



# Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement— Roadless Area Conservation; National Forest System Lands in Idaho

**CAT**  
Content  
Analysis  
Team

## Summary of Public Comment—Appendices

5500 West Amelia  
Earhart Drive, Suite 100  
Salt Lake City, UT 84116  
801/517-1020



*The policy of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, religion, sex, disability, familial status, or political affiliation. Persons believing they have been discriminated against in any Forest Service-related activity should write to: Chief, USDA Forest Service, 1400 Independence Ave., SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-0003.*

# Appendix A

## Content Analysis Process

Public responses on the notice of intent (NOI) to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the proposed management of roadless areas on National Forest System (NFS) lands in the State of Idaho were analyzed and categorized using a process called content analysis. The content analysis process consists of sorting responses, analyzing them, entering the analysis into a database, and using database reports to identify issues, topics, and themes that are presented in a *Summary of Public Comment*. The goals of the analysis process are to:

- Ensure that every response is considered.
- Identify the issues raised by respondents.
- Represent the public's viewpoints and concerns as fairly as possible.
- Present those concerns in such a way as to facilitate the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service's (Forest Service's) consideration of comments.

A *response* is a single, whole submission that may take the form of a letter, email, fax, presentation at a public meeting, etc. Responses are sorted to identify all *unique responses*. Some letters are signed by different individuals but have identical content; these are called *form letters*, and only one example of each form letter type is analyzed as a unique response. Some individuals have submitted form letters but have added information to them; these are called *form plus letters*, and only the added information is analyzed as a unique response.

Names and addresses for respondents who sent in a unique or form plus response are entered into a project-specific database. All form letters sent in by respondents are counted (see Appendix D). Analysts read and code unique and form plus responses using the coding structure (see Appendix B). Each comment is coded by subject and verified by a second analyst for accuracy and consistency. The comment number and the assigned codes for every comment are recorded in the database. The actual text of a comment is entered into the database only if the comment: 1) contains issues or concerns not covered by comments previously entered into the database; 2) requires detailed review; 3) includes a reference to a specific inventoried roadless area (IRA), road, or forest; or 4) serves as a clear example of a commonly raised issue. Database reports track all input and allow analysts to identify concerns and to analyze the relationships among them. The final *Summary of Public Comment* document provides a written narrative that provides a thematic summary of the main issues.

This process and the resulting documentation do not replace responses in their original form. Rather, they provide a map to the responses. It is important to recognize that the consideration of public comment is not a vote-counting process in which the outcome is determined by the majority opinion. Relative depth of feeling and interest among the public can serve to provide a general context for decisionmaking. However, it is the appropriateness, specificity, and factual accuracy of comment content that provide the basis for modifications to planning documents and decisions. Further, because respondents are self-selected, they do not constitute a random or representative public sample. The Forest Service encourages all interested parties to submit comment as often as they wish regardless of age, citizenship, or eligibility to vote. Respondents may therefore include State, local, and tribal governments; organizations (or public interest

groups); businesses; people from other countries; children; and people who submit multiple responses. Therefore, caution should be used when interpreting comparative terms in the *Summary of Public Comment*. Every substantive comment and suggestion has value, whether expressed by one respondent or many. All input is read and evaluated, and the analysis team attempts to capture all relevant public concern in the content analysis process.

# Appendix B

## Coding Structure

### Action Codes

**PRCSS (10000-19999) = Planning/Decision-making Processes**

10000, 001 – Decision-making Process and Methods (Other/Needs Specialist Attention.)

Category 1 Code	Category 2 Code Yes (002) or No (003)	
10100		Collaboration with public and other agencies was adequate
10200		Decision-making process characterized by trust and integrity (rule-making & state petitioning, political payback, cronies, Tammany Hall)
10300		Use of best available science/Adequacy of analysis
10400		Adequacy of entire project timeframe

11000, 001 – Public Involvement (Other/Needs specialist attention.)

Category 1 Code	Category 2 Code Yes (002) or No (003)	
11100		Agency communication was adequate/Information was made available
11200		The timeframe for comment was adequate (adequacy of comment period)
11300		Availability of forums (e.g. meetings) for public comment was adequate

12000, 001 – The Petitions Consistency with other Laws, Regulations, and Policies (Other/Needs Specialist Attention.)

Category 1 Code	Category 2 Code Yes (002) or No (003)	
12100		Revised Statute (R-S) 2477 (state/local rights to historic roads on public land)
12110		Endangered Species Act (ESA)
12111		Clean Water Act (CWA)
12112		National Forest Management Act (NFMA)
12113		Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
12114		National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
12115		Mining/mineral laws
12116		Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act (MUSYA)
12117		Management Policies of adjacent Federal/State lands
12118		Native American Treaty Rights
12119		Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review
12120		Executive Order 13272 (proper consideration of small entities)
12121		Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996
12122		Executive Order 12360 (taking of private property)
12123		Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use
12124		Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform

Category 1 Code	Category 2 Code Yes (002) or No (003)	
12125		Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995
12126		Executive Order 13132, Federalism
12127		Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments
12128		Government Paperwork Elimination Act (use of electronic transactions)
12129		Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995
12130		Regulations at 5 CFR part 1320, Controlling Paperwork Burden on the Public

13000, 001 – Petitions Consistency with other Planning Processes (Other/Needs Specialist Attention.)

Category 1 Code	Category 2 Code Yes (002) or No (003)	
13100		Individual National Forest land management plans
13110		Healthy Forest Initiative
13111		National Fire Plan
13112		State and local planning processes

**ALTER (20000-29999) = Alternatives**

20000, 001 – Additional alternatives as suggested by public  
20100, 001 – Alternatives (Other/Needs Specialist Attention.)

Category 1 Code	Category 2 Code Yes (002) or No (003)	Management Theme 01 - 05	
21000			Range of “possible” alternatives for ID State Petition is adequate
21100			Activities allowed under each management theme are appropriate
21200			The amount of land classified under a given management theme is appropriate

**NRMGT (30000 – 39999) = Natural Resource Management and Effects Analysis**

30000, 001 – Natural Resource and Transportation System Management – General (general pollution, noise pollution, debunking of fire prevention argument in favor of 2004 rule)  
31000, 001 – Natural Resource and Transportation System Management – (Other/Needs specialist attention.)

*Physical Resources – Effects*

Category 1 Code	Category 2 Code Adv Affect (004) or Benefit (005)	Management Theme 01 - 05	
32100			Water resources
32110			Water quantity
32111			Water quality
32112			Drinking water
32113			Channel morphology

Category 1 Code	Category 2 Code Adv Affect (004) or Benefit (005)	Management Theme 01 - 05	
32114			Soils, site productivity, landslides
32115			Air resources

*Forest Health and Fire Ecology – Effects*

Category 1 Code	Category 2 Code Adv Affect (004) or Benefit (005)	Management Theme 01 - 05	
33100			Forest health and fire ecology
33110			Fuels mgmt (including in WUI)
33111			Fire suppression
33112			Burned area emergency rehab
33113			Insect and disease control

*Biodiversity – Effects*

Category 1 Code	Category 2 Code Adv Affect (004) or Benefit (005)	Management Theme 01 - 05	
34100			Biodiversity
34110			Fragmentation
34111			Terrestrial animal habitat and species
34112			Aquatic animal habitat and species
34113			Terrestrial plant species
34114			Aquatic plant species
34115			Affect threatened, endangered, proposed or candidate species
34116			Sensitive species
34117			Reference landscapes

*Minerals and Geology – Effects*

Category 1 Code	Category 2 Code Adv Affect (004) or Benefit (005)	Management Theme 01 - 05	
35100			Minerals and geology
35110			Locatable minerals
35111			Leaseable minerals
35112			Salable minerals
35113			Abandoned and inactive mines
35114			Geological and paleontological resources

**RECRE (40000 – 49999) = Recreation and Heritage Management**

40000, 001 – Recreation and Heritage Management – General

41000, 001 – Recreation and Heritage Management – (Other/Needs specialist attention.)

*Recreation and Heritage – Effects*

Category 1 Code	Category 2 Code Adv Affect (004) or Benefit (005)	Management Theme 01 - 05	
40100			Recreation opportunities
40110			Dispersed recreation
40111			Developed recreation
40112			Special uses – dispersed recreation activities
40113			Special uses – developed and road based recreation activities
40114			Scenic quality
40115			Wilderness
40116			Other special designations (Wild and Scenic Rivers, etc.)
40117			Heritage resources

**LANDS (50000 – 59999) = Lands, Special Designations and Themes**

50000, 001 – Lands, Special Designations and Themes – General

51000, 001 - Lands, Special Designations and Themes – (Other/Needs specialist attention.)

*Real Estate Management – Effects*

Category 1 Code	Category 2 Code Adv Affect (004) or Benefit (005)	Management Theme 01 - 05	
50100			Real estate management
50110			Boundary management and landownership adjustments
50111			Access to non-federal ownership w/in the NFS (private inholdings, etc.)
50112			Non-recreation special uses (utility corridors, comm. sites, etc.)

**SOCEC = (60000 – 69999) = Social and Economic**

60000, 001 – Social and Economic – General

61000, 001 - Social and Economic – (Other/Needs specialist attention.)

*Social and Economics – Effects*

Category 1 Code	Category 2 Code Adv Affect (004) or Benefit (005)	Management Theme 01 - 05	
60100			Social and economic factors
60110			Non-commodity values
60111			Grazing
60112			Non-timber forest products
60113			Timber harvest
60114			Energy an non-energy minerals
60115			The ability to provide transportation systems

Category 1 Code	Category 2 Code Adv Affect (004) or Benefit (005)	Management Theme 01 - 05	
60116			Forest-dependent communities
60117			American Indians
60118			Civil rights and environmental justice
60119			Roadbuilding
60120			Road Closures

ATTMT = (99999) = Attachment

## Category 2 Code

- 001 – No qualifier necessary
- 002 – Yes
- 003 – No
- 004 – Adversely affect
- 005 – Beneficially affect

## Management Themes (Site Specific 1 Field):

- 01 – Wild Land Recreation
- 02 – Primitive Areas
- 03 – Backcountry/Restoration
- 04 – General Forest Areas
- 05 – Areas of Cultural, Historical, and Tribal Significance
- 06 – Multiple (use rarely, if at all, and only when there's no good way to split a comment)

## Letter Attribution Codes

### Organization Type

#### *Government Agency/Elected Officials*

##### *Code Description*

- F Federal Agency/Elected Official
- N International Government/Association
- S State Government Agency/Elected Official/Association
- C County Government Agency/Elected Official/Association
- T Town/City Government Agency/Elected Official/Association
- Q Tribal Government/Elected Official/Agency
- XX Regional/other governmental agency (multi-jurisdictional)

#### *Interest Group (includes legal representatives of or lobbyists for interest groups)*

##### *Code Description*

- A Agriculture Industry or Association (Farm Bureau)
- B Business, [affected business] (someone speaking for or as a business owner, chamber of commerce)
- D Place Based Group (homeowner's associations, planning cooperatives, i.e. Quincy Library Group)
- E Government Employee/Union
- G Domestic Livestock Industry (incl. permittees, commercial ranchers)
- H Consultants/legal representatives
- I Individual (unaffiliated, unknown or unidentifiable)

J	Civic Group (Kiwanis, Elks, Community Councils)
K	Special Use Permittee (Rec. homes, Ski Resort, Outfitter/Guide)
L	Timber or Wood Products Industry or Association
M	Mining Industry/Association (locatable)
O	Oil, Natural Gas, Coal, or Pipeline Industry (leasable)
P	Preservation/Conservation
R	Recreational (non-specific)
U	Utility Group (water, electrical, gas)
V	Professional Society
W	Academic (professor, research scientist, university department)
X	Conservation District
Y	Other or unidentified Organization
Z	Multiple Use or Land Rights Organization
AE	Agency Employee (analyzed separately)
AR	Animal Rights (humane treatment org)
CH	Church/Religious Group
PI	Public Interest Group/Political Party
LO	Private Land Inholding Owner
QQ	Tribal Non-Governmental Organization/Tribal Member

Codes can be broken out further to accommodate particular projects, such as --

RB	Mechanized Recreation (bicycling)
RC	Recreation/Conservation Organization (Trout Unlimited, Elk Foundation)
RM	Motorized Recreation (4X4, OHV, snowmobiling)
RN	Non-Motorized/Non-Mechanized Recreation (hiking, x-c ski, horse/stock animals)

## Response Type

### *Code Description*

1	Letter
2	Form or Letter Generator
3	Form Plus
4	Resolution
5	Transcript (dictated audio, video or telephone response)
6	Public Meeting Comment Form
7	Public Meeting Transcript (hearing/oral testimony)
8	Public meeting/workshop group notes
9	[Not used]
10	Petition

## Delivery Type

### *Code Description*

E	Email
F	Facsimile
H	Hand-Delivered or Oral Testimony (Personally Delivered)
M	US Mail or Commercial Carrier (UPS, FedEx)
T	Telephone
W	Web-Based Submission
U	Unknown

## Early Attention

### *Code Description*

1	Threat of Harm
2	Notice of Appeal or Litigation
3	Freedom of Information Act Request (FOIA)
4	Provides Proposals for New Alternatives

- 5 Requires Detailed Review
- 6 Government Entities
- 7 Requests Public Hearing

**Optional IA codes (Project Specific)**

- 5a Provides extensive technical edits – deletions/replacements
- 5m Map(s) attached
- 6a Requests cooperating agency status

**User Type**

- R Specific Road mentioned in letter (by name or number)
- A Specific IRA mentioned in letter (by name or number)
- F Specific Forest or unit mentioned in letter
- M Multiple - letter includes reference to two of the above (e.g. an IRA AND a Road).

**Common Interest Class**

*Code Description*

Not used for this project

**Requests for Information**

*Code Description*

- A Mailing List Only or Nothing to Code
- B Request to Be Removed from the Mailing List
- C Request Copy of the Federal Register Notice
- D Other Request for Specific Information
- E Request for Confirmation of Receipt of Letter

**Optional RI codes (project specific)**

- L Request for Draft Copy of Proposed Rule/Policy
- M Request for Final Copy of Rule/Policy
- Ch Request for Hard Copy of Federal Register Notice of Proposed Rule
- Cd Request for CD of Federal Register Notice of Proposed Rule
- Ce Request for Electronic Copy of Federal Register Notice of Proposed Rule

**Comment Extension**

*Code Description*

- 0 No Specific Time Mentioned or Other
- 15 Request for 15-Day Comment Period Extension
- 30 Request for 30-Day Comment Period Extension
- 45 Request for 45-Day Comment Period Extension
- 60 Request for 60-Day Comment Period Extension
- 90 Request for 90-Day Comment Period Extension
- 120 Request for 120-Day Comment Period Extension

# Appendix C

## Demographics

### Introduction

Demographic analysis presents an overall picture of respondents: where they live, their general affiliation to various organizations or government agencies, and the manner in which they respond. The comment database contains public comment organized under subject categories (see Appendix B), and demographic information. This kind of database can be used to isolate specific combinations of information about public comment. For example, a report can show public comment from certain geographic locations or show comments associated with certain types of organizations. Thus demographic coding, combined with comment coding, allows decisionmakers to use the database to focus on specific areas of public concern linked to geographic area, organizational affiliation, and response format.

The total number of responses to the notice of intent (NOI) to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) on the proposed management of roadless areas on National Forest System lands in Idaho is as follows:

5,421 original responses (5,502 Respondents)  
32,167 organized campaign responses  
37,588 total responses

The demographic analysis presented in this appendix is based on the 5,421 original responses. *Original responses* include unique letters, forms with additional unique material, and one copy of each form (i.e., a form master that is coded to ensure that the form material is included in the comment database).

Several categories are identified for demographic purposes. *Responses* are the individual letters, postcards, emails, etc., that were received. *Respondents* are the individual response writers. *Signatures* refer to the people who signed these individual responses. The number of signatures may be greater than the number of responses as there may be more than one signature per response. Likewise, the number of total responses may be larger than the number of total respondents due to multiple submissions by the same respondents. Form letters are counted and the total number of each form received can be found in Appendix D. Demographic information for form letter respondents is not recorded.

### Geographic Representation

Geographic representation was tracked for each original response. Table C-1 displays, by origin, the number of responses and signatures. Responses were received from all 50 States. Note that 48 responses did not indicate geographic information and that 58 responses originated from an area not within a U.S. State or territory.

Table C-1. Number of Responses and Signatures by Origin

Origin	Number of Responses	Number of Signatures
Alabama	29	29
Alaska	29	29
Arizona	138	138
Arkansas	31	31
California	769	773
Colorado	156	157
Connecticut	56	57
Delaware	15	15
District of Columbia	12	13
Florida	55	57
Georgia	105	105
Hawaii	48	49
Idaho	237	259
Illinois	178	178
Indiana	70	71
Iowa	34	34
Kansas	54	54
Kentucky	47	47
Louisiana	27	28
Maine	47	47
Maryland	108	109
Massachusetts	125	125
Michigan	139	139
Minnesota	123	125
Mississippi	16	16
Missouri	84	84
Montana	41	43
Nebraska	27	29
Nevada	51	51
New Hampshire	31	31
New Jersey	145	146
New Mexico	46	46
New York	397	399
North Carolina	158	159
North Dakota	6	6
Ohio	177	178
Oklahoma	47	47
Oregon	174	175
Pennsylvania	176	178
Puerto Rico	3	3
Rhode Island	14	14
South Carolina	39	41
South Dakota	13	13
Tennessee	75	75
Texas	273	274
Utah	54	54
Vermont	36	36
Virginia	140	140
Washington	272	277
West Virginia	26	26
Wisconsin	137	137
Wyoming	19	19
Armed Forces (Europe/Middle East)	1	1
Armed Forces (Pacific)	1	1
Origin not supplied	48	49
International	58	60

Origin	Number of Responses	Number of Signatures
Response submitted by Multiple States	4	85
<b>Total</b>	<b>5421</b>	<b>5562</b>

## Organizational Affiliation

Organizational affiliation was tracked for each original response. Table C-2 displays, by organization type, the number of responses and signatures.

**Table C-2. Number of Respondents and Signatures by Organization Type**

Organization Type	Number of Respondents	Number of Signatures
Business	1	2
County Government Agency/Elected Official/Association	1	1
Federal Agency/Official	2	2
Individual	5,398	5,455
Motorized Recreation	2	2
Multiple Use or Land Rights Organization	2	2
Place Based Group	1	1
Preservation/Conservation Organization	89	90
Recreation/Conservation Organization	2	3
Recreational	2	2
State Agency/Elected Official	1	1
Timber or Wood Products Industry or Association	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,502</b>	<b>5,562</b>

## Response Type

Table C-3 displays, by response format, the number of original responses/respondents and signatures.

**Table C-3. Number of Responses and Signatures by Response Type**

Response Type #	Response Type	Number of Responses	Number of Signatures
1	Letter	388	499
2	Form/Letter Generator	5,032	5,062
7	Public Meeting Transcript	1	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>5,421</b>	<b>5,562</b>

## Delivery Type

Table C-4 presents the delivery types for each original response received on the project. Responses were received by email, fax, and mail.

**Table C-4. Number of Responses/Respondents and Signatures by Delivery Type**

Delivery Type Code	Delivery Type	Number of Responses	Number of Signatures
E	Email	5,394	5,451
F	Facsimile	6	43
M	Mail or commercial carrier	21	68
<b>Total</b>		<b>5,421</b>	<b>5,562</b>

## Comment Period Extension

Table C-5 displays the number of original responses/respondents and signatures requesting a comment period extension.

**Table C-5. Number of Responses and Signatures by Request for Comment Period Extension**

Common Period Extension	Number of Responses	Number of Signatures
No specific time mentioned or other	69	73
Request for a 30-day comment period extension	4	5
Request for a 60-day comment period extension	5,027	5,093
Request for a 90-day comment period extension	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,101</b>	<b>5,172</b>

## Appendix D

### Organized Response Report

Organized responses, or “form letters,” represent 32,167 of the total responses received during the public comment period for the notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement on the proposed management of roadless areas on National Forest System lands in Idaho. Five or more responses received from different individuals but containing identical text, or identical text plus brief additional comments similar in content, are defined as organized response campaigns.

#### Organized Response Campaigns

Once an organized response campaign letter is identified, a “master” is entered into the database with all of the content information. All “form plus” responses with matching text are then linked to this master within the database with a designated number. If a response does not contain all of the text presented in a given organized response, or if it includes additional text, it is entered as an individual, unique letter. Identical responses from four or fewer respondents are also entered as individual letters.

Organized responses are identified with a number. Table D-1 presents the total number received of each organized response campaign letter and summarizes the concerns found therein.

**Table D-1. Organized Response Campaigns**

Organized Response Campaign Letter Number	Total Received	Summary of Organized Response Campaign Letter
1	10	Supports the Idaho Roadless Petition and would like the rule to be permanent. Enjoys recreational uses of roadless areas, especially all-terrain vehicle (ATV) uses. Asserts that ATV riders have a positive impact when they pick up trash and report fire safety violations. States that ATV license and registration practices encourage responsible ATV use, in which riders adhere to speed limits and safe practices, and that registration fees contribute to maintenance and reconstruction of 1,600 miles of trail in Idaho. Would like to maintain access to roadless areas in Idaho to preserve access to roads and sites that have historical and heritage value.

Organized Response Campaign Letter Number	Total Received	Summary of Organized Response Campaign Letter
2	1050	<p>States that all NFS roadless areas should be managed in accordance with the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Until this occurs, suggests that the following be implemented for the Idaho Roadless Petition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• extend the comment period to 90 days;</li> <li>• conduct public hearings throughout the country;</li> <li>• in the DEIS analyze alternatives that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ prohibit new mineral leases in all inventoried roadless areas,</li> <li>○ establish specific procedures and protocols for activities that would have negative impacts on Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive species,</li> <li>○ protect municipal watersheds from development activities, and</li> <li>○ protect water quality in limited stream segments;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• analyze impacts from oil and gas leasing, road construction, phosphate mining, and timber harvesting; and</li> <li>• analyze and disclose impacts that development on lands proposed for the "General Forest" designation would have on the following: habitats, ecosystems, water quality, tourism, recreation, hunting, fishing, and solitude.</li> </ul>
3	2328	<p>Supports management of all NFS and Idaho roadless areas in accordance with the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Requests that the comment period be extended to 90 days because a 30-day comment period is insufficient for such nationally significant lands. States that Idaho's roadless areas are important because the state has the most roadless area acreage in the continental U.S. and because these areas are in the heart of the Northern Rockies, where "nearly all of the wildlife species that characterize the region can still be found." Stresses that NFS lands are public lands that belong to all Americans, are vital to the Nation's natural heritage, and should be managed "in accordance with the public will."</p>
4	25072	<p>Supports management of all NFS and Idaho roadless areas in accordance with the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Requests that the comment period be extended to 90 days because a 30-day comment period is insufficient for such nationally significant lands. Also requests that public hearings be held throughout the country. Suggests that the rule take into account the effects of timber management, road construction, mining, and other development on endangered, threatened, and rare species; recreation and solitude; and water quality. States that Idaho's roadless areas are important because the state has the most roadless area acreage in the continental U.S. and because these areas are in the heart of the Northern Rockies, where "nearly all of the wildlife species that characterize the region can still be found." Stresses that NFS lands are public lands that belong to all Americans, are vital to the Nation's natural heritage, and should be managed "in accordance with the public will."</p>
5	3678	<p>Supports protection of all roadless areas in Idaho in accordance with the national Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Emphasizes that this will ensure forest health; preserve natural resources, such as wildlife habitat and clean water; and provide fishing, hunting, and recreational opportunities. Stresses the importance of preserving roadless areas for future generations. States that the Roadless Rule and its current exceptions were "developed over years of scientific and public scrutiny and debate." Also states that the public supports preserving Idaho and national roadless areas.</p>

Organized Response Campaign Letter Number	Total Received	Summary of Organized Response Campaign Letter
6	29	<p>Supports former Governor Risch's administration in protecting hunting and fishing and Risch's statements regarding roadless areas made at the Roadless Area Conservation National Advisory Committee meeting in November 2006. Requests that the comment period be extended to 90 days to ensure compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and to allow more public involvement. Also requests public meetings as part of the extended comment period. Wants to retain hunting and fishing opportunities in Idaho. States that roadless areas provide better wildlife habitat, and as a result lead to longer hunting seasons; more roads have a negative effect on water quality and fishing opportunities. Requests consideration of the "unroaded landscapes within the 525,000 acres being proposed for general forest management" because of their importance to hunting and fishing. Asks that impacts to the following resources be analyzed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Idaho Department of Fish and Game Mule Deer Initiative.</li><li>• Elk winter and summer range and hunting possibilities.</li><li>• Fish populations, such as various trout species and Chinook salmon in affected watersheds, including fishing opportunities and spawning habitat.</li><li>• Sage grouse habitat and hunting possibilities.</li><li>• State revenue from hunting and fishing, which was "recently estimated at \$532 million."</li><li>• Other fish and wildlife resources affected by boundary changes that reduce acreage of roadless areas.</li></ul>