

**Hidden Cedar**  
**Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement**  
**Idaho Panhandle National Forests, St. Joe Ranger District**  
**Clearwater, Latah, and Shoshone Counties, Idaho**  
**March 2007**

**Lead Agency:** USDA Forest Service

**Responsible Official:** Ranotta K. McNair, Forest Supervisor  
Idaho Panhandle National Forests  
3815 Schreiber Way, Coeur d'Alene, ID 83815

**For Further Information Contact:** Pete Ratcliffe, Project Team Leader  
St. Joe Ranger District  
222 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1, St. Maries, ID 83861  
(208)245-2531

**Abstract:** The final supplemental environmental impact statement (FSEIS) addresses needs to manage vegetation conditions and the transportation system for protection of resources and for the development and utilization of lands and resources for both the National Forest and adjacent land owners. The project area is located approximately 26 miles from St. Maries, Idaho along the upper St. Maries River and the West Fork of the St. Maries River on the St. Joe Ranger District. It encompasses approximately 33,000 acres which are approximately 47 percent National Forest System lands. The major issues identified during scoping include: effects of road construction, existing road management, and possible conflict between commercial timber harvest and watershed restoration. Alternatives considered include:

**Alternative A - No Action:** Maintain the existing level of management including fire suppression, road maintenance, recreation use, and previously authorized projects.

**Activities Common to Action Alternatives:** Precommercial thinning on 324 acres, 15 acres of riparian planting, road decommissioning and long-term storage, and 2.0 miles of road construction and 1.2 miles of reconstruction on National Forest System (NFS) lands to provide access for adjacent landowners and for management of NFS lands.

**Alternative B - Proposed Action:** Includes activities common to action alternatives and timber harvest on approximately 1,368 acres, another 9.1 miles of system road construction, another 6.1 miles of road reconstruction, 1.6 miles of temporary road construction, and 15.9 miles of road decommissioning and storage.

**Alternative C -** Includes activities common to action alternatives, timber harvest on approximately 1,393 acres, 6.1 miles of road reconstruction, and 15.9 miles of road decommissioning and storage.

**Alternative D -** Includes activities common to action alternatives, timber harvest on approximately 602 acres, 3.7 miles of road reconstruction, and 24.8 miles of road decommissioning and storage.

**Alternative E-** Includes activities common to action alternatives and 24.8 miles of road decommissioning and storage. It does not include commercial timber harvest.

**Alternative F -** Includes activities common to action alternatives, timber harvest on approximately 1,304 acres, another 6.8 miles of system road construction, 6.0 miles of road reconstruction, and 25.2 miles of road decommissioning and storage.

# **Summary**

## **Hidden Cedar**

### **Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement**

#### **Introduction**

This document is a final “supplemental” environmental impact statement (FSEIS). It is intended to provide supplemental and updated analysis and information to the Hidden Cedar Project Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) which was released to the public in June 2002. A decision was issued at that time. The Record of Decision was administratively appealed to the Regional Forester, and the decision was affirmed on September 27, 2002. A lawsuit was filed on April 21, 2003 in the District Court of Idaho alleging that the Hidden Cedar decision was in violation of federal environmental laws. The court ordered a preliminary injunction enjoining the Forest Service from implementing the logging and associated road building identified in the Hidden ROD. Other work approved with the 2002 ROD continued until Forest Supervisor Ranotta McNair withdrew the ROD for the Hidden Cedar Project on May 18, 2005. The purpose for this withdrawal was to allow the St. Joe Ranger District to further address the issues raised by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Lands Council v. Powell*, 395 F. 3d 1010 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005). A Notice of Intent to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Hidden Cedar Project was published in the Federal Register on November 21, 2005. The Draft Supplemental Hidden Cedar EIS was mailed to the public on June 1, 2006. The Environmental Protection Agency published a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register on June 16, 2006. The Idaho Panhandle National Forest published a Notice of Availability in the newspaper of record, *The Spokesman-Review*, on June 19, 2006 to let the public know the Draft Supplemental EIS was available for comment and that the comment period would end on July 31, 2006.

#### **Purpose and Need**

The purpose and need was developed through an assessment of the project area and identifying the desired condition as defined by the Idaho Panhandle Forest Plan goals and objectives. The need for the proposed action is generated by the difference between the current and projected conditions in the project area and the desired conditions for resources. The interdisciplinary team reviewed the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP), The Northern Region Overview (USDA April, 1999), and the St. Joe Geographic Assessment (GA). The St. Joe GA is a landscape-level assessment of the St. Joe River Basin, which identified ecosystem uses, conditions, trends, and risks in the St. Joe River Basin (IPNF, 1997). Using the larger scale assessments mentioned above and information specific to the project area, the interdisciplinary team completed an Ecosystem Analysis at the Watershed Scale (EAWS) for the St. Joe Landscape Analysis Area 12 - Sherwin-Staples (made up almost entirely of the Hidden Cedar Project Area; project file (PF): PD-2) to document resource conditions and note opportunities to move the landscape towards the desired condition. The following needs for the Hidden Cedar Project Area were derived from the EAWS. The roads analysis process (RAPS) was used to identify the minimum transportation system needed and roads not needed in the project area. Detailed information on project proposals to meet the purpose and need is presented under the Alternative Descriptions section of Chapter 2.

## **The Purpose and Need for a Changed Condition in the Project Area**

1. There is a need to manage for vegetative conditions that, in the long-term, encourage more resilient and sustainable forest conditions. This includes a need for treatments to improve tree species composition and structure and to address increased stand densities, increase in pole- and medium-sized trees, and loss of species diversity.

More specifically:

- a. In the moist habitat types, there is a need to treat stands where western larch and western white pine forest types have been reduced. A defined shift in species composition is occurring through the reduction of long-lived, early seral species and an increase in the representation of the more shade tolerant mid- to late-seral species within the Sherwin-Staples Landscape Analysis Area. Hemlock and grand fir are two of the more moisture-demanding tree species and are highly stressed during drought periods. Unprecedented quantities of drought-sensitive species in areas subject to periodic drought create increased risk of large-scale insect and disease outbreaks and mortality. Hemlock and grand fir are also more fire-intolerant than the species they replaced which creates a risk of high mortality in any fires that do occur. Forest stands are more stressed, more sensitive to drought, and at greater risk from insects and diseases than they were historically. Increased species diversity would reduce both stand and landscape susceptibility to insect and diseases.

The Northern Region Overview describes the changes in vegetation that are contributing to the purpose and need: “In Northern Idaho and moist portions of western Montana, Douglas-fir was largely an early succession species that regenerated well after wildfire in various mixes with white pine and larch, but then was largely eliminated by root disease and beetles after 100-140 years, giving way to pine and larch. In the absence of white pine and larch, we have experienced an increase in Douglas-fir during early succession, and an apparent increase in rot disease inoculum levels as succession proceeds. When Douglas-fir dies in stands now, the result is an effective 50-150 year acceleration of succession to grand fir and hemlock.

Replacement of white pine and larch forest types by Douglas-fir/grand fir/hemlock forest types significantly accelerates successional rates, and decreases tall tree canopy cover, large tree and large wood production, and biomass productivity.

- b. Stand structure is altered from natural conditions, including a reduction of mature large old trees and an increase in pole-sized to medium sawtimber-sized trees. Compared to historic conditions there has been a decline in ecologically important large trees and large wood with potential consequences for nutrient cycling, wildlife habitat and aquatic function. There has been a corresponding increase in densely stocked young stands and stands with dense understories. There is a need to reduce overall tree density to encourage retention and development of larger trees. There is a need to manage stands, individually and cumulatively, to develop increased resiliency to various disturbances and contribute to a landscape that is more reflective of historic conditions. There is a need to thin overstocked sapling/pole stands created by past regeneration harvest and wildfires to improve growing conditions, and maintain species and structural diversity. Biological productivity is less than historic forests with particular decreases in the production of large trees, large snags, and large down wood. Wildlife habitat and stream functions are likely to be impacted. Within the project area risk of loss from certain insects and diseases is increased relative to historical conditions. This is partially due to the change in stand density. The risk of more

frequent large catastrophic fires is increasing as well with the increased stand densities and general reduction in tree size.

2. There is a need to manage the transportation system (roads in the analysis area) to improve water quality, soils, fish habitat and wildlife security.

More specifically:

- a. There is a need to improve water quality and reduce long-term sedimentation to streams caused by existing roads. The State of Idaho listed the West Fork St. Maries River and the main stem of the St. Maries River below Clarkia under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act as water quality impaired. The pollutants of concern are temperature and sediment for the West Fork and the main stem of the St. Maries River.

The IPNF Forest Plan states that if water quality is below standards it will be improved through restoration projects.

Some roads were constructed with lower standards than are used today and in locations where roads would not be constructed now. Road encroachment on the narrow valley portions of the West Fork have forced the channel into a transport zone causing stream bank instability, channel erosion, and an increase in sedimentation. Riparian areas are understocked with trees leading to increased stream temperatures. Roads are associated with mass erosion during flood events; accelerated stream sedimentation rates; reduced channel stability; impaired floodplain functions; reduced large, woody, debris recruitment potential; reduced stream shade; and fish migration barriers.

- b. There is a need to improve fish habitat by reducing barriers caused by road/stream crossings because several of the stream crossings inhibit migratory fish access to suitable aquatic habitat and likely contribute to reduced productivity for fisheries resources within the Hidden Cedar Area. The Forest Plan states that the forest road system is to be managed to avoid adverse effects on inland native fish. Specific direction with respect to roads includes: stabilizing or obliteration of roads not needed for future management activities. Forest Plan standards are to provide fish passage to suitable habitat by design of road crossings of streams to allow fish passage or remove in-stream migration barriers and pursue fish habitat improvement projects. Additional standards were identified in the Inland Native Fish Strategy (INFS), which amends the Forest Plan.
- c. There is a need to improve wildlife security. Wildlife security areas provide for low human disturbance for those species sensitive to human activities. Human access is affecting suitability of wildlife habitat in the Landscape Analysis Area. Due to the extensive road systems there is little security for wildlife. The existing open road density in the project area increases wildlife species' vulnerability to hunting and trapping and increases disturbance levels, which may displace animals. Reductions in road density (open roads) will increase acres of wildlife security.

The Forest Plan goals for Management Area 1 are to provide wildlife habitat. Standards related to this are to utilize road use restrictions to enhance wildlife habitat except as needed for timber activities. In Management Area 4, goals are to provide for opportunities for dispersed recreation consistent with wildlife habitat needs, and wildlife standards state that road closures may be used as needed to meet wildlife habitat needs. Forest Plan (II-27), Wildlife, Elk standards state: utilize the "Guidelines for evaluation and Managing Summer

Elk Habitat in Northern Idaho” (Leege, 1984) for evaluating effects of proposed activities on elk habitat. Although the analysis area has a considerable amount of winter range (MA-4), these areas also provide year-round habitat for elk.

- d. Soil conditions need to be improved on roads and landings that are no longer needed. Soils are detrimentally impacted on these areas and have essentially been taken out of the productive land base. Old landings and existing roads have had the most impact on soil productivity. The Forest Plan states that soil-disturbing management practices will strive to maintain 80 percent of activity areas in a condition of acceptable productivity, projects should maintain sufficient large woody debris, and provisions should be made to maintain sufficient nutrient capital of the soil (Forest Plan pp. II-32 and II-33).

3. There is a need to address the management of the transportation system (roads in the analysis area) for the development and utilization of lands and resources for both the National Forest and others. The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) requires the granting of reasonable access across National Forest lands to other land owners. Access for management of National Forest System lands is also needed.

More specifically:

- a. Access needs for the Forest Service, the Idaho Department of Lands (State of Idaho or state) and Potlatch Corporation (Potlatch) within the Hidden Cedar Project Area were identified through a joint transportation system needs analysis. Those mutual needs were agreed upon to accommodate, as much as practical, the joint use of the same roads or road segments by each party, thereby reducing the possibility of additional roads needed by each party individually.

Forest Plan objectives, in accordance with ANILCA and FRTA, state that non-federal landowners will not be denied reasonable access to their property, if unavailable across other land, subject to compliance with applicable regulations and Forest Service policies and where other ownerships compromise 25% or more of a major drainage.

Coordination of road planning, design, construction and maintenance for the project area has taken place among private individuals, private corporations, the State of Idaho, and the Forest Service in the past since approximately 53 percent of the project area consists of lands owned or managed by others. Operations and maintenance is currently occurring on those existing joint ownership roads. The proposed joint ownership roads that would be constructed under all action alternatives would also be subject to design and construction coordination and operation and maintenance to accommodate each entity’s needs.

- b. Roads are needed to meet Forest Plan goals and objectives related to the development and utilization of National Forest System lands in the project area.

Forest Plan objectives for transportation facilities are to construct, manage and maintain transportation facilities to meet the management area goals in a cost-effective way while meeting needs, as much as practical, for all users and resources with the safety of all users the primary guiding principle. Forest Plan standards are to utilize the lowest standard road to meet transportation objectives compatible with resource protection and area management goals. The roads analysis process (RAP, FSM 7712) was used to identify the minimum transportation system needed and roads not needed in the project area. The need for new roads and evaluating the opportunities for reconstruction and decommissioning of roads can be found in the roads analysis. New roads on National Forest lands would be located,

designed, constructed and maintained to minimize the miles of road constructed and minimize roads constructed on undesirable areas, thus reducing the environmental impacts to other resources.

## **Proposed Action**

The proposed action includes the following activities which are common to all action alternatives:

- Precommercial thinning on 324 acres
- Two miles of road construction and 1.2 miles of reconstruction on National Forest System (NFS) lands to provide access for adjacent landowners and for management of NFS lands
- Riparian planting on 15 acres
- Road management prescription changes including road decommissioning and long-term storage

In addition to those activities it also includes timber harvest and related activities on approximately 1,368 acres, another 9.1 miles of system road construction, and another 6.1 miles of road reconstruction.

## **Alternative Development**

### **Scoping**

The scoping and public participation for this project began in March 2000 when the project was listed in the Idaho Panhandle National Forests Quarterly Schedule of Proposed Actions. A Scoping Notice was sent to the mailing list for the project that included local landowners, government agencies, and interested groups. The concerns of the Coeur D'Alene Tribe were solicited through project scoping. A Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement was published in the Federal Register on March 22, 2000. The Forest Service received four letters in response to scoping.

On May 25, 2001 a legal notice was published in the *Spokesman-Review* announcing the availability of the Hidden Cedar Draft Environmental Impact Statement for public review. The Notice of Availability was published in the Federal Register June 1, 2001. The Forest Service received four letters in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The Final EIS was completed, and Idaho Panhandle National Forests Forest Supervisor, Ranotta McNair, signed a Record of Decision (ROD) on June 28, 2002. A legal notice of availability was published in the *Spokane Spokesman-Review* June 29, 2002, and a Notice of Availability was published in the Federal Register July 19, 2002. The Record of Decision was administratively appealed to the Regional Forester, and the Regional Forester affirmed the decision on September 27, 2002.

A lawsuit was filed on April 21, 2003 in the District Court of Idaho alleging that the Hidden Cedar decision was in violation of federal environmental laws. The court ordered a permanent injunction enjoining the Forest Service from implementing the logging and associated road building identified in the Hidden ROD.

On May 18, 2005 Forest Supervisor Ranotta McNair withdrew the ROD for the Hidden Cedar Project. The purpose for this withdrawal was to allow the St. Joe Ranger District to further address the issues raised by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Lands Council v. Powell*, 395 F. 3d 1010 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005).

The Forest Service published a Notice of Intent to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Hidden Cedar Project in the Federal Register on November 21, 2005.

Chuck Mark (St. Joe District Ranger) and other representatives of the Forest Service met with representatives of the Coeur d'Alene Tribe on March 24, 2006. The group discussed the Hidden Cedar Project, and representatives of the Coeur D'Alene Tribe expressed no concerns about the project.

The Draft Supplemental Hidden Cedar EIS was mailed to the public on June 1, 2006, and the Environmental Protection Agency published a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register on June 16, 2006. The Idaho Panhandle National Forest published a Notice of Availability in the newspaper of record, *The Spokesman-Review*, on June 19, 2006 to let the public know the Draft Supplemental EIS was available for comment and that the comment period would end on July 31, 2006. The Forest Service received eight comment letters. Those letters and the Forest Service's response to them are included as Appendix E of the FSEIS.

### **Alternative-Driving Issues**

#### **Issue 1 - Road Construction** (Addressed with Alternatives A, C, D, and E)

Some people objected to road construction because of potential effects on forest resources such as water quality, fisheries, and wildlife habitat. They were also concerned about future maintenance of those roads. Alternatives C, D and E were developed to address concerns related to new road construction. See descriptions of alternatives later in this chapter.

- a. Effects of new road construction on water and fish in the project area:** New road construction can impact water quality and fish habitat by increasing the potential for sediment delivery to the stream system. Sediment production from new road construction is compared in the alternatives.
- b. The effects of road construction on wildlife security in the project area:** Road construction may alter wildlife habitat by changing wildlife movement or habitat connectivity. A comparison of alternatives takes into account the long-term effects of roads as they relate to open-road densities. Current levels and changes in disturbance/security resulting from implementation of the project are displayed by alternative.

#### **Issue 2 - Existing Road Management** (Addressed in all action alternatives, but to a greater extent in Alternatives D & E)

People were concerned that the proposed action did not go far enough to restore watersheds, particularly the decommissioning of existing roads in riparian areas; and some were concerned with how existing roads affect wildlife security. Alternatives D and E were developed to specifically address the issues related to roads in riparian areas and wildlife security.

- a. The effects of existing roads on water quality and fish habitat:** Riparian roads and road/stream crossings intercept and alter natural water flow patterns and fluvial process, which can increase sediment supply to the stream system, which in turn may increase channel degradation or aggradation and may adversely affect fish habitat.
- b. Effects of existing roads on wildlife security:** Motorized vehicle use on roads reduces wildlife security. A comparison of acres of secure habitat (acres greater than ½ mile from an open road) is derived from changes in road management prescriptions (see elk analysis in Chapter 3).

### **Issue 3 - Possible Conflict Between Commercial Timber Harvest and Watershed Restoration** (addressed in Alternative E)

A concern was expressed regarding the use of timber harvest and road building while at the same time trying to achieve objectives related to watershed restoration, and an alternative with no commercial timber harvest was suggested. Alternative E was developed to address the issue of timber harvest and related road construction while restoring watersheds.

## **Alternatives Considered in Detail**

### **Activities Common to Action Alternatives**

Precommercial thinning on 324 acres, 15 acres of riparian planting, road decommissioning and long-term storage, and 2.0 miles of road construction and 1.2 miles of reconstruction on National Forest System (NFS) lands to provide access for adjacent landowners and for management of NFS lands.

### **Alternative A – No Action**

This alternative proposes to maintain an existing level of management within the Hidden Cedar Project Area. Fire suppression, road maintenance, recreation use, and vegetative treatments such as planting would continue. It does not propose any new management. A list of on-going activities can be found at the beginning of Chapter 3 under Past, Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Activities.

### **Alternative B – (Proposed Action)**

The proposed action includes the following activities which are common to all action alternatives. In addition to those activities it also includes timber harvest on approximately 1,368 acres, another 9.1 miles of system road construction, another 6.1 miles of road reconstruction, 1.6 miles of temporary road construction, and 15.9 miles of road decommissioning and storage.

### **Alternative C**

Alternative C includes activities common to action alternatives, timber harvest on approximately 1,393 acres, 6.1 miles of road reconstruction, and 15.9 miles of road decommissioning and storage.

### **Alternative D**

Alternative D includes activities common to action alternatives, timber harvest on approximately 602 acres, 3.7 miles of road reconstruction, and 24.8 miles of road decommissioning and storage.

### **Alternative E**

Alternative E includes activities common to action alternatives and 24.8 miles of road decommissioning and storage. It does not include commercial timber harvest.

### **Alternative F**

Alternative F includes activities common to action alternatives and timber harvest on approximately 1,304 acres, another 6.8 miles of system road construction, 6.0 miles of road reconstruction, and 25.2 miles of road decommissioning and storage.

## Comparison of Alternatives

### How Alternatives Meet the Purpose and Need

**Table S-1 Summary Comparison of Purpose and Need Objectives**

Measurement Parameters	A		B		C		D		E		F	
<b>Move Vegetation Toward Historical Conditions</b>												
Composition:	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%
Long-lived, early-seral tree species: WL/WP Forest Types	1,661	11	1,959	13	1,959	13	1,851	12	1,661	11	1,923	12
Stand Structure:												
Brush-seedling sapling	2,147	14	2,375	15	Same as Alt B		2,228	15	Same as Alt A		2,339	15
Pole-small-medium	10,756	70	10,537	68			10,624	69			10,573	68
Mature-large	1,684	11	1,675	11			1,675	11			1,675	11
Old Growth = allocated w/in PA	851	6	851	6			851	6			851	6
Stand Density:	Acres		Acres		Acres		Acres		Acres		Acres	
Reduction in stand density	0		1,129		1,154		461		0		1,101	
Improve conditions for overstocked seedling/sapling stands	0		324		324		324		324		324	
<b>Improve Water Quality, Aquatic Habitat, Soil Conditions and Wildlife Security Through Road Changes</b>												
Miles of road recontour w/in 50 feet of stream channel	0.0		4.9		4.9		5.3		5.3		5.2	
Miles of road storage or decom on existing roads	0		15.9		15.9		24.8		24.8		25.2	
Net reduction in stream crossings* (after road construction )	0		20		20		33		33		34	
Net long-term reduction in sediment (tons/year) including work done under 2002 ROD	19.6		38.7		46.8		58.3		58.3		51.7	
Net acres of improving soil productivity related to roads	0		14		55		90		90		65	
Acres of wildlife security	660		1,009		1,009		2,240		2,240		2,240	
<b>Provide Access for Other Landowners</b>												
	no		yes		yes		yes		yes		yes	

## Addressing the Issues

Please see Chapter 3 of the FSEIS for a complete discussion of these issues. Table S-2 displays the alternatives issue by issue and is National Forest System lands and roads unless noted differently. Miles of road by management prescription (under Issue 2) **includes** proposed miles of new road construction and the connected action (access request) of 5.6 miles construction on private land.

**Table S-2 Summary Comparison of Issue Indicators by Alternative**

Indicators	Alternatives					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
<b>Issue #1 – Road Construction Activity</b>						
New system road construction miles (NFS land)	0	11.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	8.8
Temporary road construction	0	1.6	0	0	0	1.6
Sediment increase from road construction (tons/year)	0.0	12.1	3.9	3.9	3.9	10.5
Sediment decrease from restoration work (tons/year)	0	31.1	31.1	42.6	42.6	42.6
Net long-term change in sediment production for entire Hidden Cedar Project (tons / year; negative number equals reduction in sediment production)	-19.6	-38.7	-46.8	-58.3	-58.3	-51.7
Number of new stream crossings – FS activities	0	17	5	5	5	16
Number of stream crossings removed – FS activities	0	20	20	33	33	34
Net change in number of stream crossings – FS activities	0	-3	-15	-28	-28	-18
Number of new stream crossings – other and FS activities	0	33	21	21	21	32
Number of stream crossings removed – other and FS activities	0	20	20	33	33	34
Net change in number of stream crossings – other and FS activities	0	+13	+1	-12	-12	+2
Miles of appropriately functioning fish habitat	0	0	0	6.2	6.2	6.2
Trend of fishery condition	stable	stable	↑ in 1 stream	↑ in 4 streams	↑ in 4 streams	↑ in 3 streams
Wildlife security on NFS land (total road density – mi. /sq. mi. in wildlife analysis area)	3.6	2.9	2.8	2.5	2.5	2.6
Wildlife security on all lands in wildlife analysis area (total road density – mi. / sq. mi.)	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.1

Indicators	Alternatives					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
<b>Issue #2 – Road Management</b>						
Miles of road by management Rx on NFS land in project area:						
Open road	40.5	38.7	38.7	36.4	36.4	36.4
Gated – Mgmt. Prescription A	14.5	11.9	11.9	8.6	8.6	8.7
Barrier – Mgmt. Prescription B	11.9	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.4
LTS – Mgmt. Prescription C	34.9	54.6	47.1	39.3	39.3	43.7
Decommission - Mgmt. Prescriptions D & E	11.2	15.3	13.7	26.8	26.8	28.4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>113.0</b>	<b>124.1</b>	<b>115.0</b>	<b>115.0</b>	<b>115.0</b>	<b>120.6</b>
Miles of road by management Rx on all land in project area after new construction:						
Open road	89.5	87.7	87.7	85.4	85.4	85.4
Gated – Mgmt. Prescription A	104.3	105.2	105.2	101.8	101.8	102.9
Barrier – Mgmt. Prescription B	52.2	45.0	46.4	45.2	45.2	44.9
LTS – Mgmt. Prescription C	53.2	73.9	66.4	58.6	58.6	62.8
Decommission - Mgmt. Prescriptions D & E	11.5	15.6	14.0	27.3	27.3	28.9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>310.7</b>	<b>327.4</b>	<b>319.7</b>	<b>318.3</b>	<b>318.3</b>	<b>324.9</b>
Sediment increase from road construction (tons/year)	0.0	12.1	3.9	3.9	3.9	10.5
Sediment decrease from road storage and decommissioning (tons/year)	0	31.1	31.1	42.6	42.6	42.6
Number of new stream crossings	0	17	5	5	5	16
Number of stream crossings removed	0	20	20	33	33	34
Net change in number of stream crossings	0	-3	-15	-28	-28	-18
Miles of road recontoured within 50 feet of stream channel	0	4.9	4.9	5.3	5.3	5.3
Miles of appropriately functioning fish habitat	0	0	0	6.2	6.2	6.2
Trend of fishery condition	stable	stable	↑ in 1 stream	↑ in 4 streams	↑ in 4 streams	↑ in 3 streams
Acres of security for wildlife	660	1,009	1,009	2,240	2,240	2,240
<b>Issue #3 – Commercial Logging</b>						
Water yield increase for the St. Maries River	7.3%	8.6%	8.6%	<8.6%	7.3%	8.6%
Estimated acres soil productivity improvement from road storage & decommissioning	0	64	64	99	99	101
Net acres of soil productivity improvement related to roads (after road construction)	0	14	55	90	90	65
Maintain at least 80 percent of the activity area (including system roads) in a condition of acceptable productivity potential	Yes	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*
Miles of appropriately functioning fish habitat	0	0	0	6.2	6.2	6.2
Trend of fishery condition	stable	stable	↑ in 1 stream	↑ in 4 streams	↑ in 4 streams	↑ in 3 streams