

**Boise Office**

1101 W. River St., Ste. 110  
P.O. Box 7985  
Boise, Idaho 83707  
Tel. (208) 629-7447

**Challis Office**

1301 E. Main Ave.  
P.O. Box 36  
Challis, Idaho 83226  
Tel. (208) 879-4488

**Twin Falls Office**

236 River Vista Place  
Suite 301  
Twin Falls, Idaho 83301  
Tel. (208) 969-9585

Fax (all offices)  
(208) 629-7559



**David P. Claiborne \***

**S. Bryce Farris**

**Patxi Larrocea-Phillips**

**Evan T. Roth**

**Daniel V. Steenson**

**Matthew A. Sturzen**

**Katie L. Vandenberg**

**Andrew J. Waldera \*\***

**James R. Bennetts (retired)**

*Attorneys licensed in Idaho  
\* Also licensed in Washington  
\*\* Also licensed in Oregon*

**Saturday, April 18, 2020**

Nez Perce Clearwater National Forests  
ATTN: Zach Peterson, Forest Planner  
903 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Kamiah, Idaho 83536  
*via U.S. Mail*  
*and via Email: [sm.fs.fpr\\_npclw@usda.gov](mailto:sm.fs.fpr_npclw@usda.gov)*  
*and online at <http://bit.ly/NezClearFPRComments>*

RE: Forest Plan Revision Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Peterson:

Please accept this letter as the official comments upon all matters now pending related to the Nez Perce – Clearwater National Forests (“NPC”), Forest Plan Revision (“FPR”), and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”), and related processes, submitted on behalf of the Idaho Recreation Council (“IRC”) and its affiliated entities mentioned herein. The IRC may be contacted through undersigned counsel, or may be contacted directly at 501 Baybrook Court, Boise, Idaho 83706. Its Executive Director, Sandra Mitchell, may be contacted by telephone at (208) 424-3870. IRC has several comments, objections and concerns related to the FPR, discussed further and at length below.

## **I. THE IDAHO RECREATION COUNCIL.**

The IRC is an Idaho nonprofit association representing Idaho motorized, mechanized and other recreation interests, which acts through committee(s) comprised of representatives from numerous Idaho recreation organizations, including but not limited to the Idaho Off-Road 4x4 Club, the Idaho State ATV Association, the Idaho Aviation Association, the Backcountry Horsemen of Idaho, the Idaho Trail Machine Association, the Gem State Mountain Bike Alliance, RAFT (of Lewiston), the Idaho Gem Club, the Western Whitewater Association, the Northwest Jet Boat Association, the Idaho UTV Association, and the Idaho State Snowmobile Association. IRC

members use motorized and non-motorized means, including off-highway vehicles (motorcycles, all-terrain vehicles, utility type vehicles, Jeeps/4-wheel drives), snowmobiles, horses, llamas, mules, mountain bikes, boats and rafts (motorized and non-motorized), small-scale suction dredges, skiing and hiking, to access state and federally-managed lands throughout the United States and especially in Idaho, including the NPC, and adjoining wilderness and non-wilderness areas. IRC members have used and enjoyed, and hope for themselves and future generations to use and enjoy, a variety of recreational, aesthetic, and commercial activities within the NPC, which require continued use and access to the NPC, in particular by means of motorized travel. These activities (including sightseeing, hunting, fishing, camping, wildlife and plant viewing, recreational rock hounding, small-scale suction dredge mining, photography and travel) require motorized access. IRC and its members regularly attend public meetings, submit input, and otherwise participate in planning activities within the NPC.

IRC supports a truly collaborative framework for recreational enthusiasts and environmental interests to work together in cooperation with land managers, legislators, local government and the public to ensure a positive future for responsible recreational access for everyone, now and into the future. IRC members have enjoyed the motorized use of the NPC. For some, OHVs and OSVs are primarily used to provide access to points of interest or to gain entry to wilderness areas, while for others (particularly snowmobile, UTV, ATV, and motorcycle users) riding the designated areas, roads and trails is the primary reason they visit the NPC. Motorized travel within the NPC is a tremendous recreational asset, as well as an increasingly significant economic asset for the local counties and communities. Accordingly, preserving responsible motorized access to the NPC is an extremely high priority for the IRC.

## **II. THE 2012 PLANNING RULE.**

In 2012 the United States Department of Agriculture-Forest Service division, issued a planning rule for National Forest System land management planning. This planning rule was published in the Federal Register and received an enormous amount of comments from stakeholders and citizens who wanted to be involved in the rule that would set the tone for forest management plans into the future. The planning rule clearly outlines sustainability within forests. Under the sustainability section it states that the “plan must provide for social, economic, and ecological sustainability within Forest Service authority and consistent with inherent capability of the plan area.” *See* C.F.R. §219.8 (2012). Additionally, the rule states under §219.8(4)(b)(1) that “the plan must include plan components, including standards or guidelines, to guide the plan area’s contribution to social and economic sustainability, taking into account: (2) sustainable recreation; including recreation settings, opportunities, and access; and scenic character...” This mandates that the Forest Service must consider the viability of sustainability for different activities throughout the NPC before making any substantive decision, including the decision to study or manage a potential wilderness area.

### III. WILDERNESS AREA BACKGROUND.

Before attempting to add more Wilderness in Idaho, government officials should be updated on the status of wilderness areas in Idaho and the United States. *See* The Beginnings of the National Wilderness Preservation System, The Wilderness Connect-The University of Montana, (Feb. 7, 2019). The Wilderness Act called for the creation of a National Wilderness System. There are now 767 Wilderness Areas in the United States. *See id.* It would take a person more than two years to visit a different Wilderness each and every day in order to visit all 767 Wilderness Areas. A total of 110,025,309 acres is designated as Wilderness. *See id.* This is an area more than twice the size of Idaho and slightly larger than the State of California (3rd largest state in the Union). This is up from 9.1 million acres in the 1964 Wilderness Act. *See id.* Today, there are 12 times more Wilderness acres than existed in 1964. On average, the lower 48 states average 2.7% of their lands as designated Wilderness. In Idaho, we now have 9.0% of our land base in Wilderness, or 3 times the amount of the average in the lower 48 states. The Selway-Bitterroot, Gospel Hump, and Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness are essentially separated by a primitive jeep road (Magruder Corridor) or the Salmon River Wild River (Wild and Scenic Rivers). This system is regarded as the largest contiguous Wilderness in the lower 48, with 3.9 million acres. Clearly, this data shows Idaho has done its part toward creation of a National Wilderness System – Idaho has contributed its fair share – more wilderness in Idaho is completely unnecessary and unreasonable.

### IV. FOREST SERVICE GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS.

#### a. Forest Service Manual.

The Forest Service Manual (FSM) guides the Forest Service in drafting a plan for the NPC. Within the manual, it states that the agency should “use the current land management plan as a starting point for revision, and make changes based on a need to do so.” Forest Service Manual, Chapter 1920 (Jan. 30, 2015). Additionally, the FSM notes that the objectives of the Forest Service should be to sustain multiple uses indefinitely while keeping in mind that the productivity of the land and the uses contribute to surrounding communities social, cultural and economic vitality. *See id.* p. 9.

#### b. Forest Service Handbook.

The Forest Service Handbook (FSH) regarding wilderness management echoes the FSM in many ways, but provides more detailed guidance for the agency. The FSH further delves into the process of how lands may be recommended and then become a part of the National Wilderness Preservation System, or as a Wilderness Study Area. According to the FSH “the process occurs in four primary steps: inventory, evaluation, analysis, and recommendation. **Each step requires public participation.** All plan revisions or new plans must complete this process before the

Responsible Official determines, in the plan decision document, whether to recommend lands within the plan area to Congress for wilderness designation.” Forest Service Handbook, Chapter 70, p. 4 (Jan. 30, 2015). Public participation for the inventory step in the FPR would show that a large number of groups oppose more wilderness in the NPC. Given that public participation is mandated by the FSH, it is also mandated that the Responsible Official overseeing the FPR should also include collaboration from State and local governments. *See id.*

### **c. Executive Order Applicability.**

The NPC must also act and be mindful of the President’s Executive Order issued December 21, 2018, styled as the *EO on Promoting Active Management of America’s Forests, Rangelands, and other Federal Lands to Improve Conditions and Reduce Wildfire Risk*. The EO mandates policy including partnerships with State agencies and nonprofit organizations to improve forest health and for wildfire management preparation. As part of this policy, the NPC is directed to perform “maintenance on public roads needed to provide access for emergency services and restoration work.” *See id.*, at p. 3. This obviously cuts against closing areas to motorized travel. Continued use of motorized routes, as we all know, provides inherently for their continued maintenance, much of which is performed by State partners and off-road clubs.

## **V. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REVISED FOREST PLAN.**

As recognized in the FPR, the FPR is very important because consistency with the FPR is required in future projects and activities within the NPC. Therefore, the IRC feels certain broad and wide-ranging principles must be reflected in the FPR to ensure future management decisions are made with a proper starting point in mind.

### **a. Economic Importance of Outdoor Recreation.**

The Forest lies within north-central Idaho in a region comprising Clearwater, Idaho, Latah, Lewis and Nez Perce counties. The Forest partially lies within Benewah and Shoshone counties. These counties receive tremendous economic benefits from recreational activity within the Forest, in particular motorized recreation. For that reason, it is important that the FPR contain desired conditions and standards that facilitate and increase this economic impact. Within the aforementioned counties, the impact of summer OHV recreation is remarkable. *See Economic Importance of off-highway vehicle recreation: an analysis of Idaho counties*, University of Idaho, 2014.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Accessible at [http://www.idahostateatv.org/publications/Off-Highway\\_Rec\\_Analysis.pdf](http://www.idahostateatv.org/publications/Off-Highway_Rec_Analysis.pdf).

Motorized outdoor recreation is a major contributor to the economic conditions and vitality of the communities within, and around, the NPC. Major portions of the land base in the counties mentioned above are federally-owned. The IRC believes that if any further restrictions or limits are imposed upon, or there are other opportunity losses for motorized recreation, the economies of the seven counties in which the NPC lies will suffer due to the inability to harvest natural resources, graze or recreate with OHVs on trails within the NPC. We invite you to carefully examine the studies and data as to the economic contribution of motorized recreation compiled through recent studies.<sup>2</sup> As you will see, **annual motorized recreation expenditures in the seven affected counties average \$62,665,104.** More strikingly, **GDP contribution to the seven NPC counties from tourism alone, of which motorized recreation is a part, is upwards of \$2.3 Billion annually.** See Exhibit A. This is not an insignificant amount and reflects the importance of motorized recreation to the local communities. Further, a heavy majority of OHV recreationists come from outside of the aforementioned counties – constituting a significant contributor towards tourism and related revenue.

#### **b. Water Quality.**

Recreational facilities where water quality is impaired by introduced pollutants should be repaired or relocated within two years. Far too often such conditions result in the total decommissioning of the recreation facility. IRC prefers management approaches directed toward repair and replacement of recreational features, as opposed to decommissioning. The IRC encourages the Forest to consider preferences and ranking for consideration of alternatives where a recreational feature presents a resource concern, with road/trail decommissioning being the least preferred alternative. The loss of a recreational opportunity ought to be reserved for the most extreme conditions. Repair, improvement and reconstruction ought to be the preferred alternative, followed by relocation, followed by conversion to another road/trail type, followed by total decommissioning.

#### **c. Wildlife.**

The NPC should recognize that animal activity near and around existing human uses evidences that the animals are accepting of the existing human use. This reflects wise recognition of actual conditions.

The IRC supports the concept of managing for Canada Lynx in accordance with the Northern Rockies Lynx Management Direction and ROD. Importantly, the FPR should further recognize that it is not proper to manage for Canada Lynx by increasing roadless or wilderness areas, but

---

<sup>2</sup> Accessible at <https://www.idahosnow.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Idahos-Billion-Dollar-Industry.pdf>.

instead by creating habitat preferred by Snowshoe Hare, the preferred prey of the Canada Lynx. Data suggests the NPC is at the extreme south of any habitat for Canada Lynx and actual populations are scarce in the forest. This population is just not a significant issue.

It is understanding, for biological reasons, to exclude domestic sheep and goat grazing and trailing in bighorn sheep habitat because the domestic animals are away from humans and may interact with the wild animals. However, any restriction on the use of goat packing in bighorn sheep range is not appropriate. Pack goats are attended to by humans and there is very little danger of pack goats interacting with the wild sheep population.

With respect to elk, the major decline of the elk herds on the NPC occurred during the winter of 1996-97. The “strong desire to recover and grow elk populations” has been ongoing for the past 50 years, and more so during the past 22. Every, that is every, forest plan developed for both the Clearwater and Nez Perce National Forests, beginning with the Multiple Use plans in the 1960’s, has identified advancing plant succession as the cause limiting elk populations. With exception of wildfire, and logging, neither forest has adequately provided habitat conditions to reverse the downward trend in Clearwater Basin elk populations. Motorized recreation is simply not a negative contributor to elk survival or elk habitat.

The standard suggested at FW-GDL-WLMU-03 is unclear. Is there an intent to restrict motorized recreation in elk winter range to protect elk population? We object to OHV route closures except in very limited circumstances where data suggests elk need protection on winter range (which is from December 1 to March 15) or during calving season (May 1 to June 15). There is simply no good faith basis to ever restrict OHV activity based on “big game management” or “big game protection” from June 15 through November 30. There is really never a need to restrict OSV activity for these purposes – no data suggests a need.

We support MA3-DC-ELK-01, which recognizes elk enjoy and use nutritional resources in areas of motorized activity. However, IRC objects to MA2-GDL-ELK-01, which would prohibit new motorized routes unless an adjacent area of 5,000 acres non-motorized is allowed for “elk habitat”. The two notations are inconsistent. Use of motorized routes is not constant on a daily basis. Elk will populate and graze in areas adjacent to motorized routes. No available data suggests otherwise. Motorized recreation does not effect nutritional resources off the motorized route. Requiring 5,000 acres of non-motorized adjacent to every motorized route creates an unsustainable condition derived to simply prohibit new motorized routes. The focus should instead be on protecting elk during critical seasons of winter and calving, if necessary in a specific range, as mentioned above. In those rare and limited instances, a closure may have merit between December 1 and June 15.



#### d. Cultural Resources.

Many people that visit the Forest wish to view, enjoy and learn about cultural resources such as ancient camps, villages, trail ways, homesteads, mines, mining camps, forest service sites and other historic features. The IRC encourages the inclusion of an objective relative to cultural resources that would provide that where motorized access to such sites currently exists, such access shall be maintained. It is important that all people, regardless of limitations, are able to access these sites if motorized means exist under present on-the-ground conditions.

#### e. Sustainable Recreation Management.

##### *1. Recreational Opportunities Need to Increase.*

The FPR categorizes recreational opportunity based on classifications of primitive, semi-primitive non-motorized, semi-primitive motorized, roaded natural, and rural. The IRC objects to these limited classifications, as discussed in detail below, but the IRC objects to the inclusion of significant parts of the roaded front range within the Forest as being classified as semi-primitive non-motorized. These areas within the roaded front range should more properly be classified as semi-primitive motorized. This will allow for future recreation opportunity in the roaded front range. As indicated at page 73 of the FPR, only 45% of the Forest is accessible in the summer season by motorized means. However, that includes roaded, natural and rural. Those conditions are not desirable to OHV users. Only 22% of the Forest is designated as semi-primitive, motorized, which is the true experience desired by most OHV users. **Only Alternative X provides for increased opportunity for a semi-primitive motorized summer experience, and as such it is a preferred approach of the IRC. With respect to winter recreation, Alternative X is preferred for the same reasons.**

Additionally, a desired condition and objective should be developed to provide that opportunities be increased for OHV travel by OHVs greater than 50 inches in width – so called UTVs, SOHVs and Jeeps/4WD Vehicles. Too many trails are being limited to motorcycles or ATVs less than 50 inches in width, forcing other OHV users to operate on full-size auto roads. These OHV users need trail opportunities, and that should be an objective of the FPR. The NPC acknowledges the need to provide more opportunities for the growing mountain bike community, which is true and needed, but the NPC totally ignores the increase use and popularity of OHVs larger than 50 inches in width. The uses should be treated the same, new opportunities should be developed for both, and the NPC should avoid such overt bias in favor of non-motorized recreation.

Far too often, forest planning and travel planning results in the loss of motorized recreational opportunities. This is an undesired condition. With the potential categorization of Recommended

Wilderness Areas on the horizon, motorized recreation could be radically reduced even more. This condition cannot be allowed to occur. Motorized recreation is increasing in popularity year after year, as the population ages, and as such there is increasing need for places and opportunities to recreate. Further reduction of opportunity will cause needless congestion on a finite resource.

Many members of the various IRC groups camp in the NPC and ride OHVs on many of the trails within the NPC. Our members have also been extensively involved in working with the USFS on volunteer projects on the trails we enjoy. The IRC and its member groups have played an important role in creating and preserving the recreational trail opportunities in the NPC. The consideration of additional wilderness areas does not accurately characterize the needs and use of the areas. The IRC does not support the addition of any Wilderness area however denominated, whether it be WSA, RWA, an evaluation area, formally designated, or a focal area.

It is IRC's hope that you will take this opportunity presented by the FPR to **increase motorized recreational opportunities in the NPC**. The demand for recreational access will only increase and it makes sense to find ways to disperse use rather than to confine it. Access to the NPC is important to not only the quality of life of those who live, work and play in the area, but to the economic stability of the surrounding communities.

## *2. Modification to the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum.*

In addition to the above, the IRC proposes that the recreation opportunity spectrum be modified in order to promote responsible shared use of the Forest lands and its resources. The Forest Service Handbook (FSH 1909.12) and Manual (FSM 1920) directives, provide that –

FSH 91.1: “*Recreation setting*. The social, managerial, and physical attributes of a place that, when combined, provide a distinct set of recreation opportunities. The Forest Service uses the recreation opportunity spectrum to define recreation settings and categorize them into six distinct classes: primitive, semi-primitive non-motorized, semi-primitive motorized, roaded natural, rural, and urban.”

In 23.22b:–“Sustainable Recreation Resources and Opportunities to Connect People with Nature-Recreational settings and sustainable recreation opportunities may form the basis for applying certain plan components to management areas or geographic areas. Recreational settings are usually described by the recreational opportunity spectrum (ROS) (FSM 2310).”

The recreation opportunity spectrum drives management allocations and prescriptions for recreation on the Forest. The IRC agrees that ROS has application as a tool in planning recreation related issues. However, it is not the Ten Commandments, etched in stone by God to guide man's activities forever. It is a tool that has uses but must be constantly reviewed and modified to meet



the evolving needs and desires of the public. There must be flexibility in the use of ROS to meet these needs as our technology and society changes. The primitive, semi-primitive non-motorized, and semi-primitive motorized opportunities all pivot on whether or not motorized recreation is allowed. The assumption is that those who participate in motorized recreation are not compatible with, appreciative of or needful of a primitive setting as non-motorized uses. While the current ROS establishes the boxes into which all recreationists must fit, and if they don't fit they will just have to change, the IRC proposes that the boxes change instead.

The “**Primitive**” ROS setting is defined as large, remote, wild, and predominately unmodified landscapes. There is no motorized activity and little probability of seeing other people. Primitive ROS settings are managed for quiet solitude away from roads, people, and development. There are few, if any, facilities or developments. Its attributes are:

- Physical: Remote (3 miles from motorized use), predominately unmodified, naturally evolving, 5,000 + acres;
- Infrastructure: Non-motorized trails are present, rivers and lakes offer fishing, camp/picnic sites not developed or defined, no sanitation facilities, leave no trace, water supply is undeveloped-natural, signing is minimal-constructed of rustic and natural materials, interpretation comes through self-discovery and at trailheads, some bridges made of natural materials (wood) may exist but are rare;
- Vegetation: Natural, no treatments except for fire use;
- Managerial: Few signs, few encounters with rangers, travel on foot and horse, no motorized travel allowed;
- Social: Very high probability of solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, high challenge and risk, little evidence of people.

The “**Semi-Primitive Motorized**” ROS settings, the first in the spectrum that allows motorized recreation, is defined as areas of the Forests managed for backcountry motorized use on designated routes. Routes are designed for Off Highway Vehicles (OHVs) and other high clearance vehicles. This setting offers visitors motorized opportunities for exploration, challenge, and self-reliance. Mountain bikes and other mechanized equipment are also sometimes present. Rustic facilities are present for the primary purpose of protecting the natural resources of the area or providing portals to adjacent areas of Primitive, or Semi-Primitive, Non-Motorized areas. Its attributes are:

- Physical: Predominately natural, or natural appearing, 2,500 + acres (no minimum size within designated Wilderness);
- Infrastructure: Motorized trails exist, fishing sites– rivers, lakes, and reservoirs with some trails & primitive roads (motorized trails), camp/picnic sites not developed, some identified dispersed areas, limited sanitation facilities, rustic, may have rustic outhouses available, undeveloped natural and rustic water supply developments, signing is rustic and made of natural materials, interpretation comes through self-discovery, some located on site or at trailheads, water crossings may involve rustic structures or bridges made of natural material - some designed for motorized use;
- Vegetation: treatment areas are very small in number, widely disbursed, and consistent with natural vegetation patterns;

- Managerial: Minimum or subtle on-site controls with some restrictions, motorized off-highway vehicles allowed;
- Social: moderate probability of solitude, closeness to nature, high degree of challenge and risk using motorized equipment; motorized use visible and audible.

One user group that doesn't fit the above boxes is snowmobilers. They don't want or need roads or trails and go into remote areas where no one else, including skiers or snowshoers, can or will go. They value all of the attributes of a primitive setting, including challenge, risk, and solitude. The only exception is that they use motorized sleds, the only way anyone can get there short of a helicopter. In every sense the experience they want is "Primitive Motorized". Certainly, the sleds they use are modern engineering marvels, but no more so than modern skis, backpacks, tentage, sleeping bags, clothing, rafts, coolers, oars and other high-tech equipment routinely used in every ROS setting, including "Primitive".

The "**Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized**" ROS is a major step down from the setting that many in the snowmobile community value and want to experience. They do not want trails, sanitation facilities or developments of any kind. They highly value solitude, challenge, risk and self-reliance. They want a primitive, unmodified setting where they will be likely to encounter few if any other recreationists. The setting they desire is primitive in every aspect except the presence of motors.

One might say that the "Primitive" ROS equates with designated wilderness, but there are many settings that qualify as "Primitive" outside of designated wilderness, such as the Great Burn. Snowmobilers have been experiencing a "Motorized Primitive" setting there for decades in an area too remote for anyone without a motor to access in the winter months. Any sign of their presence is erased as the snow melts each spring.

The IRC proposes that the FPR adopt an additional ROS class, unique to snowmobiling in certain settings. We would define that class as follows:

**"Primitive Motorized"**: This ROS setting is defined as large, remote, wild, and predominately unmodified landscapes. There is motorized activity in the winter months and little probability of seeing other people. Primitive Motorized ROS settings are managed for solitude away from roads, people, and development. There are few, if any facilities or developments. Its attributes are:

- Physical: Remote (3 miles from motorized use), predominately unmodified, naturally evolving, 5,000 + acres;
- Infrastructure: No groomed or marked over-snow trails are present, camp/picnic sites not developed or defined, no sanitation facilities, leave no trace, water supply is undeveloped-natural, there is no above snow signing, interpretation comes through self-discovery and at trailheads, some bridges made of natural materials (wood) may exist but are rare;
- Vegetation: Natural, no treatments except for fire use;
- Managerial: No signs, few encounters with rangers, motorized over-snow travel allowed;
- Social: Very high probability of solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, high challenge and risk, little evidence of people.

All of the ROS boxes should be periodically examined and changed to fit an evolving world. The categorizing of opportunities strictly on the basis of motor use is one of those changes you need to examine. For winter recreation at least, there must be room near the top of the granite tablet to add one new category, “Primitive Motorized”.

The IRC further opposes any suggestions or standard that would limit or restrict new motorized routes or areas in the primitive and semi-primitive non-motorized areas. As mentioned above, the latter category should be adjusted to reclassify the roaded front range as semi-primitive motorized so that new opportunity can be created in that area. Furthermore, standards should be included for the semi-primitive motorized, roaded natural and rural areas to provide that motorized recreation opportunity should be increased through the addition of new roads and trails to meet public need, provide loop opportunities, or to provide enhanced recreation opportunity. Also, a standard should be included to indicate that when a motorized road/trail opportunity is lost, the lost opportunity will be mitigated by the addition of a new opportunity in other areas within the Forest.

#### **f. Infrastructure.**

The IRC objects to the objective of decommissioning and removing roads from the system. Rather than decommissioning, as stated above, preferred alternatives should be developed such as conversion of the road to a trail, with preference to creating OHV opportunity for UTVs, Jeep and 4WD vehicles, before converting to an ATV or motorcycle trail. The IRC further objects to the objective of decommissioning precisely 30 miles of unneeded road. The determination of need is highly subjective. Moreover, placing a precise number is unsupported by any scientific or technical data. Road decommissioning should be the least preferred alternative for road management and should be reserved for the extreme cases of absolute necessity. Instead of decommissioning, the objective ought to be for the reconstruction, relocation or conversion of unneeded roads to trails.

#### **g. Recommended Wilderness.**

##### *1. There is No Need for Additional Wilderness or RWA.*

The NPC is already home to the largest intact wilderness area in the lower 48 states. There is no need for additional wilderness in the NPC. The IRC objects not only to the addition of wilderness area to the Forest, but also to the management direction of managing recommended wilderness as if it is already wilderness area. A variety of recreational opportunities exist in the RWAs, including motorized and mechanized uses. It would be more appropriate to manage the RWAs as backcountry, to permit existing motorized and mechanized uses, but to prohibit new road construction. That is, for any designated RWA all historical motorized access should be reinstated, retained and continued, based on conditions pre-existing any RWA designation (whether past or present). IRC would agree that expanded and new motorized opportunities should not take place in RWAs.

In addition to the above, it is important that the FPR recognize areas released from wilderness designation by Congressional action. This would include all areas previously considered for, but then rejected for, inclusion in the River of No Return Wilderness Area, Public Law 96-312 (96<sup>th</sup> Congress, July 23, 1980), and the Gospel Hump Area, Public Law 95-237 (95<sup>th</sup> Congress, Feb. 24, 1978). These laws directed that lands rejected for wilderness inclusion be managed in accordance with the multiple use principle and be available for resource utilization. This is an express Congressional mandate that considered but excluded areas are not to be wilderness and are to be kept open for all allowed use and development.

## *2. The Great Burn Generally.*

An area of great concern to the IRC is the area known as the Great Burn.<sup>3</sup> This area provides a significant winter recreation opportunity for snowmobile users and special summer opportunity for trail use by horsemen and mountain bikers. Snowmobiling and mountain biking in the Great Burn is important to any back-country adventurer. The area provides stunning vistas and technical challenges to the rider. The area attracts snowmobile enthusiasts from throughout North America. The area is approximately 15 to 17 miles from the nearest plowed road, thereby offering riders with solitude and untouched opportunity. Winter over-snow use has been occurring over the past 30 years and does nothing to damage the physical environment, and the snow is so plentiful in the area that it provides no winter range for big game<sup>4</sup> or critical habitat for endangered species<sup>5</sup>. There is no environmental damage posed by OSV use in the Great Burn. There is further no evidence that trail use by non-motorized users (such as hikers, horsemen and mountain bikers) is causing any negative environmental effects. Allowing snowmobile use in the riding areas of the Great Burn and bicycle use on the trails in the Great Burn does not degrade the character of the

---

<sup>3</sup> For all purposes herein, when we say “the Great Burn” we mean all of those areas encompassing the Great Burn Recommended Wilderness Area under present and existing management directives.

<sup>4</sup> There are some allegations that OSV use in the Great Burn negatively effects mountain goat populations. There is no evidence to support this contention. Goats are known to winter on Land Owner Mountain, outside the Forest in the Lolo National Forest, about one-half mile from the parking lot and Hoodoo Pass. Goats are regularly seen about 300 to 400 yards from snowmobiles travelling on the 250 road, the only access to the Hoodoo riding area. The goats do not display any sort of reaction and have wintered in this area for at least the past 30 years, evidencing that they are accepting of the human use. There have also been contentions that snowmobiles are disturbing goats in the Goat Lake and Blacklead Mountain area. There has never been a sighting of a goat or a track in this area in the winter. There is an average of over twelve feet of snow in these areas and goats can't get around in those snow depths.

<sup>5</sup> The 2012 Travel Plan ROD states that **NO** evidence of Lynx was found in the Great Burn Area. (2.b. pg 52). The FWS wildlife biologist at a NOC Collaborative meeting stated, as a matter of record, that there is **NO** evidence that snowmobile activity negatively impacts wolverines.

area nor does it degrade the resource. The FPR should reflect the foregoing and adjust management directions accordingly.

Based on the foregoing, the IRC supports creation of a special management area for the Great Burn. However, in the FPR maps, several snowmobile areas have been omitted. The historic winter motorized recreational areas that must be preserved include all areas of the Great Burn, notably Goat Lake and its surrounding geophysical bowls, Blacklead Mountain and its surrounding geophysical bowls, Doe Creek drainage and its surrounding geophysical bowls, Deer Creek drainage and its surrounding geophysical bowls, and the Williams Lake cherry stem access. The Efficient Public Collaboration Group has presented a recommendation for special management of the Great Burn area that calls for opening of winter and summer motorized recreation areas within one year, and adoption of an adaptive management strategy and plan for the area within three years. *See Exhibit B.* The IRC supports this proposal.

### *3. Mallard Larkin Area.*

The Efficient Public Collaboration Group has presented a recommendation for inclusion of the Mallard Larkin area as recommended wilderness area and subsequent management in accordance with regional directives consistent therewith. *See Exhibit C.* While the IRC generally opposes any additional wilderness, or RWA, this proposal can be tolerated IF no other areas are designated as RWA, and a special management area is adopted for the Great Burn.

### *4. Meadow Creek Area.*

The Meadow Creek area has been mentioned as a potential RWA. IRC opposes any such designation for this area. This area presents great motorized recreation opportunities. Provided herewith, at **Exhibit D**, is a list of 47.5 miles of OHV trail in the Meadow Creek area that should be permitted to continue as a historic use. Motorcycle trail opportunity in this area exceeds 100 miles. *See Exhibit E.* Please preserve these unique and special motorized opportunities by excluding the Meadow Creek area from RWA – it lacks suitability for this purpose.

With respect to the West Meadow Creek Special Management Area, this area is not located within existing wilderness and ought not be closed to all motorized recreation. There are a handful of motorcycle trails within this area that should be preserved and maintained as such. No biological reason exists to do otherwise. The Anderson Butte ATV trail should further remain open to OHVs of 50 inches or less. OSV activity should be permitted throughout West Meadow Creek SMA.

### *5. Pot Mountain and Rawhide Areas.*

Pot Mountain represents a high value area, and high-volume use area, for mountain biking and motorcycle riding. It also offers excellent snowmobiling as long as there is adequate snow cover at the lower levels. The road is groomed from Pierce and then close to the Pot Mountain area, offering easy access. It was logged in the past, and roads were established, and therefore it lacks wilderness quality. The old roads provide great trails for motorized recreation. This area should not be considered for RWA. It is more appropriate at semi-primitive, motorized. Similarly, for the same reasons, the Rawhide area is not an appropriate RWA.

### **h. River Systems.**

The IRC objects to any new designation of Wild & Scenic River (“WSR”) segments in the NPC to the extent any segment so designated would include (1) areas where motorized road or trail crossings occur, unless provisions are included to preserve the access routes, or (2) areas where small-scale suction dredge mining occurs. Designation of Wild & Scenic ought to not be used as a means to close motorized routes, or to bisect them in such a way as to destroy their usefulness and value, or to eliminate recreational suction dredge mining. Valuable river corridors can be preserved and protected while still maintaining historic motorized uses and prospecting that has apparently been ongoing, yet still making the area suitable for WSR selection.

#### *1. Fish Creek.*

Table 28 of the FPR lists eligible wild and scenic rivers within the Forest. Fish Creek should not be designated as a wild river, but rather as a scenic river. There is a motorized trail that parallels Fish Creek for almost its entire length. This condition precludes consideration of the creek as a wild river.

#### *2. North Fork Clearwater River.*

Additionally, North Fork Clearwater River ought not to be designated as a wild river. Again, it is more appropriately designated as a scenic river. Operating from Dworshak Reservoir, jet boaters enjoy the opportunity to navigate the North Fork two to three months each year. The North Fork Clearwater River provides an excellent and challenging opportunity for jet boat recreation, and its system designation ought to be such to preserve that opportunity – it ought not be managed as a wilderness river closed to motorized uses.

The North Fork Clearwater River lacks characteristics for inclusion within the WSR system. This river segment is not uniquely distinguishable from other river segments. For example, the Forest seems to focus on use of the river segment by Harlequin ducks, and suggests they have no other



suitable river habitat. This is not an accurate statement, as other river segments are not by the Forest in other areas to provide river habitat for said duck (e.g., Middle Fork Clearwater, Selway River, and Lochsa Rivers). Since there are already existing designated WSR on the NPC that recognize this resource, the North Fork Clearwater does not present itself as a worthy addition to the WSR system.

Additionally, there are no state or local agencies expressing an interest in this segment becoming a WSR, or in assisting in administering it as such. Rather the interest is only in preserving the recreational use of this segment, and fish and wildlife resources. The local counties oppose WSR designation for the North Fork, as does IDPR, and IDFG is neutral.

## **VI. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.**

### **a. Purpose and Need for Action.**

IRC agrees that continuity in the FPR is of the utmost importance. However, the addition of a sizeable wilderness area, or wilderness study area or recommended wilderness area, appears to be arbitrary and concerning to the IRC because a number of OHV trails and OSV play areas are in the areas being considered for wilderness. The IRC agrees that there needs to be a consistent approach to the organizational changes and the ability for all stakeholders to understand the implementation of the FPR. The IRC also agrees with the Forest Service, that there needs to be clear consistency and a reduction in redundancy for the updated FPR. Additionally, the IRC concurs with the statement that the plan must be relevant. The Forest Service should sustain the ability of recreational use of the NPC, especially for OHV and OSV recreationists. Further, the IRC notes that it would be willing to work with the Forest Service's direction of "adaptive and flexible management" of issues on the basis that the Forest Service does not arbitrarily deny recreational use.

### **b. Issues.**

#### *1. Recommended Wilderness and Wild and Scenic Rivers.*

There is a lack of need for any designation or consideration of recommended wilderness, additional wilderness or of new wild and scenic rivers. The IRC's reasoning in this regard is discussed above.

#### *2. Recreation and Access Management.*

There is a strong and urgent need for increased motorized recreation opportunities in the NPC. In particular, as the DEIS recognizes, there is a need for increased opportunities for motorized recreation in the front country and in the backcountry, during summer and winter seasons. Data suggests that more than one-half of the recreational use of the NPC is related to motorized

recreation. *See* Table 2, Chapter 3, DEIS (showing data for NPC visits as 37.9% for driving for pleasure, 7.2% for motorized trail use, 5.2% for OHV use, 2.6% for OSV use, and 0.5% for other motorized uses).

With such tremendous motorized use, and the fact that motorized sport activity is increasing every year as populations age, increased opportunities are needed to avoid congestion. The DEIS recognizes emerging and increasing mountain bike use, yet totally ignores the tremendous growth among UTV sport recreation. Data available from Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation (attached as **Exhibit F**) reveals that UTV as a means of sport recreation has expanded significantly. In 2010, there were 6,078 UTVs registered in Idaho, compared with 40,393 registered in 2019, a 665% increase and a growth rate of 74% per year. UTV registration surpass motorbike registrations, and UTVs account for 24% of all registered OHVs. The FPR and DEIS should recognize for, and plan for, the burgeoning growth and popularity of UTVs. An FPR objective ought to be the retention and increase of low-level maintained roads and trails that will accommodate UTV's wider than 50 inches and other high clearance off-road vehicles.

At page E-8 of the DEIS, the DEIS singles out concerns of wilderness advocates, reflecting an apparent bias to plan the Forest in a manner to meet their concerns. This is not appropriate. Particularly where the NPC knows there is a countervailing viewpoint that is just as legitimate. To recognize, plan for and accept the concerns of wilderness advocates, to the ignorance of the concerns of motorized users, is inappropriate. Such references of implicit bias ought to be removed. The FPR and DEIS should plan for all citizens and take heed of all viewpoints.

### c. Alternatives.

**The IRC expresses its strong preference for adoption of Alternative X.** This alternative is consistent with state and local preferences, and deference to local communities and peoples is highly encouraged. This alternative also allows for great timber harvest opportunities, which directly relates to overall forest health. Importantly, Alternative X also excludes any RWA and any new WRS. It recognizes a preference for increased summer motorized use opportunities, particularly by encouraging loop opportunities. This alternative also maximizes PILT dollars for the local communities. IRC prefers Alternative X. The DEIS also confirms that Alternative X provides the best option to achieve desired conditions for all wildlife in the shortest time.

IRC considered and rejected the other alternatives for good reasons. Alternative W creates tremendous RWA areas and then excludes motorized use in the RWAs. IRC cannot support a management strategy that treats RWA as if it was already Congressionally-designated wilderness. Alternative Y is intolerable because it prohibits OSV use in the Great Burn, and motorized recreation in RWAs. Alternative Z had some attractive elements, but ultimately was found to be inappropriate because it included too much RWA and provided no opportunity for increased

summer motorized recreation. It also provides the least amount of PILT dollars for local communities.

#### **d. Wildlife and Species of Concern.**

The NPC is home to a vast number of animals. Some of those species are harvested during controlled hunting seasons administered by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Examples include bear, deer, elk and sheep. There are also some species that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, in conjunction with other federal agencies, has determined to be endangered or threatened. **The IRC is very supportive of a desired condition indicating that animal activity near and around existing human uses evidences that the animals are accepting of the existing human use.** This reflects wise recognition of actual conditions, and the ability of animals and humans to coexist.

##### *1. Canada Lynx.*

The Canada Lynx is a species that was placed on the threatened list in 2000. The main threats to the lynx are “forest fragmentation from timber harvest and human development and natural disturbances, such as wildfires and outbreaks of insects and disease.” U.S. DEP’T OF AGRIC., SALMON-CHALLIS NAT’L FOREST, DRAFT, ASSESSMENT REPORT 82-83 (2017). A number of theories have pointed that lynx competitors may follow packed snowmobile trails into lynx habitat and compete with the lynx for their primary food source. These theories have been shown to be less than factual. The first time this theory was proven false was in the Northern Rockies Lynx Amendment DEIS. That Amendment DEIS stated that “because no evidence has been provided that packed snow trails facilitate competition to a level that negatively affects lynx, we do not consider packed snowtrails to be a threat to lynx at this time.”

##### *2. North American Wolverine.*

There is no scientific evidence that winter recreation has any significant impact on wolverines. Studies have shown that trapping and predation are the major causes of mortality. These animals cover huge territories and are constantly on the move. Their population densities are naturally low, 500 square miles for males and 100 for females, and there is no real idea as to whether they are at a healthy population level or not. They freely cross major highways on their travels and do not hesitate to use snowmobile and ski tracks to ease their passage. The only time that they may actually be vulnerable is during the period of natal denning during late winter and early spring, but the data is so scarce that there can be no science-based conclusions drawn at this time. At those few natal sites that have been found, researchers have excavated dens, removed the kits and tagged them. While the females may relocate the dens following this heavy-handed human encroachment, we have seen no reports of mortality. These are truly tough animals.

The results from years of studying wolverines in Idaho will soon be completed. This study came about through the efforts of the snowmobile community. When the Payette NF proposed to close thousands of acres to snowmobiling based on wolverine concerns without any science to back up their proposal, the IRC worked with Jeff Copeland to start the study. The results that have been presented show that wolverines choose to live in high recreational areas. It is apparent that wolverines are reacting to recreational presence based on increases in activity levels and movement rates. The question then is whether or not this has a negative impact on their health or reproductive rates or otherwise. It is important to note that this study is about winter recreation, both motorized and non-motorized, and how it impacts wolverines. Basing any management decisions on the impact of snowmobilers on wolverines would be premature and unfair.

### *3. Grizzly Bear, Bighorn Sheep, Mountain Goat.*

There is no valid science to suggest that motorized recreation is having any negative effects on grizzly bear, bighorn sheep or mountain goat. With regard to mountain goat specifically, present data is lacking to show that current or historic OSV activity is in areas of critical winter habitat for mountain goats. The available data seems to suggest mountain goat mortality rates are higher in the Bitterroot Selway Wilderness than in the Great Burn. There is no justifiable basis to restrict, prohibit or limit motorized recreation activity, in winter or summer, to protect these species.

We wish to offer, in particular, that Mountain Goat appear undisturbed by OSC activity. Attached at Exhibit G is a photo taken approximately April 10, 2020 on the Forest Service road to Hoodoo Pass. The particular location is adjacent to the Land Owner Mountain Goat winter range. This is really the only identified location of a Goat winter range relevant to the Great Burn. This photo is factual evidence that Goats are not terrified of snowmobile activity. The Goat had to hear the snowmobile approach the truck and did not run away. This dispels the myth that Goats are traumatized by snowmobile noise up to three miles distant (apparent a position offered by the Great Burn Study Group in a collaborative session, but without any corroborating evidence). It also is verifiable evidence that Mountain Goats are wintering in low level snow areas, not 10 feet of snow (headwaters of Williams Creek and the South Fork of Kelly Creek).

### *4. Elk.*

The elk section of the DEIS is focused on the nutrition research conducted by John and Rachel Cook, through the Clearwater Basin Collaborative (CBC). According to their research, summer-fall nutrition is the primary factor regulating elk populations in the Clearwater Basin. Not motorized recreation or motorized routes. This section also notes that Idaho Department of Fish and Game's Elk Management Plan has identified six primary habitat issues affecting elk: invasive

plants, wildland fires, timber and rangeland management, ecological succession, human development, and energy development.” Again, Motorized recreation is not a factor.

The DEIS mentions that “the cumulative effects of predation and reduced access to quality foraging habitats are believed by biologists to be the most significant contributing factors retarding recovery of struggling elk population over much of the National Forest managed landscape.” Predation is most definitely a limiting issue. Access to quality forage habitats is also a major issue, not because of disturbance or motorized vehicles, but rather, advanced plant succession from wildfire and logging, are no longer producing high quality vegetation.

The DEIS discusses “the energetic cost of moving away from disturbance associated with roads and trails may be substantial (Cole et al. 1997) and could limit population productivity or reduce an elk’s ability to withstand winter by depleting fat reserves (Cook et al. 2004). The displacement of elk away from roads and trails may cause substantial reductions in habitat utilization. Population level impacts could occur if elk are forced into marginal habitats to avoid disturbance.” Fortunately, it was good to see that absolutely NO data was contained within the DEIS to demonstrate that these possibilities are a current issue on the NPC. In fact, that portion of the forest with the most significant population decline has very low road densities – a factor demonstrating that motorized recreation and routes are not a significant element when it comes to elk population.

“The outcomes of management strategies in the 1987 Plans for elk have not been favorable for elk herds. Since 1987, when plans were signed, elk populations in game management zones with low quality or declining forage, high amounts of hiding cover, and low road densities, such as the Lolo Zone, the Selway Zone, and some game management units in the Elk City Zone, have declined. Meanwhile, those with high quality and quantity of forage, such as in the Palouse, Dworshak, some portions of the Elk City, and Hells Canyon zones, have increased or remained at the Idaho Department of Fish and Game objective, despite having high road densities and high vulnerability.”

The DEIS further notes that **“Current conditions in the plan area suggest the limiting factor is forage, rather than hiding cover, as cover is abundant in the plan area.”** Roads are not to blame for elk population concerns. The DEIS identifies six goals underlying management of elk habitat, and none relate to roads. Emphasis seems to always be on higher nutrition. Here again, we see that Alternative X is the most aggressive in terms of the amount and rate at which desired conditions for elk habitat and nutrition are achieved. This is all the more reason that Alternative X should be adopted.

As a whole, the DEIS reflects that the major elk population issues in the NPC are the Lolo and Selway Zones, areas where roads are a very minimal issue, if at all. Basically forest-wide, elk

population management issues are both the quantity and quality of seasonal habitats and predation. Roads and road management are not significant contributing factors to these issues.

**e. Interdisciplinary Team Members and Cooperating Agencies.**

IRC is concerned that the Interdisciplinary Team does not well represent local interests. The ID team includes a Nez Perce Tribe liaison, but nobody to represent general state or local interests. Idaho and Clearwater Counties, as cooperating agencies, have requested inclusion in the ID team meetings. This request should be granted. Additionally, a state representative or liaison associated with IDPR and IDL should be included on the ID team.

**VII. SUPPORT OF OTHER COMMENTERS**

**a. Support of Backcountry Sled Patriots Comments.**

If it has not already done so, it is expected that comments on the FPR will be submitted by the Backcountry Sled Patriots. This is a well-known, active and responsible group of OSV enthusiasts. Their comments on the FPR generally focus on the Great Burn area. The IRC supports and joins in the comments of the Backcountry Sled Patriots.

**b. Multi County Comments.**

If they have not already done so, it is expected that comments on the FPR will be submitted by multiple counties in concert and agreement with one another, consisting of Idaho, Clearwater, Lewis, Shoshone, Benewah, Nez Perce and Adams Counties in Idaho, and Mineral and Ravalli Counties in Montana. The IRC supports and joins in the comments of the Multiple Counties. IRC particularly supports their suggestions for special management of the Hoodoo Area. The Multiple Counties also suggest identification of a motorized trail from Elk City to Florence, and then to the Payette NF, and the section of trail identified by the GEM connecting Smith Ridge to adjacent Idaho State lands, which are each part of a larger system. The Elk City to Florence trail would most likely cross Johns Creek, which needs an ROS setting that allows for the construction of this trail. The Smith Ridge connector needs an ROS setting enabling its construction. This objective would be a great addition to the GEM system and the vision of OHV enthusiasts to develop an OHV route running the length of Idaho from north to south.

**c. Efficient Public Collaboration.**

If it has not already done so, it is expected that comments on the FPR will be submitted by the collaborative group known as Efficient Public Collaboration. This is a broad coalition of groups and individuals with an interest in the NPC. IRC participated in its process. The IRC supports and joins in the comments of Efficient Public Collaboration.



## VIII. CONCLUSION.

The Nez Perce and Clearwater Forests are a tremendous recreation asset enjoyed by thousands upon thousands of people each year. The ability to escape society and travel through secluded parts of the forest for hours on end in motorized vehicles and vessels is a thrill and escape for many people that deal with everyday life in an urban setting. It is important that a Forest Plan Revision be developed that recognizes, appreciates and supports continued recreation, both motorized and non-motorized, within the NPC. The IRC believes the comments and suggestions set forth herein will be for the better of the NPC and the humans that appreciate all that the NPC offers. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We trust that the above will be well-received and fully considered.

Very truly yours,



David P. Claiborne

*david@sawtoothlaw.com*

Encl.

cc: Sandra Mitchell, IRC, via email  
Jeff Cook, Id. Dept. of Parks & Recreation, via email

# **EXHIBIT**

**A**

## Economic Impact of Forest-Related Sectors

Region	Forestry & Logging	Wood Product Manufacturing	Paper Manufacturing	Tourism	Total Forest-Related	Forest-Related as Percentage of All Sectors	All Sectors
<b>Employers</b>	296	25	3	482	806	19.13%	4,213
Employment (Direct)	1,623	1,459	1,207	5,677	9,966	19.45%	51,251
Employment (Diirect,indirect, and induced))	2,496	3,184	3,702	7,304	16,686	32.56%	
Payroll (Direct)	\$89,978,232	\$73,702,371	\$93,265,342	\$89,688,159	\$346,634,104	17.28%	\$2,005,758,549
Payroll ) Diirect,indirect, and induced))	\$121,780,457	\$136,559,593	\$176,392,084	\$122,402,580	\$557,134,714	27.78%	
Gross domestic product	\$83,014,933	\$149,197,721	\$325,219,303	\$178,618,682	\$736,050,639	13.93%	\$5,283,561,491
Gross domestic product (Direct, indirect, and induced))	\$110,435,557	\$251,049,674	\$552,373,577	\$247,303,985	\$1,161,162,793	21.98%	
<b>Clearwater County</b>							
Employers	37	3	-	40	80	25.72%	311
Employment (Direct)	278	38	-	195	511	19.53%	2,616
Employment (Diirect,indirect, and induced))	427	83	-	251	761	29.09%	
Payroll (Direct)	\$15,508,932	\$1,208,882	-	\$2,569,617	\$19,287,431	19.77%	\$97,566,600
Payroll ) Diirect,indirect, and induced))	\$20,990,464	\$2,239,880	-	\$3,506,904	\$26,737,248	27.40%	
Gross domestic product	\$12,388,844	\$4,055,457	-	\$7,703,048	\$24,147,349	8.99%	\$268,453,933
Gross domestic product (Direct, indirect, and induced))	\$16,480,998	\$6,823,972	-	\$10,665,147	\$33,970,117	12.65%	
<b>Idaho County</b>							
Employers	54	4	-	69	127	22.01%	577
Employment (Direct)	117	214	-	371	702	16.46%	4,264
Employment (Diirect,indirect, and induced))	180	467	-	477	1,124	26.36%	
Payroll (Direct)	\$4,562,089	\$11,142,812	-	\$4,959,866	\$20,664,767	13.40%	\$154,214,094
Payroll ) Diirect,indirect, and induced))	\$6,174,530	\$20,645,983	-	\$6,769,014	\$33,589,527	21.78%	
Gross domestic product	\$7,434,519	\$25,221,062	-	\$14,713,564	\$47,369,145	9.57%	\$494,764,942
Gross domestic product (Direct, indirect, and induced))	\$9,890,211	\$42,438,580	-	\$20,371,458	\$72,700,249	14.69%	
<b>Lewis County</b>							
Employers	19	2	-	21	42	20.00%	210
Employment (Direct)	139	165	-	153	457	27.80%	1,644
Employment (Diirect,indirect, and induced))	214	360	-	197	771	46.90%	-
Payroll (Direct)	\$7,738,924	\$6,270,645	-	\$2,487,838	\$16,497,407	31.29%	\$52,726,525
Payroll ) Diirect,indirect, and induced))	\$10,474,197	\$11,618,578	-	\$3,395,295	\$25,488,070	48.34%	\$0
Gross domestic product	\$7,051,612	\$12,272,399	-	\$2,635,005	\$21,959,016	12.99%	\$169,015,707
Gross domestic product (Direct, indirect, and induced))	\$9,380,826	\$20,650,327	-	\$3,648,259	\$33,679,412	19.93%	
<b>Benewah County</b>							
Employers	83	6	-	28	117	33.72%	347
Employment (Direct)	340	524	-	161	1,025	29.66%	3,456
Employment (Diirect,indirect, and induced))	523	1,143	-	207	1,873	54.20%	
Payroll (Direct)	\$18,596,552	\$28,315,092	-	\$1,850,443	\$48,762,087	34.87%	\$139,842,371
Payroll ) Diirect,indirect, and induced))	\$25,169,383	\$52,463,677	-	\$2,525,406	\$80,158,466	57.32%	
Gross domestic product	\$17,751,699	\$57,930,610	-	\$6,947,504	\$82,629,813	23.15%	\$356,916,489
Gross domestic product (Direct, indirect, and induced))	\$23,615,255	\$97,477,768	-	\$9,619,069	\$130,712,092	36.62%	
<b>Latah County</b>							
Employers	71	3	-	140	214	19.35%	1,106
Employment (Direct)	535	185	-	1,937	2,657	19.23%	13,814
Employment (Diirect,indirect, and induced))	823	404	-	2,492	3,719	26.92%	
Payroll (Direct)	\$30,346,941	\$9,315,579	-	\$27,880,688	\$67,543,208	13.11%	\$515,261,417
Payroll ) Diirect,indirect, and induced))	\$41,072,871	\$17,260,390	-	\$38,050,376	\$96,383,637	18.71%	
Gross domestic product	\$25,862,949	\$16,954,468	-	\$62,750,738	\$105,568,155	8.27%	\$1,275,830,048
Gross domestic product (Direct, indirect, and induced))	\$34,405,728	\$28,528,678	-	\$86,880,653	\$149,815,059	11.74%	
<b>Nez Perce County</b>							
Employers	21	5	3	119	148	11.91%	1,243
Employment (Direct)	180	329	1,207	2,195	3,911	18.63%	20,997
Employment (Diirect,indirect, and induced))	277	718	3,702	2,824	7,521	35.82%	
Payroll (Direct)	\$12,205,506	\$17,364,088	\$93,265,342	\$40,169,421	\$163,004,357	18.65%	\$874,091,782
Payroll ) Diirect,indirect, and induced))	\$16,519,463	\$32,173,087	\$176,392,084	\$54,821,515	\$279,906,149	32.02%	
Gross domestic product	\$10,774,061	\$32,127,586	\$325,219,303	\$64,928,878	\$433,049,829	19.20%	\$2,254,989,270
Gross domestic product (Direct, indirect, and induced))	\$14,332,836	\$54,059,941	\$552,373,577	\$89,896,365	\$710,662,719	31.52%	
<b>Shoshone County</b>							
Employers	11	2	-	65	78	18.62%	419
Employment (Direct)	34	4	-	665	703	15.76%	4,460
Employment (Diirect,indirect, and induced))	52	9	-	856	917	20.56%	
Payroll (Direct)	\$1,019,288	\$85,273	-	\$9,770,286	\$10,874,847	6.32%	\$172,055,760
Payroll ) Diirect,indirect, and induced))	\$1,379,549	\$157,998	-	\$13,334,070	\$14,871,617	8.64%	
Gross domestic product	\$1,751,249	\$636,139	-	\$18,939,944	\$21,327,332	4.60%	\$463,591,102
Gross domestic product (Direct, indirect, and induced))	\$2,329,703	\$1,070,408	-	\$26,223,034	\$29,623,145	6.39%	

# **EXHIBIT**

## **B**

## **Efficient Public Collaboration Topic #1**

### **Forest Plan Revision Recommendation for the Great Burn**

- I. **Introduction:** Efficient Public Collaboration (EPC) is a non-profit organization working collaboratively to find resolutions to natural resource issues and to make recommendations to public agencies. EPC is organized using the Forest Service's definition of collaboration:

*"Collaboration: A structured manner in which a collection of people with diverse interests share knowledge, ideas, and resources while working together in an inclusive and cooperative manner towards a common purpose." 36 CFR 219.19*

EPC is a collection of people with diverse interests (representing approximately 45 organizations/ groups/interests), working in a structured manner (non-profit organization with a Mission Statement and Charter), sharing knowledge, ideas and resources, while working together in an inclusive and cooperative manner (EPC is open to any group or organization agreeing to the Charter) and works towards a common purpose (EPC works toward a single goal of "what is in the greater public interest" when looking at public lands). EPC is not a collection of people, each working towards their own individual interest.

EPC is **not** an advocacy group lobbying towards any one position or agenda. EPC is a platform to facilitate the diverse public interests in a collaborative process focused on a common purpose, a purpose greater than each individual interest.

- II. **The Collaborative Topic:** The Collaborative Topic EPC addresses in this document is:

*What land allocation and Plan Components should the Great Burn (Hoodoo Roadless Area) be assigned as part of the Nez Perce –Clearwater NF's Forest Plan Revision.*

- III. **EPC's Recommendation:** The Collaborative Group came to a consensus on the following recommendation:

EPC's Collaborative Group for the Great Burn supports an alternative for the Great Burn that allocates it to a Special Management Area (rather than recommended wilderness) that allows a variety of summer and winter recreational activities (both motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized) while protecting the natural beauty and resources of the area. EPC also support this as the Preferred Alternative in the Draft EIS. Recommended Plan Components are attached in Appendix A.

This recommendation would not remove the Great Burn from consideration for wilderness designation in the future.

In summary, the EPC is making this recommendation for the following reason. A more detail discussion will follow:

- The Great Burn is the only remaining area on the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest that provide this high elevation setting with numerous lakes that can be utilized by a variety of uses that are not available in wilderness
- There is historical use of this area by a variety of user which have social and economic benefits.
- Human intervention has increased fuels and altered the climate that may not allow for natural processes under the wilderness act
- The Idaho Roadless Rule eliminated development in the Great Burn

This recommendation does not establish a position of EPC. EPC does not advocate for or against any position. This EPC recommendation is only in the context of this area, on this National Forest, at this time.

**IV. EPC's Process for arriving at the Recommendation:** EPC's common purpose/goal is to facilitate a dialogue concerning as broad a set of interests held by the public related to the Great Burn as possible and within the parameters that we understand the Forest Plan Revision to be operating under. The Collaborative Group (representatives approximately 34 organizations/groups) came together not to negotiate over how to divvy up the pie, but to collectively identify how all interests could be captured within or close to the area. Although EPC is open to any organizations/group that agrees to EPC's purpose/goal, some organizations chose not to participate. In staying with EPC's goal, their interests were still taken into account by the Collaborative Group.

The rationale for the Collaborative Committee/Group's recommendation is outlined in detail below. The Collaborative Committee/Group looked at 1) Public Participation, 2) Social and Economic Sustainability, and 3) Ecological Sustainability.

### **1) Public Interest and EPC's Process:**

EPC's core goal is to facilitate a dialogue concerning as broad a set of interests held by the public as possible. EPC relied on the definitions of "public" and "public involvement" identified in 36 CFR 219.4, 40 CFR 1501.7, 36 CFR 220, and FSH 1909.12 Chapter 70 as a guide to assure we met the collaborative's common goal of including all possible public interests. This also assists in avoiding the polarized dialogue of negotiation based on each participant locking in to only their own organizations agenda. This provided a means to engage the participants in a process



that did not begin with identification of their individual interests, but that captured all possible public interests.

The Collaborative Committee/Group discussed the importance of public participation since the Forest Service's direction is so extensive on the topic. The Collaborative Committee/Group asked; what does public participation mean and what importance does public participation have in the process and decision making for public lands? The Collaborative Committee/Group took into account the importance of public participation; that recommending contrary to public interest would require substantial justification.

EPC also believes this philosophy follows the intent of a recent letter by Christopher B. French's (Reviewing Officer for the Chief) dated March 14, 2019, Subject: Objection Response for the Umatilla, Malheur, and Wallowa-Whitman National Forests Revised land management Plans.

EPC looked at each of the categories of public participation (219.4) with the following results:

1. Individuals and public and private organization or entities: The Collaborative Committee/Group found there is unanimous agreement amongst all publics, regardless of interest, that the Great Burn is a special area, worthy of protection. The discussion amongst the public was not the special nature of the area, but rather how public access the area.

Public comments concerning the Great Burn are split between recommending or not recommending for wilderness. The actual split is difficult to determine based on individual comments. This is due to the fact that organizations, particularly those with funding and paid staff, are much more effective at soliciting and submitting comments. The range of opinion may or may not vary when looking at input locally, regionally, or nationally.

There are other sources of information that shed light on where the public stands on this topic:

- a. Idaho County (considered a local public) held an advisory vote on wilderness additions in 2018. The results were 72 percent in opposition to additional wilderness (5,046 to 1,948).
- b. Bonner County (considered a regional public) had put designating Scotchman Peak as wilderness on their ballot in 2018. The results were 54 percent in opposition to wilderness designation (5,672 to 4,831).
- c. Clearwater Basin Collaborative (CBC). CBC has been discussing this topic for several years with varying results and agreements. There has not been a consensus on the Great Burn and support for wilderness varies depending on the compromise being put forward.

- d. **Efficient Public Collaboration (EPC):** The Great Burn Collaborative Group for this topic consists of approximately 35 organizations/groups working collaboratively. As indicated in this document, the collaborative Committee/Group did reach a consensus concerning the Great Burn.

These are only samples of the public and care should be taken as to how to apply them; however, they are public input that should be considered.

- 2. **State Government (Idaho State):** The Idaho State Legislature, The Sixty-fourth legislature, Second regular Session 2018 approved a joint Senate and House Memorial No. 103 which opposed any new wilderness in Idaho.
- 3. **State of Idaho, Department of Fish and Game:** IDFG stated that wilderness adversely affects IDFG's ability to perform their statutory responsibility to study, survey, and manage the state's fish and game populations.
- 4. **State of Idaho, Department of Parks and Recreation:** The Department of Parks and Recreation does not support the recommendation of the Great Burn as wilderness because it eliminates recreational uses, particularly snowmobiles and mountain bikes.
- 5. **Local Governments (Idaho, Clearwater, Mineral, Missoula, and Ravalli Counties):** The Great Burn is in both Clearwater and Idaho County. Ravalli, Mineral, and Missoula Counties in Montana have expressed interest in the Great Burn as it affects their residents both socially and economically.
  - a. Clearwater County has a Natural Resource Plan. Although the Great Burn is on federal land, their Natural Resource Plan addresses the area since it affects the economic and social sustainability of Clearwater County. Because of social and economic concerns and the amount of existing wilderness around the County, Clearwater County does not support wilderness designation for the Great Burn.
  - b. Idaho County has a Natural Resource Plan. Although the Great Burn is on federal land, their Natural Resource Plan addresses wilderness since it affects the economic and social sustainability of Idaho County. Because of social and economic concerns, the election results, and the amount of existing wilderness in and around Idaho County, Idaho County Commissioners do not support wilderness designation for the Great Burn.
  - c. Ravalli County does not have a Natural Resource Plan. Although the Great Burn is on federal land and outside Ravalli County, the commissioners are still concerned with the economic and social sustainability of Ravalli County. Because of social and economic concerns and the amount of existing wilderness in and adjacent to the county, the Ravalli County Commissioners do not support wilderness designation for the Great Burn.
  - d. Missoula County did not have a position on the Great Burn at this time.

- e. Mineral County provides a major portal to the Great Burn and therefore the commissioners are concerned with the economic and social impacts the management of the Great Burn have on Mineral County. Because of social and economic concerns and the amount of existing wilderness adjacent to the county, Mineral County Commissioners do not support wilderness designation for the Great Burn.
  - f. Both Idaho and Clearwater Counties support the State of Idaho Memorial No.103 discussed earlier.
6. Other Federal Agencies: No other Federal Agencies were identified as having input or comments.
7. Nez Perce Tribe: See Nez Perce Tribe comments.
8. Youth and Low Income: No information available

**Conclusion:** The Collaborative Committee/Group took into account the public comments and interest as identified in 219.4.

After discussion, EPC concluded there are differing views over the Great Burn as to whether it should or should not be wilderness. However, when we looked at each of the entities identified in the planning rule, the vast majority of those entity's comments are squarely for recognition of the Great Burn as a special place but not recommending as wilderness. The reason for this is largely due to the amount of existing wilderness in close proximity to this area, the amount of wilderness in the State of Idaho, the restrictions it puts on the people and State Agencies, that it is the only area remaining that provides for a specific recreational setting and opportunity, and the interest in this area by other recreation visitors, including horseman, hunters, mountain bikers, aviators, and snowmobilers.

It was this conclusions that helped EPC make the recommendation cited in this document.

## **2) Social and Economic Sustainability**

EPC relied on the list of items to be taken into consideration identified in 36 CFR 219.8 and the ecosystem services in 36 CFR 219.19 as a guide to assure we met the collaborative's common goal of including all possible public interests in the coming to the recommendation. This provided a means to engage the participants in a process that did not begin with identification of their individual interests, but that captured all possible public interests.

EPC also took into account and recognized the importance of social and economic consideration as highlighted in a recent letter by Christopher B. French's (Reviewing Officer for the Chief) dated March 14, 2019, Subject: Objection Response for the Umatilla, Malheur, and Wallowa-Whitman National Forests Revised land management Plans, which stated, "The Revised Plans

also did not fully account for the unique social and economic needs of the affected communities” in his rationale for instructing the forest to withdraw the draft Record of Decision.

The Collaborative Committee/Group looked at the history and context of the area and is summarized below:

The Great Burn was designated as recommended wilderness in the 1987 Clearwater Forest Plan. During this period there was considerable emphasis on timber production and much of the Forest was suitable for timber production and scheduled to be roaded. The Great Burn was one of two areas recommended for wilderness. Snowmobiling was taking place in the Great Burn, but at low levels. Mountain biking was also a minor recreational activity at that time.

Since the Plan was first signed thirty years ago, there have been many changes or changed conditions. These changes include, but are not limited to:

1. Implementation of the Idaho Roadless Rule, which removed large tracks of land from the suitable timber base and restricted or eliminated timber harvest and road construction.
2. Increase in snowmobile technology has allowed snowmobilers to access more back-country areas. This recreational activity has grown considerably since the first Forest Plan over 30 years ago and new technologies like snow bikes and hybrids will continue to add new winter users.
3. Increase in mountain biking as a recreational activity, including in the Great Burn.
4. Consolidation of the Clearwater and Nez Perce National Forests into one forest, which has approximately 1.2 million acres of existing wilderness.
5. Listing of salmon and steelhead under the Endangered Species Act which resulted in direction under INFISH and PACFISH further restricting timber harvest on the Forests.

Snowmobiles and mountain bikes were restricted in the Great Burn in 2014 because it was recommended for wilderness in the 1987 Forest Plan. The Great Burn is the only remaining high elevation setting on the Forest where the recreating public can access by means other than hiking or horseback or where mechanized equipment like game carts can be used. This is true for both summer and winter activities. All similar areas on the Forest are either in existing wilderness, have been restricted, or physically not viable. There are few areas in close proximity to the forest that provide similar opportunities because they are either existing wilderness, recommended for wilderness, or are restricted.

The Great Burn is unique because it provides recreational opportunities to a variety of users in one area. Its high elevation scenery, mountain peaks, and numerous high mountain lakes make it a desirable area. These areas are desired by a diverse public. Comments heard are that people using mountain bikes, snowmobilers, or other users of mechanized means appreciate

these areas as much as hikers or people on horseback. Their concern is that with each decision, areas like the Great Burn are only available to a specific user group. Under the multiple-use concept there should be some areas in this setting available to them.

This area provides the high elevation steep open basins as well as open meadows and ridgelines some snowmobilers seek. It provides both challenging and easy opportunities. The closest area with similar attributes is the West Bighole in Montana. Snowmobilers claim the Great Burn is safer than other similar areas, which is a draw for this area. Mallard Larkin is another roadless area close to the Great Burn, but it does not provide the snowmobile or mountain bike opportunities the Great Burn does because of limited access, difficult terrain, or restrictive vegetation.

The Great Burn provides mountain bike opportunities with challenging trails to numerous high lakes and above timberline opportunities. With the advent of bike packing gear the Great Burn provides opportunities for camping and back country hunting using bicycles. There are no other areas in close proximity that provide the number of high lakes available to mountain biking. Bicycles have been fitted with scabbards to carry chainsaws, allowing bicyclists to become an integral part of many forest's trail maintenance, s and they have been responsible for clearing hundreds of miles of trails each year.

Other recreational users, including backcountry hunters, horseman, and fisherman want to see some unique areas like the Great Burn available to mechanized uses or use of motors like chainsaws to open trail or for other recreational, administrative and/or management needs.

Over the years, motorized and mechanized activities have been eliminated or restricted from areas recommended for wildernesses across the Region 1. The increased use of the Great Burn by snowmobilers has partly been a result of the incremental closure of other high elevation snowmobile areas. As areas are closed, users are looking for the few remaining areas; the Great Burn is one of those areas. The Great Burn provides some of the most sought after high elevation, high basin snowmobiling areas. It is also recognized for its safety as many of the areas have lower avalanche risk. In 2014, after approximately 30 years of existing use, the Forest Service restricted snowmobiling and mountain biking in the Great Burn.

Since this reduction has been done incrementally EPC recommends that a cumulative effects analysis be complete.

**Conclusion:** There was unanimous agreement from everyone the Collaborative Committee/Group heard from that the Great Burn is a special area that needs preservation.

EPC's process for its recommendation is grounded in the list of plan components 219.8. Specifically taking into account:

- (1) Social, cultural, and economic conditions relevant to the area influenced by the plan: The Great Burn has over 30 years of existing recreational use including snowmobiling and mtn bikes. This has established a long social, cultural, and economic condition relevant to the area. This has been recognized not only by the public but by the five affected counties. We ask that the social and economic impact of eliminating these uses be considered in evaluating this alternative.
- (2) Sustainable recreation; including recreation settings, opportunities, and access; and scenic character: This is the only area on the Forest or within close proximity to the Forest that provides this unique recreational opportunity. The question that the Collaborative Committee/Group could not find an answer to was, "If not here then where?" We ask that evaluation of this alternative include identification of the distance to other areas providing the same recreational opportunities.
- (3) Multiple uses that contribute to local, regional, and national economies in a sustainable manner: Eliminating these multiple uses would adversely affect the contribution they make to local and regional economies, as well as their sustainability. We ask that evaluation of the alternatives analyze these economic impacts on local and regional economies.
- (4) Ecosystem Service: Is discussed in more detail below.
- (5) Cultural and historic resources and uses: See Nez Perce comments.
- (6) Opportunities to connect people with nature: This is the only area that provides this unique setting that is available to people who may only be able to access the area by motorized or mechanized means. To remove this area would reduce opportunities to connect people with nature not increase. We ask that evaluation of the alternative include identification of the distance to other areas providing the same opportunities for connection with nature for those only able to access through motorized or mechanized means.

EPC's process also focused on the definition of Ecosystem Services (219.19):

- (1) *Provisioning services, such as clean air and fresh water, energy, food, fuel, forage, wood products or fiber, and minerals;*
- (2) *Regulating services, such as long-term storage of carbon; climate regulation; water filtration, purification, and storage; soil stabilization; flood and drought control; and disease regulation;*



*(3) Supporting services, such as pollination, seed dispersal, soil formation, and nutrient cycling; and*

*(4) Cultural services, such as educational, aesthetic, spiritual, and cultural heritage values, recreational experiences, and tourism opportunities.*

Recommending this area as wilderness removes the only area that can provide Ecosystem Services that wilderness cannot provide. There is approximately 1.2 million acres of existing wilderness on the Forest that provide for Ecosystem Services associated with wilderness.

The Collaborative Committee/Group agrees that Ecosystem Service, items 1 thru 3 are provide by and protected in the Great Burn with any mix of multiple uses, including the elimination of mechanized uses. However, the services listed in #4 seem to require access to nature through multiple means. We ask that evaluation of the alternative pay particular attention to whether the ecosystem services including: *Cultural services, such as educational, aesthetic, spiritual, and cultural heritage values, recreational experiences, and tourism opportunities*, are served.

### **3) Ecological Sustainability:**

EPC relied on the list of items to be taken into consideration identified in 36 CFR 219.8 as a guide to assure we met the collaborative's common goal of including all possible public interests in the coming to the recommendation. This provided a means to engage the participants in a process that did not begin with identification of their individual interests, but that captured all possible public interests.

36 CFR 219.8 Sustainability, states, "The plan must include plan components, including standards or guidelines, to maintain or restore the ecological integrity of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystem and watersheds in the plan area, as follows:

(a) Ecosystem Sustainability (1) Ecosystem Integrity, ..... taking into account:

- (i) Interdependence of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems in the plan area,
- (ii) Contributions of the plan area to ecological conditions within the broader landscape influenced by the plan area,
- (iii) Conditions in the broader landscape that may influence the sustainability of resources and ecosystems within the plan area,

- (iv) System drivers, including dominant ecological processes, disturbance regimes, and stressors, such as natural succession, wildland fire, invasive species, and climate change; and the ability of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems on the plan area to adapt to change,
- (v) Wildland fire and opportunities to restore fire adapted ecosystems,
- (vi) Opportunities for landscape scale restoration.

(a)(2) Air, soil, and water.

(a)(3) Riparian areas.

This direction is also pointed out in The Wilderness Society's (TWS) letter dated April 7, 2015 and posted on the Forest's website.

The Collaborative Committee/Group considered these comments as well in discussing the protection of ecological sustainability. The Collaborative Committee/Group considered not only the wilderness act, but other applicable laws as well. These include, but are not limited to, the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act (MUSYA), Resource Protection Act (RPA), National Forest Management Act (NFMA), Organic Act, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act (ESA), and National Historic Preservation Act (NHPR). All of these, plus others, provide guidance for the management of and protection of public lands. They provide protection for a range of resources, including wildlife, fish, vegetation, watershed, and ecosystems.

There are situation in which the wilderness act may not provide adequate protection and in fact have adverse effects to ecological sustainability. Due to fire suppression of the last 100 years some fuel loads have increased to above desired condition. Climate change resulting in dryer, longer, and warmer summers combined with increased fuel loads may result in wildfires that can adversely affect ecological sustainability. The use of management tools like prescribed fire may provide for better ecological sustainability.

As identified by Idaho Department of Fish and Game, wilderness adversely affects the state's statutory responsibility and ability to manage wildlife, which in turn could adversely affect ecological sustainability.

When the Collaborative Committee/Group looked at this area it was through the totality of all interest not just one. The Great Burn is covered by the Idaho Roadless Rule, which is a higher level decision than a Forest Plan. The Idaho Roadless Rule restricts or eliminates timber harvest and road construction in the Great Burn. Because of the protection by the Idaho Roadless Rule and the many existing laws and regulations there does not appear to be threat to ecological sustainability of the Great Burn whether it is or is not recommended for wilderness. Either way the forest will provide plan components that protect the areas ecological sustainability in accordance with 36 CFR 219.8(a).

The larger decision for the Forest Plan is how to manage recreation and/or travel through this area, while protecting ecological sustainability. Historically (for more than 30 years) snowmobiles and other users have utilized this area. We found no documentation as to adverse effects from the management of the area over the last 30 years; the area is still a unique and beautiful place.

When looking at the specific items under 36 CFR 219.8 (a) the collaborative Committee/Group came to the following conclusions:

- (i) Interdependence of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems in the plan area: *This item would not be affected whether recommended or not recommended for wilderness given the existing laws, regulation, Idaho Roadless Rule, and plan components as required by the planning rule.*
- (ii) Contributions of the plan area to ecological conditions within the broader landscape influenced by the plan area: *There was agreement from all on this item. However, the ecological condition within the broader landscape would not be affected whether recommended or not recommended for wilderness given the existing laws, regulation, Idaho Roadless Rule, and plan components as required by the planning rule.*
- (iii) Conditions in the broader landscape that may influence the sustainability of resources and ecosystems within the plan area: *Condition within the broader landscape would not be affected whether recommended or not recommended for wilderness given the existing laws, regulation, Idaho Roadless Rule, and plan components as required by the planning rule.*
- (iv) System drivers, including dominant ecological processes, disturbance regimes, and stressors, such as natural succession, wildland fire, invasive species, and climate change; and the ability of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems on the plan area to adapt to change: *With issues like climate change, invasive species, and fuel loads, the collaborative agreed that having management options (i.e. - prescribed fire or treatment of invasive species) would better provide for ecosystem sustainability than would be provided if the area was recommended or designated as wilderness.*
- (v) Wildland fire and opportunities to restore fire adapted ecosystems: *Similar to (iv) above, given climate change and fuel loads, the ability to restore the fire adapted ecosystem may best be achieved using prescribed fire and other management action rather than relying on uncharacteristic wildfires resulting from climate change.*
- (vi) Opportunities for landscape scale restoration. *The collaborative did not feel that landscape scale restoration was an issue for the Great Burn.*

**Conclusion:** The Collaborative Committee/Group agreed that there appears to be no issue with protecting this beautiful area so many people want to see protected. This conclusion is based on the existing laws, regulations, Idaho Roadless Rule, and the required plan components to provide for ecological sustainability. This appears to be true whether the area is recommended or not recommended for wilderness.

**Summary:** The issue for the Great Burn appears to be more how people recreate and travel through the area while protecting resources, particularly wildlife. It is less of an issue about the biological environment given the existing situation.

The Collaborative Committee/Group's recommendation is for a collaborative effort consisting of a variety of users (user groups, IDFG, Nez Perce Tribe, a University, and the Forest) to work in a collaborative process for the protection of the area. This would include studies to determine impacts, monitoring, and establishment of use areas. It is our desire to see everyone working together and looking at the same data. As an example, there are opportunities for IDFG and snowmobilers to work together to collect information on mountain goat location and population. This should result in greater agreement resulting in the protection of the area and benefiting everyone.

In discussions with IDFG, they believe there is room to protect mountain goats and allow for snowmobiling in portions of the Great Burn. It is this cooperative attitude that the Collaborative Group/Committee is recommending.

**V. The Collaborative Participants and Other Organization Contacted:**

<b>Organization in Collaborative Group Agreeing to Recommendation</b>	<b>Group Representative</b>
Area II, Agency on Aging, Director	Zeke Ulery
American Legion (AL)	Jinny Cash
Back County Hikers, Bicyclists & Equestrian, Inc	Cory Biggers
Clearwater County Commissioner	Mike Ryan
Clearwater Trekkers	Leslie Anderson
Idaho Aviation Association (IAA)	Bill Ables
Idaho Co. Veterans Association (VFW, AL	Jinny Cash
Idaho County Commissioner	Skip Brant
Idaho Park & Rec	Randy Doman
Idaho Pathfinders	Todd Stenzel
Idaho Recreation Council	Mark Jennings
Idaho Soil and Water Conservation Commission	Eileen Rowan
Idaho State Snowmobile Association	Sandra Mitchell
Idaho Wild Sheep Foundation	Mike Schiegel
International Mountain Bike Assoc. (IMBA)	Aaron Clark
Health Care Administration	Michelle Gardner
Lewis and Clark ATV Club	Jim McIver
Lewis County Commissioner	Greg Johnson
Mineral County Commissioner	Roman Zylawy
Mining Interest	Ron Harding
Montana Mountain Bike Alliance. (MMBA)	Greg Beardslee
National Wild Turkey Foundation	Alex Arnold
Public Lands Access Year-round (PLAY)	Dave Galantuomini
Ravalli County Commissioner	Chris Hoffman
River Access For Tomorrow (RAFT)	Jim McIver
Small Businesses	Don Ebert
Small Businesses	Kelli Rosollini
Team Lochsa	Scott Bledsoe
The Oregon Pilots Association (OPA)	Bill Ables
The Recreational Aviation Foundation (RAF)	Bill Ables
Twin Rivers Back Country Horseman (TRBCHI)	Carl Paulson
Professor Natural Resources School	Steve Daley-Laursen
Professor of Environmental Philosophy	Bert Baumgartner (Dr.)
Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW)	Jinny Cash
Western Whitewater Association	Shay White

<b>Organization/ Individual Advising the Collaborative</b>	
University of Idaho (Law - Student)	Chris Murrey
University of Idaho (Professor of Law)	Barb Cosens (Dr.)
Idaho Department of Fish and Game	Zach Swearingen
Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest	Zach Peterson

<b>Organization in Collaborative Group Having a different Recommendation</b>	<b>Group Representative</b>
None	

## Appendix A – Plan Components

### *Desired Condition*

**GA2-DC-SPECIAL-01.** *There are opportunities for exploration, risk, challenge, and primitive recreation in both summer and winter. Outfitter guides may support these uses.*

**GA2-DC-SPECIAL-02.** *Summer recreation opportunities range from semi-primitive non-motorized to primitive, with the exception of access to Fish Lake, which is semi-primitive motorized.*

**GA2-DC-SPECIAL-03.** *Winter recreation opportunities range from semi-primitive motorized (maximum 36%), to semi-primitive non-motorized, to primitive.*

**GA2-DC-SPECIAL-04.** *Vegetation composition, structure and patterns represent the natural range of variation, and largely appear to be affected by natural ecological processes and disturbances, e.g. fire, insects and disease.*

### *Goal*

**GA2-GOAL-SPECIAL-01.** *The Forest, public representatives, and representative from IDFG, Nez Perce Tribe, Clearwater County, and the University of Idaho collaborate on project identification, research, adaptive management, and monitoring of activities.*

### *Objectives*

**GA2-OBJ-SPECIAL-01.** *Open areas to winter motorized and summer mechanized travel within first year.*

**GA2-OBJ-SPECIAL-02.** *Complete a management plan with an adaptive management strategy to identify recreational opportunities for winter and summer travel within 3 years.*

### *Standards*

None

### *Guidelines*

None

### *Suitability*

<b>Proposed Activities in Areas</b>	<b>Suitable</b>	<b>Not Suitable</b>
Motorized Travel - Summer	Access to Fish Lake Only	Remaining Area
Motorized Travel - Winter	Yes, Maximum 36%	Remaining Area
Mechanized Travel - Summer and Winter	Yes, designated routes or areas only	
Motorized, Aircraft, and Mechanized Uses for Administrative Purposes	Yes	
Motorized, Aircraft, and Mechanized Uses for other agencies, including State, Tribal, and Local Gov. for Administrative Purposes	Yes, by permit only	
Recreational Aircraft	Yes, by permit only	
Timber Harvest, Road Construction, Mining	See Idaho Roadless Rule for direction concerning these activities	



# **EXHIBIT**

**C**

**Efficient Public Collaboration: Topic #3**  
**Forest Plan Revision – Draft EIS**  
**Comments: Recommended Wilderness Area (RWA)**

- I. **Introduction:** Efficient Public Collaboration (EPC) is a non-profit organization working collaboratively to find resolutions to natural resource issues and to make recommendations to public agencies. EPC is organized using the U.S. Forest Service definition of collaboration:

*“Collaboration: A structured manner in which a collection of people with diverse interests share knowledge, ideas, and resources while working together in an inclusive and cooperative manner towards a common purpose.” 36 CFR 219.19*

EPC is a collection of people with diverse interests (the Collaborative Pool has approximately 46 organizations/ groups/interests), working in a structured manner (non-profit organization with a Mission Statement and Charter), sharing knowledge, ideas and resources, while working together in an inclusive and cooperative manner (EPC is open to any group or organization agreeing to the Charter), and works towards a common purpose (EPC works toward a single goal of what is in the broadest possible public interest when looking at public lands). EPC is not a collection of people, each working towards their own individual interest, but rather focused on a common purpose, a purpose exceeding each individual interest.

- II. **EPC’s Process for arriving at its Recommendation:** EPC’s common purpose/goal is to facilitate a dialogue that focuses on multiple public interests or the greatest good. In short, EPC defines the public interest, as framed by the courts, as identifying the broadest a set of interests held by the public related to the topic and within the parameters the agency must operate under. EPC’s Collaborative Group for this topic represents approximately 40 organizations/groups that came together not to negotiate over how to divvy up the pie, but to collectively identify how all interests could be considered and a solution in the broadest possible interest identified. .

While EPC is open to any organizations/group that agrees with its purpose/goal, some organizations choose not to participate in the EPC’s process. The interests of these groups are still taken into account by EPC’s Collaborative Group.

- III. **The Collaborative Topic:** EPC’s Advisory Group, after discussions with EPC members and National Forests, selects a topic to collaborate on. The Collaborative Topic EPC addresses in this document is:

*What lands should be allocated as Recommended Wilderness Areas (RWA) and what Plan Components should be assigned to these RWAs as part of the Nez Perce –Clearwater NF’s Forest Plan Revision.*

**IV. EPC's Recommendation:** The Collaborative Group came to a consensus on the following recommendations for each of the Roadless Areas (RA). The rational for each recommendation will follow:

- a. Mallard Larkin RA: Recommend as a RWA
- b. Hoodoo RA (Great Burn): Not recommend as a RWA,
- c. North Fork Face RA (Selway Addition): Not recommend as a RWA
- d. Sneakfoot RA (Selway Addition): Not recommend as a RWA
- e. East Meadow Creek RA and West Meadow Creek RA: Not recommend as a RWA
- f. All Other RA: Not recommend as a RWA

**V. EPC's Rational for each of the Roadless Areas Recommendation:**

The Collaborative Group's rational for each of the recommendations are based on the following:

- a. **General - Context:** There is approximately 1.14 million acres (29%) of congressionally designated wilderness on the Nez-Perce Clearwater National Forest (Forest). This is the second largest land allocation on the Forest and an allocation the revision process can not alter. Although the Forest can recommend areas for wilderness they cannot designate wilderness. The largest land allocation is from the Idaho Roadless Rule which created approximately 1.48 million acres (38%) of Forest as Idaho Roadless Area. The Idaho Roadless Rule is a higher level decision than the Forest Plan and therefore the revision process can not alter this allocation either. Land suitable for timber production is another allocation of approximately 932,000 acres (24%) of the Forest. Although this allocation can be altered by the revision process, this number represents the highest acreage possible and could only be reduced through revision.

From a recreational opportunity aspect (ROS) or an access stand point the Forest is currently around 54% non-motorized. Of this approximately 30% is in a primitive classification, which is largely in designated wildernesses and cannot be changed in the revision process. Roaded Natural and Rural classification are also fairly consistent between alternative ranging from 24% to 26% combined. The main issue is with the Semi-Primitive allocation divided between motorized and non-motorized. In the DEIS SPNM and SPM range by alternative from:

Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized (SPNM):	34% to 13%
Semi-Primitive Motorized (SPM):	32% to 18%

It should be noted that these number can misrepresent the actual usage on the forest. Examples of this include:

Example 1: An area may be mapped as semi-primitive motorized for winter but given the terrain, snow condition, and/or vegetation there may be large areas that are not used or physically not capable of being used by motorized vehicles.

Example 2: Conversely, there may be areas mapped as semi-primitive non-motorized that because of terrain, vegetation, or other physical restriction are not utilized or desired by the public.

Example 3: There is also the situation where areas within a mapped semi-primitive motorized allocation are closed to motorized travel for a variety of reason, including but not limited to, resource protection, winter range, calving season, and/or to reduce motorized density.

In general the public appears to be more interested in specific areas and types of use rather than overall percentages of ROS allocation acres. There are some groups that do focus on ROS percentages. Although the Forest DEIS did not address this concern with ROS, EPC did take this into account as it identified the varying public interest in making its recommendation.

- b. **General - Protection of Resources:** There is almost total agreement that many of these roadless areas provide for important resources like fisheries, wildlife, water quality, and other resource. The vast majority of interests agree these values and areas need protection. The differences appear to be more about how to protect them.

Some groups view Wilderness designation as the vessel to provide maximum protection. They want the permanent protection provided by a congressionally protected area and not able to be altered by the next revised forest plan.

There are others who want the full range of management activities, including timber harvest as the way to provide protection.

There are some who what the area protected but believe the wilderness act is too restrictive and in some cases, because of the act's restrictions actually threaten some of the resource by restricting activities needed to protect the resources. These groups see the Idaho Roadless Rule with the addition of the Forest Plan providing the protection needed. This concept appears to have the greatest support.

- c. **Mallard Larkin RA:** Recommends as a RWA  
EPC agrees with the wilderness assessment's description of the Mallard Larkin RA. EPC also agreed with the wilderness assessment that there were minimal conflicts identified with summer/winter motorized use or mtn biking. Because of the high degree of wilderness character and minimal user conflicts, EPC recommends this area as a RWA. EPC also recommends this area as a RWA because the collaborative

felt that it provided for a greater amount of public interest when considered part of a total package of areas recommended as wilderness. Although there are some who do not want to see any recommended wilderness, there are others who do what to see areas recommended for wilderness; adding this serve the greater interest, thus increasing interests addressed.

d. **Hoodoo RA (Great Burn):** Not recommend as a RWA

The rational for the Hoodoo RA was discussed in a previous recommendation to the Forest during its comment period prior to the DEIS. EPC recommended the area be recognized as a “special management” area protecting the resources similar to wilderness but allowing for certain activities to continue. EPC believe the rationale for the recommendation is still valid. That recommendation is attached to this recommendation. A summary of that rational follows:

- The Great Burn is the only remaining area on the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest that provide this high elevation setting with numerous lakes that can be utilized by a variety of uses that are not available in the existing wildernesses on the Forest.
- There are historical uses of this area by a variety of user which have social and economic benefits.
- Human intervention has increased fuels and altered the climate that may not allow for natural processes under the wilderness act
- The Idaho Roadless Rule eliminated development in the Great Burn

EPC agrees with the wilderness assessment concerning the ecological value of this area; however, we feel the assessment and the DEIS did not accurately identified the historical users and those interests nor did it describe the context and intensity of this area in relationship to the entire forest.

EPC recognized there are some groups who want to see this area as an RWA, however, the collaborative was not able to determine that in doing so would address the greater interests.

e. **North Fork Face and Sneakfoot RAs (Selway Addition):** Not recommend as a RWA

EPC agreed with the wilderness assessment’s description concerning the ecological value of the North Face and Sneakfoot RA. However, EPC did not feel that the wilderness assessment or the DEIS accurately described or recognized the current users and the many interests nor did it describe the context and intensity of this area in relationship to the entire forest.

There has always been a public interest in areas that have easy access (close to towns or hwys) with quality summer and winter recreation opportunities. This area has and does provide that opportunity for the public, particularly those on the east

side of the Forest. This is a relatively small area but a popular area with potential for growth and capable of accommodating increased use.

This area provides for a mix of family oriented recreational opportunity that can consist of snowmobiling, snowshoeing, x-county skiing, snowboarding, hiking, mtn biking, and other activities. It provides a range of opportunities from easy to difficult. As mentioned earlier, this is an area that has great opportunity for the recreating public that ROS mapping does not account for.

It also provides easy access to the Selway Wilderness. It provide for a transition from the highway to a semi-primitive motorized to semi-primitive non-motorized and then primitive. Bringing the wilderness boundary closer to the motorized activities only diminishes the wilderness character and increases conflict. It would not positively add to the Selway's wilderness character, but would eliminate an important recreational area valued by a wide range of mixed users and interests, including local (city and counties) and state governments.

For these reason, EPC agreed that the greater interest for this areas is not recommended wilderness but to build on the opportunity for the diverse recreational opportunities it has provided over the years and continues to provide.

f. **East Meadow Creek RA and West Meadow Creek RA:** Not recommend as a RWA.

EPC agreed with the wilderness assessment's description concerning the ecological value of the East Meadow Creek and west Meadow Creek RA's. However, EPC did not feel that the wilderness assessment or the DEIS accurately described or recognized the current users and the many interests nor did it describe the context and intensity of this area in relationship to the entire forest.

There are those who are interested in the Forest providing a backcountry motorized experience. Some have described it as a primitive motorized experience. It consists of people who enjoy the high backcountry but do not have the means to get there. They are not interested in road, but rather motorized trails. There are two areas on the Forest that have the potential to be managed with and emphasis for this semi-primitive motorized recreation experience; East and West Meadow Creek RA is one of those areas. The Bighorn-Weitas RA is the other.

The DEIS or Draft Plan does not identify any area with an emphasis on managing for this recreational opportunity. It identifies areas as semi-primitive motorized, but as mentioned earlier, just the mapping of areas does not look at or recognized an area's potential to be managed to accomplish an objective.

This semi-primitive motorized opportunity is lacking on the Forest. There is approximately 1.5 million acres of semi-primitive non-motorized/primitive on the

Forest. There is a desire to have a quality semi-primitive motorized area, with an emphasis on managing for and promoting that opportunity rather than occurring randomly.

For these reason, EPC agreed that the greater interest for this areas is not recommended wilderness but to build on the opportunity for diverse and equitable recreational opportunities across the forest, opportunities that have existed for the last thirty years.

g. **All Other RA:** Not recommend as a RWA:

The other roadless areas were not identified has having high wilderness characteristics. They are either smaller, have well established uses, and/or not supported as recommended wilderness area

**VI. Collaborative Group Participants and Other Organization Contacted:** The following is a list of those who make up EPC's Recommended Wilderness Project Collaborative Group and others who have been involved in our discussions and deliberations. There was unanimous agreement on the EPC recommendation among EPC Collaborative and Advisory Group members.

**The Collaborative Participants and Other Organization Contacted:**

<b>Organization in Collaborative Group Agreeing to Recommendation</b>	<b>Group Representative</b>
Area II, Agency on Aging, Director	Zeke Ulery
American Legion (AL)	Jinny Cash
Clearwater County Commissioner	Mike Ryan
Clearwater Trekkers	Leslie Anderson
Community of Dixie	Steve Repp
Elk City	Karen Crosby
Empire Lumber	Greg Danly
Idaho Aviation Association (IAA)	Bill Ables
Idaho Co. Veterans Association (VFW)	Jinny Cash
Idaho County Commissioner	Skip Brant
Idaho Park & Rec	Randy Doman
Idaho Pathfinders	Todd Stenzel
Idaho Recreation Council	Mark Jennings
Idaho Soil and Water Conservation Commission	Eileen Rowan
Idaho State Snowmobile Association	Sandra Mitchell
Idaho Wild Sheep Foundation	Mike Schiegel
Health Care Administration	Michelle Gardner
Lewis and Clark ATV Club	Jim McIver
MacKay Bar Guest Ranch	Joni Dewey
Mining Interest	Ron Hartig
National Wild Turkey Foundation	Alex Arnold
Public Lands Access Year-round (PLAY)	Dave Galantuomini
River Access For Tomorrow (RAFT)	Jim McIver
Small Businesses	Don Ebert
Small Businesses	Kelli Rosollini
The Oregon Pilots Association (OPA)	Bill Ables
The Recreational Aviation Foundation (RAF)	Bill Ables
Twin Rivers Back Country Horseman (TRBCHI)	Carl Paulson
EPC Chair	Marty Gardner
Professor (Ret.) of Natural Resource Management	Steve Daley-Laursen (Dr.)
Professor of Environmental Philosophy	Bert Baumgartner (Dr.)
Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW)	Jinny Cash
Western Whitewater Association	Shay White



<b>Organization in the Collaborative Group Pending Internal Processes for Final Response</b>	<b>Group Representative</b>
Lewis County Commissioner	Greg Johnson
Lewis Clark Valley Chamber Commerce	Kristin Kemak

<b>Organization/ Individual Advising the Collaborative</b>	
Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS)	Jared Everson
Professor of Law	Barb Cosens (Dr.)
Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Clearwater Region	Zach Swearingen
Idaho Department of Lands	Tyre Holfeltz

<b>State of Idaho Government Consulted</b>	
Idaho State Senator, District 7	Senator Carl Crabtree
Idaho State Representative, District 7	Representative Priscilla Giddings

<b>Organization in the Collaborative Group Having a different Recommendation</b>	<b>Group Representative</b>
None	

<b>US Congressional Offices</b>	
At this time, US Congressional Offices have sent representatives to observe meetings, discussions, and reviewed material on this subject.	

# **EXHIBIT**

## **D**

Trail #	Name	Mileage	RWA / Ranger District Area	Trail Status	Notes
334	HORSE POINT	2.8	West Meadow Creek	data conflict	Horse Ridge area off of Limber Luke Boundary Trail 835 trail not listed on trail document. Shows up on travel map. IDPR doc shows open status
502	BARGAMIN CREEK	4.9	East Meadow Creek	data conflict	trail document shows closed status. Shows up on travel map and IDPR doc indicates open status
504	HOT SPRINGS	2.8	West Meadow Creek	o	located above Red River Hot Springs. Not in the Meadow Creek drainages. Trail document and IDPR document indicate open status
509	Otto	3.4	Elk City Drainages - 832/505 Boundry Trail	o	Otto Trail connects with 505 Boundary Trail. Not in the Meadow Creek drainages. Located close to Elk City township. On westside of Mountain range. IDPR doc indicates open status
510	Flint Creek		Elk City Drainages - 832/505 Boundry Trail	c	Flint Creek Logging road that leads up to 835 Boundry Trail. ATV users requesting trail be re-opened on ridge. Not in Meadow Creek drainages. Located on westside of mountain range close to Elk City township. trail document indicates Closed to ATVs and MC. Trail shows up on travel map
513	SPOOK CREEK	3.5	East Meadow Creek	o	trail doc and IDPR doc indicates open status
517	BILK MOUNTAIN	5.9	East Meadow Creek	data conflict	trail document shows closed status. IDPR doc indicates open status There is a section of trail in bitterroot wilderness and also section in Meadow Creek area on Elk . Do we want the Meadow Creek section opened?
529	ARCHER	5	East Meadow Creek	o	Is this a ATV trail? There is MC prior to this trail trail document and IDPR doc shows open status
530	GROUSE RIDGE	5.8	East Meadow Creek	data conflict	Boundary on Selway-Bitterroot Wildernes trail not listed on forest trail document. But shows up on travel map. IDPR doc shows open
531	PATROL RIDGE	3.6	East Meadow Creek	o	trail document and IDPR doc shows open status.
533	Running Creek		East Meadow Creek	data conflict	Is this a ATV trail? There is MC prior to this trail Running Creek Trail? Trail document shows closed status. IDPR doc indicates open status
534	Lynx Creek	6.1	East Meadow Creek	o	Lynx Creek. Trail document and IDPR doc shows open status
535	PARACHUTE RIDGE	1.9	East Meadow Creek	o	trail document and IDPR doc shows open status.
541	GREEN MOUNTAIN	8	East Meadow Creek	data conflict	Sections: 1) Special Order Closure (Grn Mtn Trail #141) 2) ATV section off of 1166 Divide Connect/Butter Creek that joins up with 505 by the Red River Hot Springs. Trail doc indicates to ATVs and to MC
581	HOT SPRINGS CREEK	4.5	East Meadow Creek	o	looks like there is also a N-M trail identified as 130? On the Selwary-Bitterroot Wilderness boundary trail document and IDPR doc shows open status
602			Meadow Creek	data conflict	trail not listed in trail document. Shows on travel map. Not listed on IDPR document map shows trail linked to TR 603 Indian Hill trail.
603	INDIAN HILL	4.2	East Meadow Creek	data conflict	Boundary There is a N-M red dotted line without trail number from 603 to 632 trail not listed on trail document. Shows up on travel map and IDPR doc indicates open status
605	FIVE MILE CONTOUR	10.8	West Meadow Creek	data conflict	Leads off of Limber Luke Boundary Trail 835 trail not listed on trail document. Shows up on travel map and IDPR doc indicates open status
609	DISGRACE BUTTE	11.7	East Meadow Creek	data conflict	trail not listed in trail document. Shows on map and IDPR doc indicates open status
611	Sable Hill	4.5	West Meadow Creek	data conflict	trail document shows closed status and IDPR doc indicates open status
615	MATTESON RIDGE	2.6	West Meadow Creek	o	trail document and IDPR doc shows open status.
628	UPPER BUCK LAKE	4.8	East Meadow Creek	data conflict	trail not listed in trail document. Shows on map and IDPR doc indicates open status
632	PROSPECT RIDGE	3.9	East Meadow Creek	data conflict	trail not listed in trail document. Shows on map and IDPR doc indicates open status
647	GRANITE PEAK	4.4	East Meadow Creek	o	Boundary trail document and IDPR doc shows open status
668	PARALLEL	16.8	West Meadow Creek	data conflict	trail document shows closed status. IDPR doc shows open status

670	Parallel Divide		West Meadow Creek	data conflict	trail document shows closed status. Map shows trail link from 668 to 505 boundry trail. IDPR doc doesn't list trail. Has this trail been decommissioned? No longer in use or for non-motorized users?
672	WEST FORK SABLE CREEK	0.9	East Meadow Creek West Meadow Creek	data conflict	Boundary some sections are MC and other sections are identified as N-M trail document shows closed status. IDPR shows status open
711	GREEN RIDGE	3.4	West Meadow Creek	data conflict	Leads off of Limber Luke Boundary Trail 835 trail not listed on trail document. Shows up on travel map and IDPR doc indicates open status
726	MEADOW CREEK	11.1	East Meadow Creek	data conflict	Boundary there are sections identified as MC and then turns into N-M and back to MC trail not listed on trail document. Shows up on travel map and IDPR doc indicates open status
729			West Meadow Creek	data conflict	east fork of Horse Creek. Trail not listed on trail document. Shows up on travel map. Is this a non-motorized trail
732			West Meadow Creek	data conflict	trail by NF-2116, Horse Ridge point. Trail not listed on trail document. Shows up on travel map. Not listed on IDPR doc. Is this a non-motorized trail
733	Horse Creek	1.8	West Meadow Creek	data conflict	Horse Creek off of NF-443 Buck Meadows trail not listed in trail document. Shows up on travel map and IDPR doc indicates open status
809	Butte Creek	6.3	West Meadow Creek	o	Butte Creek. Leads off of Anderson Butte Lookout trail document and IDPR list shows open status
830	Kirks Fork	3.4	West Meadow Creek	o	not located in Meadow Creek Drainages. Westside of mtn close to elk city. Kirks Fork TH area / Flatiron ridge. Trail doc and IDPR doc shows open status
832	E. FK. AMERICAN RIVER	7.2	Elk City Drainages - 832/505 Boundry Trail	possible data conflict	ATV trail from Flatiron to Anderson Butte LO trail doc says open fro jct 825 to 831; closed from jct 510 to 831 IDPR doc shows status open
846	LOWER KIRKS FORK	2.5	Elk City Drainages - 832/505 Boundry Trail	data conflict	Leads off of American River trail trail not listed in trail document. IDPR shows open status
849	DENT CUTOFF	0.1	West Meadow Creek	data conflict	Trail doc shows trail closed. IDPR doc shows trail open status
887	Box Sing	1.3	TBD	data conflict	trail document shows trail open to ATV, MC, UTVs over 50" IDPR doc shows open status cannot find trail on travel map. Need to locate when GIS map software is available

open trails  
closed trails

47.5  
none yet

# **EXHIBIT**

## **E**

Trail Number	TRAIL NAME	SYMBOL	JURISDICTION	ATV	MOTORCYCLE	MILES
502	BARGAMIN CREEK		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	0.5
832	E. FK. AMERICAN RIVER		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	1.4
581	HOT SPRINGS CREEK		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	4.5
509	OTTO		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	3.4
334	HORSE POINT		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	0.8
531	PATROL RIDGE		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	3.6
668	PARALLEL		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	1.7
668	PARALLEL		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	2.2
605	FIVE MILE CONTOUR		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	6.1
517	BILK MOUNTAIN		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	4.5
887	BOX SING		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	1.3
832	E. FK. AMERICAN RIVER		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	1.7
632	PROSPECT RIDGE		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	3.9
615	MATTESON RIDGE		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	2.6
609	DISGRACE BUTTE		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	4.9
334	HORSE POINT		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	7.5
535	PARACHUTE RIDGE		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	1.9
726	MEADOW CREEK		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	2.7
628	UPPER BUCK LAKE		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	2.2
672	WEST FORK SABLE CREEK		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	0.1
513	SPOOK CREEK		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	1.4
849	DENT CUTOFF		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	0.1
534	LYNX CREEK		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	6.1
809	BUTTE CREEK		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	0.0
668	PARALLEL		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	2.2
830	KIRKS FORK		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	0.2
517	BILK MOUNTAIN		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	1.4
726	MEADOW CREEK		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	8.2
809	BUTTE CREEK		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	2.8
668	PARALLEL		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	3.9
672	WEST FORK SABLE CREEK		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	1.0
830	KIRKS FORK		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	3.2
611	SABLE HILL		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	4.5
605	FIVE MILE CONTOUR		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	2.0
846	LOWER KIRKS FORK		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	1.9
733	HORSE CREEK		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	1.8
809	BUTTE CREEK		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	1.2
505	DIVIDE		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	4.2
505	DIVIDE		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	1.2
628	UPPER BUCK LAKE		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	0.7
809	BUTTE CREEK		9 FS - FOREST SERVICE		01/01-12/31	0.5

504	HOT SPRINGS	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	0.9
609	DISGRACE BUTTE	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	6.8
502	BARGAMIN CREEK	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	1.1
505	DIVIDE	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	0.3
605	FIVE MILE CONTOUR	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	2.7
530	GROUSE RIDGE	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	2.1
668	PARALLEL	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	5.2
647	GRANITE PEAK	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	4.4
502	BARGAMIN CREEK	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	3.1
628	UPPER BUCK LAKE	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	1.8
668	PARALLEL	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	0.4
832	E. FK. AMERICAN RIVER	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	0.4
711	GREEN RIDGE	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	3.4
668	PARALLEL	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	1.7
513	SPOOK CREEK	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	2.2
505	DIVIDE	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	0.1
726	MEADOW CREEK	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	0.2
809	BUTTE CREEK	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	1.8
668	PARALLEL	9 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31	3.3
835	BOUNDARY TRAIL	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	1.6
835	BOUNDARY TRAIL	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	2.3
810	BLACKHAWK CONNECT	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	0.7
529	ARCHER	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	4.9
541	GREEN MOUNTAIN	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	0.3
835	BOUNDARY TRAIL	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	1.1
835	BOUNDARY TRAIL	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	0.1
505	DIVIDE	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	2.6
505	DIVIDE	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	0.5
505	DIVIDE	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	1.3
505	DIVIDE	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	0.9
835	BOUNDARY TRAIL	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	2.7
505	DIVIDE	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	1.3
835	BOUNDARY TRAIL	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	0.2
505	DIVIDE	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	0.2
505	DIVIDE	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	0.6
505	DIVIDE	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	1.1
603	INDIAN HILL	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	4.2
533	RUNNING CREEK	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	1.9
541	GREEN MOUNTAIN	7 FS - FOREST SERVICE	01/01-12/31 01/01-12/31	1.2
<b>Total</b>				<b>177.4</b>



# **EXHIBIT**

## **F**

**Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation**  
***Off Highway Vehicle Registrations***  
***By Type for Sticker Year 2019***

As of: 3/31/2020

OHV Type	Count
Motorbike	37,808
Specialty Off Highway	389
UTV	40,393
ATV	89,170
<b>2019 Total</b>	<b>167,760</b>

*Reports run on a different date may report different values*

# 2019 Off Highway Vehicle Registrations

As of March 31, 2020

## By Use Area Designation and OHV Type

Row Labels	ATV	Motorbike	Specialty Off		Grand Total
			Highway	UTV	
Undesignated	9,428	6,277	55	5,095	20,855
01 Ada	4,657	3,084	30	1,627	9,398
02 Adams	778	167	2	434	1,381
03 Bannock	2,706	1,097	16	1,125	4,944
04 Bear Lake	1,462	295	1	758	2,516
05 Benewah	1,179	145	2	649	1,975
06 Bingham	2,577	812	5	1,220	4,614
07 Blaine	568	552	5	224	1,349
08 Boise	3,090	1,918	13	1,144	6,165
09 Bonner	3,488	1,096	9	1,449	6,042
10 Bonneville	4,374	2,608	16	1,785	8,783
11 Boundary	442	100		158	700
12 Butte	384	154		160	698
13 Camas	338	268	1	153	760
14 Canyon	3,431	900	8	996	5,335
15 Caribou	808	241	5	503	1,557
16 Cassia	1,689	403	7	806	2,905
17 Clark	341	125	2	147	615
18 Clearwater	1,488	281	1	606	2,376
19 Custer	999	401		415	1,815
20 Elmore	1,969	797	6	694	3,466
21 Franklin	1,520	466	2	633	2,621
22 Fremont	2,439	1,095	36	1,300	4,870
23 Gem	1,662	502	4	765	2,933
24 Gooding	818	344	6	470	1,638
25 Idaho	2,644	499	4	1,119	4,266
26 Jefferson	1,880	906	2	905	3,693
27 Jerome	918	290	3	458	1,669
28 Kootenai	7,765	3,597	54	3,441	14,857
29 Latah	1,891	433	3	745	3,072
30 Lemhi	852	218	3	411	1,484
31 Lewis	318	42	1	121	482
32 Lincoln	263	84		101	448
33 Madison	550	446	7	220	1,223
34 Minidoka	1,187	313	5	546	2,051
35 Nez Perce	2,903	490		1,135	4,528
36 Oneida	487	66		215	768
37 Owyhee	3,008	1,812	19	1,159	5,998
38 Payette	1,585	343	5	715	2,648
39 Power	415	91	2	328	836
40 Shoshone	1,502	397	14	997	2,910
41 Teton	416	433	5	216	1,070
42 Twin Falls	3,974	1,760	17	1,858	7,609
43 Valley	3,197	1,299	9	1,959	6,464
44 Washington	780	161	4	428	1,373
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>89,170</b>	<b>37,808</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>40,393</b>	<b>167,760</b>

# 2019 Off Highway Vehicle Registrations *As of March 31, 2020*

## By County and OHV Type

County / State	ATV	Motorbike	Specialty Off Highway	UTV	Grand Total
ADA	12,829	8,545	87	5,112	26,573
ADAMS	477	109		282	868
BANNOCK	3,727	1,486	18	1,728	6,959
BEAR LAKE	813	157		345	1,315
BENEWAH	992	133	3	548	1,676
BINGHAM	3,110	1,247	7	1,420	5,784
BLAINE	550	637	2	248	1,437
BOISE	757	317	2	328	1,404
BONNER	2,794	886	11	1,119	4,810
BONNEVILLE	5,304	2,875	19	2,261	10,459
BOUNDARY	595	211		247	1,053
BUTTE	276	111		116	503
CAMAS	107	68		49	224
CANYON	9,809	3,773	35	3,589	17,206
CARIBOU	640	178	4	405	1,227
CASSIA	1,438	390	6	650	2,484
CLARK	46	20		34	100
CLEARWATER	1,033	236	1	503	1,773
CUSTER	676	174		302	1,152
ELMORE	1,295	538	2	468	2,303
FRANKLIN	1,287	363	1	557	2,208
FREMONT	996	357	5	571	1,929
GEM	1,444	403	2	690	2,539
GOODING	905	429	6	543	1,883
IDAHO	1,891	380	2	811	3,084
JEFFERSON	2,199	1,421	8	1,122	4,750
JEROME	1,309	465	3	599	2,376
KOOTENAI	7,987	3,609	40	3,445	15,081
LATAH	1,888	413	2	760	3,063
LEMHI	788	185	3	415	1,391
LEWIS	660	92	2	258	1,012
LINCOLN	311	134	1	106	552
MADISON	1,277	730	9	568	2,584
MINIDOKA	1,467	322	4	716	2,509
NEZ PERCE	3,089	563	1	1,152	4,805
ONEIDA	399	71	1	194	665
OWYHEE	661	158	2	349	1,170
PAYETTE	1,404	300	7	621	2,332
POWER	338	69	1	264	672
SHOSHONE	1,095	298	9	703	2,105
TETON	345	366	2	173	886
TWIN FALLS	4,037	1,815	20	1,896	7,768
VALLEY	942	485	3	698	2,128
WASHINGTON	675	148	3	382	1,208

# 2019 Off Highway Vehicle Registrations *As of March 31, 2020*

## By County and OHV Type

County / State	ATV	Motorbike	Specialty Off Highway	UTV	Grand Total
AK	13	8		11	32
AL	2	1		4	7
AR	5	6		4	15
AZ	93	26	2	102	223
CA	355	183	3	272	813
CO	86	64	2	312	464
CT	1				1
FL	39	26		20	85
GA	4	6		9	19
HI	4	1			5
IA	10	4		5	19
IL	8	16		18	42
IN	10	2			12
KS	22	21	3	12	58
KY	2	5			7
LA	6	1		10	17
MA	1	1		1	3
MD	4	1		2	7
MI	11	14		7	32
MN	37	24		67	128
MO	19	14		12	45
MS		2		4	6
MT	25	60	4	16	105
NC	6	1		6	13
ND	10	19	2	12	43
NE	10	6		8	24
NH		2			2
NM	8	14		5	27
NV	123	51	4	114	292
NY	6	1		1	8
OH	9	11	1	1	22
OK	5	4		8	17
OR	115	54	1	163	333
PA	14			7	21
SC	2	1		4	7
SD	9	11		8	28
TN	20	11		5	36
TX	79	35	1	63	178
UT	1,301	489	10	625	2,425
VA	6	3		8	17
WA	1,849	590	14	970	3,423
WI	19	17		7	43
WV	6	3		4	13
WY	103	168	4	96	371

**2019 Off Highway Vehicle Registrations** *As of March 31, 2020*

**By County and OHV Type**

County / State	ATV	Motorbike	Specialty Off Highway	UTV	Grand Total
Invalid Address	51	164	4	43	262
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>89,170</b>	<b>37,808</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>40,393</b>	<b>167,760</b>

# **EXHIBIT**

## **G**

