F5)	Hunsicker	Deborah	MGA0021, MGA0024, PRO0012
66	(F10)	Wilson	William	COL0006, IRA0002, IRA0008, IRA0011, MGA0013, MGA0021, MGA0090, PRO0006, TBR0034, VEG0035, WLF0014, WLF0018
67	Idaho ATV Association Inc	Jones	William	ACC0001, MGA0022
68		Ray	Janisse	COL0004, IRA0008, SOE0005
69		Walker	Barbara	MGA0021, MGA0039, PRO0006
70		Norton	Rebecca	MGA0021
71		Thayer	June	ACC0014, MGA0021

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
72		Sturgeon	Stephen	COL0004, IRA0002, MGA0021, PRO0006
73	FH Stoltze & Lumber Co	Roady	Chuck	ACC0001, ACC0041, ACC0046, TBR0002, TBR0023
74	Idaho Conservation League (P1)	Drumheller	Susan	MGA0021
75		Brown	Deborah	MGA0021
76	(F1)	Heller	Dion	MGA0021
77	(F1)	Cook	Arlene	MGA0021
78	(F1)	Lauritzen	Robert	ACC0016
79	(F1)	Dees	Francesca	WLF0002
80	(F7)	Hathaway	Sandy	MGA0021, MGA0024
81		Baird	Dennis	MGA0024, MGA0071, REG0001
82		Wilson	Irene	MGA0024, MGA0048
83		Newcombe	Ray	MGA0021, MGA0024, MGA0048
84		Valentine	William & Antoinette	MGA0021, PRO0006
85		Moncur	Max	IRA0009
86	(F6)	Burke	Colleen	MGA0021
87	(F5)	Clark	Charles	MGA0092, MGA0099, REG0001, SCI0014
88	(F5)	Fischman	Ken	MGA0023, MGA0024, PRO0012
90	(F5)	Adair	Ann	MGA0021
91		Kingsley	Anna-Lisa	MGA0021
92	(F5)	Dunfield	William	MGA0024, PRO0012, WLF0002
93	(F5)	Haag	Kenneth & Mary Jo	MGA0021, MGA0024, PRO0012
94		Marieb	Kathy	ACC0050, IRA0008, IRA0011, IRA0014, WLF0025
95		Sutter	Richard	MGA0024
96		Flores	Lupito	MGA0024, MGA0069, REG0001, REG0017
97	Foundation for North American Wild Sheep	Thagard	Neil	
98		Fredericksen	Harvey	MGA0002
99		Tweto	Halvor	ACC0086, MGA0021, MGA0090
100		Johnson	Orin	MGA0021
101	Idaho State Snowmobile Association	Mitchell	Sandra	COL0002
102		Giddings	Ronald & Maryann	MGA0021
103		Jolley	John & Suzy	MGA0013, MGA0021, MGA0024
104		Fisher	Richard	MGA0021
105		Yates	Rick	MGA0013
106		Peek	Pat Cary	MGA0021
107		Littlepage	Dean	IRA0002, MGA0016
108		Mason	Cynthia	MGA0024, MGA0039, MGA0090
109	Idaho State Snowmobile Association (F9)	Mitchell	Sandra	ACC0001, ACC0011, MGA0014, PRL0012, PRO0014

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
110	(F8)	Sudnikovich	Mike	ACC0011, ACC0015, ACC0123, EDT0024, EDT0071, EDT0084, MGA0005, MGA0014, MGA0025, MGA0047, MGA0051, MGA0066, MGA0068, REG0006, SOE0005, SOE0013, TBR0060, WLF0023, WLF0024
111		Valentine	William & Antoinette	MGA0024
112		Schombel	Stephen	ACC0015, IRA0011, MGA0021
113		Anderson Hanson	Maury Pat	MGA0021
114		Hasson	Alex	ACC0015, IRA0011, IRA0014, MGA0021, PRO0006, WLF0025
115		Marconi	Hugh	ACC0018, ACC0057, MGA0024
116		Edwards	Mike	ACC0044, IRA0011, MGA0089
117		Cox	Neil	MGA0024, MGA0095, REG0001
118		Beery	Jacqueline	ACC0005
119		Gerber	Guy	ACC0004
120		Hartman	Candy	MGA0021, WLF0025
121		Williams	Tina	
122		Einhaus	Leslie	ACC0024, IRA0011, MGA0021, MGA0095
123		Deaton	Tamara	PRL0002
124		Baldrige	Scott	
125		Fields	Mary	ACC0033, TBR0002
126		Thormahlen	Jim	MGA0021
127		Rose	Renee	MGA0021, PRO0006
128		Smith	John	EDT0056, FRE0009, SCI0023
129	Kootenai Ridge Riders ATV Club (F11)	Goodell	George	ACC0005, ACC0068, MGA0022, MGA0039, MGA0065, MGA0091, WLF0005
130	(F8)	Howell	Don	
131		Keele	Van	IRA0011, MGA0021, WLF0025
132		Leahy	Russell	ACC0001, ACC0005, MGA0002, MGA0037
133		Vinson	Barbara	VEG0035
134		Caldwell	Bill	MGA0024, REG0001
135		Haskett	Matthew	WLF0025
136		Stehlik	Linda	ACC0001, MGA0040
137		Wood	Michael	MGA0021, MGA0039
138		Canepa	Leslye	FRE0013, IRA0002, MGA0021, VEG0035, VEG0036, WLF0018
139	(F5)	Jobe	Cindie	MGA0021
140	(F5)	Bateman	Guy Dean	IRA0002
141		Rabe	Fred	EDT0044, MGA0064
142		Eggers	Darrah	MGA0059
143		Blank	DL	IRA0002, MGA0013, MGA0021

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
144		Streeter	David	MGA0021, PRO0006
145		Murray	Vince & Lynn	ACC0010, ACC0117, CCI0001, EMS0001, EMS0002, MGA0024, MGA0071
146	(F8)	Hill	Craig	ACC0001, ACC0020, ACC0075, ACC0079, ACC0083, EDT0068, EDT0073, EDT0076, EDT0077, EDT0080, IRA0027, MGA0005, MGA0007, MGA0010, MGA0068, MGA0070, MGA0072, MGA0089, WAT0046, WLF0038
147		Marshall	Kim	MGA0021, MGA0024
148		Blackburn	Lois	MGA0024, MGA0069, REG0001
149		Artly	Richard	MGA0024, REG0001
150		Clark	Lawrence	MGA0021, MGA0024, PRO0006
151		Maggi	Maria Theresa	MGA0099, REG0006, REG0024
152	Smurfit-Stone Container Corp	Mountjoy	Jim	MGA0050, MIN0005, SOE0006, TBR0009, TBR0023, VEG0027
153		Paulson	Steve	IRA0002, IRA0008, IRA0011, IRA0012, IRA0020, IRA0022, IRA0024, MGA0001, MGA0003, MGA0010, MGA0016, MGA0024, MGA0069, MGA0073, MON0006, PRL0011, REG0001, REG0006, REG0024, REG0031, SCI0001, SCI0005, SCI0034
154		Lohman	Michael	ACC0001, ACC0002, PRO0014, WLF0026
155		McMillen	James	ACC0005
156		Swanson	John	IRA0008
157	Save Our Earth	Leonard	Marion	MGA0013, VEG0004, WLF0066
158		Ingraham	Pat	ACC0001, EDT0001
159		Margolis	Susanna	COL0010, MGA0021, MGA0095, PRO0030
160	(F9)	Mael	Alvin	PRL0012
161		Fillpot	Elise	MGA0021, SOE0007, WLF0002
162		Eovaldi	Suzanne	MGA0095
163		Carl	Gary	WLF0025
164	(F5)	Potter	Jack & Rachel	MGA0021
165		McMillen	Mimi	MGA0021
166		Rudio	Barbara	MGA0021
167		Reckin	Gene	MGA0039
168	TIMBER	Newman	Steve	ACC0111, EDT0070, EDT0078, FRE0001, REG0012, SOE0006, TBR0002, TBR0009, TBR0031, VEG0026, VEG0035, VEG0042, WAT0014, WLF0024

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
169		Spurgin	Ralph	MGA0021, MGA0083
170		Roberts	David & Candice	MGA0050, SOE0006, TBR0025, TBR0037, VEG0084
171		Bass	Rick	IRA0008, VEG0053, WLF0001
172		Jensen	Orell	MGA0095
173		Roskelley	John	ACC0092, ACC0127, IRA0011, MGA0013, MGA0021, MGA0095, REG0023, VEG0040, WAT0002, WAT0005, WAT0012, WAT0026, WLF0043, WLF0066
174	Spokane Mountaineers Conservation Committee	Ashmore	Andrew	MGA0024
175		Kopczynski	Chris	MGA0024
176	Idaho Water Resource Board	Rigby	Jerry	EDT0040, PRO0026
177		Eaves	Sandy	MGA0021
178	(F1)	Hawkes	Jean	MGA0024
179	(F1)	Watson	Marianne	MGA0024
180	(F1)	Pignolet	Joanna	
181		Stehlik	Linda	MGA0041
182		Pond	Robert	IRA0002, IRA0011, PRO0006
183		Butz	Michelle	MGA0021, PRO0006
184		Blake	Carol	MGA0021, PRO0006
185		Price	George & Carol	COL0010, FRE0020, IRA0011, PRO0030, SOE0008, SOE0012, TBR0034, VEG0016, VEG0053
186	(F5)	Springer	Sara Lou	COL0010
187	(F5)	Flynn	Todd	SOE0005
188	(F5)	Miller	Patricia	SOE0005
189	(F5)	Lichtenberg	Janene	SOE0005
190	(F5)	Caya	Neal	SOE0005
191	(F5)	Montana	Molly	SOE0007
192	(F5)	Davies	Derrick	PRO0012, WLF0002
193	(F5)	Hough	Philip	PRO0012
194	(F5)	Hammer	Tammy	
195	(F5)	Fry	Robin Alan	MGA0021
196		Fields	Edwin	MGA0021, PRO0006

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
197	US Environmental Protection Agency Region 10	Reichgott	Christine	ACC0010, ACC0036, ACC0039, ACC0040, ACC0051, ACC0083, ACC0095, ACC0097, ACC0101, ACC0121, ACC0125, ACC0126, AIR0001, EDT0020, EDT0062, EMS0006, FRE0010, FRE0024, GLO0003, GLO0005, GRZ0001, GRZ0006, IRA0016, MIN0003, MIN0006, MIN0011, TBR0024, TBR0035, TBR0041, VEG0014, VEG0053, VEG0065, WAT0001, WAT0012, WAT0018, WAT0020, WAT0022, WAT0030, WAT0031, WAT0040, WAT0041, WAT0043, WAT0049
198		Stamm	John	MGA0021, WLF0018
199	Rocky Mountain Ecosystem Service	Andersen	Ted	FRE0012, FRE0023, LND0007, LND0008, LND0009
200		Alderson	George & Frances	MGA0024, REG0001, WAT0028
201		Jones	Cedron	MGA0021
202	Montana Wilderness Association	Hernandez	Cesar	COL0015
203		Sauer	Greg	IRA0008, IRA0011, MGA0021, MGA0061, MGA0073, MGA0077, WLF0018
204	(F5)	Davidson	Matthew	MGA0021
205		Compton	Elinor	MGA0021, PRO0006
206		Sheets	Mark	EMS0001, MGA0021, MGA0049, PRO0006, REG0001
207	(F11)	Berget	Janice	ACC0001, FRE0009
208	(F11)	Peterson	Mike	ACC0001, ACC0043, MGA0002, MGA0041, OFP0004, TBR0002
209	(F11)	Parnell	Jean	LND0011
210	(F11)	Wagner	Michael	LND0011
211	(F11)	Johnson	Clarence	TBR0002, VEG0053
212	(F11)	Pacheco	Monica	FRE0010, OFP0004, VEG0006, VEG0053
213	(F11)	Wagner	Mike	ACC0001, TBR0002, VEG0053
214	(F11)	Drake	Jackalyne	OFP0004, VEG0053
215		Ledbetter	Bob	COL0004, MGA0021
216	International Mountain Bicycling Association	Dice	Jenn	ACC0025, ACC0026, MGA0040, MGA0105, REG0036
217	Montana Wilderness Association	Hadden	Dave	MGA0021
218		Coryell	Larry	ACC0037, EDT0032, EDT0082, FRE0022, MGA0039, MGA0053, TBR0023, TBR0035, TBR0055, VEG0005, VEG0006, VEG0022, VEG0023, VEG0046, VEG0047, VEG0065, WLF0044
219	Mountain States Legal Foundation & Communities for a Great Northwest	Opsahl	Ronald	EDT0055, REG0025

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
220		McLaughlin	William	COL0015, MGA0021
221		Interested Party		MGA0021
222	Yaak Valley Forest Council (F13)	King	Robyn	IRA0008, IRA0011, MGA0021, TBR0034, WLF0018
223	(F14)	Conat	Richard	ACC0001, FRE0007, MGA0050, MGA0084, MGA0089, MGA0091, SOE0006, TBR0002, TBR0023, TBR0025, WAT0048
224		Manley	James	MGA0021
225		Welles	Jo	MGA0021
226		McLeod	Pat	MGA0021, MGA0099, SOE0005, WLF0002
227		Stephens	Ken	MGA0073, PRO0023
228	(F1)	Lee	Paula & Jan	MGA0021, WLF0002
229	(F12)	Kirkpatrick	Joanna	MGA0024, MGA0102, VEG0035, WAT0002
230	(F5)	Luders	David Gunther	MGA0024
231	(F5)	Barcklay	Roderick	MGA0021, PRO0012
232		Davidson	Matthew	MGA0021
233		Bertelsen-James	Jan	MGA0018, MGA0021, PRO0006
234		Close	Scott	ACC0001, SCI0028
235		Aders-Todd	Sandi	MGA0024
236	(F1)	Dabrowski	Tom	MGA0024
237		Wade	Jon	ACC0034, MGA0040, MGA0077
238		Merrill	Ron	ACC0001
239		Brajcich	Andrew	MGA0021
240		Parkin	Wade	TBR0002
241		Blackler	Edd	MGA0021
242		Sandvold	Lee	MGA0022
243	(F2)	Schubert	Derek	PRO0021
244		Norris	Dennis	MGA0024
245		Conces	Claudia	MGA0021
246		Remington	L K	MGA0021
247		Rosales	Yolanda	MGA0099
248		Hildreth	Michael	VEG0006
249	(F1)	Deeds	Dave	MGA0090
250		Rana	Paul	EDT0069, EDT0081, MGA0023
251		Schroeter	Franklin	ACC0004, MGA0021, REG0035, WLF0025
252	Snowmobile Alliance of Western States	Hurwitz	Dave	MGA0002, MGA0013, MGA0022, MGA0040, MGA0077
253		Crane	Gayle	MGA0021, WLF0002

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
254	Montana Logging Association	Altemus	Julia	EDT0028, EDT0031, FRE0010, MGA0051, REG0006, SOE0006, TBR0009, TBR0024, TBR0025, TBR0034, TBR0035, TBR0037, TBR0051, VEG0006, VEG0008, VEG0027, VEG0035, VEG0057, WAT0029, WAT0048
255	(F1)	Olsen	Cyndi Rae	MGA0024, MGA0090
256		Chinn	Brad	IRA0002
257	US Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	Wardell	John	ACC0018, ACC0036, ACC0040, ACC0083, ACC0086, ACC0095, ACC0097, ACC0098, AIR0001, EDT0060, EDT0083, GLO0003, GRZ0001, GRZ0002, GRZ0004, GRZ0005, IRA0016, MGA0049, MGA0056, MGA0099, MIN0002, MIN0003, MON0001, MON0002, VEG0053, WAT0001, WAT0006, WAT0012, WAT0013, WAT0015, WAT0018, WAT0019, WAT0023, WAT0034, WAT0041, WAT0044
258		Thomas	Robert & Alice	PRO0006, REG0021
259		Deutsch	Donna	MGA0021
260		Beck	Bob	MGA0021
261		MacLean	Colin	MGA0021, PRO0006
262		Linehan	Tim	COL0006, MGA0021
263	(F3)	Morkert	Linda	COL0010
264	(F13)	Ledbetter	Judith	PRO0006
265		Ferrell	Melinda	MGA0021, PRO0006
266	Montana Department of Environmental Quality	Ray	Robert	WAT0006, WAT0011, WAT0023, WAT0024, WAT0030, WAT0034, WAT0036, WAT0044, WAT0045, WAT0052, WAT0053
267		Wongstrom	Jeff	ACC0036, IRA0011, MGA0099, TBR0034, WLF0018
267		Anderson	Sarah	ACC0036, IRA0011, MGA0099, TBR0034, WLF0018
268		Interested Party	Liz	MGA0021
269		Hayes, Jr.	William	AIR0003, FRE0004, FRE0007, TBR0062
270		Ferrell	Doug	MGA0021, PRO0006, REG0001
271	USDI Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance	Sleeger	Preston	EDT0027
272		Garvey	Lydia	WLF0018
273		Sheets	Mark	MGA0021
274		Zachary	Carol	MGA0099, PRO0006
275		Schubert	John	ACC0001
276		Baker	Ivy	MGA0021
277		Lauer	Trish	IRA0008, IRA0011, MGA0021, PRO0022, WAT0005, WLF0002, WLF0018

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
278		Olson	Hazel	WAT0002
279	(P2)	Scarabosio	Dario	COL0010
280		Illi	Warren	ACC0001, LND0001, LND0006, LND0011, LND0012, TBR0002
281	Montana State Senate	Weinberg	Dan	MGA0021
282	Montana Wood Products Association	Engstedt	Ellen	REG0006, SOE0006, TBR0025, TBR0037
283	Backcountry Hunters and Anglers – Montana Chapter	Long	Ben	MGA0021, MGA0083, WLF0001, WLF0025, WLF0033
284	Kootenai River Development Council, Inc	Rumelhart	Paul	SOE0006, TBR0002
285		Connors	John	ACC0051, MGA0021, MGA0039
286		Kreck	Loren	MGA0021
287		Brown	Carrie	
288		Crist	Doug	MGA0021, REG0001, TBR0034
289		Cripe	Marie	MGA0002, TBR0038
290		Bade	Wren	MGA0021
291		Breitenbach	Duke	MGA0021, WLF0006
292	(F5)	Braun	Stephen	REG0001
293	Yaak Valley Forest Council	Canepa	Sarah	ACC0015, ACC0018, ACC0023, ACC0069, CCI0002, COL0006, FRE0006, FRE0021, IRA0001, IRA0002, IRA0008, MGA0010, MGA0021, MGA0081, MGA0083, MON0002, MON0004, OFP0001, OFP0003, REG0001, SOE0014, TBR0005, TBR0034, TBR0055, VEG0006, VEG0035, VEG0053, VEG0065, WAT0006, WAT0025, WAT0046, WAT0054, WLF0002, WLF0018, WLF0025, WLF0044, WLF0060
294	Wild West Inst, Lands Council	Juel	Jeff	EMS0001, IRA0008, IRA0011, MGA0003, MGA0041, MON0005, OFP0001, OFP0003, REG0001, REG0006, REG0028, SCI0015, SOE0005, TBR0009, VEG0053, VEG0082, WAT0010, WLF0004, WLF0046
295	(F11)	Smart	Don	FRE0010, WLF0006
296		Brackebusch	Mark	ACC0057, MGA0048, WLF0002
297		Lyman	Dave	ACC0037, ACC0050, EMS0004, MGA0021, MGA0095, PRO0002, PRO0006, WLF0066
298		Whitson	Lena	COL0006, MGA0021
299	Montana Women in Timber	Keller	Sheila	ACC0001, MGA0002, PRO0003, PRO0004, SCI0016, TBR0034, TBR0038
300		Lyman	Debbie	COL0003, MGA0085, MGA0095, PRO0006

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
301		Sedler	Jim	FRE0014, IRA0002, MGA0021, WLF0018
302		Cant	John GH	MGA0021, PRO0006, TBR0034
303		Ellingsen	Valley	MGA0021
304		Oneil	Donna	ACC0001, FRE0009, MGA0039, MGA0060, MGA0063, MGA0077, MGA0089, SCI0037
305		Nagel	Bill & Joanne	MGA0039, SOE0002, WLF0033
306		Wandler	Jerry	ACC0080, COL0010, FRE0010, FRE0013, MGA0014, MIN0005, PRO0008, TBR0002, TBR0026, TBR0060
307		Stehlik	Linda	ACC0033, EDT0042, EDT0046, EDT0049, FRE0010, MGA0002, TBR0002, WLF0026
308		Leivestad	Ole & Rusti	ACC0010, ACC0056, COL0015, IRA0002, MGA0021, PRL0008, TBR0050
309		Hernandez	Hannah	ACC0018, FRE0001, MGA0021, REG0001, VEG0013, WAT0044, WLF0006
310		Johnson	Tony	IRA0008, MGA0021
311		Johnson	Cindy	MGA0021
312		Statz	Jed	MGA0014, MGA0077
313		Wojnarowicz	Daniel	MGA0021
314		Hinds	Colleen	MGA0021
315		McKeon	Bob	MGA0021
316		Miller	Russ	FRE0007
317		Wimberley	Neil	MGA0021, MGA0083
318		Wimberley	Ann	MGA0021, MGA0083
319	Coeur D'Alene Tribe	Matheson	Quanah	HRT0003, TBL0001, TBL0006
320	(F13)	Needs	Kelly	PRO0011
321		Buentemeier	Barbara	FRE0007, TBR0023, TBR0038
322		Janssen	Bill & Sue	ACC0018, ACC0069, COL0006, IRA0002, IRA0008, MGA0021, MGA0081, MGA0098, PRO0006, REG0018, SOE0006, TBR0034, TBR0054, VEG0053, WLF0014, WLF0025, WLF0043
323		Monatair	Jerry & Lisa	IRA0008
324	Cabinet Mountains Pika Club	Clough	Charlie	MGA0013, MGA0021
325		Starling	Bob & Lynette	ACC0115, COL0010, TBR0031
326		Stewart	Janine	ACC0001, COL0005, MGA0002, MGA0041, MGA0077, SCI0015
327		Davis	Larry & Shawneen	MGA0005, MGA0039, MGA0040, MGA0077, PRO0005
328		Sedler	Laura	FRE0014, IRA0002, MGA0021, REG0023, WLF0018
329		Holifield	Jennifer	MGA0021, MGA0086, WLF0012, WLF0013, WLF0054

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
330		Wegner	Steve	WAT0024
331	FH Stoltze Lumber	Buenteimeier	Ron	ACC0001, EMS0005, GLO0004, MGA0051, PRO0007, PRO0014, REG0006, SOE0006, TBR0025, TBR0026, TBR0035, TBR0037, VEG0035, VEG0057
332		Hutchins	Judy	ACC0037, FRE0001, MGA0013, MGA0098, TBR0042, VEG0035, WLF0018
333		Foust	John & Ginger	MGA0021
334		Hogan	Eugene Jr.	IRA0008, MGA0021, MGA0039, PRO0011
335		Eyster	Erryl	MGA0021, MGA0095
336	Montana Dept. of Natural Resource Committee	Sexton	Mary	ACC0002, ACC0035, ACC0045, ACC0097, ACC0108, FRE0013, FRE0020, IRA0007, LND0013, MGA0025, MGA0066, MGA0082, REG0012, TBR0002, TBR0009, TBR0023, TBR0024, TBR0025, TBR0037, VEG0043, VEG0071, WAT0006, WAT0009, WAT0011, WAT0012, WAT0034, WAT0041, WAT0048, WAT0049, WLF0045
337		Cant	Geoffrey	MGA0024
338		Standley	Krys	COL0006, MGA0021, TBR0034, VEG0035, VEG0036, WLF0018
339	Idaho Conservation League and Wilderness Society	Oppenheimer	Jonathan	ACC0014, ACC0016, ACC0082, ACC0086, ACC0090, ACC0107, AIR0002, EDT0057, GRZ0007, IRA0001, IRA0002, IRA0008, IRA0009, IRA0011, IRA0012, IRA0016, IRA0019, IRA0020, IRA0022, IRA0024, LND0003, MGA0035, MGA0045, MGA0048, MGA0049, MGA0057, MGA0067, MGA0073, MGA0085, MGA0092, MIN0011, PRO0001, REG0001, REG0004, REG0005, REG0006, REG0014, REG0024, REG0025, REG0026, REG0027, REG0028, SOE0005, SOE0006, TBR0014, VEG0009, VEG0014, VEG0035, VEG0053, VEG0068, VEG0076, VEG0077, VEG0080, VEG0081, WAT0005, WAT0043, WAT0046, WAT0047, WAT0048, WAT0055, WLF0006, WLF0021, WLF0025, WLF0039, WLF0052
340		Torrisi	Molly	IRA0002
341		Vogel	Paul	MGA0021, MGA0024
342	Riley Creek Timber	Boeh	RE (Bob)	FRE0009, VEG0006, VEG0057

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
343		Burnim	Peter and Cindy	EDT0016, FRE0012, MGA0092, WLF0018
344		Smith	Alta	MGA0039
345		Renaud	Susan	MGA0021, SOE0005
346	Idaho Conservation League (F15)	Drumheller	Susan	MGA0024
347		Reynolds	Mike	ACC0032, COL0010
348		Dexter	Barry	FRE0012, TBR0062
349		Baum	Bill	MGA0021
350		Robinson	Chris	TBR0038
351		Ley	Art	MGA0021
352		Avery	Pamela	ACC0014
353		Jackson	Bill	MGA0040, MGA0041, MGA0077
354		Deaton	Doug	ACC0025, IRA0007, MGA0022, MGA0040
355	Capitol Trail Vehicle Association	Salo	Ken	ACC0001, ACC0002, ACC0004, ACC0006, ACC0007, ACC0009, ACC0015, ACC0034, ACC0041, ACC0047, ACC0049, ACC0052, ACC0053, ACC0054, ACC0056, ACC0060, ACC0062, ACC0063, ACC0080, ACC0084, ACC0085, ACC0087, ACC0091, ACC0093, ACC0096, ACC0097, ACC0101, ACC0103, ACC0105, ACC0106, ACC0109, ACC0110, ACC0111, ACC0112, ACC0113, ACC0129, COL0009, COL0010, COL0011, COL0012, EDT0003, EDT0015, EDT0019, IRA0009, LND0001, MGA0005, MIN0005, PRL0001, PRL0012, PRO0014, PRO0015, PRO0020, PRO0032, PRO0033, REG0006, REG0014, REG0035, REG0039, REG0040, REG0042, SCI0009, SCI0015, SCI0017, SCI0020, SCI0021, SCI0022, SCI0023, SCI0024, SCI0028, SCI0029, SCI0031, SCI0037, SOE0006, SOE0009, VEG0017, WAT0027, WLF0020, WLF0055, WLF0064
356		Bakes	Warren	IRA0002
357		Munson	Russell	ACC0001
358		Olsen	Scott & Joshua	MGA0021
359		Knight	Ellen	MGA0016, MGA0024, MGA0068
360		O'Brien	John III	ACC0005, MGA0021
361		Scherzer	Martha	MGA0021
362	Idaho Forest Owners Association	Pence	Arleen	EDT0018, FRE0002, FRE0009, TBR0023, TBR0024, VEG0024
363		Costigan	Cheryl	MGA0021
364		Wittrock	Paul	

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
365		Stiger	Susan	ACC0057, ACC0082, ACC0094, MGA0024
366		Vignere	Joel	MGA0021
367		Baroni	Richard	MGA0024
368		Olsen	Lance	WLF0002
369		Cleere	Erin	PRO0006
370		Elkins	R	
371		Masters	Kerry	MGA0024
372		Bowers	Chris	MGA0021
373	International Mountain Bicycling Association	Dice	Jenn	ACC0025, ACC0027, ACC0028, EDT0048, MGA0041, REG0036
374		Latta	John & Diane	IRA0008, MGA0021, MGA0039, MGA0058, MGA0073, MGA0083, SCI0027
375		Kuhl	Richard	MGA0021, PRO0006
376		McMillan	Janet	MGA0021
377		Soderling	Alan	ACC0048, MGA0018
378	Great Burn Study Group	Dupree	Beverly	EDT0047, IRA0009, MGA0008, MGA0024, MGA0068, WLF0018
379	Idaho Women in Timber	McAvoy	Jackie	FRE0002, SOE0006, TBR0024, VEG0027
380		Smith	Lynn	MGA0061
381		Baird	Kurt & Donald	MGA0021, MGA0039
382		Bosworth	Robert	FRE0007, TBR0009, WLF0024
383		Brown	Ron	
384	Idaho Dept of Lands	Furman	Richard	ACC0037, EDT0001, EDT0003, EDT0017, EMS0006, SCI0036, TBR0017, TBR0025, TBR0035, TBR0037, VEG0035, VEG0065, VEG0067, VEG0076, VEG0083, WAT0033
385		Houff	Patty	MGA0021, VEG0017
386	Kootenai Environmental Alliance	Mihelich	Mike	EDT0063, EMS0006, MON0007, REG0001, REG0012, REG0019, SCI0008, SCI0015, TBR0035, TBR0043, VEG0043, WAT0056
387	Montana Wilderness Association & Cabinet Resource Group	Hernandez	Cesar	ACC0001, ACC0083, ACC0095, ACC0116, EDT0036, EDT0043, EDT0045, EDT0050, EDT0065, EDT0072, EMS0007, FRE0001, FRE0021, FRE0025, FRE0026, IRA0006, MGA0021, MGA0039, MGA0083, MON0002, PRO0006, REG0001, REG0022, REG0041, SOE0006, TBR0002, VEG0017, VEG0020, VEG0087, WAT0007, WAT0034, WAT0036, WLF0001, WLF0018, WLF0033, WLF0044, WLF0046, WLF0057
388		Evans	Larry	OFF0001, OFF0002

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
389		Melka	Susan	EMS0006, MON0007, REG0001, SCI0011, SCI0015, TBR0009, VEG0035
390		Chamberlain	Doug	ACC0011, MGA0014, PRO0005
391		Hughes	Jonathan	MGA0014
392		Addison	David	ACC0092, IRA0008, WLF0018
393		Doll	Joseph	ACC0011, MGA0014
394		Glenn	Hayden & Jane	ACC0018, ACC0058, ACC0059, EDT0021, MGA0035, MGA0039, MGA0088, MON0001, REG0006, WAT0005, WLF0046
395	American Wildlands and Yellowstone to Yukon	Davitt	Kim	REG0001, WLF0018, WLF0038, WLF0039, WLF0040
396		Gillingham	Maggie	MGA0021
397		Nehis	Tom	MGA0021
398		Ryder	Cal & Irene	COL0010, FRE0001, FRE0017, IRA0002, MGA0021, MGA0049, MGA0055, MGA0083, MGA0091
399		Mesin	Bo	MGA0021
400		Wuerthner	George	IRA0002, MGA0021
401		D'Angelo	George	ACC0041, IRA0002, IRA0009, MGA0016, MGA0024, VEG0053
402		Boyd	Will	EMS0006, MGA0024
403		Christopherson	Tim	FRE0020, TBR0003
404		Marshall	John	ACC0056, MGA0021, SOE0002
405		Jaqueth	Scott	MGA0002
406		Blessing	Fred	TBR0002
407	Yaak Valley Forest Council (P3)	King	Robyn	MGA0021
408		Haarstick	Steve	MGA0002, TBR0025
409		Boyd	Kristina	ACC0029
410		Nelson	Lynn	MGA0001, MGA0024, MGA0069, REG0001
411		Garrett	Steve & Debbie	ACC0009, MGA0022, MGA0060, TBR0002
412		Sharkey	K	ACC0009
413	Lincoln County Board of County Commissioners	Konzen	John	ACC0001, FRE0007, FRE0009, MGA0053, MGA0066, PRO0018, SCI0026, SOE0011, TBR0002, TBR0023, TBR0025, TBR0038, VEG0017
414		Neuman	Nancy	MGA0021, PRO0006
415	NW Environmental Defense Center	Strong	Katie	REG0001, REG0005, REG0006
416		Ryan	Eric	ACC0016, EDT0023, EDT0025, EDT0079, FRE0014, MGA0097, MON0004
417	Bull River Watershed Council	Ferguson	Kathy	ACC0001, ACC0025, FRE0019, MGA0039, MGA0053

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
418		Lund	Roger	FRE0009, IRA0007, MGA0025, MGA0039, MGA0066, MGA0076, MGA0089, REG0006, TBR0002, TBR0035, TBR0037, TBR0038, VEG0014, VEG0018, VEG0027
419		Campbell	Mary	ACC0069, ACC0086, ACC0128, FRE0010, IRA0002, IRA0008, MGA0021, REG0001, TBR0032, VEG0024, VEG0035, VEG0053, VEG0080, WLF0007, WLF0014, WLF0025, WLF0036
420		Etienne	John	ACC0115, EDT0082, MGA0075, VEG0053
421	Sierra Club- Upper Columbia River Group (Center for Justice)	Osborn	John	ACC0037, IRA0002, MGA0092, SCI0030, WAT0008, WAT0020, WAT0041
422	Lands Council	Peterson	Mike	ACC0108, COL0010, COL0014, EDT0033, EDT0041, MGA0021, MON0005, OFP0001, OFP0002, OFP0003, SCI0005, VEG0035, WAT0005, WAT0008, WAT0017, WAT0030, WAT0035, WAT0044, WLF0052
423	Kinnikinnick Chapter Idaho Native Plant Society	Hough	Phil	ACC0018, IRA0001, MGA0021, MGA0085, MGA0087, MGA0099, TBR0034, VEG0024, VEG0035, VEG0053, VEG0065
424	Friends of Scotchman Peaks	Hough	Phil	ACC0014, ACC0083, MGA0013, MGA0021, MGA0024, MGA0073, MGA0099, PRO0006, WLF0002, WLF0033
425	Treasure State Alliance	Osterman	Craig	ACC0001, FRE0009, MGA0041, TBR0038, WLF0056
426		Bass	Rick	ACC0036, ACC0092, FRE0001, GRZ0002, MGA0021, MGA0081, PRO0017, VEG0006, VEG0053
427	Blue Ribbon Coalition	Hawthorne	Brian	ACC0001, ACC0009, ACC0091, ACC0104, ACC0115, COL0010, MGA0014, MGA0022, MGA0041, PRO0030, SCI0036
428	Alliance for the Wild Rockies and the Great Bear Foundation	Sedler	Liz	MGA0021, MGA0069, MGA0073, REG0001, REG0005, REG0006, SCI0025, VEG0043, WAT0012, WAT0042, WAT0048, WLF0026, WLF0049
429		Ogden	Betsy	ACC0001, MGA0022, PRO0005, REG0037
430		Hernandez	Hannah	ACC0018, ACC0122, COL0010, FRE0001, FRE0012, REG0001, VEG0005, VEG0013, WAT0001, WLF0006

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
431	Gooding Cr Search & Rescue, ID State S/R (F16)	Funk	Tony	MGA0014
432		Porter	Ed & Mary	PRO0005
433		DiPangrazio	Tony	ACC0001, MGA0022, SOE0006
434	Spokane Mountaineers	Ream	Lorna	ACC0083, ACC0109, ACC0115, FRE0012, GRZ0001, IRA0002, LND0002, MGA0020, MGA0021, SOE0005, TBR0024, TBR0046, VEG0006, VEG0009, VEG0026, VEG0035, VEG0067, WAT0010, WAT0012, WLF0007, WLF0044
435		King	Karen	MGA0021
436		Lance/Posten	Robert & Kathryn	COL0006, IRA0008, MGA0013, MGA0021, MGA0039, MGA0049, MGA0083, SOE0005, TBR0047, VEG0035, VEG0036, VEG0053, WLF0018
437		Wimer	Ken	
438		Rabe	Fred	MGA0021
439		DeLaTorre	Frank	MGA0002, MGA0014
440		Leone	Sean	ACC0001
441		Marsden	Wally	ACC0001
442		Grahl	Michael	WLF0015
443		Harbuck	John	MGA0021
444		Finney	John & Christa	ACC0013, ACC0022, ACC0056, ACC0062, ACC0083, ACC0091, ACC0115, COL0002, EDT0001, EDT0002, EDT0004, EDT0005, EDT0006, EDT0007, EDT0008, EDT0010, EDT0074, EDT0075, GLO0003, MGA0004, MGA0014, MGA0019, MGA0025, MGA0039, MGA0041, MGA0077, MGA0078, MGA0101, MGA0105, REG0007, REG0033, REG0042, SOE0014, WLF0008, WLF0031, WLF0051, WLF0053
445		Ahlf	Reid	COL0010, FRE0009, FRE0010, FRE0017, PRO0024, TBR0002
446		Hurwitz	Dave	ACC0011, MGA0014, MGA0022
447		Bayley	Joseph	MGA0024, REG0001, REG0031, VEG0006, WLF0007
448		Kroschel	Mike	ACC0116, HRT0002
449		Mihelich	Mike	EMS0008, MON0002, SCI0008, VEG0042
450		Marvin	Judith	IRA0008, MGA0021
451		Lee	Chris	WLF0031
452		Feathers	Jesse	COL0010, MGA0021, MGA0024, PRO0006

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
453		Fuqua	Pam	ACC0057, ACC0069, COL0010, FRE0006, MGA0039, MON0002, REG0001, SCI0033, VEG0035, VEG0053, WLF0006, WLF0016, WLF0025
454		Saccoman	Joe	ACC0011, MGA0014
455		Rosenkoetter	Travis	MGA0021
456	Coeur D'Alene Tribe	Nomee	Alfred	ACC0039, ACC0091, AIR0002, EDT0003, EDT0011, EDT0013, EDT0014, HRT0001, LND0005, MGA0007, MON0001, REG0009, REG0010, REG0011, SOE0001, SOE0006, SOE0014, TBL0003, TBL0004, TBL0008, TBR0009, VEG0006, VEG0043, WAT0001, WAT0021, WLF0046, WLF0061, WLF0063
457	Coeur D'Alene Tribe	Matheson	Quanah	HRT0003, TBL0005
458	Washington Department of Ecology	Parodi	Jean	IRA0030, WAT0018
459	Yaak Valley Forest Council	Canepa	Sarah	IRA0008
460	Sierra Club	Clark	Bob	ACC0036, IRA0008, IRA0009, IRA0011, IRA0014, REG0001, SCI0010, WAT0048, WLF0009, WLF0016, WLF0033
462		Lambacher	Jason	MGA0024
463		Thompson	Chad	MGA0095, WAT0002
464		Vanderwater	Tom	MGA0024
465	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	Corsi	Chip	ACC0018, ACC0036, ACC0091, EDT0003, EDT0022, EDT0026, EDT0029, EDT0058, EDT0072, FRE0006, FRE0017, GRZ0002, GRZ0003, LND0009, MIN0007, MIN0010, MIN0011, MON0003, SCI0012, SCI0019, SCI0033, TBR0024, TBR0035, VEG0006, VEG0043, VEG0053, VEG0063, WAT0016, WAT0021, WAT0030, WLF0031, WLF0032, WLF0034, WLF0035, WLF0041, WLF0042, WLF0056, WLF0065
466		Gades	Chuck	ACC0037, FRE0009, FRE0011, TBR0002, TBR0038
467	Intermountain Forest Association	Howarth	Serena	FRE0007, FRE0009, FRE0010, FRE0020, MGA0073, REG0006, TBR0002, TBR0023, TBR0037, VEG0006, VEG0071
468	Selkirk Conservation Alliance	Sedler	Liz	ACC0037, IRA0002, IRA0008, IRA0028, REG0001, REG0005, REG0006, SCI0013, SCI0025, VEG0043, WAT0001, WAT0013, WAT0015, WAT0042, WLF0026, WLF0049, WLF0050, WLF0052
469	(F9)	Buell	Rayan	ACC0001, TBR0034

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
470		Lund	Roger & Marion	ACC0005, MGA0022, MGA0025, MGA0028, TBR0014, TBR0023, TBR0045, VEG0057
471		Hessler	Howard	MGA0013, SOE0008
473	Backcountry Backpackers – Idaho Conservation League	Pavia	Jerry	FRE0014, IRA0011, MGA0024, MGA0094, MON0002, REG0023, WLF0031
474		Statz	Jed	MGA0014
475		Swanson	John	ACC0036, ACC0092, IRA0002, MGA0013, MGA0021, MGA0024, MGA0049, PRO0031, VEG0035, WAT0025, WLF0002, WLF0018
476	(F12)	Norden	Chris	MGA0024, MGA0049, VEG0035
477		St George	Don	ACC0005
478		Wimberley	Neil	MGA0024, MGA0095, WLF0001
479		Wimberley	Ann	MGA0024, MGA0095, WLF0001
480		Holland	David	ACC0001, COL0005, EDT0014, EMS0003, MGA0014, MGA0062, MIN0001, REG0008, TBL0002, WAT0003
481		Brown	KR	COL0005, IRA0002, MGA0024, MGA0091
482		Williams	Karen	ACC0016, EDT0003, VEG0017, VEG0035, VEG0038, WAT0059
483		Davis	Shawneen	MGA0022
484		Davis	Larry	MGA0022
485		Shoeman	Robert	ACC0004, IRA0002, MGA0024, TBR0002, WAT0002
486		Gunter	Patrick	ACC0001, ACC0034, MGA0022
487		Krajic	Jay	MGA0024, VEG0035
488		Weiser	Stephen	MIN0004, WAT0008
489		Linscott	Mark	MGA0077
490		Holbert	John	ACC0001, ACC0034, MGA0022
491		Elkins	Richard & Elizabeth	MGA0002, MGA0014
492		Schroeder	Jesse	MGA0022, SOE0005
493		Hawkinson	Colby	ACC0092, IRA0008, MGA0024, MGA0069, REG0001
494		Mendenhall	Dale	ACC0001, MGA0014
495		Carlberg	Karen	ACC0092, MGA0021, MGA0095
496	Benewah County Commissioners	Buell	Jack	FRE0013, TBR0002
497		Prorak	Al & Diane	MGA0024, MGA0069, REG0001
498		Koerner	Tim	
499	Flathead Lutheran Bible Camp	Ells	Aaron	LND0010
500		Deaton	Doug	MGA0002, MGA0014
501		Cobb Jr	Fields	MGA0024, VEG0011, VEG0013
502		Brooks	Casey	FRE0009, SOE0002, TBR0038

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #s
503		Carter	Ken	REG0029, REG0030
504		Rabe	Fred	EDT0035, MGA0064
505		Rabe	Fred	MGA0091
506	Friends of the Clearwater	Macfarlane Poplawsky	Gary Al	COL0010, EDT0053, EMS0001, EMS0002, FRE0017, IRA0002, IRA0008, IRA0010, IRA0012, IRA0013, IRA0022, IRA0024, MGA0003, MGA0010, MGA0024, MGA0035, MGA0052, MGA0069, MGA0103, PRO0016, REG0001, REG0006, REG0028, REG0029, SCI0002, SCI0017, SCI0034, TBR0043, TBR0044, VEG0006, VEG0013, VEG0014, VEG0021, VEG0030, VEG0043, VEG0059, VEG0080, WAT0010
507		Nogel	Bill & Joanne	COL0006, MGA0021
508	Conservation Research and Management Consulting Services (for MWA)	Jacobs	Michael	EDT0039
508		Schloeder	Catherine	EDT0039
510		Harvey	Ann	MGA0021
511		Morrison	Mary Lou	MGA0021, WLF0002
512	(F12)	Dean	John	MGA0024, MGA0102, VEG0035, WAT0002
513	(F12)	Luzzo	Tony	MGA0024, MGA0095, VEG0035, WAT0002
514	Boundary County Commissioners	Smith Dinning Kirby	Ronald Dan Walt	FRE0020, IRA0009, MGA0025, MGA0032, MGA0081, MGA0096
515	Taylor/Parmenter Land Owners (F17)	Heinert	Ralph	PRL0009
516	(F11)	Moeller	Billie	MGA0080
517	Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks	Satterfield, Jr	James	ACC0101, IRA0008, IRA0009, LND0014, MGA0021, MGA0039, MGA0083, MGA0085, MGA0108, TBR0041, WAT0048, WAT0060, WAT0061, WLF0002, WLF0006, WLF0062

Table B: Comment letters in alphabetical order

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
392		Addison	David	ACC0092, IRA0008, WLF0018
235		Aders-Todd	Sandi	MGA0024
445		Ahlf	Reid	COL0010, FRE0009, FRE0010, FRE0017, PRO0024, TBR0002
200		Alderson	George & Frances	MGA0024, REG0001, WAT0028
113		Anderson Hanson	Maury Pat	MGA0021
267		Anderson	Sarah	ACC0036, IRA0011, MGA0099, TBR0034, WLF0018
149		Artly	Richard	MGA0024, REG0001
352		Avery	Pamela	ACC0014
290		Bade	Wren	MGA0021
81		Baird	Dennis	MGA0024, MGA0071, REG0001
381		Baird	Kurt & Donald	MGA0021, MGA0039
276		Baker	Ivy	MGA0021
356		Bakes	Warren	IRA0002
124		Baldrige	Scott	
367		Baroni	Richard	MGA0024
171		Bass	Rick	IRA0008, VEG0053, WLF0001
426		Bass	Rick	ACC0036, ACC0092, FRE0001, GRZ0002, MGA0021, MGA0081, PRO0017, VEG0006, VEG0053
62		Baugh	Kathryn	ACC0018, MGA0021
349		Baum	Bill	MGA0021
447		Bayley	Joseph	MGA0024, REG0001, REG0031, VEG0006, WLF0007
18		Beasley	Peggy & Andy	MGA0021, PRO0006
19		Beasley	Peggy & Andy	MGA0021, PRO0006
260		Beck	Bob	MGA0021
118		Beery	Jacqueline	ACC0005
233		Bertelsen-James	Jan	MGA0018, MGA0021, PRO0006
25		Billi	Keith	ACC0001
148		Blackburn	Lois	MGA0024, MGA0069, REG0001
241		Blackler	Edd	MGA0021
184		Blake	Carol	MGA0021, PRO0006
143		Blank	DL	IRA0002, MGA0013, MGA0021
406		Blessing	Fred	TBR0002
40		Bond	Pete	ACC0001
382		Bosworth	Robert	FRE0007, TBR0009, WLF0024
372		Bowers	Chris	MGA0021
409		Boyd	Kristina	ACC0029
402		Boyd	Will	EMS0006, MGA0024
296		Brackebusch	Mark	ACC0057, MGA0048, WLF0002
239		Brajcich	Andrew	MGA0021
291		Breitenbach	Duke	MGA0021, WLF0006

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
502		Brooks	Casey	FRE0009, SOE0002, TBR0038
287		Brown	Carrie	
75		Brown	Deborah	MGA0021
481		Brown	KR	COL0005, IRA0002, MGA0024, MGA0091
383		Brown	Ron	
321		Buentemeier	Barbara	FRE0007, TBR0023, TBR0038
343		Burnim	Peter and Cindy	EDT0016, FRE0012, MGA0092, WLF0018
183		Butz	Michelle	MGA0021, PRO0006
134		Caldwell	Bill	MGA0024, REG0001
49		Callen	Janet	ACC0005, PRL0002
419		Campbell	Mary	ACC0069, ACC0086, ACC0128, FRE0010, IRA0002, IRA0008, MGA0021, REG0001, TBR0032, VEG0024, VEG0035, VEG0053, VEG0080, WLF0007, WLF0014, WLF0025, WLF0036
138		Canepa	Leslye	FRE0013, IRA0002, MGA0021, VEG0035, VEG0036, WLF0018
337		Cant	Geoffrey	MGA0024
302		Cant	John GH	MGA0021, PRO0006, TBR0034
163		Carl	Gary	WLF0025
495		Carlberg	Karen	ACC0092, MGA0021, MGA0095
503		Carter	Ken	REG0029, REG0030
390		Chamberlain	Doug	ACC0011, MGA0014, PRO0005
256		Chinn	Brad	IRA0002
403		Christopherson	Tim	FRE0020, TBR0003
150		Clark	Lawrence	MGA0021, MGA0024, PRO0006
369		Cleere	Erin	PRO0006
234		Close	Scott	ACC0001, SCI0028
501		Cobb Jr	Fields	MGA0024, VEG0011, VEG0013
205		Compton	Elinor	MGA0021, PRO0006
245		Conces	Claudia	MGA0021
285		Connors	John	ACC0051, MGA0021, MGA0039
13		Corn	Stewart	MGA0021
218		Coryell	Larry	ACC0037, EDT0032, EDT0082, FRE0022, MGA0039, MGA0053, TBR0023, TBR0035, TBR0055, VEG0005, VEG0006, VEG0022, VEG0023, VEG0046, VEG0047, VEG0065, WLF0044
363		Costigan	Cheryl	MGA0021
9		Cottrell	Dan	MGA0021
10		Cottrell	Marcella Ray	MGA0021
117		Cox	Neil	MGA0024, MGA0095, REG0001
253		Crane	Gayle	MGA0021, WLF0002
289		Cripe	Marie	MGA0002, TBR0038
288		Crist	Doug	MGA0021, REG0001, TBR0034

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
401		D'Angelo	George	ACC0041, IRA0002, IRA0009, MGA0016, MGA0024, VEG0053
232		Davidson	Matthew	MGA0021
484		Davis	Larry	MGA0022
327		Davis	Larry & Shawneen	MGA0005, MGA0039, MGA0040, MGA0077, PRO0005
483		Davis	Shawneen	MGA0022
354		Deaton	Doug	ACC0025, IRA0007, MGA0022, MGA0040
500		Deaton	Doug	MGA0002, MGA0014
123		Deaton	Tamara	PRL0002
439		DeLaTorre	Frank	MGA0002, MGA0014
259		Deutsch	Donna	MGA0021
52		Deveny	Christine	MGA0021
348		Dexter	Barry	FRE0012, TBR0062
433		DiPangrazio	Tony	ACC0001, MGA0022, SOE0006
393		Doll	Joseph	ACC0011, MGA0014
53		Dunne	Loretta	MGA0021
177		Eaves	Sandy	MGA0021
116		Edwards	Mike	ACC0044, IRA0011, MGA0089
142		Eggers	Darrah	MGA0059
122		Einhaus	Leslie	ACC0024, IRA0011, MGA0021, MGA0095
370		Elkins	R	
491		Elkins	Richard & Elizabeth	MGA0002, MGA0014
303		Ellingsen	Valley	MGA0021
17		Eovaldi	Suzanne	COL0010, EDT0012, MGA0095, WLF0025
162		Eovaldi	Suzanne	MGA0095
420		Etienne	John	ACC0115, EDT0082, MGA0075, VEG0053
388		Evans	Larry	OFP0001, OFP0002
335		Eyster	Erryl	MGA0021, MGA0095
452		Feathers	Jesse	COL0010, MGA0021, MGA0024, PRO0006
270		Ferrell	Doug	MGA0021, PRO0006, REG0001
265		Ferrell	Melinda	MGA0021, PRO0006
196		Fields	Edwin	MGA0021, PRO0006
125		Fields	Mary	ACC0033, TBR0002
161		Fillpot	Elise	MGA0021, SOE0007, WLF0002

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
444		Finney	John & Christa	ACC0013, ACC0022, ACC0056, ACC0062, ACC0083, ACC0091, ACC0115, COL0002, EDT0001, EDT0002, EDT0004, EDT0005, EDT0006, EDT0007, EDT0008, EDT0010, EDT0074, EDT0075, GLO0003, MGA0004, MGA0014, MGA0019, MGA0025, MGA0039, MGA0041, MGA0077, MGA0078, MGA0101, MGA0105, REG0007, REG0033, REG0042, SOE0014, WLF0008, WLF0031, WLF0051, WLF0053
104		Fisher	Richard	MGA0021
96		Flores	Lupito	MGA0024, MGA0069, REG0001, REG0017
333		Foust	John & Ginger	MGA0021
47		Fredericksen	Harvey	MGA0091, MGA0092
98		Fredericksen	Harvey	MGA0002
453		Fuqua	Pam	ACC0057, ACC0069, COL0010, FRE0006, MGA0039, MON0002, REG0001, SCI0033, VEG0035, VEG0053, WLF0006, WLF0016, WLF0025
466		Gades	Chuck	ACC0037, FRE0009, FRE0011, TBR0002, TBR0038
411		Garrett	Steve & Debbie	ACC0009, MGA0022, MGA0060, TBR0002
12		Garvey	Lydia	MGA0021, MGA0095
272		Garvey	Lydia	WLF0018
119		Gerber	Guy	ACC0004
102		Giddings	Ronald & Maryann	MGA0021
396		Gillingham	Maggie	MGA0021
394		Glenn	Hayden & Jane	ACC0018, ACC0058, ACC0059, EDT0021, MGA0035, MGA0039, MGA0088, MON0001, REG0006, WAT0005, WLF0046
30		Good	Richard	ACC0119, EDT0059
442		Grahl	Michael	WLF0015
486		Gunter	Patrick	ACC0001, ACC0034, MGA0022
408		Haarstick	Steve	MGA0002, TBR0025
56		Hancock	John & Lynn	MGA0021
8		Hannon	Beverly	WLF0003
22		Hannon	Beverly	ACC0065, ACC0120, MGA0095, WLF0003
443		Harbuck	John	MGA0021
120		Hartman	Candy	MGA0021, WLF0025
510		Harvey	Ann	MGA0021

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
24		Harvey	Geoffrey & Donna	ACC0005, PRL0002
135		Haskett	Matthew	WLF0025
114		Hasson	Alex	ACC0015, IRA0011, IRA0014, MGA0021, PRO0006, WLF0025
493		Hawkinson	Colby	ACC0092, IRA0008, MGA0024, MGA0069, REG0001
269		Hayes, Jr.	William	AIR0003, FRE0004, FRE0007, TBR0062
309		Hernandez	Hannah	ACC0018, FRE0001, MGA0021, REG0001, VEG0013, WAT0044, WLF0006
430		Hernandez	Hannah	ACC0018, ACC0122, COL0010, FRE0001, FRE0012, REG0001, VEG0005, VEG0013, WAT0001, WLF0006
471		Hessler	Howard	MGA0013, SOE0008
248		Hildreth	Michael	VEG0006
314		Hinds	Colleen	MGA0021
334		Hogan	Eugene Jr.	IRA0008, MGA0021, MGA0039, PRO0011
490		Holbert	John	ACC0001, ACC0034, MGA0022
329		Holifield	Jennifer	MGA0021, MGA0086, WLF0012, WLF0013, WLF0054
480		Holland	David	ACC0001, COL0005, EDT0014, EMS0003, MGA0014, MGA0062, MIN0001, REG0008, TBL0002, WAT0003
385		Houff	Patty	MGA0021, VEG0017
391		Hughes	Jonathan	MGA0014
446		Hurwitz	Dave	ACC0011, MGA0014, MGA0022
332		Hutchins	Judy	ACC0037, FRE0001, MGA0013, MGA0098, TBR0042, VEG0035, WLF0018
280		Illi	Warren	ACC0001, LND0001, LND0006, LND0011, LND0012, TBR0002
158		Ingraham	Pat	ACC0001, EDT0001
221		Interested Party		MGA0021
268		Interested Party	Liz	MGA0021
353		Jackson	Bill	MGA0040, MGA0041, MGA0077
322		Janssen	Bill & Sue	ACC0018, ACC0069, COL0006, IRA0002, IRA0008, MGA0021, MGA0081, MGA0098, PRO0006, REG0018, SOE0006, TBR0034, TBR0054, VEG0053, WLF0014, WLF0025, WLF0043
405		Jaqueth	Scott	MGA0002
172		Jensen	Orell	MGA0095
311		Johnson	Cindy	MGA0021
100		Johnson	Orin	MGA0021

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
310		Johnson	Tony	IRA0008, MGA0021
103		Jolley	John & Suzy	MGA0013, MGA0021, MGA0024
201		Jones	Cedron	MGA0021
131		Keele	Van	IRA0011, MGA0021, WLF0025
435		King	Karen	MGA0021
91		Kingsley	Anna-Lisa	MGA0021
359		Knight	Ellen	MGA0016, MGA0024, MGA0068
498		Koerner	Tim	
175		Kopczynski	Chris	MGA0024
487		Krajic	Jay	MGA0024, VEG0035
286		Kreck	Loren	MGA0021
448		Kroschel	Mike	ACC0116, HRT0002
375		Kuhl	Richard	MGA0021, PRO0006
462		Lambacher	Jason	MGA0024
436		Lance/Posten	Robert & Kathryn	COL0006, IRA0008, MGA0013, MGA0021, MGA0039, MGA0049, MGA0083, SOE0005, TBR0047, VEG0035, VEG0036, VEG0053, WLF0018
374		Latta	John & Diane	IRA0008, MGA0021, MGA0039, MGA0058, MGA0073, MGA0083, SCI0027
277		Lauer	Trish	IRA0008, IRA0011, MGA0021, PRO0022, WAT0005, WLF0002, WLF0018
132		Leahy	Russell	ACC0001, ACC0005, MGA0002, MGA0037
215		Ledbetter	Bob	COL0004, MGA0021
451		Lee	Chris	WLF0031
21		Leimbach	Paul	EDT0014, EDT0054, MGA0039
308		Leivestad	Ole & Rusti	ACC0010, ACC0056, COL0015, IRA0002, MGA0021, PRL0008, TBR0050
440		Leone	Sean	ACC0001
351		Ley	Art	MGA0021
262		Linehan	Tim	COL0006, MGA0021
489		Linscott	Mark	MGA0077
107		Littlepage	Dean	IRA0002, MGA0016
154		Lohman	Michael	ACC0001, ACC0002, PRO0014, WLF0026
418		Lund	Roger	FRE0009, IRA0007, MGA0025, MGA0039, MGA0066, MGA0076, MGA0089, REG0006, TBR0002, TBR0035, TBR0037, TBR0038, VEG0014, VEG0018, VEG0027
470		Lund	Roger & Marion	ACC0005, MGA0022, MGA0025, MGA0028, TBR0014, TBR0023, TBR0045, VEG0057

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
297		Lyman	Dave	ACC0037, ACC0050, EMS0004, MGA0021, MGA0095, PRO0002, PRO0006, WLF0066
300		Lyman	Debbie	COL0003, MGA0085, MGA0095, PRO0006
261		MacLean	Colin	MGA0021, PRO0006
151		Maggi	Maria Theresa	MGA0099, REG0006, REG0024
224		Manley	James	MGA0021
115		Marconi	Hugh	ACC0018, ACC0057, MGA0024
159		Margolis	Susanna	COL0010, MGA0021, MGA0095, PRO0030
94		Marieb	Kathy	ACC0050, IRA0008, IRA0011, IRA0014, WLF0025
441		Marsden	Wally	ACC0001
404		Marshall	John	ACC0056, MGA0021, SOE0002
147		Marshall	Kim	MGA0021, MGA0024
450		Marvin	Judith	IRA0008, MGA0021
108		Mason	Cynthia	MGA0024, MGA0039, MGA0090
371		Masters	Kerry	MGA0024
315		McKeon	Bob	MGA0021
220		McLaughlin	William	COL0015, MGA0021
226		McLeod	Pat	MGA0021, MGA0099, SOE0005, WLF0002
376		McMillan	Janet	MGA0021
155		McMillen	James	ACC0005
165		McMillen	Mimi	MGA0021
389		Melka	Susan	EMS0006, MON0007, REG0001, SCI0011, SCI0015, TBR0009, VEG0035
494		Mendenhall	Dale	ACC0001, MGA0014
238		Merrill	Ron	ACC0001
399		Mesin	Bo	MGA0021
449		Mihelich	Mike	EMS0008, MON0002, SCI0008, VEG0042
316		Miller	Russ	FRE0007
323		Monatair	Jerry & Lisa	IRA0008
85		Moncur	Max	IRA0009
33		Mondal	Kenneth	MGA0021
36		Mondal	Kenneth	MGA0024
511		Morrison	Mary Lou	MGA0021, WLF0002
357		Munson	Russell	ACC0001
145		Murray	Vince & Lynn	ACC0010, ACC0117, CCI0001, EMS0001, EMS0002, MGA0024, MGA0071
305		Nagel	Bill & Joanne	MGA0039, SOE0002, WLF0033
397		Nehis	Tom	MGA0021
410		Nelson	Lynn	MGA0001, MGA0024, MGA0069, REG0001

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
414		Neuman	Nancy	MGA0021, PRO0006
83		Newcombe	Ray	MGA0021, MGA0024, MGA0048
42		Newsham	Beverly	IRA0008, MGA0021, MGA0024, MGA0083, WLF0002
507		Nogel	Bill & Joanne	COL0006, MGA0021
244		Norris	Dennis	MGA0024
70		Norton	Rebecca	MGA0021
360		O'Brien	John III	ACC0005, MGA0021
429		Ogden	Betsy	ACC0001, MGA0022, PRO0005, REG0037
368		Olsen	Lance	WLF0002
358		Olsen	Scott & Joshua	MGA0021
278		Olson	Hazel	WAT0002
304		Oneil	Donna	ACC0001, FRE0009, MGA0039, MGA0060, MGA0063, MGA0077, MGA0089, SCI0037
240		Parkin	Wade	TBR0002
153		Paulson	Steve	IRA0002, IRA0008, IRA0011, IRA0012, IRA0020, IRA0022, IRA0024, MGA0001, MGA0003, MGA0010, MGA0016, MGA0024, MGA0069, MGA0073, MON0006, PRL0011, REG0001, REG0006, REG0024, REG0031, SCI0001, SCI0005, SCI0034
106		Peek	Pat Cary	MGA0021
15		Peterson	Lorne	MGA0021, MGA0095
182		Pond	Robert	IRA0002, IRA0011, PRO0006
432		Porter	Ed & Mary	PRO0005
39		Prebble	Lynn	MGA0021
185		Price	George & Carol	COL0010, FRE0020, IRA0011, PRO0030, SOE0008, SOE0012, TBR0034, VEG0016, VEG0053
497		Prorak	Al & Diane	MGA0024, MGA0069, REG0001
141		Rabe	Fred	EDT0044, MGA0064
438		Rabe	Fred	MGA0021
504		Rabe	Fred	EDT0035, MGA0064
505		Rabe	Fred	MGA0091
250		Rana	Paul	EDT0069, EDT0081, MGA0023
68		Ray	Janisse	COL0004, IRA0008, SOE0005
167		Reckin	Gene	MGA0039
246		Remington	L K	MGA0021
345		Renaud	Susan	MGA0021, SOE0005
347		Reynolds	Mike	ACC0032, COL0010
170		Roberts	David & Candice	MGA0050, SOE0006, TBR0025, TBR0037, VEG0084
350		Robinson	Chris	TBR0038

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
247		Rosales	Yolanda	MGA0099
127		Rose	Renee	MGA0021, PRO0006
455		Rosenkoetter	Travis	MGA0021
173		Roskelley	John	ACC0092, ACC0127, IRA0011, MGA0013, MGA0021, MGA0095, REG0023, VEG0040, WAT0002, WAT0005, WAT0012, WAT0026, WLF0043, WLF0066
166		Rudio	Barbara	MGA0021
416		Ryan	Eric	ACC0016, EDT0023, EDT0025, EDT0079, FRE0014, MGA0097, MON0004
398		Ryder	Cal & Irene	COL0010, FRE0001, FRE0017, IRA0002, MGA0021, MGA0049, MGA0055, MGA0083, MGA0091
454		Saccoman	Joe	ACC0011, MGA0014
20		Samy	Shar	MGA0021
242		Sandvold	Lee	MGA0022
203		Sauer	Greg	IRA0008, IRA0011, MGA0021, MGA0061, MGA0073, MGA0077, WLF0018
46		Scherzer	Ernest	ACC0001, COL0006, MGA0021, MGA0039, WLF0033
361		Scherzer	Martha	MGA0021
508		Schloeder	Catherine	EDT0039
112		Schombel	Stephen	ACC0015, IRA0011, MGA0021
492		Schroeder	Jesse	MGA0022, SOE0005
251		Schroeter	Franklin	ACC0004, MGA0021, REG0035, WLF0025
275		Schubert	John	ACC0001
301		Sedler	Jim	FRE0014, IRA0002, MGA0021, WLF0018
328		Sedler	Laura	FRE0014, IRA0002, MGA0021, REG0023, WLF0018
38		Seidel	Bob	ACC0001, FRE0001, IRA0007, REG0012, VEG0026, VEG0035, WAT0014, WLF0024
412		Sharkey	K	ACC0009
206		Sheets	Mark	EMS0001, MGA0021, MGA0049, PRO0006, REG0001
273		Sheets	Mark	MGA0021
23		Sherman	Susan & Michael	MGA0039
16		Shively	Daniel	MGA0021
485		Shoeman	Robert	ACC0004, IRA0002, MGA0024, TBR0002, WAT0002
344		Smith	Alta	MGA0039
128		Smith	John	EDT0056, FRE0009, SCI0023
380		Smith	Lynn	MGA0061

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
63		Snow	Donald	MGA0021, PRO0006
54		Snyder	Elaine	MGA0021
377		Soderling	Alan	ACC0048, MGA0018
169		Spurgin	Ralph	MGA0021, MGA0083
477		St George	Don	ACC0005
198		Stamm	John	MGA0021, WLF0018
338		Standley	Krys	COL0006, MGA0021, TBR0034, VEG0035, VEG0036, WLF0018
325		Starling	Bob & Lynette	ACC0115, COL0010, TBR0031
312		Statz	Jed	MGA0014, MGA0077
474		Statz	Jed	MGA0014
61		Stavenow	Richard	FRE0026
136		Stehlik	Linda	ACC0001, MGA0040
181		Stehlik	Linda	MGA0041
307		Stehlik	Linda	ACC0033, EDT0042, EDT0046, EDT0049, FRE0010, MGA0002, TBR0002, WLF0026
227		Stephens	Ken	MGA0073, PRO0023
326		Stewart	Janine	ACC0001, COL0005, MGA0002, MGA0041, MGA0077, SCI0015
365		Stiger	Susan	ACC0057, ACC0082, ACC0094, MGA0024
144		Streeter	David	MGA0021, PRO0006
41		Sturgeon	Sally	MGA0021
72		Sturgeon	Stephen	COL0004, IRA0002, MGA0021, PRO0006
95		Sutter	Richard	MGA0024
156		Swanson	John	IRA0008
475		Swanson	John	ACC0036, ACC0092, IRA0002, MGA0013, MGA0021, MGA0024, MGA0049, PRO0031, VEG0035, WAT0025, WLF0002, WLF0018
71		Thayer	June	ACC0014, MGA0021
258		Thomas	Robert & Alice	PRO0006, REG0021
463		Thompson	Chad	MGA0095, WAT0002
126		Thormahlen	Jim	MGA0021
340		Torrisi	Molly	IRA0002
99		Tweto	Halvor	ACC0086, MGA0021, MGA0090
84		Valentine	William & Antoinette	MGA0021, PRO0006
111		Valentine	William & Antoinette	MGA0024
464		Vanderwater	Tom	MGA0024
366		Vignere	Joel	MGA0021
133		Vinson	Barbara	VEG0035
341		Vogel	Paul	MGA0021, MGA0024
237		Wade	Jon	ACC0034, MGA0040, MGA0077

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
69		Walker	Barbara	MGA0021, MGA0039, PRO0006
306		Wandler	Jerry	ACC0080, COL0010, FRE0010, FRE0013, MGA0014, MIN0005, PRO0008, TBR0002, TBR0026, TBR0060
43		Wedel	Jeffery	MGA0021
330		Wegner	Steve	WAT0024
488		Weiser	Stephen	MIN0004, WAT0008
225		Welles	Jo	MGA0021
298		Whitson	Lena	COL0006, MGA0021
482		Williams	Karen	ACC0016, EDT0003, VEG0017, VEG0035, VEG0038, WAT0059
121		Williams	Tina	
82		Wilson	Irene	MGA0024, MGA0048
50		Wilson	William	ACC0069, EDT0014, WAT0046
318		Wimberley	Ann	MGA0021, MGA0083
479		Wimberley	Ann	MGA0024, MGA0095, WLF0001
317		Wimberley	Neil	MGA0021, MGA0083
478		Wimberley	Neil	MGA0024, MGA0095, WLF0001
437		Wimer	Ken	
364		Wittrock	Paul	
313		Wojnarowicz	Daniel	MGA0021
51		Wolff	Edward & Marilyn	MGA0021, PRO0006
267		Wongstrom	Jeff	ACC0036, IRA0011, MGA0099, TBR0034, WLF0018
137		Wood	Michael	MGA0021, MGA0039
400		Wuerthner	George	IRA0002, MGA0021
105		Yates	Rick	MGA0013
274		Zachary	Carol	MGA0099, PRO0006
55		Zwisler	Steven	MGA0021, PRO0006, SOE0005
29	(F1) Friends of the Scotchman Peaks and Idaho Conservation League	Drumheller	Susan	MGA0021
77	(F1)	Cook	Arlene	MGA0021
236	(F1)	Dabrowski	Tom	MGA0024
249	(F1)	Deeds	Dave	MGA0090
79	(F1)	Dees	Francesca	WLF0002
178	(F1)	Hawkes	Jean	MGA0024
76	(F1)	Heller	Dion	MGA0021
78	(F1)	Lauritzen	Robert	ACC0016
228	(F1)	Lee	Paula & Jan	MGA0021, WLF0002
255	(F1)	Olsen	Cyndi Rae	MGA0024, MGA0090
180	(F1)	Pignolet	Joanna	
179	(F1)	Watson	Marianne	MGA0024
31	(F2) Yaak Valley Forest Council	King	Robyn	MGA0021, WLF0002
243	(F2)	Schubert	Derek	PRO0021

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
34	(F3) Troy & Libby Snowmobile Clubs	Wandler	Jerry	ACC0013, IRA0009, MGA0039, MGA0077
263	(F3)	Morkert	Linda	COL0010
35	(F4) Troy & Libby Snowmobile Clubs	Wandler	Jerry	ACC0013, IRA0009, MGA0025, MGA0039, MGA0077
26	(F5) Montana Wilderness Association	Hadden	David	IRA0008, IRA0009, MGA0021, PRO0006, WLF0002
90	(F5)	Adair	Ann	MGA0021
231	(F5)	Barcklay	Roderick	MGA0021, PRO0012
140	(F5)	Bateman	Guy Dean	IRA0002
292	(F5)	Braun	Stephen	REG0001
190	(F5)	Caya	Neal	SOE0005
87	(F5)	Clark	Charles	MGA0092, MGA0099, REG0001, SCI0014
204	(F5)	Davidson	Matthew	MGA0021
192	(F5)	Davies	Derrick	PRO0012, WLF0002
92	(F5)	Dunfield	William	MGA0024, PRO0012, WLF0002
88	(F5)	Fischman	Ken	MGA0023, MGA0024, PRO0012
187	(F5)	Flynn	Todd	SOE0005
195	(F5)	Fry	Robin Alan	MGA0021
28	(F5)	Gargas	Matt & Meridith	MGA0021, WLF0002
93	(F5)	Haag	Kenneth & Mary Jo	MGA0021, MGA0024, PRO0012
194	(F5)	Hammer	Tammy	
193	(F5)	Hough	Philip	PRO0012
65	(F5)	Hunsicker	Deborah	MGA0021, MGA0024, PRO0012
139	(F5)	Jobe	Cindie	MGA0021
189	(F5)	Lichtenberg	Janene	SOE0005
230	(F5)	Luders	David Gunther	MGA0024
188	(F5)	Miller	Patricia	SOE0005
191	(F5)	Montana	Molly	SOE0007
164	(F5)	Potter	Jack & Rachel	MGA0021
32	(F5)	Rockwell	David	MGA0021
27	(F5)	Sherman	Sue	MGA0099
186	(F5)	Springer	Sara Lou	COL0010
86	(F6)	Burke	Colleen	MGA0021
80	(F7)	Hathaway	Sandy	MGA0021, MGA0024
146	(F8)	Hill	Craig	ACC0001, ACC0020, ACC0075, ACC0079, ACC0083, EDT0068, EDT0073, EDT0076, EDT0077, EDT0080, IRA0027, MGA0005, MGA0007, MGA0010, MGA0068, MGA0070, MGA0072, MGA0089, WAT0046, WLF0038
130	(F8)	Howell	Don	

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
110	(F8)	Sudnikovich	Mike	ACC0011, ACC0015, ACC0123, EDT0024, EDT0071, EDT0084, MGA0005, MGA0014, MGA0025, MGA0047, MGA0051, MGA0066, MGA0068, REG0006, SOE0005, SOE0013, TBR0060, WLF0023, WLF0024
109	(F9) Idaho State Snowmobile Association	Mitchell	Sandra	ACC0001, ACC0011, MGA0014, PRL0012, PRO0014
469	(F9)	Buell	Rayan	ACC0001, TBR0034
160	(F9)	Mael	Alvin	PRL0012
66	(F10)	Wilson	William	COL0006, IRA0002, IRA0008, IRA0011, MGA0013, MGA0021, MGA0090, PRO0006, TBR0034, VEG0035, WLF0014, WLF0018
129	(F11) Kootenai Ridge Riders ATV Club	Goodell	George	ACC0005, ACC0068, MGA0022, MGA0039, MGA0065, MGA0091, WLF0005
207	(F11)	Berget	Janice	ACC0001, FRE0009
214	(F11)	Drake	Jackalyne	OFF0004, VEG0053
211	(F11)	Johnson	Clarence	TBR0002, VEG0053
516	(F11)	Moeller	Billie	MGA0080
212	(F11)	Pacheco	Monica	FRE0010, OFF0004, VEG0006, VEG0053
209	(F11)	Parnell	Jean	LND0011
208	(F11)	Peterson	Mike	ACC0001, ACC0043, MGA0002, MGA0041, OFF0004, TBR0002
295	(F11)	Smart	Don	FRE0010, WLF0006
210	(F11)	Wagner	Michael	LND0011
213	(F11)	Wagner	Mike	ACC0001, TBR0002, VEG0053
512	(F12)	Dean	John	MGA0024, MGA0102, VEG0035, WAT0002
229	(F12)	Kirkpatrick	Joanna	MGA0024, MGA0102, VEG0035, WAT0002
513	(F12)	Luzzo	Tony	MGA0024, MGA0095, VEG0035, WAT0002
476	(F12)	Norden	Chris	MGA0024, MGA0049, VEG0035
222	(F13) Yaak Valley Forest Council	King	Robyn	IRA0008, IRA0011, MGA0021, TBR0034, WLF0018
264	(F13)	Ledbetter	Judith	PRO0006
320	(F13)	Needs	Kelly	PRO0011
223	(F14)	Conat	Richard	ACC0001, FRE0007, MGA0050, MGA0084, MGA0089, MGA0091, SOE0006, TBR0002, TBR0023, TBR0025, WAT0048
346	(F15) Idaho Conservation League	Drumheller	Susan	MGA0024
431	(F16) Gooding Cr Search & Rescue, ID State S/R	Funk	Tony	MGA0014

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
515	(F17) Taylor/Parmenter Land Owners	Heinert	Ralph	PRL0009
74	(P1) Idaho Conservation League	Drumheller	Susan	MGA0021
279	(P2)	Scarabosio	Dario	COL0010
407	(P3) Yaak Valley Forest Council	King	Robyn	MGA0021
428	Alliance for the Wild Rockies and the Great Bear Foundation	Sedler	Liz	MGA0021, MGA0069, MGA0073, REG0001, REG0005, REG0006, SCI0025, VEG0043, WAT0012, WAT0042, WAT0048, WLF0026, WLF0049
395	American Wildlands and Yellowstone to Yukon	Davitt	Kim	REG0001, WLF0018, WLF0038, WLF0039, WLF0040
473	Backcountry Backpackers – Idaho Conservation League	Pavia	Jerry	FRE0014, IRA0011, MGA0024, MGA0094, MON0002, REG0023, WLF0031
283	Backcountry Hunters and Anglers – Montana Chapter	Long	Ben	MGA0021, MGA0083, WLF0001, WLF0025, WLF0033
496	Benewah County Commissioners	Buell	Jack	FRE0013, TBR0002
427	Blue Ribbon Coalition	Hawthorne	Brian	ACC0001, ACC0009, ACC0091, ACC0104, ACC0115, COL0010, MGA0014, MGA0022, MGA0041, PRO0030, SCI0036
3	Bonner County Commissioners	Young Phillips Dye	Joseph Marcia Karl	FRE0013, FRE0015, SOE0011
4	Boundary County Commissioners	Smith Dinning Kirby	Ronald Dan Walt	FRE0013, FRE0015, SOE0011
514	Boundary County Commissioners	Smith Dinning Kirby	Ronald Dan Walt	FRE0020, IRA0009, MGA0025, MGA0032, MGA0081, MGA0096
417	Bull River Watershed Council	Ferguson	Kathy	ACC0001, ACC0025, FRE0019, MGA0039, MGA0053
324	Cabinet Mountains Pika Club	Clough	Charlie	MGA0013, MGA0021
58	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	Gordon	Don	ACC0096, REG0001

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
355	Capitol Trail Vehicle Association	Salo	Ken	ACC0001, ACC0002, ACC0004, ACC0006, ACC0007, ACC0009, ACC0015, ACC0034, ACC0041, ACC0047, ACC0049, ACC0052, ACC0053, ACC0054, ACC0056, ACC0060, ACC0062, ACC0063, ACC0080, ACC0084, ACC0085, ACC0087, ACC0091, ACC0093, ACC0096, ACC0097, ACC0101, ACC0103, ACC0105, ACC0106, ACC0109, ACC0110, ACC0111, ACC0112, ACC0113, ACC0129, COL0009, COL0010, COL0011, COL0012, EDT0003, EDT0015, EDT0019, IRA0009, LND0001, MGA0005, MIN0005, PRL0001, PRL0012, PRO0014, PRO0015, PRO0020, PRO0032, PRO0033, REG0006, REG0014, REG0035, REG0039, REG0040, REG0042, SCI0009, SCI0015, SCI0017, SCI0020, SCI0021, SCI0022, SCI0023, SCI0024, SCI0028, SCI0029, SCI0031, SCI0037, SOE0006, SOE0009, VEG0017, WAT0027, WLF0020, WLF0055, WLF0064
319	Coeur D'Alene Tribe	Matheson	Quanah	HRT0003, TBL0001, TBL0006
457	Coeur D'Alene Tribe	Matheson	Quanah	HRT0003, TBL0005
456	Coeur D'Alene Tribe	Nomee	Alfred	ACC0039, ACC0091, AIR0002, EDT0003, EDT0011, EDT0013, EDT0014, HRT0001, LND0005, MGA0007, MON0001, REG0009, REG0010, REG0011, SOE0001, SOE0006, SOE0014, TBL0003, TBL0004, TBL0008, TBR0009, VEG0006, VEG0043, WAT0001, WAT0021, WLF0046, WLF0061, WLF0063
508	Conservation Research and Management Consulting Services (for MWA)	Jacobs	Michael	EDT0039
6	Dept. of Environmental Quality	Bergquist	June	EDT0066, EDT0067, WAT0031, WAT0034, WAT0037, WAT0038, WAT0039, WAT0049
73	FH Stoltze & Lumber Co	Roady	Chuck	ACC0001, ACC0041, ACC0046, TBR0002, TBR0023
331	FH Stoltze Lumber	Buentemeier	Ron	ACC0001, EMS0005, GLO0004, MGA0051, PRO0007, PRO0014, REG0006, SOE0006, TBR0025, TBR0026, TBR0035, TBR0037, VEG0035, VEG0057
499	Flathead Lutheran Bible Camp	Ells	Aaron	LND0010
97	Foundation for North American Wild Sheep	Thagard	Neil	

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
424	Friends of Scotchman Peaks	Hough	Phil	ACC0014, ACC0083, MGA0013, MGA0021, MGA0024, MGA0073, MGA0099, PRO0006, WLF0002, WLF0033
506	Friends of the Clearwater	Macfarlane Poplawsky	Gary Al	COL0010, EDT0053, EMS0001, EMS0002, FRE0017, IRA0002, IRA0008, IRA0010, IRA0012, IRA0013, IRA0022, IRA0024, MGA0003, MGA0010, MGA0024, MGA0035, MGA0052, MGA0069, MGA0103, PRO0016, REG0001, REG0006, REG0028, REG0029, SCI0002, SCI0017, SCI0034, TBR0043, TBR0044, VEG0006, VEG0013, VEG0014, VEG0021, VEG0030, VEG0043, VEG0059, VEG0080, WAT0010
44	FSEEE	Fink	Marc	EDT0052, REG0001, REG0005, REG0006
378	Great Burn Study Group	Dupree	Beverly	EDT0047, IRA0009, MGA0008, MGA0024, MGA0068, WLF0018
67	Idaho ATV Association Inc	Jones	William	ACC0001, MGA0022
339	Idaho Conservation League and Wilderness Society	Oppenheimer	Jonathan	ACC0014, ACC0016, ACC0082, ACC0086, ACC0090, ACC0107, AIR0002, EDT0057, GRZ0007, IRA0001, IRA0002, IRA0008, IRA0009, IRA0011, IRA0012, IRA0016, IRA0019, IRA0020, IRA0022, IRA0024, LND0003, MGA0035, MGA0045, MGA0048, MGA0049, MGA0057, MGA0067, MGA0073, MGA0085, MGA0092, MIN0011, PRO0001, REG0001, REG0004, REG0005, REG0006, REG0014, REG0024, REG0025, REG0026, REG0027, REG0028, SOE0005, SOE0006, TBR0014, VEG0009, VEG0014, VEG0035, VEG0053, VEG0068, VEG0076, VEG0077, VEG0080, VEG0081, WAT0005, WAT0043, WAT0046, WAT0047, WAT0048, WAT0055, WLF0006, WLF0021, WLF0025, WLF0039, WLF0052

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
465	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	Corsi	Chip	ACC0018, ACC0036, ACC0091, EDT0003, EDT0022, EDT0026, EDT0029, EDT0058, EDT0072, FRE0006, FRE0017, GRZ0002, GRZ0003, LND0009, MIN0007, MIN0010, MIN0011, MON0003, SCI0012, SCI0019, SCI0033, TBR0024, TBR0035, VEG0006, VEG0043, VEG0053, VEG0063, WAT0016, WAT0021, WAT0030, WLF0031, WLF0032, WLF0034, WLF0035, WLF0041, WLF0042, WLF0056, WLF0065
384	Idaho Dept of Lands	Furman	Richard	ACC0037, EDT0001, EDT0003, EDT0017, EMS0006, SCI0036, TBR0017, TBR0025, TBR0035, TBR0037, VEG0035, VEG0065, VEG0067, VEG0076, VEG0083, WAT0033
362	Idaho Forest Owners Association	Pence	Arleen	EDT0018, FRE0002, FRE0009, TBR0023, TBR0024, VEG0024
101	Idaho State Snowmobile Association	Mitchell	Sandra	COL0002
176	Idaho Water Resource Board	Rigby	Jerry	EDT0040, PRO0026
379	Idaho Women in Timber	McAvoy	Jackie	FRE0002, SOE0006, TBR0024, VEG0027
467	Intermountain Forest Association	Howarth	Serena	FRE0007, FRE0009, FRE0010, FRE0020, MGA0073, REG0006, TBR0002, TBR0023, TBR0037, VEG0006, VEG0071
64	International Mountain Bicycling Association	Cook	Christopher	ACC0009, ACC0025, ACC0029, ACC0036, ACC0054, COL0010, COL0015, EDT0051, IRA0002, IRA0011, IRA0024, MGA0014, PRL0010, PRO0027, PRO0029, PRO0030, REG0001, REG0036, SCI0003, SCI0028, SOE0005
216	International Mountain Bicycling Association	Dice	Jenn	ACC0025, ACC0026, MGA0040, MGA0105, REG0036
373	International Mountain Bicycling Association	Dice	Jenn	ACC0025, ACC0027, ACC0028, EDT0048, MGA0041, REG0036
423	Kinnikinnick Chapter Idaho Native Plant Society	Hough	Phil	ACC0018, IRA0001, MGA0021, MGA0085, MGA0087, MGA0099, TBR0034, VEG0024, VEG0035, VEG0053, VEG0065
2	Kootenai County Commissioners	Johnson Currie Brodie	Gus Elmer Katie	FRE0010, FRE0013, FRE0015, SOE0011
386	Kootenai Environmental Alliance	Mihelich	Mike	EDT0063, EMS0006, MON0007, REG0001, REG0012, REG0019, SCI0008, SCI0015, TBR0035, TBR0043, VEG0043, WAT0056
284	Kootenai River Development Council, Inc	Rumelhart	Paul	SOE0006, TBR0002

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
60	Kootenai Tribe of Idaho	Porter	Jennifer	IRA0014, MGA0025, MGA0039, MGA0093, TBL0005, TBL0007
422	Lands Council	Peterson	Mike	ACC0108, COL0010, COL0014, EDT0033, EDT0041, MGA0021, MON0005, OFP0001, OFP0002, OFP0003, SCI0005, VEG0035, WAT0005, WAT0008, WAT0017, WAT0030, WAT0035, WAT0044, WLF0052
11	Lester School		Emily	WLF0025
14	Lester School		Sidney	WLF0025
413	Lincoln County Board of County Commissioners	Konzen	John	ACC0001, FRE0007, FRE0009, MGA0053, MGA0066, PRO0018, SCI0026, SOE0011, TBR0002, TBR0023, TBR0025, TBR0038, VEG0017
266	Montana Department of Environmental Quality	Ray	Robert	WAT0006, WAT0011, WAT0023, WAT0024, WAT0030, WAT0034, WAT0036, WAT0044, WAT0045, WAT0052, WAT0053
336	Montana Dept. of Natural Resource Committee	Sexton	Mary	ACC0002, ACC0035, ACC0045, ACC0097, ACC0108, FRE0013, FRE0020, IRA0007, LND0013, MGA0025, MGA0066, MGA0082, REG0012, TBR0002, TBR0009, TBR0023, TBR0024, TBR0025, TBR0037, VEG0043, VEG0071, WAT0006, WAT0009, WAT0011, WAT0012, WAT0034, WAT0041, WAT0048, WAT0049, WLF0045
517	Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks	Satterfield, Jr	James	ACC0101, IRA0008, IRA0009, LND0014, MGA0021, MGA0039, MGA0083, MGA0085, MGA0108, TBR0041, WAT0048, WAT0060, WAT0061, WLF0002, WLF0006, WLF0062
254	Montana Logging Association	Altemus	Julia	EDT0028, EDT0031, FRE0010, MGA0051, REG0006, SOE0006, TBR0009, TBR0024, TBR0025, TBR0034, TBR0035, TBR0037, TBR0051, VEG0006, VEG0008, VEG0027, VEG0035, VEG0057, WAT0029, WAT0048
281	Montana State Senate	Weinberg	Dan	MGA0021
217	Montana Wilderness Association	Hadden	Dave	MGA0021
202	Montana Wilderness Association	Hernandez	Cesar	COL0015

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
387	Montana Wilderness Association & Cabinet Resource Group	Hernandez	Cesar	ACC0001, ACC0083, ACC0095, ACC0116, EDT0036, EDT0043, EDT0045, EDT0050, EDT0065, EDT0072, EMS0007, FRE0001, FRE0021, FRE0025, FRE0026, IRA0006, MGA0021, MGA0039, MGA0083, MON0002, PRO0006, REG0001, REG0022, REG0041, SOE0006, TBR0002, VEG0017, VEG0020, VEG0087, WAT0007, WAT0034, WAT0036, WLF0001, WLF0018, WLF0033, WLF0044, WLF0046, WLF0057
299	Montana Women in Timber	Keller	Sheila	ACC0001, MGA0002, PRO0003, PRO0004, SCI0016, TBR0034, TBR0038
282	Montana Wood Products Association	Engstedt	Ellen	REG0006, SOE0006, TBR0025, TBR0037
219	Mountain States Legal Foundation & Communities for a Great Northwest	Opsahl	Ronald	EDT0055, REG0025
7	Northwest Access Alliance	Bratlie	Norm	ACC0011, ACC0020, ACC0073, ACC0074, ACC0075, ACC0083, ACC0129, EDT0076, EDT0079, MGA0005, MGA0068, MGA0070
415	NW Environmental Defense Center	Strong	Katie	REG0001, REG0005, REG0006
1	Predator Conservation Alliance	Gaillard	David	SCI0004, WLF0018
342	Riley Creek Timber	Boeh	RE (Bob)	FRE0009, VEG0006, VEG0057
199	Rocky Mountain Ecosystem Service	Andersen	Ted	FRE0012, FRE0023, LND0007, LND0008, LND0009
157	Save Our Earth	Leonard	Marion	MGA0013, VEG0004, WLF0066
468	Selkirk Conservation Alliance	Sedler	Liz	ACC0037, IRA0002, IRA0008, IRA0028, REG0001, REG0005, REG0006, SCI0013, SCI0025, VEG0043, WAT0001, WAT0013, WAT0015, WAT0042, WLF0026, WLF0049, WLF0050, WLF0052
5	Shoshone County Commissioners	Cantamessa Vergobbi	Jon Jim	FRE0013, FRE0015, SOE0011
460	Sierra Club	Clark	Bob	ACC0036, IRA0008, IRA0009, IRA0011, IRA0014, REG0001, SCI0010, WAT0048, WLF0009, WLF0016, WLF0033
421	Sierra Club- Upper Columbia River Group (Center for Justice)	Osborn	John	ACC0037, IRA0002, MGA0092, SCI0030, WAT0008, WAT0020, WAT0041
152	Smurfit-Stone Container Corp	Mountjoy	Jim	MGA0050, MIN0005, SOE0006, TBR0009, TBR0023, VEG0027
252	Snowmobile Alliance of Western States	Hurwitz	Dave	MGA0002, MGA0013, MGA0022, MGA0040, MGA0077

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
434	Spokane Mountaineers	Ream	Lorna	ACC0083, ACC0109, ACC0115, FRE0012, GRZ0001, IRA0002, LND0002, MGA0020, MGA0021, SOE0005, TBR0024, TBR0046, VEG0006, VEG0009, VEG0026, VEG0035, VEG0067, WAT0010, WAT0012, WLF0007, WLF0044
174	Spokane Mountaineers Conservation Committee	Ashmore	Andrew	MGA0024
168	TIMBER	Newman	Steve	ACC0111, EDT0070, EDT0078, FRE0001, REG0012, SOE0006, TBR0002, TBR0009, TBR0031, VEG0026, VEG0035, VEG0042, WAT0014, WLF0024
425	Treasure State Alliance	Osterman	Craig	ACC0001, FRE0009, MGA0041, TBR0038, WLF0056
57	Troy & Libby Snowmobile Clubs	Wandler	Jerry	ACC0013, ACC0112, EDT0037, EDT0038, MGA0022, MGA0039, MGA0041, MGA0060, MGA0063, MGA0077, MGA0078, MGA0080
59	Troy & Libby Snowmobile Clubs	Wandler	Jerry	ACC0013, ACC0112, EDT0034, IRA0009, MGA0022, MGA0039, MGA0041, MGA0073, MGA0077, MGA0104
257	US Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	Wardell	John	ACC0018, ACC0036, ACC0040, ACC0083, ACC0086, ACC0095, ACC0097, ACC0098, AIR0001, EDT0060, EDT0083, GLO0003, GRZ0001, GRZ0002, GRZ0004, GRZ0005, IRA0016, MGA0049, MGA0056, MGA0099, MIN0002, MIN0003, MON0001, MON0002, VEG0053, WAT0001, WAT0006, WAT0012, WAT0013, WAT0015, WAT0018, WAT0019, WAT0023, WAT0034, WAT0041, WAT0044
197	US Environmental Protection Agency Region 10	Reichgott	Christine	ACC0010, ACC0036, ACC0039, ACC0040, ACC0051, ACC0083, ACC0095, ACC0097, ACC0101, ACC0121, ACC0125, ACC0126, AIR0001, EDT0020, EDT0062, EMS0006, FRE0010, FRE0024, GLO0003, GLO0005, GRZ0001, GRZ0006, IRA0016, MIN0003, MIN0006, MIN0011, TBR0024, TBR0035, TBR0041, VEG0014, VEG0053, VEG0065, WAT0001, WAT0012, WAT0018, WAT0020, WAT0022, WAT0030, WAT0031, WAT0040, WAT0041, WAT0043, WAT0049
45	USDI	Stewart	Robert	MGA0023
271	USDI Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance	Sleeger	Preston	EDT0027

Analysis of Public Comment

#	Organization	Last Name	First Name	PC Statement #'s
458	Washington Department of Ecology	Parodi	Jean	IRA0030, WAT0018
294	Wild West Inst, Lands Council	Juel	Jeff	EMS0001, IRA0008, IRA0011, MGA0003, MGA0041, MON0005, OFP0001, OFP0003, REG0001, REG0006, REG0028, SCI0015, SOE0005, TBR0009, VEG0053, VEG0082, WAT0010, WLF0004, WLF0046
48	Yaak Valley Forest Council	Bass	Rick	COL0006, COL0010, IRA0008, IRA0018, MGA0021, VEG0061, VEG0062
37	Yaak Valley Forest Council	Canepa	Sarah	COL0006, IRA0008, MGA0021, PRO0006, SCI0032, WLF0002
293	Yaak Valley Forest Council	Canepa	Sarah	ACC0015, ACC0018, ACC0023, ACC0069, CCI0002, COL0006, FRE0006, FRE0021, IRA0001, IRA0002, IRA0008, MGA0010, MGA0021, MGA0081, MGA0083, MON0002, MON0004, OFP0001, OFP0003, REG0001, SOE0014, TBR0005, TBR0034, TBR0055, VEG0006, VEG0035, VEG0053, VEG0065, WAT0006, WAT0025, WAT0046, WAT0054, WLF0002, WLF0018, WLF0025, WLF0044, WLF0060
459	Yaak Valley Forest Council	Canepa	Sarah	IRA0008

Appendix B – Content Analysis Process and Coding Structure

Content Analysis Process

Analysis of the public comments was completed is a systematic approach of compiling and categorizing all viewpoints and concerns that were submitted. Every comment letter and/or petition that was unique and substantially different was logged into the Comment Log (see Appendix A). It is very important to remember that the comment period is not a vote-counting process; the most useful comments are those that are unique, substantially different, and suggest specific changes to the Proposed LMPs and Monitoring program.

The steps outlined in the Introduction of this report (Process Used to Analyze Public Comments) explain the process used in handling the comment letters. Form letters, emails, postcards, faxes and petitions were processed differently. Hereinafter, when the reference is to “form” it includes letters, emails, postcards, faxes, and petitions. Following is the process that was used:

- **Step 1:** The first “form” that was received was assigned a communication number (i.e., F1), entered into the Comment Log, and subsequently coded and entered into the database. Other, new “forms” were then assigned subsequent numbers (i.e., F2). If the originator of the form letter was known, that name and/or organization was entered into the database for that first “form.”
- **Step 2:** All “forms” that were similar to the first “form” received were read to determine if there were unique and substantially different comments contained in the “form.” If there were substantially different comments in the “form,” it was then entered into the Comment Log and followed the process in Step 1. If there were not substantially different comments in the “form,” that “form” was included in our planning record but not entered into the Comment Log or database because: a) the decisionmakers and planning team were looking for unique and substantially different comments and for the most part, these “forms” repeated the same comments in the initial “form;” b) the public comment period is not a vote-counting process; and c) at times, respondents may not have been aware that they were submitting a comment through a “form” (see explanation in Planning Record about “spam email”).
- **Step 3:** For some of the “forms” that were emailed or faxed, the process was further modified due to the volume of emails and faxes received. Form letters that were faxed or emailed were read to determine if there were unique and substantially different comments. If not, the screen from the KIPZ email inbox was printed, which contained the senders email address and subject of their email. This information can be found in the planning record.
- **Step 4:** Petitions were entered into the database and identified by the “petition initiator” (if known). Comments in the petition were coded and entered into the database. Each petitioner’s name was not entered into the database; however, the petition is part of the Planning Record.

Following is a brief description of each “form” letter and/or petition that was received either by postal mail, email, and/or fax and how it was processed:

F1: This postcard was received via postal mail and Steps 1 and 2 were followed in processing these postcards. The postcards contained comments specific to the Kootenai National Forest.

F2: This letter was received via postal mail, email, and fax; and many duplicates of the same letter were received using all three methods of mailing. Steps 1-3 were followed in processing these emails and

faxes. The significant volume of these faxes resulted in mechanical failure of some fax machines (note: faxes were sent to different locations and recipients across the region). The subject line of the email/fax was either “Protect the Cabinet-Yaak Wildlands” or “Proposed Land Management Plan;” however, the content of most of the letters was the same. These emails/faxes contained comments specific to the Kootenai National Forest.

F3: This letter was received via postal mail and Steps 1 and 2 were followed in processing these letters. These letters contained a checklist for the respondent to complete and comments were specific to the Kootenai National Forest.

F4: This letter was received via postal mail and Steps 1 and 2 were followed in processing these letters. These letters contained a checklist for the respondent to complete and comments were specific to the Idaho Panhandle National Forests.

F5: This letter was received via email and generated from a Montana Wilderness Association web site (www.nationalforestation.org) where respondents used the website to create a letter through the selection of a “menu of paragraphs.” Respondents/website users also had an option to include personal and specific comments. Steps 1 and 2 were followed in processing these emails; however, the entire list of possible paragraphs from the website was utilized as the comment letter for coding. These emails contained comments specific to the Kootenai National Forest.

F6: This letter was received via email and Steps 1-3 were followed in processing these emails. The subject line varied by email but most all emails contained the same comments. The email subject line included: “Changing wilderness recommendation is a bad idea”; or “Restore wilderness recommendations to Forest Plan;” or “We (I) value the wilderness recommendation;” or “Weaker wildlands category is no substitute.” These emails contained comments specific to the Kootenai National Forest.

F7: This postcard was received via postal mail and Steps 1 and 2 were followed in processing these postcards. These postcards contained comments specific to the Idaho Panhandle National Forests.

F8: This letter was received via postal mail and was generated by an individual. A few other respondents used different paragraphs from this letter. Steps 1 and 2 were followed in processing these letters. These letters contained comments specific to the Idaho Panhandle National Forests.

F9: This letter was received via postal mail and Steps 1 and 2 were followed in processing these letters. These letters contained comments specific to the Idaho Panhandle National Forests.

F10: This letter was received via postal mail and Steps 1 and 2 were followed in processing these letters. The two letters contained comments specific to the Kootenai National Forest.

F11: This letter was received via postal mail and Steps 1 and 2 were followed in processing these letters. The letters contained comments specific to the Kootenai National Forest.

F12: This letter was received via email and Steps 1-3 were followed in processing these emails. The subject line in the emails varied slightly but usually contained the following: “Protect Potential Wilderness Lands: Idaho Panhandle National Forest Comments.” The emails contained comments specific to the Idaho Panhandle National Forests.

F13: This letter was received via postal mail and Steps 1 and 2 were followed in processing these letters. There was a long and a short version of the letter; however, both versions addressed the same concerns. The letters contained comments specific to the Kootenai National Forest.

F14: This letter was received via postal mail and Steps 1 and 2 were followed in processing these letters. This letter consisted of statements followed by “Agree,” “Disagree,” and “No Opinion,” giving the respondent the opportunity to circle their answer. The letters contained comments specific to the Kootenai National Forest.

F15: This postcard was received via postal mail and Steps 1 and 2 were followed in processing these letters. These postcards contained comments specific to the Idaho Panhandle National Forests.

F16: This letter was received via postal mail and Steps 1 and 2 were followed in processing these letters. It consisted of paragraphs from other form letters that were received. These letters contained comments specific to the Idaho Panhandle National Forests.

F17: This letter was received via postal mail and Steps 1 and 2 were followed in processing these letters. These letters contained comments specific to the Kootenai National Forest.

P1: This petition was from the Idaho Conservation League and Step 4 was followed in processing this petition. This petition contained comments specific to the Idaho Panhandle National Forests.

P2: This petition was generated by regular attendees of the Yaak workgroup meetings and Step 4 was followed in processing this petition. This petition contained comments specific to the Kootenai National Forest.

P3: This petition was from the Yaak Valley Forest Council and Step 4 was followed in processing this petition. This petition contained comments specific to the Kootenai National Forest.

Coding Structure

Following is the list of the Subject and Category Codes that were assigned to each of the unique and substantially different comments contained in the letters that are in the comment log tables (Appendix A) and was used to sort and lump the comments. The subject codes are used in every section in this report, including the Public Concern Statements.

SUBJECT	CATEGORY and DEFINITION/DESCRIPTION	SUB CODE	CAT CODE
ACCESS and RECREATION			
Chapter 1			
ACCESS & REC	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Motorized (summer)	ACC	2100
ACCESS & REC	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Motorized (winter)	ACC	2101
ACCESS & REC	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Mechanized	ACC	2102
ACCESS & REC	Forestwide Desired Condition-- Non-Motorized (summer and winter)	ACC	2103
ACCESS & REC	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Roads	ACC	2104
ACCESS & REC	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Trails	ACC	2105
ACCESS & REC	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Developed recreation	ACC	2106
ACCESS & REC	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Dispersed recreation	ACC	2107
ACCESS & REC	Bull GA Desired Condition (KNF)	ACC	2200
ACCESS & REC	Clark GA Desired Condition (KNF)	ACC	2201
ACCESS & REC	Koocanusa/Tobacco GA Desired Condition (KNF)	ACC	2202
ACCESS & REC	Libby GA Desired Condition (KNF)	ACC	2203
ACCESS & REC	Yaak GA Desired Condition (KNF)	ACC	2204
ACCESS & REC	Cda GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	ACC	2205
ACCESS & REC	Lower Kootenai GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	ACC	2206
ACCESS & REC	Pend Oreille GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	ACC	2207
ACCESS & REC	Priest GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	ACC	2208
ACCESS & REC	St. Joe GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	ACC	2209
ACCESS & REC	Monitoring	ACC	2300
Chapter 2			
ACCESS & REC	Forestwide Suitability	ACC	2400
ACCESS & REC	Objectives	ACC	2500
Chapter 3			
ACCESS & REC	Guidelines	ACC	2600
ACCESS & REC	Other sources of design criteria	ACC	2700
ACCESS & REC	Comprehensive Evaluation Report (CER)	ACC	2800
ACCESS & REC	Other - All comments that don't fit into any above categories	ACC	2900
INVENTORIED ROADLESS AREAS			
INVENTORIED ROADLESS AREAS	Sources of Design Criteria i.e., inventoried roadless areas and roadless areas	IRA	3100
INVENTORIED ROADLESS AREAS	Allocation i.e., IRAs should be recommended wilderness, IRAs should be MA6 etc	IRA	3101

SUBJECT	CATEGORY and DEFINITION/DESCRIPTION	SUB CODE	CAT CODE
INVENTORIED ROADLESS AREAS	General i.e., wilderness evaluation process (process to inventory the IRAs for being recommended for wilderness)	IRA	3102
VEGETATION			
Chapter 1			
VEGETATION	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Vegetation Attributes (species/dominance type, size class/age, HRV = range of variation and historic variability, historical regimes, and forest health)	VEG	4100
VEGETATION	Forestwide Desired Condition—Old Growth	VEG	4101
VEGETATION	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Disturbance (fire, insects & disease)	VEG	4102
VEGETATION	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Down wood (coarse woody debris)	VEG	4103
VEGETATION	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Landscape Pattern (patch size)	VEG	4104
VEGETATION	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Plants (Threatened, Species of Concern-SOC, Species of Interest-SOI and Appendix A in the Plan)	VEG	4105
VEGETATION	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Noxious Weeds (Invasive Plants)	VEG	4106
VEGETATION	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) (Condition class 1, 2 and 3 – See Glossary)	VEG	4107
VEGETATION	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Fire Regime (5 natural fire regimes – I, II, III, IV, and V – see Glossary)	VEG	4108
VEGETATION	Bull GA Desired Condition (KNF)	VEG	4200
VEGETATION	Clark GA Desired Condition (KNF)	VEG	4201
VEGETATION	Koocanusa/Tobacco GA Desired Condition (KNF)	VEG	4202
VEGETATION	Libby GA Desired Condition (KNF)	VEG	4203
VEGETATION	Yaak GA Desired Condition (KNF)	VEG	4204
VEGETATION	Cda GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	VEG	4205
VEGETATION	Lower Kootenai GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	VEG	4206
VEGETATION	Pend Oreille GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	VEG	4207
VEGETATION	Priest GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	VEG	4208
VEGETATION	St. Joe GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	VEG	4209
VEGETATION	Monitoring	VEG	4300
Chapter 2			
VEGETATION	Objectives	VEG	4400
Chapter 3			
VEGETATION	Guidelines – Old Growth	VEG	4500
VEGETATION	Guidelines – Plants	VEG	4501
VEGETATION	Guidelines – Down Wood	VEG	4502
VEGETATION	Other sources of design criteria	VEG	4600
VEGETATION	Comprehensive Evaluation Report (CER)	VEG	4700
VEGETATION	Other - All comments that don't fit into any above categories	VEG	4800
TIMBER			
Chapter 1			
TIMBER	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Long-term Sustained Yield (LTSYC)	TBR	5100

SUBJECT	CATEGORY and DEFINITION/DESCRIPTION	SUB CODE	CAT CODE
TIMBER	Forestwide Desired Condition—Restocking	TBR	5101
TIMBER	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Other	TBR	5102
TIMBER	Bull GA Desired Condition (KNF)	TBR	5200
TIMBER	Clark GA Desired Condition (KNF)	TBR	5201
TIMBER	Koocanusa/Tobacco GA Desired Condition (KNF)	TBR	5202
TIMBER	Libby GA Desired Condition (KNF)	TBR	5203
TIMBER	Yaak GA Desired Condition (KNF)	TBR	5204
TIMBER	Cda GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	TBR	5205
TIMBER	Lower Kootenai GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	TBR	5206
TIMBER	Pend Oreille GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	TBR	5207
TIMBER	Priest GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	TBR	5208
TIMBER	St. Joe GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	TBR	5209
TIMBER	Monitoring	TBR	5300
Chapter 2			
TIMBER	Forestwide Suitability	TBR	5400
TIMBER	Objectives (harvest levels, Total Sale Program Quantity - TSPQ)	TBR	5500
Chapter 3			
TIMBER	Guidelines	TBR	5600
TIMBER	Other sources of design criteria	TBR	5700
TIMBER	Comprehensive Evaluation Report (CER)	TBR	5800
TIMBER	Other - All comments that don't fit into any above categories	TBR	5900
FIRE			
Chapter 1			
FIRE	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Wildland Fire Use	FRE	6100
FIRE	Forestwide Desired Condition—Fuel Treatment (Prescribed burning, mechanical treatment)	FRE	6101
FIRE	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) and Communities at Risk and Community Protection Zone	FRE	6102
FIRE	Bull GA Desired Condition (KNF)	FRE	6200
FIRE	Clark GA Desired Condition (KNF)	FRE	6201
FIRE	Koocanusa/Tobacco GA Desired Condition (KNF)	FRE	6202
FIRE	Libby GA Desired Condition (KNF)	FRE	6203
FIRE	Yaak GA Desired Condition (KNF)	FRE	6204
FIRE	Cda GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	FRE	6205
FIRE	Lower Kootenai GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	FRE	6206
FIRE	Pend Oreille GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	FRE	6207
FIRE	Priest GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	FRE	6208
FIRE	St. Joe GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	FRE	6209
FIRE	Monitoring	FRE	6300
Chapter 2			
FIRE	Objectives	FRE	6400
Chapter 3			
FIRE	Guidelines	FRE	6500
FIRE	Other sources of design criteria	FRE	6600
FIRE	Comprehensive Evaluation Report (CER)	FRE	6700
FIRE	Other - All comments that don't fit into any above categories	FRE	6800

SUBJECT	CATEGORY and DEFINITION/DESCRIPTION	SUB CODE	CAT CODE
WILDLIFE			
Chapter 1			
WILDLIFE	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Habitat (general)	WLF	7100
WILDLIFE	Forestwide Desired Condition – Habitat (Snags and Downwood)	WLF	7101
WILDLIFE	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Habitat (Connectivity)	WLF	7102
WILDLIFE	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Habitat (Security)	WLF	7103
WILDLIFE	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Species (Bald Eagle)	WLF	7104
WILDLIFE	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Species (Gray Wolf)	WLF	7105
WILDLIFE	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Species (Canada Lynx)	WLF	7106
WILDLIFE	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Species (Grizzly bear)	WLF	7107
WILDLIFE	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Species (Caribou)	WLF	7108
WILDLIFE	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Species of Interest (SOI) and Species of Concern (SOC) (Also in App. A of Plan)	WLF	7109
WILDLIFE	Bull GA Desired Condition (KNF)	WLF	7200
WILDLIFE	Clark GA Desired Condition (KNF)	WLF	7201
WILDLIFE	Koocanusa/Tobacco GA Desired Condition (KNF)	WLF	7202
WILDLIFE	Libby GA Desired Condition (KNF)	WLF	7203
WILDLIFE	Yaak GA Desired Condition (KNF)	WLF	7204
WILDLIFE	Cda GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	WLF	7205
WILDLIFE	Lower Kootenai GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	WLF	7206
WILDLIFE	Pend Oreille GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	WLF	7207
WILDLIFE	Priest GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	WLF	7208
WILDLIFE	St. Joe GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	WLF	7209
WILDLIFE	Monitoring	WLF	7300
Chapter 2			
WILDLIFE	Objectives	WLF	7400
Chapter 3			
WILDLIFE	Guidelines - General	WLF	7500
WILDLIFE	Guidelines – Grizzly Bear	WLF	7501
WILDLIFE	Guidelines – Bald Eagle	WLF	7502
WILDLIFE	Guidelines – Gray Wolf	WLF	7503
WILDLIFE	Guidelines – Caribou	WLF	7504
WILDLIFE	Guidelines – Species of Concern, species of interest	WLF	7505
WILDLIFE	Guidelines – Bats	WLF	7506
WILDLIFE	Guidelines – Big game	WLF	7507
WILDLIFE	Other sources of design criteria	WLF	7600
WILDLIFE	Comprehensive Evaluation Report (CER)	WLF	7700
WILDLIFE	Other - All comments that don't fit into any above categories	WLF	7800
WATERSHEDS, RIPARIAN, SOIL, & AQUATIC SPECIES			
Chapter 1			
WATERSHED	Forestwide Desired Condition -- IPNF Watersheds	WAT	8100
WATERSHED	Forestwide Desired Condition – KNF Watersheds	WAT	8101
WATERSHED	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Soil	WAT	8102
WATERSHED	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Riparian	WAT	8103
WATERSHED	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Aquatic Habitat (Streams)	WAT	8104

SUBJECT	CATEGORY and DEFINITION/DESCRIPTION	SUB CODE	CAT CODE
WATERSHED	Forestwide Desired Condition -- Aquatic Species (TES, SOC/SOI & Also App. A of the Plan)	WAT	8105
WATERSHED	Bull GA Desired Condition (KNF)	WAT	8200
WATERSHED	Clark GA Desired Condition (KNF)	WAT	8201
WATERSHED	Koocanusa/Tobacco GA Desired Condition (KNF)	WAT	8202
WATERSHED	Libby GA Desired Condition (KNF)	WAT	8203
WATERSHED	Yaak GA Desired Condition (KNF)	WAT	8204
WATERSHED	Cda GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	WAT	8205
WATERSHED	Lower Kootenai GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	WAT	8206
WATERSHED	Pend Oreille GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	WAT	8207
WATERSHED	Priest GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	WAT	8208
WATERSHED	St. Joe GA Desired Condition (IPNF)	WAT	8209
WATERSHED	Monitoring – IPNF Watersheds	WAT	8300
WATERSHED	Monitoring – KNF Watersheds	WAT	8301
WATERSHED	Monitoring –Watersheds (when a forest isn't identified)	WAT	8302
WATERSHED	Monitoring – Soil	WAT	8303
WATERSHED	Monitoring – Aquatic Species	WAT	8304
Chapter 2			
WATERSHED	Forestwide Suitability – Riparian	WAT	8400
WATERSHED	Objectives – IPNF Watersheds	WAT	8500
WATERSHED	Objectives – KNF Watersheds	WAT	8501
WATERSHED	Objectives – Watersheds (when a forest isn't identified)	WAT	8502
WATERSHED	Objectives – Soil	WAT	8503
WATERSHED	Objectives – Aquatic Species	WAT	8504
Chapter 3			
WATERSHED	Guidelines – IPNF Watersheds	WAT	8600
WATERSHED	Guidelines – KNF Watersheds	WAT	8601
WATERSHED	Guidelines – Watersheds (when a forest isn't identified)	WAT	8602
WATERSHED	Guidelines – Soil	WAT	8603
WATERSHED	Guidelines – Aquatic Species	WAT	8604
WATERSHED	Other sources of design criteria	WAT	8700
WATERSHED	Comprehensive Evaluation Report (CER)	WAT	8800
WATERSHED	Other - All comments that don't fit into any above categories	WAT	8900
TRIBAL (American Indian rights and interest)			
TRIBAL	Forestwide Desired Condition	TBL	9100
TRIBAL	Monitoring	TBL	9101
TRIBAL	Objectives	TBL	9102
TRIBAL	Guidelines	TBL	9103
TRIBAL	Other Design Criteria	TBL	9104
TRIBAL	Other	TBL	9105
COOPERATION/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT			
COOPERATION	Forestwide Desired Condition	CCI	9200
COOPERATION	Other	CCI	9201

SUBJECT	CATEGORY and DEFINITION/DESCRIPTION	SUB CODE	CAT CODE
GRAZING			
GRAZING	Forestwide Desired Condition	GRZ	9300
GRAZING	Objectives	GRZ	9301
GRAZING	Guidelines	GRZ	9302
GRAZING	Other Design Criteria	GRZ	9303
GRAZING	Forestwide suitability	GRZ	9304
GRAZING	CER	GRZ	9305
GRAZING	Other	GRZ	9306
HERITAGE			
HERITAGE	Forestwide Desired Condition	HRT	9400
HERITAGE	Monitoring	HRT	9401
HERITAGE	Objectives	HRT	9402
HERITAGE	Guidelines	HRT	9403
HERITAGE	Other Design Criteria	HRT	9404
HERITAGE	Other	HRT	9405
LANDS AND SPECIAL USES			
LANDS/SU	Forestwide Desired Condition	LND	9500
LANDS/SU	Guidelines	LND	9501
LANDS/SU	Other Design Criteria	LND	9502
LANDS/SU	Forestwide suitability – Utility corridors	LND	9503
LANDS/SU	Forestwide suitability – Communication sites	LND	9504
LANDS/SU	Other	LND	9505
MINERALS			
MINERALS	Forestwide Desired Condition	MIN	9600
MINERALS	Monitoring	MIN	9601
MINERALS	Objectives	MIN	9602
MINERALS	Other Design Criteria	MIN	9603
MINERALS	Forestwide suitability	MIN	9604
MINERALS	Other	MIN	9605
OTHER FOREST PRODUCTS			
OTHER PRODUCTS	Forestwide Desired Condition	OFF	9700
OTHER PRODUCTS	Other Design Criteria	OFF	9701
OTHER PRODUCTS	Other	OFF	9702
SOCIAL AND ECONOMICS			
SOCIAL/ECON	Forestwide Desired Condition	SOE	9710
SOCIAL/ECON	Monitoring	SOE	9711
SOCIAL/ECON	Objectives	SOE	9712
SOCIAL/ECON	CER	SOE	9713
SOCIAL/ECON	Other	SOE	9714

SUBJECT	CATEGORY and DEFINITION/DESCRIPTION	SUB CODE	CAT CODE
AIR QUALITY			
AIR QUALITY	Guidelines	AIR	9720
AIR QUALITY	Other Design Criteria	AIR	9721
AIR QUALITY	Other	AIR	9722
BUILDINGS, OTHER STRUCTURES			
BUILDINGS	Other Design Criteria	BDG	9730
BUILDINGS	Other	BDG	9731
MANAGEMENT AREAS			
MA 1a – Designated Wilderness	Suitable Uses and Desired Condition	MGA	9800
MA 1a	Changes to Allocations (from >> to) (i.e., Change from MA1a to MA1e)	MGA	9801
MA 1a	Objectives	MGA	9802
MA 1a	Other Design Criteria	MGA	9803
MA 1a	Other	MGA	9804
MA 1b – Recommended Wilderness	Suitable Uses and Desired Condition	MGA	9805
MA 1b – Recommended Wilderness – KNF	KNF – support recommended wilderness, want more recommended wilderness (Scotchman Peaks, Cabinet Peaks Addition, Northwest Peaks, Buckhorn Ridge, Willard Estelle, Ten Lakes, etc.)	MGA	9806
MA 1b – Recommended Wilderness - IPNF	IPNF – support recommended wilderness, want more recommended wilderness (Scotchman Peaks, Mallard Larkins, Grandmother Mtn., Selkirk Crest, Long Canyon, Parker Canyon)	MGA	9807
MA 1b	Changes to Allocations (from >> to)	MGA	9808
MA 1c – Wilderness Study Areas	Suitable Uses and Desired Condition	MGA	9810
MA 1c	Changes to Allocations (from >> to)	MGA	9811
MA 1d – Wild Lands	Suitable Uses and Desired Condition	MGA	9820
MA 1d	Changes to Allocations (from >> to)	MGA	9821
MA 1e – Primitive Lands	Suitable Uses and Desired Condition	MGA	9830
MA 1e	Changes to Allocations (from >> to)	MGA	9831
MA 2a /2b– Designated and Eligible or Suitable Wild & Scenic Rivers	Suitable Uses and Desired Condition	MGA	9840
MA 2a/2b	Changes to Allocations (from >> to)	MGA	9841
MA 2a/2b	Other Design Criteria	MGA	9842
MA 2a/2b	Other	MGA	9843
MA 3 – Special Interest Areas	Suitable Uses and Desired Condition	MGA	9850
MA 3	Changes to Allocations (from >> to)	MGA	9851

SUBJECT	CATEGORY and DEFINITION/DESCRIPTION	SUB CODE	CAT CODE
MA 3	Other Design Criteria	MGA	9852
MA 3	Other	MGA	9853
MA 4a – Research Natural Areas	Suitable Uses and Desired Condition	MGA	9860
MA 4a	Changes to Allocations (from >> to)	MGA	9861
MA 4a	Objectives	MGA	9862
MA 4a	Other Design Criteria	MGA	9863
MA 4a	Other	MGA	9864
MA 4b – Experimental Forests	Suitable Uses and Desired Condition	MGA	9865
MA 4b	Changes to Allocations (from >> to)	MGA	9866
MA 5 – IPNF Backcountry	Suitable Uses and Desired Condition	MGA	9870
MA 5	Changes to Allocations (from >> to)	MGA	9871
MA 5a – KNF nonmotorized summer/winter	Suitable Uses and Desired Condition	MGA	9872
MA 5a	Changes to Allocations (from >> to)	MGA	9873
MA 5b – KNF motorized summer/winter	Suitable Uses and Desired Condition	MGA	9874
MA 5b	Changes to Allocations (from >> to)	MGA	9875
MA 5c – KNF nonmotorized summer, motorized winter	Suitable Uses and Desired Condition	MGA	9876
MA 5c	Changes to Allocations (from >> to)	MGA	9877
MA 6 – General Forest	Suitable Uses and Desired Condition	MGA	9880
MA 6	Changes to Allocations (from >> to)	MGA	9881
MA 7 – Primary Recreation Areas	Suitable Uses and Desired Condition	MGA	9890
MA 7	Changes to Allocations (from >> to)	MGA	9891
MA	General - MA Allocation change (i.e., want Savage Peak non-motorized)	MGA	9892
MA	General – MA Suitability and Desired Conditions	MGA	9893
OTHER			
SCIENCE	Use of best science, adequacy of analysis	SCI	9900
SCIENCE	Adaptive Management	SCI	9901
COLLABORATION	Any public involvement concerns, workgroup concerns etc. This would include requests to extend the comment period. (see Cim/Com Grasslands page 2-1)	COL	9910
EMS	EMS (i.e., audit process)	EMS	9920
GLOSSARY	Glossary	GLO	9930

SUBJECT	CATEGORY and DEFINITION/DESCRIPTION	SUB CODE	CAT CODE
MONITORING	Any monitoring comments not specific to a resource (i.e., public needs to be able to comment on the monitoring Plan)	MON	9940
PROCESS	Decisionmaking and planning process and methods, influences on decisionmaking, coordination with other agencies/tribes, consistency with other agencies	PRO	9950
PROJECT LEVEL	i.e., travel management, close a specific road etc.	PRL	9960
REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS	2005 Planning Rule (i.e., no EIS, consultation, no standards, NEPA tied to the Planning Rule etc.)	REG	9970
REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS	2005 Planning Rule – Plan components (i.e., Goals, vision, strategy, objectives, guidelines)	REG	9971
REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS	Laws, Regulations and Policies (i.e., NFMA, Endangered Species Act etc.)	REG	9980
EDITORIAL COMMENTS	Any comment that is an editorial comment to the Plan.	EDT	9990
ATTACHMENTS	If a comment letter includes any of the following, give the attachment this code (i.e., map, news articles, journals, references, literature etc.)	EDT	9991

Appendix C – Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
AMS	Analysis of the Management Situation
ASQ	Allowable Sale Quantity
ATV	All-terrain Vehicle
AUM	Animal Unit Month
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMP	Best Management Practices
CER	Comprehensive Evaluation Report
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CMAI	Culmination of Mean Annual Increment
CMW	Cabinet Mountains Wilderness
DBH	Diameter Breast Height
DEQ	Department of Environmental Quality
ECA	Equivalent Clearcut Acres
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EMS	Environmental Management System
EMU	Elk Management Unit
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FAR	Functioning at Risk
FLMP	Final Land Management Plan
FS	Forest Service
FSM	Forest Service Manual
FWP	Fish, Wildlife and Parks
GA	Geographic Area
GIS	Geographic Information System
HM	Head Month
HR	House Resolution
HUC	Hydrologic Unit Code
ICBEMP	Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project
IDAPA	Idaho Administrative Procedures Act
IDFG	Idaho Department of Fish and Game
IMBA	International Mountain Bicycling Association
INFS	Inland Native Fish Strategy
IPNF	Idaho Panhandle National Forests
IRA	Inventoried Roadless Area
KIPZ	Kootenai and Idaho Panhandle Planning Zone
KNF	Kootenai National Forest
LMP	Land Management Plan
LTSYC	Long-Term Sustained Yield Calculation

Acronym	Definition
MA	Management Area
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MUSYA	Multiple Use Sustained-yield Act
NCDE	Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NFMA	National Forest Management Act
NNL	National Natural Landmark
NPF	Not Properly Functioning
OHV	Off-highway Vehicle
PC	Public Concern Statement
PLMP	Proposed Land Management Plan
RCA	Riparian Conservation Area
RNA	Research Natural Area
ROS	Recreation Opportunity Spectrum
RTP	Rural Tax Program
SIA	Special Interest Area
SMZ	Streamside Management Zone
TES	Threatened and Endangered Species
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
TSPQ	Timber Sale Program Quantity
US DOT	US Department of Transportation
USFWS	US Fish and Wildlife Service
VRU	Vegetation Response Unit
WQLS	Water Quality Limited Stream
W&SRs	Wild and Scenic Rivers
WSA	Wilderness Study Area
WUI	Wildland Urban Interface

Appendix D – Major Changes from Proposed to Final Land Management Plans

(Completed upon release of the Final Land Management Plans)

Appendix E – List of Preparers

Name	Organizational Unit	Task
Kirsten Kaiser	KIPZ Team Leader	Land Management Plan team leader
Jodi Kramer	KIPZ Public Affairs Officer	Manager for the content analysis and public involvement process, and report/summary preparation
Ellen Frament	KIPZ Analyst	Data analysis, PC statement reports ,and management of the ACCESS database
Nancy Kmonk	Kootenai National Forest	Data entry and management of the COCA database
Patty Johnson, Jonette Johnston-Tubb, and Cindy Johnson	Kootenai National Forest	Data entry
Kristin Whissennand, Judy York, Maple Taylor and Holly Knox	TEAMS Planning Enterprise Unit	Coding comment letters and writing PC statements
Judy York and Lois Ziemann	TEAMS Planning Enterprise Unit	Formatting, editing and cover layout