

APPENDIX A
ROADLESS LOGGING IN IDAHO’S NEZ PERCE AND CLEARWATER NATIONAL FORESTS

The following abbreviations apply to the tables below.

EA=Environmental Assessment

DN-FONSI=Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact (issued with EAs)

FEIS=Final Environmental Impact Statement; DEIS=Draft Environmental Impact Statement; SEIS=Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

ROD=Record of Decision (issued with FEISs)

CE=Categorical exclusion

DM=Decision Memo (issued with CEs)

*Unless otherwise noted, the NEPA documents in the same row as the project name in the first column (e.g. “FEIS”) refer to the that project’s NEPA document.

Table 1. *Projects involving roadless areas in Nez Perce and Clearwater National Forests in the approximate decade leading up to the 2001 Roadless Rule.*

Project name, (year of decision), NEPA document (FEIS or EA)	Size and type of activity in roadless area	Forest Service’s conclusion on whether there was a negative impact to the roadless area	Was the roadless portion of the project implemented? How many acres of roadless logged?
Wing Creek-Twenty mile Timber Sales (1989) FEIS, ROD	2,334 acres of timber harvest. FEIS p. 47, ROD p. 8. The Forest Service considered the entire project area as “essentially roadless.” FEIS p. 1	Yes. “Vegetation management would change natural processes; harvest units would be visually apparent for many years.” Final EIS p. 97. “Lands committed to timber production are not suitable for wilderness classification.” Final EIS p. 99.	Yes: 2,334 acres.
Mallard Timber Sale	1,863 acres of timber harvest in	Yes. “[A] decision to implement the road construction and timber harvest management practices in Alternatives 2, 3, 4	In part. These were big sales, and were not all sold at

<p>(1990) FEIS, ROD</p>	<p>Roadless Area 1847: Jack Creek (388 acres), Lone Park (911 acres), and Bat Creek (564 acres). FEIS p. 40</p> <p>Approximately 60 miles of road constructed or reconstructed. <i>See</i> FEIS p. 41.</p> <p>Total project projected to impact 75 percent of Roadless Area 1847 for alternative 4. FEIS pp. 120-21</p>	<p>would be a critical decision; the roadless character of a large unroaded expanse would be lost.” Mallard FEIS p. 21.</p> <p>“[I]t can be reasonably assumed that [timber harvest and road construction] in addition to those proposed in this EIS would further reduce roadless acreages in the analysis area.” Mallard FEIS p. 120.</p> <p>“Selection of Alternative Four in this Record of Decision is the critical, irreversible and irretrievable decision to commit Roadless Area 1847 to development.” ROD p. 7</p>	<p>once immediately after the ROD. Because some of the sales were delayed, the promulgation of the 2001 Roadless Rule caused the Forest Service to drop proposed logging in roadless. As a result, Jack Creek (388 acres) was sold and logged, but not Lone Park or Bat Creek.</p>
<p>Cove Timber Sale (1990) FEIS, ROD</p>	<p>3,851 acres of timber harvest proposed in Roadless Area 1921: Noble (639 acres), Grouse (160 acres), 1190B (75 acres)*, Rhett (706 acres), Vista (386 acres), Blowout (1,178 acres), Rabbit (707 acres). FEIS p. 54,</p>	<p>Yes. “[A] decision to implement the road construction and timber harvest management practices proposed in Alternatives 2, 3, or 4 would be a critical decision; the roadless character of a large unroaded expanse would be lost...Even with application of all possible mitigation measures, evidence of roads would remain” FEIS pp. 22-23.</p> <p>“About 90 percent of the roadless area would be directly or indirectly affected. Natural integrity and natural appearance would be significantly modified over most of the area.” FEIS p. 164</p>	<p>In part. These were big sales and were not all sold at once immediately after the ROD. Because some of the sales were delayed, the promulgation of the 2001 Roadless Rule caused the Forest Service to drop proposed logging in roadless. As a result, Noble (639 acres), Grouse (160 acres), and 1190B (75 acres) were</p>

	<p>ROD p. 8 (Alternative 4 chosen).</p> <p>Approximately 81 miles of road constructed. <i>See</i> FEIS p. 55</p> <p>Project predicted to impact 90 percent of roadless area directly or indirectly, about 5,660 acres would remain roadless. FEIS p. 164.</p>	<p>“Adverse Effects Which Cannot be Avoided—The roadless character of the area would be forgone with implementation of an action alternative.” FEIS p. 165.</p>	<p>sold and logged, but Rhett, Vista, Blowout, and Rabbit were not.</p>
<p>Fuzzy Bighorn (1995) EA</p>	<p>Alternatives proposed from 236 to 287 acres of timber harvest, but only Alternatives B and E proposed shelterwood logging in Bighorn-Weitas Roadless Area. EA p. S-4</p>	<p>“<i>Natural Integrity</i> would be affected by the proposed actions in Alternatives B and E by harvesting trees and creating sign of human alteration as in stumps within the roadless area.” EA p. IV-16</p> <p>“Since Alternatives C and E do not enter the roadless area, the activity proposed in those alternatives would not affect the integrity of the roadless area.” EA p. IV-17.</p>	<p>Friends of the Clearwater has no record as to whether this project moved forward. However, in the EA, the preferred alternative—Alternative D—avoided logging in roadless in the roadless area.</p>
<p>Goat Roost Road Proposal (1995) Draft EA (1994)</p>	<p>Road construction (.1 to 1.25) proposed for Sneakfoot Meadows, to impact 80-480 acres. <i>See</i> Draft EA pp. 14, 35-</p>	<p>Road construction would remove sections 10, 11, 12 from the roadless land base. <i>See</i> EA pp. 3, 14. “Approximately 1.25 miles of road would be constructed through the roadless area in sections 11 and 12. The roadless attributes of sections 11 and 12 would be reduced by implementation of this alternative...Direct impacts to the roadless resource</p>	<p>Yes. The project moved forward with removing 480 acres of the roadless base with 1.25 miles road construction in Sneakfoot Meadows Roadless Area.</p>

	36.	<p>would be from the road corridor itself.” Draft EA p. 35. Building the road reduced the natural integrity of the roadless area from 80-480 acres, depending upon the alternative. Draft EA p. 14.</p> <p>In the White Sand Ecosystem Management Project: In these alternatives [including alternative selected], the Sneakfoot Meadows Roadless Area could be considered for Wilderness designation, except for the norther portion relative to the Goat Roost project (less than 1% of total roadless area) and the portion surrounding the temporary road to the landing area just west of Savage Pass Road (about 1% of the total roadless area). White Sands FEIS p. 4-53</p>	See White Sands FEIS p. 4-53.
White Sand Ecosystem Management (1996) FEIS/ROD	<p>Timber harvest and road construction: 928 acres proposed for North Fork Spruce-White Sand Roadless Area, and 423 acres proposed for Sneakfoot Meadows Roadless Area. FEIS p. 4-48.</p> <p>Loss of 3,500 acres (10 percent) total from both roadless areas. FEIS p. 2-32</p> <p>Approximately 6.5 miles of road constructed. See</p>	<p>North Fork Spruce-White Sand Roadless Area: “The interior area between [Elk Summit and Colt Creek] roads would be further developed with roads and some harvesting, creating additional disturbances to the naturalness of the landscape...Alternative 5 proposes to...construct 6.1 miles of permanent road and .3 miles of temporary road. The road construction would remove 1,984 acres from the roadless area...Overall, the natural integrity and appearance would remain intact in the bulk of the roadless area, except for the 3,500 acres between Elk Summit, Savage Pass, and Colt Creek roads.” FEIS 4-49</p> <p>Sneakfoot Meadows Roadless Area: “In Alternatives 3, 4, and 5, harvesting is proposed between Sneakfoot Meadows and Savage Pass Road and three adjacent units, totaling 176 acres...Harvesting would consist of shelterwood with reserves and would retain 33% of the existing vegetation, but would create unnatural disturbances in the immediate area.” FEIS p. 4-49 through 4-50.</p>	No. This project did not go forward.

	<p>FEIS p. 4-48</p> <p>Alternative 5 was the preferred alternative. <i>See abstract on inside cover page.</i></p>	<p>“Wilderness qualities would be primarily affected within the Savage Ridge area and along Elk Summit Road where harvesting would occur.” FEIS p. 4-50</p> <p>“Harvesting and temporary road building would affect the size and shape of Wilderness attributes. The harvesting proposed (shelterwood with reserves) would leave 33 percent of the existing vegetation. Roadbuilding would be for temporary roads...0.1 mile affecting 32 acres (Alternative 5).” FEIS p. 4-52</p> <p>Cumulative effects: “The 3,500 acres between White Sand Creek and Savage Pass and Colt Creek roads would be eliminated from roadless area consideration.” FEIS p. 4-53.</p>	
<p>Fish Bate Salvage (1996)</p> <p>FEIS/ROD</p>	<p>Total acres proposed for harvest were 2,257. FEIS p. 22; ROD p. 5 (Alt. 7 chosen).</p> <p>Timber harvest would be scattered throughout an unroaded area adjacent to the Siwash Roadless Area. FEIS pp. 47-48, 109-10. The FEIS did not specify how many acres would be logged in the roadless area. FEIS p. 217.</p>	<p>“In each of the harvest alternatives [including the alternative chosen], the band of unroaded land within the project area would have areas of timber harvest scattered throughout it and the wilderness character of the area would be changed. Timber harvest in the Bates Creek drainage would separate the unroaded land within the project area from the rest of the unroaded piece that joins the project area to the Siwash Roadless Area.” FEIS p. 47-48</p> <p>“Those characteristics that now might make the area suitable for wilderness would be changed. The area would lose natural integrity, would no longer appear natural, would be less remote, and have less opportunity for solitude...The introduction of man’s activity (logging) throughout the project area, even though roads would not be constructed, would normally preclude its being considered undeveloped and suitable for wilderness.” FEIS p. 217</p>	<p>No. This project did not go forward.</p>

<p>Middle Fork (1997) FEIS/ROD</p>	<p>Of 2,865 acres of timber harvest proposed, 2,170 acres of timber harvest and 3.6 mi. road construction proposed in Middle Fork Face Roadless Area. FEIS pp. 2-21, 3-92; ROD p. 3 (selecting alternative 5)</p>	<p>“Alternative 3, 4, and 5 [Alternative 5 selected] would enter and fragment the roadless area to the extent that it could no longer be considered for wilderness designation.” FEIS p. 2-22.</p> <p>“Alternative[...5 would change the natural integrity of the area from high to low. The human induced changes for the vegetative manipulation, specifically harvest other than sanitation/salvage of less than 5% of canopy, would be the main reason for this shift. Under these alternatives the apparent naturalness would also change from high to low. This is because of the amount and intensity of the harvest within the roadless area.” FEIS p. 3-93.</p> <p>“The harvest proposed with [the alternative selected] would affect the roadless area to the extent that Wilderness consideration is unlikely. However, when considering the area influenced by roads, the areas remaining without roads would meet the current minimum criteria for Wilderness consideration. The impact of helicopter harvest on the roadless character is unclear and subject to a variety of interpretations.” ROD p. 10.</p>	<p>This project went forward with logging in roadless, but only helicopter logging. No roads were constructed.</p>
<p>JJ (Jerry Johnson) Ecosystem Restoration Project (2000) DEIS</p>	<p>The preferred action proposed 198 acres of timber harvest in the Weir Post Office Roadless Area DEIS pp. S-8 (Alternative #4 preferred action) IV-62, IV-71. The Forest Service</p>	<p>“The harvesting of 198 acres and underburning of 596 acres would affect the natural integrity and appearance, but as in other action alternatives, would mimic natural processes...In the smaller proposed units (155 acres), less vegetation (20-30%) would be retained and in the larger units (43 acres), the majority of the vegetation (60-75%) would be retained. The impacts would be heightened during the time the activity would occur and in the few years following. After several years, the impacts would be significantly reduced...The accumulation of unnatural fuels would be decreased more</p>	<p>No. This project morphed into the Johnson Fuels Project, and no timber harvest or roadbuilding proceeded in the roadless area.</p>

	<p>also recognized the recent moratorium on constructing new roads and in the recently announced roadless initiative. DEIS p. S-19</p>	<p>than in alternative 1, which would contribute to the intactness of the natural integrity. The effects of this alternative would be even more consistent with what historically occurred within much of this area...The overall natural integrity and appearance would remain intact.” p. IV-71</p>	
--	--	---	--

* While every other named unit was entirely within the inventoried roadless area boundary, a portion of 1190B’s acres were not in roadless.

Table 2. *Projects involving inventoried roadless areas in Nez Perce and Clearwater National Forests when the 2001 Roadless Rule governed activities in Idaho national forests, 2001-2008. Projects that proposed logging in unroaded areas (areas with roadless characteristics that are not in the Forest Service roadless inventory) have been left out.*

Project name, (year of decision), NEPA document (EIS or EA)	Size and type of activity in roadless area	Forest Service’s conclusion on whether there was a negative impact to the roadless area	Was the roadless part of the project implemented?
<p>North Lochsa Face (2002)</p> <p>FEIS/1st ROD (1999/2000);</p> <p>Draft SEIS (Jan. 2002)</p> <p>Final SEIS/2nd ROD (Nov. 2002)</p>	<p>The original proposal analyzed (1999) predicted timber harvest impacting 3,250 acres roadless in the North Lochsa Slope Roadless Area. ROD pp. 6 (selecting alternative 3A), 14.</p> <p>The Draft SEIS (Jan. 2002) still proposed logging in roadless (<i>see</i> pp. 3-312 to 3-314), but the 2nd ROD dropped logging in roadless. <i>See</i> 2nd ROD p. 15.</p>	<p>The selected alternative was one of three that would have “the greatest direct and indirect effects upon the area’s roadless characteristics and wilderness features due to proposed timber harvest and burning activities.” FEIS p. 141.</p> <p>“Past timber harvest and road construction activities implemented with the South Bend and Cabin Patch timber sales have had direct effects on a continuous block of the roadless area south of Canyon Creek. This equates to approximately 2,240 acres that has lost its roadless characteristics. Add this to the timber sale activities proposed with this project, a continuous block west and south of Bimerick Creek (approximately 17,000 acres) would lose its roadless characteristics.” FEIS p. 143.</p> <p>Logging and commercial thinning impact on natural integrity: “Natural integrity would increase by removing insect and disease infected off-site ponderosa pine....” Draft SEIS (Jan. 2002) p. 3-312.</p> <p>“Vegetative composition and structure would be improved by replacing off-site trees...Improves forest health...Reduces the potential for large, stand-replacing wildfire by removing dead and dying trees...Improves the potential to provide snag or old growth habitat in areas off-site ponderosa pine.” Draft SEIS</p>	<p>No. Due to the uncertainty of litigation on the 2001 Roadless Rule, the Chief of the Forest Service reserved decision authority for timber harvest and road construction, so this decision avoided having to submit to that authority by dropping the roadless logging. 2nd ROD pp. 33-36.</p>

		<p>(Jan. 2002) p. 3-313. For apparent naturalness, “[w]ould modify scenic quality in the area, in the short term.” Draft SEIS (Jan. 2002) p. 3-313.</p> <p>“These alternatives would have the greatest direct and indirect short term effects upon the area’s roadless characteristics and wilderness features due to proposed timber harvest and burning activities.” Draft SEIS (Jan. 2002) p. 3-317.</p>	
<p>Middle-Black (2003)</p> <p>FEIS (2002)/ROD (2003)</p>	<p>Alternative 2 proposed timber harvest as the primary management tool, with 6,530 acres proposed for harvest in Mallard-Larkins, Siwash, and Pot Mountain Roadless Areas. Alternative 4 proposed burning as the primary management tool, with 4,380 acres proposed burning in the same three roadless areas. FEIS p. 219.</p>	<p>Natural integrity analysis for Alternative 2: “Natural processes would be altered in and adjacent to timber harvest by harvesting trees—resulting in removal of biomass and the effects that would have on the ecosystem. The design of the timber harvest—removing a maximum of 50 percent tree cover—would result in effects similar to that resulting from mixed severity fire occurrence.” FEIS p. 221. “Area of timber harvest would no longer provide a reference landscape.” FEIS p. 222</p> <p>Apparent naturalness for Alternative 2: “The areas of timber harvest would appear natural in background views, but for many years would be evident as mans activity in the middle and foreground.” FEIS p. 222.</p> <p>“There would be no irreversible or irretrievable commitment of the roadless character in any of the alternatives. The harvested or burned trees would be irretrievably committed, but there would be no long term irreversible or irretrievable commitment of the forest since natural processes would continue to function following the actions.” FEIS p. 226</p>	<p>Alternative 4 chosen, so no logging in roadless areas. <i>See</i> USDA, Forest Service, ARO Letter-Middle-Black Ecosystem Management Project ROD-Clearwater NF-Appeal #03-01-00-0023-Friends of the Clearwater et al., File Code 1570-1 (Apr. 9, 2003).</p>
<p>Clean Slate (2004)</p> <p>Appeal Resolution</p>	<p>Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 proposed activities in Roadless Area 1850</p>	<p>The FS responded to the objection that the roadless analysis was flawed: “The FEIS does state on page 278 that there are no expected irreversible or irretrievable commitments under any of the alternatives. This is not true, since Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 all propose harvest activities within the Inventoried Roadless</p>	<p>No. The Forest Service selected an alternative that did not propose logging in the</p>

(2004)		<p>Area. However, the selected Alternative 3 modified does not propose harvest or road activities in the Inventoried Roadless Area so there will not be any expected irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resource under the selected alternative. Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 all propose harvest activities within the IRA and, therefore, were not selected...The [Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement] says that Alternatives 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 would result in an irretrievable commitment within the three unroaded areas because of the loss of production and the use of natural resources through harvesting and burning. Thus, the FSEIS is correct on unroaded irreversible or irretrievable commitments of unroaded resources.” <i>Forest Service’s ARO Letter—Clean Slate Ecosystem Management Project ROD-Nez Perce NF-Appeal #04-01-00-0037-Friends of the Clearwater, et al.</i>, p. 7 (Sept. 3, 2004).</p>	roadless area.
--------	--	--	----------------

Table 3. *Projects involving inventoried roadless areas in the Nez Perce and Clearwater National Forests after the promulgation of the 2008 Idaho Roadless Rule.*

Project name (year of decision), roadless classification*	Size and type of activity in roadless area	Forest Service’s conclusion on whether there was a negative impact to the roadless area	Was the roadless part of the project implemented?***
Nut Basin (2010) CE / DM	480 acres of timber harvest and burning in Little Slate Creek IRA. DM pp. 3, 8-9.	No. “[R]oadless characteristics will not be negatively affected by the proposal and the ability of the area to be considered for wilderness will not be altered. One or more of the roadless areas characteristics will be improved as a result of implementation of the project.” DM p. 9 (Did not discuss the roadless characteristics that would be improved.)	Yes
Nez Perce Roadside Hazard Tree Project (2013) DN-FONSI	272 acres of timber harvest in Little Slate Creek North, North Fork Spruce-White Sands, Dixie Summit-Nut Hill, and Gospel. USDA, Forest Service, <i>Projects in IRAs_2001_without graphs_2008 to present</i> (disclosed 2017) (timber harvest in Idaho roadless areas), on file with authors.	No. “Impacts to Wilderness attributes and characteristics in IRAs will be very slight given that treatments will occur adjacent to existing roads and only targets hazard trees that would eventually fall. Natural integrity will not be impacted because activities will occur along existing forest roads.” DN-FONSI p. 15 “The project will have a beneficial effect to roadless manageability and primitive recreation opportunities as it will allow the ability to safely travel road systems within the roadless and unroaded areas.” DN-FONSI p. 16. “Removal of hazard trees adjacent to forest roads within Idaho Roadless areas for public health and safety reasons are allowed.” DN-FONSI p. 2	Yes
Fire Suppression (2015) WLR, BCR, SAHTS,	75-100 estimated acres of timber harvest in Gospel Hump, Mallard, Sneakfoot Meadows, John Day, Little Slate, Rackliff-Gedney,	Not analyzed. Disclosed after harvest as within an authorized exception of the Idaho Roadless Rule. “Rule References: 36 CFR 294.24(c)(1)(vii) – The cutting, sale or removal of timber is permissible in Idaho Roadless Areas	Yes

FPSA	<p>Silver Creek-Pilot Knob, O’Hara Falls Creek, West Meadow Creek (Most decks removed and sold).</p> <p>USDA, Forest Service, <i>Projects in IRAs_2001_without graphs_2008 to present</i> (disclosed 2017) (timber harvest in Idaho roadless areas), on file with authors.</p>	<p>designated as Backcountry/Restoration only where incidental to the implementation of a management activity not otherwise prohibited by this subpart. Also 36 CFR 294.26(c) Other activities in Idaho Roadless areas- Motorized equipment and mechanical transport- nothing in the subpart shall be construed as affecting the use of motorized equipment and mechanical transport.”</p> <p>USDA Forest Service, 2015 Post-fire Road Maintenance Idaho Roadless Rule Briefing Paper p. 2 (Nov. 10, 2015).</p>	
<p>Orogrande Community Protection Project (2016)</p> <p>BCR</p> <p>EA / DN-FONSI</p>	<p>280 acres originally approved for cutting in the West Fork Crooked River IRA. <i>See</i> DN-FONSI p. 14. Although a later supplemental information purported to reduce the roadless logging to 160 acres, none of the logging units in the roadless area were dropped. USDA, Forest Service, Orogrande Community Protection Environmental Assessment Supplemental Information Report pp. 2, 13-14 (Dec. 16), on file with authors; compare with EA p. 22.</p>	<p>No significant impact. “The irregular shelterwood cut will be obvious and will not appear natural initially due to the ground disturbance caused by equipment and the stumps left behind...[A]pparent naturalness will increase over time...[T]rees will regrow to 15’ tall within 19-21 years...At this size trees will form a canopy overhead and provide shade and visual screening for the visitor. The temporary road will be obvious until it is obliterated and blends in with the surrounding landscape...within 10 years.” Orogrande EA p. 283.</p>	Yes.
Windy Shingle		Cause-effect relationship of a 94-acre Intermediate/Regeneration Harvest to Salmon Face Roadless Area:	No. The IRA logging was not chosen in the

<p>(2017)</p> <p>CE / DM</p>		<p>“94 acres, or 1%, of the 9,200 acres of the Salmon Face IRA will be harvested with the purpose to restore a healthier and more resilient stand, therefore enhancing natural integrity which in turn enhances roadless characteristics. The effects of this project...are considered to be beneficial to the entire roadless area and does not have irreversible effects.” USDA, Forest Service, Categorical Exclusion Worksheet: Resource Considerations, Windy-Shingle Project p. 3 (May 2017), on file with authors.</p>	<p>decision memo. See DM p. 7</p>
<p>Lolo Insects and Disease</p> <p>(2018)</p> <p>FEIS/Draft ROD</p>		<p>Does not offer overall conclusion on impact, but has findings that are long-term negative impacts.</p> <p>Natural: Implementation of Alternatives 2 and 3 would modify vegetation on approximately 437 acres (approximately 6%) of 3 units within the Eldorado Creek roadless expanse by regeneration harvest. Helicopter, skyline/cable, and tractor logging systems would be used to harvest the units that occur in the roadless expanse... The 437 acres of regeneration harvest would be obvious from the road and trails that bisect the units. 14-28 trees would be retained indefinitely and additional retention would include landslide prone areas and riparian habitat conservation areas (RHCAs) would be excluded from the unit...The remaining 6,544 acres of the Eldorado Creek roadless area including the unroaded expanse would be unaffected by the project. Long term disturbance would be sustained, although the mechanism of disturbance would be human influenced and not natural processes. FEIS p. 123.</p> <p>Undeveloped: “Except for stumps, harvest areas would be increasingly less noticeable within 20-40 years as the stands mature and transition from early successional (non-forest) habitats into the next forested stand...Post-disturbance successional patters of vegetation in openings created is anticipated to blend in with the remained of the roadless area within several years. The undeveloped qualities of the</p>	<p>No. The Forest Service dropped proposed logging in the inventoried roadless area from the Final EIS. However, in the draft Record of Decision, the Forest Service authorized logging in the unroaded area bordering the inventoried roadless area. See Draft ROD p. 11-12.</p>

		remainder of the IRA (95 %) would be unaffected by the harvest.” FEIS p. 124	
--	--	--	--

* Idaho Roadless Rule classifications: Wildland Recreation (WLR); Special Areas of Historic or Tribal Significance (SAHTS); Primitive (P); Backcountry Restoration (BCR); General Forest, Rangeland, and Grassland (GFRG)

**Approximate total acres harvested in roadless from 2010-2017: 1,139 acres on Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest only. *See* USDA, Forest Service, *Projects in IRAs_2001_without graphs_2008 to present* (disclosed 2017) (timber harvest in Idaho roadless areas), on file with authors.