

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	R. Baldwin to R. Lawrence, re Nominations (9 pages)	12/30/1999	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System
CEA (Robert Z. Lawrence)
OA/Box Number: 950000

FOLDER TITLE:

[12/28/1999 - 12/31/1999]

2014-0316-F

wr10770

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Yu-Chin Chen (CN=Yu-Chin Chen/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-DEC-1999 14:21:06.00

SUBJECT: WTO Ruling Against the U.S. In British Subsidies Case

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Martin N. Baily (CN=Martin N. Baily/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: John G. Fernald (CN=John G. Fernald/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Victoria A. Greenfield (CN=Victoria A. Greenfield/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

Yu-Chin Chen (CN=Yu-Chin Chen/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here are some basic info regarding the British steel case that the US recently lost in the WTO. Officially, it's the CVD case involving "certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products (lead bars)" from the UK.

The key issue in this case (filed by the EC) is against a provision of the U.S. countervailing duty (CVD) regulations regarding the treatment of subsidies after a state-owned company is privatized. Specifically, the question is whether the benefits of government equity infusions in government-owned companies survive the privatization process during which the ownership or assets are transferred to private entities at a fair market value.

In CVD cases, current U.S. methodology does not consider the privatization of previously subsidized state-owned companies an automatic termination of the effect of the subsidy. Instead, for steel CVD cases, CVD margin is imposed based on assessing the benefit of the subsidy at the time it is given and then allocating it over a period of 15 or 18 years, which is considered the average useful life of the assets purchased with the subsidy. In this specific case (see details below), the U.S. considered the subsidies bestowed to BSC (a state-owned company) between 1977-1985 to have been passed on to UES (established by BSC), then to British Steel plc when it subsequently purchased UES in 1995, renaming it BSES. The EC argued that the US imposed the CVD on imports from BSES without first justifying that the subsidies did continue to accrue a benefit, thus violating WTO requirements. The US argued that the WTO SCM Agreement says nothing about requiring "new" benefit determinations with a mere transfer of ownership.

The WTO panel ruled that the sale of a company on the open market creates a new and different company, which cannot be assumed to benefit from the subsidies that were given when it was owned by the government. This means that if Commerce wants to impose CVD on products produced by the new company, it would have to prove again that it received benefits from previous government subsidies, a task US has charged as impossible to do (according to Inside U.S. Trade).

The US has 60 days to file an appeal.

Let me know if you'd like more detailed info. The USTR people who work on the case are out this week, but I can get more info from them next week if necessary.

Yu-chin

Factual Background (Excerpts from the WTO report):

ú This dispute concerns the imposition of countervailing duties by the United States on certain hot rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products originating in the United Kingdom in the context of three successive annual reviews.

ú On 8 May 1992, a countervailing duty investigation was initiated by the United States against imports of hot rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel from, inter-alia, the United Kingdom. The period of investigation was calendar year 1991. On 27 January 1993, the United States Department of Commerce (USDOC) issued a final determination establishing a subsidy rate of 12.69 per cent on imports from United Engineering Steels Limited (UES). On 22 March 1993, following an affirmative injury determination by the United States International Trade Commission (USITC), the USDOC published a countervailing duty order at the above rate on imports from UES.

ú During the period of investigation, UES was a joint-venture equally owned by British Steel Public Limited Company (British Steel plc) and Guest, Keen and Nettlefolds (GKN), both of which were privately-owned companies. The alleged subsidies countervailed were not provided to either co-owner of UES but to state-owned British Steel Corporation (BSC). BSC established UES in 1986 in association with GKN. British Steel plc was related to BSC in the sense that the former assumed the property, rights and liabilities of the latter in September 1988. The British government privatized British Steel plc in December 1988 through a sale of shares. Both parties agree that the privatization of British Steel plc was "at arm's length, for fair market value and consistent with commercial considerations".

ú On 21 March 1995, UES became a wholly-owned affiliate of British Steel plc as this company bought out GKN's interests. UES was subsequently renamed British Steel Engineering Steels (BSES).

ú The alleged subsidies countervailed relate principally to equity infusions granted by the British Government to BSC during fiscal years 1977/78) 1985/86. The USDOC classified such alleged subsidies as non-recurrent and thus spread them out over 18 years, deemed to be the useful life of productive assets in the steel industry. The USDOC found that the alleged subsidies in question "passed through" from BSC to UES

first, and then more recently to BSES.

ú Following the original imposition of CVDs in March 1993, the DOC has undertaken six annual reviews to set the duty rate on imports of the subject product. The first review is not being challenged as it was initiated on 15 April 1994, prior to the entry into force of the SCM Agreement. The fifth review, initiated on 24 April 1998, is not being challenged either as it was completed (11 August 1999) after the request for establishment of the Panel (WTO documents WT/DS138/3 and WT/DS138/3/Corr.1). Similarly, the sixth review, initiated on 30 April 1999, is not subject to challenge given that it was opened after the request for establishment of the Panel. Therefore, the subject of this Panel are the outcomes of the second, third and fourth reviews, initiated in 1995, 1996 and 1997, respectively. UES and BSES were the only exporters involved in these reviews.

ú The 1995 review, covering imports during calendar year 1994, was initiated on 14 April 1995 and was completed on 14 November 1996. In this review, the USDOC determined a subsidy rate of 1.69 per cent on imports from UES.

ú The 1996 review, covering imports during calendar year 1995, was initiated on 25 April 1996 and completed on 14 October 1997. In this review, the USDOC established two separate subsidy rates on account of the fact that UES transformed itself into BSES during the period of review. In particular, the USDOC established a subsidy rate of 2.40 per cent, applicable to imports from UES made during the period 1 January 1995 through 20 March 1995, and another subsidy rate of 7.35 per cent, corresponding to imports from BSES during the period 21 March 1995 through 31 December 1995.

ú The 1997 review, covering imports during calendar year 1996, was initiated on 29 April 1997 and was completed on 15 April 1998. In this review, the USDOC determined a subsidy rate of 5.28 per cent on imports from BSES.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa D. Branch (CN=Lisa D. Branch/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-DEC-1999 09:44:13.00

SUBJECT: Phone Message from Ken Froot

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Contact: Ken FrootCompany: Phone: 617-495-6677FAX: Message: He called on Fri, 12/24, at 10am. He would like to suggest a person for employment at CEA.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa D. Branch (CN=Lisa D. Branch/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-DEC-1999 19:37:05.00

SUBJECT: Mercatus Center Panel Discussion, Fri, 1/21/00, Charlottesville, VA

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

John Nicholson called today to inform you that your session starts in the afternoon (of the 21st) around 2:30pm. He wants to make sure you have no problem with this timeslot. He will arrange to have a car pick you up from the office shortly before or at noon, and return you to the office around 6pm. He asks that I confirm immediately your participation for that time. Is 2:30 okay with you?

poc: 703-993-4930

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jason A. Bernstein (CN=Jason A. Bernstein/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-DEC-1999 19:37:44.00

SUBJECT: Chapter 1

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Robert,

Welcome back.

I have been busy this week working on the charts and fact-checking for Chapter 1. The current set of charts are attached. As you can see, I have made several changes. For the "productivity" chart (1.2), I added trend lines displaying the the growth rates in different time periods. However, the problem is that the average growth in output per hour is only 0.5 percentage points higher in the recent expansion (1993-1999) than it was in the "slow" years (1973-1993). Therefore, the graph doesn't show a straight horizontal line combined with an upward trend in the way that you want it. I also changed the productivity chart composed by Steven Braun and Stephen Lin to show the trend starting in 1990. However, the data they use is an average between the BLS data (which we have been using) and another data series. We should probably decide on which series we want to use, especially when we start reporting the numbers in the text.

I have also made some changes to the GDP per capita chart (1.1) by dividing it into the different time periods. As you can see, I also changed the story behind the chart (i.e. the tagline) to reflect the fact that during the current expansion, GDP growth has been on more of a steady increase when compared to previous expansions and is closer to the overall trend during the past century.

I also added another chart (1.3) comparing growth in per capita income and output per hour during the different time periods. While this chart is somewhat unsophisticated, I thought it shows the difference between the 1973-93 and other periods nicely. Let me know what you think.

I have already made significant progress toward fact-checking (I'm about 60% finished) and have some corrections to the text to make, which I will give you in one document as soon as I finish up some more checking. Just to note that we should decide on which productivity series to use (BLS or the average between BLS and another series.) Also note that (to the best of my knowledge) weekly wages are not available by quintile (only some quartiles and deciles) and that hourly wages are only available by decile through ERI.

Sorry for the long message. Let me know when you have any questions.

Jason

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D64]ARMS229973113.046 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

Clinton Presidential Records Automated Records Management System [EMAIL]

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Hex Dump file is not in a recognizable format, has been incorrectly decoded or is damaged.

File Name: p_21137992_cea_html_1.msoff

Attachment Number: [ATTACH.D64]ARMS229973113.046

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Howard Shatz <shatz@fas.harvard.edu> (Howard Shatz <shatz@fas.harvard.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-DEC-1999 21:47:17.00

SUBJECT: ASSA Meetings

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Professor Lawrence:

Will you be at the meetings? I would love to catch a few minutes with you if you have time.

Decent news on the dissertation front (I'm making progress).

Decent news on the job front (I have some good interviews).

Howard

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Susan P. Clements (CN=Susan P. Clements/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-DEC-1999 12:10:46.00

SUBJECT: an IMPORTANT NOTE on backing up your files

TO: Yu-Chin Chen (CN=Yu-Chin Chen/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William H. Gillespie (CN=William H. Gillespie/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Warren A. Herold (CN=Warren A. Herold/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria A. Greenfield (CN=Victoria A. Greenfield/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Susan P. Clements (CN=Susan P. Clements/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven N. Braun (CN=Steven N. Braun/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen F. Lin (CN=Stephen F. Lin/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah L. Rosen (CN=Sarah L. Rosen/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sandra F. Daigle (CN=Sandra F. Daigle/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rosalind V. Rasin (CN=Rosalind V. Rasin/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Noah Y. Weisberger (CN=Noah Y. Weisberger/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael J. Brien (CN=Michael J. Brien/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary Fibich (CN=Mary Fibich/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary E. Jones (CN=Mary E. Jones/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary A. Thomas (CN=Mary A. Thomas/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Martin N. Baily (CN=Martin N. Baily/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark N. Levine (CN=Mark N. Levine/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa D. Branch (CN=Lisa D. Branch/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda A. Reilly (CN=Linda A. Reilly/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leigh L. Linden (CN=Leigh L. Linden/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kathryn L. Shaw (CN=Kathryn L. Shaw/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karin A. Braack (CN=Karin A. Braack/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie M. Meyers (CN=Julie M. Meyers/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph E. Aldy (CN=Joseph E. Aldy/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John L. Goldie (CN=John L. Goldie/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John G. Fernald (CN=John G. Fernald/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John C. Williams (CN=John C. Williams/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason A. Bernstein (CN=Jason A. Bernstein/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James M. Treadway (CN=James M. Treadway/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Francine P. Obermiller (CN=Francine P. Obermiller/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas V. Almond (CN=Douglas V. Almond/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles F. Stone (CN=Charles F. Stone/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Catherine H. Furlong (CN=Catherine H. Furlong/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carol L. Capece (CN=Carol L. Capece/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Amorosi (CN=Brian A. Amorosi/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Audrey Choi (CN=Audrey Choi/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrew R. Feldman (CN=Andrew R. Feldman/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alice H. Williams (CN=Alice H. Williams/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

It has come to my attention that many of you keep your work files primarily on the fileserver (e.g., drives F:, G:, H:, & I:). This is to clarify that those files should be backed up to your hard drive (C:\WORK directory).

We expect our PCs to boot up as operative computers even in the event of network failure;
but in that event you will not have access to any of your fileserver files.

So your first backup chore should be to copy your work files to your own computer's hard drive.

Your second backup chore is then to copy to removable media (preferably 3 1/2 " disk)
the subset of those files that you consider to be absolutely essential for your work in the next few weeks.

I'm forwarding below my earlier email on procedures to follow should you need a larger capacity backup capability.
Please don't wait until the last minute to make that request if you're going to need it --
how about c.o.b. today as a deadline?

----- Forwarded by Susan P. Clements/CEA/EOP on 12/29/99
11:48 AM -----

From: Susan P. Clements on 12/27/99 10:23:55 AM
Record Type: Record

To: All CEA Users
cc:
Subject: CD backup available for Y2K

We have a CD-write drive working at my PC.
If you need to backup files too big for 1.44MB diskettes,
please call or e-mail me to arrange to have your files backed up to CD.

In preparation, please do the following:

First collect into a single directory on your hard drive (e.g.,
C:\WORK\BACKUP)
all the files you will want backed up .

After checking with me (so that we have only one backup in process
at a time, lest we fill up the fileserver):
copy your C:\WORK\BACKUP (or whatever) directory to I:\Y2Kbkup
and rename I:\Y2Kbkup\BACKUP (or whatever) after yourself (e.g.,
I:\Y2Kbkup\Braun).

Let me know when that's done and I'll write the CD.

I will delete the I:\Y2Kbkup\your-name directory after I've made
the CD,
to keep from filling up the fileserver --
so you might want to keep the C:\WORK\BACKUP directory as an extra
precaution.

I will return the CD to you for verification that it was created
correctly and completely;
so please be prepared to take responsibility for that.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa D. Branch (CN=Lisa D. Branch/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-DEC-1999 12:19:30.00

SUBJECT: Phone Message from Roger Porter

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Contact: Roger PorterCompany: Phone: 617-496-4036FAX: Message:

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Martin N. Baily (CN=Martin N. Baily/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-DEC-1999 14:55:26.00

SUBJECT: misc

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Trust you had fun in Florida.

Nothing happened in the morning staff meetings and there were no West Wing meetings that I went to. There were some noises about drug prices and internet sales, but I only know what was in the paper.

The biggest ERP problems were in the families chapter (still) and in the micro chapter. We spent a lot of time on these, and Kathryn and Chad are working on families, while Will and John F are working on micro.

The comments from Treasury on Chapter 1 seemed mild. Mike Treadway has edited a version, so we are fine there.

I sent you a somewhat revised version of the union memo. take a look and send it over to Karen.

Ideally I will come back into the office on Weds (going to the 8 am meeting on Weds) but if it is essential I will come in on Tuesday.

Have a great New Year's celebration and see you in the next millenium.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Michael J. Brien (CN=Michael J. Brien/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-DEC-1999 01:11:03.00

SUBJECT: Re: Summaries and Challenge Paragraphs.

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Robert:

Here is a first pass at the description of Chapter 4 needed for the conclusion of Chapter 1. Please let me know if you would like more specific details on what is actually covered in the chapter. I will be out of the office on Thursday but I can be reached at home at (703) 538-2435.

Mike

Chapter 4 "Work and Learning in the 21st Century"

Chapter 4 examines the implications for the labor market of an increasingly technology-driven economy. The chapter begins by focusing on two key transformations of the labor market -- the increasing value of education and the increasing opportunities for women and minorities. Despite substantial increases in the level of educational attainment over the century, the last several decades has seen a gap develop between the earnings of those with a college education and of those with less education. The new economy has put a high premium on a new set of skills and there appears to be a growing mismatch between the skills workers possess and the skills firms demand. The last part of this chapter examines the role of government and the policies put forth by this Administration to help workers adjust to the rapidly changing economy. This includes a discussion of education policies from preschool to post-secondary, and private and government training programs.

An important challenge is to develop a comprehensive set of education and training policies that create a framework of lifetime learning within which workers can acquire and maintain the skills they need to be successful in the new labor market. Chapter 4 discusses a number of specific initiatives that have been attempted or proposed. These include the efforts to reduce class size and improve teacher quality, policies that have been shown to be effective at the elementary and secondary levels; the Hope Scholarship program, a tax credit that will hopefully make the first two years of college as universal as high school; and the Workforce Investment Act, a new training initiative being phased in 2000 that will help provide workers the necessary skills.

Robert Z. Lawrence
12/21/99 10:00:23 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc: Audrey Choi/CEA/EOP@EOP, Martin N. Baily/CEA/EOP@EOP
Subject: Summaries and Challenge Paragraphs.

At the end of chapter one, we would like a section in which we outline major challenges for economic policy. Could you please draft a couple of paragraphs which (a) summarize very briefly the major points of your chapter and (b) indicate the major policy challenges which come out of the discussion. Thanks.

Message Sent

To:

Michael J. Brien/CEA/EOP@EOP
Kathryn L. Shaw/CEA/EOP@EOP
William H. Gillespie/CEA/EOP@EOP
John C. Williams/CEA/EOP@EOP
John G. Fernald/CEA/EOP@EOP
Joseph E. Aldy/CEA/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-DEC-1999 09:29:32.00

SUBJECT: Re: Mercatus Center Panel Discussion, Fri, 1/21/00, Charlottesville, VA

TO: Lisa D. Branch (CN=Lisa D. Branch/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Fine

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-DEC-1999 08:47:32.00

SUBJECT: Re: ASSA Meetings

TO: Howard Shatz <shatz@fas.harvard.edu> (Howard Shatz <shatz@fas.harvard.edu> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Sorry, I won't be there. Have a happy new year!

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa D. Branch (CN=Lisa D. Branch/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-DEC-1999 14:03:32.00

SUBJECT: URGENT MESSAGE FROM ROBERT

TO: Yu-Chin Chen (CN=Yu-Chin Chen/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William H. Gillespie (CN=William H. Gillespie/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Warren A. Herold (CN=Warren A. Herold/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria A. Greenfield (CN=Victoria A. Greenfield/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Susan P. Clements (CN=Susan P. Clements/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven N. Braun (CN=Steven N. Braun/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen F. Lin (CN=Stephen F. Lin/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah L. Rosen (CN=Sarah L. Rosen/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sandra F. Daigle (CN=Sandra F. Daigle/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rosalind V. Rasin (CN=Rosalind V. Rasin/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Noah Y. Weisberger (CN=Noah Y. Weisberger/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael J. Brien (CN=Michael J. Brien/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary Fibich (CN=Mary Fibich/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary E. Jones (CN=Mary E. Jones/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary A. Thomas (CN=Mary A. Thomas/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Martin N. Baily (CN=Martin N. Baily/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark N. Levine (CN=Mark N. Levine/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa D. Branch (CN=Lisa D. Branch/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda A. Reilly (CN=Linda A. Reilly/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leigh L. Linden (CN=Leigh L. Linden/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kathryn L. Shaw (CN=Kathryn L. Shaw/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karin A. Braack (CN=Karin A. Braack/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie M. Meyers (CN=Julie M. Meyers/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph E. Aldy (CN=Joseph E. Aldy/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John L. Goldie (CN=John L. Goldie/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John G. Fernald (CN=John G. Fernald/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John C. Williams (CN=John C. Williams/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason A. Bernstein (CN=Jason A. Bernstein/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James M. Treadway (CN=James M. Treadway/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Francine P. Obermiller (CN=Francine P. Obermiller/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas V. Almond (CN=Douglas V. Almond/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles F. Stone (CN=Charles F. Stone/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Catherine H. Furlong (CN=Catherine H. Furlong/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carol L. Capece (CN=Carol L. Capece/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Amorosi (CN=Brian A. Amorosi/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Audrey Choi (CN=Audrey Choi/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrew R. Feldman (CN=Andrew R. Feldman/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alice H. Williams (CN=Alice H. Williams/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Robert would like to wish you all a Happy New Year !! Anyone whose
workload this afternoon would
allow them to leave at 3p.m. should feel free to do so. Have a great
weekend!

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Conroy_Scott ("Conroy_Scott/wo"@fs.fed.us [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-DEC-1999 18:41:04.00

SUBJECT: Forw[2]: Interagency meeting agenda.

TO: Thomas Brumm (CN=Thomas Brumm/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Donald R. Arbuckle (CN=Donald R. Arbuckle/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter.Coppelman@usdoj.gov (Peter.Coppelman@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gary_D_Frazer@fws.gov (Gary_D_Frazer@fws.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

From: Conroy_Scott/wo@sv2wo

Subject: Forw: Interagency meeting agenda.

To: phil_allard@blm.gov, llinden@cea.eop.gov, rlawrence@cea.eop.gov,
john.watts@usdoj.gov, louise.milkman@usdoj.gov, peter.coppleman@usdoj.gov,
suriano.elaine@epa.gov, sanderson.dick@epa.gov, jfurnish/wo@sv2wo,
cwood/wo@sv2wo, mconnolly/wo@sv2wo, sconroy/wo@sv2wo, jriber/wo@sv2wo,
Craig.Johnson@noaa.gov, Don.Knowles@noaa.gov, Art.Jeffers@noaa.gov,
Donna.Brewer@noaa.gov, jere.glover@sba.gov, tcroote@omb.eop.gov,
darbuckle@omb.eop.gov, Jeremy.Anderson@usda.gov, bmyrick@usda.gov,
Jennifer.Smith@sba.gov, Anne.Kennedy@usda.gov, jschaub@usda.gov,
dbice@usda.gov, john_fay@fws.gov, gary_frazier@fws.gov, A.West@usda.gov,
hdiazsoltero/wo@sv2wo, Dinah_Bear@ceq.eop.gov, Thomas_Brum@ceq.eop.gov,
aferlo/wo@sv2wo, Stuart_R._Kasdin@omb.eop.gov,
Elwood_Holstein@omb.eop.gov, tmuir@ostp.eop.gov, rbierbaum@ostp.eop.gov

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="Boundary_(ID_v2wzq+ps7r07YqGRhFMKSv)"

Attached is the draft final chapter 1 in .rtf and .doc formats for 1/3/00

meeting. Enclosed in the

forwarded message from Chris Wood are the interagency meeting agenda and
draft

alternatives document in .doc and .rtf formats. EPA alternatives input
document

will be faxed.

Please call Scott Conroy if you do not receive fax 703-605-5136. See you

in the

next Millennium!

- deis_chapter1.entire_DS_12.30.1999.rtf.rtf - deis_chapter1.entire_DS_12.30.1999.docFrom:

Wood_Chris/wo@sv2wo

Subject: Interagency meeting agenda.

To: Conroy_Scott/wo@sv2wo

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="Boundary_(ID_GO5Hz8g5cW7oNydkw4HvFA)"

Attached is the agenda for the Roadless Interagency team meeting to be held

Monday, January

3, 2000, from 2-4. Thanks, Chris

INTERAGENCY REVIEW TEAM MEETING AGENDA

January 3, 2000, 2-4pm

Location: USDA Forest Service, Chief's conference room, 2d floor, corner
of

14th and Independence Avenues, SW, Washington, DC (no
clearance required to enter building).

Purpose of the meeting: 1) overview public scoping and agency outreach
efforts

2) close

discussion of Chapter One 3) begin discussion of alternatives to be
analyzed.

Expected outcomes: Closure on the issue of the purpose and need for agency
action. Initiate

in-depth discussions of range of alternatives. If time allows, begin
discussion

of alternatives that

might be analyzed in detail. This meeting will likely cover both
technical and

policy

aspects of the roadless rulemaking.

I. Overview of public scoping and outreach. Chris Wood and Steve
Marshall

II. Discussion on Chapter One -- Scott Conroy and Chris Wood

III. Alternatives discussion -- Conroy, Wood, Julia

Next meeting: Please note that the next meeting will be held on January 10,
2000, from 2-4pm in

the Chief's conference room, USDA Forest Service. Meeting topics will
include

alternatives

analyzed in detail and those considered but not analyzed in detail.

Happy New Year!

- alternatives.rtf - alternatives.doc===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

{\rtf1\ansi\ansicpg1252\uc1 \deff0\deflang1033\deflangfe1033{\fonttbl{\f0\froma

Clinton Presidential Records Automated Records Management System [EMAIL]

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Hex Dump file is not in a recognizable format, has been incorrectly decoded or is damaged.

File Name: p_v1207616_cea_html_1.txt

Attachment Number: alternatives.rtf

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR ROADLESS AREA CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT WITHIN THE NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

Chapter 1. Purpose of and Need for Action

Introduction

This chapter describes the underlying purpose and need to which the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service is responding in developing this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and proposed rule to conserve and enhance roadless areas within the 192 million acre National Forest System (NFS). Alternatives for managing the roadless portions of NFS lands, including the proposed action and no action, are analyzed and displayed in this DEIS.

The proposed rule is designed to achieve two objectives. First, from a national level, it would immediately prohibit certain activities that compromise the values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas. Second, it would provide procedures and criteria for evaluating, conserving, and enhancing the values of inventoried roadless and other NFS unroaded areas.

Background

Many areas of the National Forest System remain unroaded for a variety of reasons, including rugged terrain, environmental sensitivity, controversy associated with roadless entries, market demands, and other socio-economic conditions. In 1979, the Forest Service completed an inventory of roadless areas for their wilderness character and value through the Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE II). Since then, Congress designated some areas in that inventory as wilderness. Others were released for a variety of management activities, including some activities that allow for road construction. A large number of the RARE II areas still remain roadless.

During the RARE II evaluation, only areas that met criteria for wilderness were considered. For the purpose of the wilderness review, roadless areas were required to "be of sufficient size as to make predictable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition." Among other factors, this included a general size threshold of 5,000 acres¹. Some RARE II areas not designated as wilderness were developed according to subsequent forest plan decisions. Controversy over the remaining unroaded areas on NFS lands has increased due to the values associated with their important social and ecological characteristics. President Clinton emphasized these values in his remarks on the George Washington and Jefferson National Forest on October 13, 1999:

[W]ithin our national forests there are large parcels of land that don't contain roads of any kind, and in most cases, never have...these areas represent some of the last,

¹ Roadless areas in the East did not have to meet this acreage requirement, but were evaluated against other criteria identified in Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 1909.12, Chapter 7.

best, unprotected wildland anywhere in our nation. They offer unparalleled opportunities for hikers, hunters, and anglers. They're absolutely critical to the survival of many endangered species...and I think it's worth pointing out they are also very often a source of clear and fresh water for countless communities.

In spite of the extensive RARE II inventory and subsequent roadless area evaluations conducted for the Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP, or forest plans) during the 1970s and 1980s, controversy associated with the management of inventoried roadless and some other unroaded areas remains high.

In addition, there is a heightened awareness of the many values of roadless areas other than wilderness. These values take on added significance in the face of increasing development of other parts of the landscape. For example, in the U.S. nearly 16 million acres of forest, cropland, and open space were converted to urban and other uses between 1992 and 1997. The average conversion rate for those five years – 3.2 million acres per year – is more than twice the rate of 1.4 million acres per year recorded from 1982 to 1992. These values include solitude, refuges for rare species of wildlife and fish, bulwarks against invasive species, reference areas for research, source areas for drinking water, high biological diversity, dispersed recreation opportunities, and relatively undisturbed landscapes.

There are also increasing environmental and budgetary concerns about the advisability of new road construction in roadless areas. With more than 380,000 miles of roads in the NFS transportation system, the Agency's annual funding is sufficient to maintain only about 17 percent of these roads to federal and state safety and environmental standards. The Forest Service estimates an \$8.4 billion backlog on road maintenance and reconstruction on existing Forest Service roads.

To respond to these concerns, in February 1999, the agency temporarily suspended road construction and reconstruction in certain unroaded areas for 18 months while reviewing and revising the regulations governing the management of the NFS transportation system. In the course of this rulemaking effort (also known as the Interim Rule), the Forest Service received over 80,000 public comments, most addressing the need for more roadless area protection. In addition, the Agency has received extensive and unprecedented comment related to roadless areas while conducting scoping for the proposed Rule for NFS Land and Resource Management Planning (36 CFR Parts 217 and 219).

In the 23 years since enactment of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), all national forests and grasslands have completed their initial forest plans. Twelve units have already completed their regularly scheduled revisions; the remaining 115 plans are scheduled for revision by 2010. This comprehensive unit-by-unit planning process has established forest level public involvement and resource analysis and procedures for land use allocation decisions. However, national controversies, litigation, and congressional interest, over roadless area management remain widespread.

The Underlying Need

This action is needed for several compelling reasons: 1) the continuing loss of open space and fragmentation of forest land, 2) road construction and reconstruction, and other activities in inventoried roadless and certain other unroaded areas can compromise roadless values, 3) national controversy concerning roadless area management continues to generate costly and time consuming appeals and litigation, and 4) the budgetary constraints related to road management have significant environmental consequences and impacts on other Agency priorities.

Road construction and reconstruction activities, for example, can alter resource conditions and cause substantial ecological impacts, such as stream sedimentation, noxious weed invasion, and wildlife habitat fragmentation. Roads can alter human use patterns and affect recreation experiences. Similar effects could occur in previously roaded areas, but constructing a new road in an undeveloped area can have a disproportionate level of impact. Appropriate road maintenance can mitigate some of these effects. However, present and foreseeable funding is expected to be only a small fraction of the total needed to meet environmental and safety standards. Although the agency has taken significant steps to clarify and improve road management priorities and practices through the proposed Road Policy (36 CFR 212), this effort does not by itself conserve or enhance the resource values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas.

In addition, the remaining roadless areas on NFS lands are disproportionately important to the relatively small percentage of the U.S. land base they occupy. New scientific information from the Columbia River Basin – an area that comprises x states and y million acres, and 2% of the entire National Forest System – demonstrates their ecological significance. For example; the draft Interior Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Plan found:

- “The existence of unroaded areas is by far the most valuable output from Forest Service and BLM administered lands in the Basin” (47% of the value outputs today, 41% in the year 2045.)
- Over 70% of the 94 key wildlife species in the basin (species of focus) are negatively affected by one or more of the factors associated with road construction.
- About 60% of the best remaining aquatic habitats in the basin (aquatic strongholds) are found within roadless or very low road density lands.

Many of the remaining roadless areas are found in headwater areas with steep slopes. Road construction makes these areas more susceptible to increased erosion, landslides, and slope failure. Road construction can allow entry of invasive species, increased incidence of person-caused fire, disrupt important habitat connectivity, and otherwise compromise the values and characteristics that make roadless areas ecologically unique and socially important.

Road construction or reconstruction is associated with a host of Forest Service management activities, from wildland fire fighting to timber harvest. Road construction, however, tends to be more costly in unroaded areas than elsewhere because of their remoteness and often rugged terrain, increasing the potential for disproportionately higher environmental degradation and construction and maintenance costs.

Areas without roads have inherent values and characteristics that are increasingly scarce and highly desirable for the social, economic, and ecological values they represent. Under present management policies, maintenance of areas with these values cannot be assured for future generations. In an increasingly developed landscape, these values will become more and more important with the passage of time.

The Purpose

The purpose of this proposed rule is to conserve and enhance the values associated with roadless areas. To accomplish this objective, national direction for the conservation and enhancement of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas is necessary. Some issues best lend themselves to resolution at the national level while others, due to their site-specific nature, are better resolved through local forest and activity planning.

Therefore, the proposed rule is divided into two parts. Part 1 would prohibit certain activities that pose the greatest threats to inventoried roadless areas from a national level due to the continuing unresolved national controversy. Part 2 relies upon the Agency's forest planning process to implement a consistent set of criteria and procedures to conserve and enhance important social and ecological values and characteristics of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas. This is consistent with President Clinton's direction to Secretary of Agriculture Glickman dated October 13, 1999:

[I] have determined that it is in the best interest of our Nation...to provide strong and lasting protection for these forests...Specifically, I direct the Forest Service to develop, and propose for public comment, regulations to provide appropriate long-term protection for most or all of these currently inventoried "roadless" areas, and to determine whether such protection is warranted for any smaller "roadless" areas not yet inventoried.

Separating the appropriate national level prohibition against certain activities in inventoried roadless areas instituted by Part 1 from the procedural action described in Part 2 is a logical outcome of two years of public comment, scientific analysis, and agency deliberation related to roadless areas and other road management issues. As the draft planning rule states, certain issues require national attention, and others lend themselves to resolution at a local level. Experience gained from twenty-three years of forest planning, the Interim Rule, the proposed Planning Regulations, and the proposed Forest Service Road Policy provides a solid foundation for actions included in the proposed Roadless Rule.

The purpose of Part 2 is to assure that values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas are considered, conserved, and enhanced through agency management. To accomplish this, the Agency proposes to define criteria and establish procedures to identify and consider the social, economic, and ecological characteristics and values of roadless and other unroaded areas that should be maintained, restored, or enhanced through forest planning. President Clinton emphasized this in his remarks on the George Washington and Jefferson National Forest on October 13, 1999:

[I]t is very important to point out that we are not trying to turn the national forests into museums. Even as we strengthen protections, the majority of our forests will continue to be responsibly managed for sustainable timber production and other activities... environmental protection and economic growth can, and must, go hand in hand.

Part 2 focuses on the identification and evaluation of roadless characteristics and values at the local level for several vital reasons: 1) two decades of forest planning demonstrates, and the draft planning regulations anticipate, that certain issues are most appropriately resolved at the local level, 2) the specific nature, type, extent, and quality of many roadless area characteristics and related public uses are often unique to a particular location, and 3) there are no comprehensive national inventories of unroaded areas less than 5,000 acres in size and their characteristics from which to conduct an objective analysis.

The Proposed Action

In response to Presidential direction, the Forest Service is proposing a rule that would conserve and enhance roadless areas and the values associated with unroaded landscapes in the 192 million acre National Forest System. This proposed rule would effectively and responsibly balance the equally important needs of (1) prohibiting certain activities that could most threaten the conservation of inventoried roadless areas and (2) defining criteria and establishing procedures to identify and consider the social, economic, and ecological characteristics and values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas that should be maintained or enhanced through forest planning.

Inventoried roadless areas considered in this analysis have been identified from three primary sources. First, inventories of roadless areas conducted for forest plans usually provide the most accurate and up to date data. Second, more recent agency inventories including those associated with forest plan revision and amendments and other regional analyses, such as the Southern Appalachian Assessment, offer a more comprehensive and up-to-date view of roadless areas within a given geographic region. Finally, in the absence of more recent data, the original 1979 RARE II inventory is used. Specific inventoried roadless areas included in this proposal are listed and displayed on maps in Appendix A.

If adopted, Part 1 of the proposed rule would prohibit road construction and reconstruction on approximately 50 million acres of inventoried roadless areas, subject to valid existing rights and public health and safety requirements. Those portions of inventoried roadless areas subsequently found to contain existing classified (system) roads may not be subject

to these prohibitions upon completion of a specified forest level analysis as previous road construction and development may have already altered their roadless characteristics.

Part 2 of the proposed rule would identify consistent procedures and criteria that national forests and grasslands would use in forest plan and activity level planning processes for the following purposes: 1) to analyze those portions of inventoried roadless areas containing existing classified roads not subject to the prohibition described in Part 1; and 2) to determine appropriate management direction to conserve and enhance ecological and social values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas. Before decisions are made regarding development or use, a specified analysis of roadless values would be required. This analysis could occur at the forest level for individual projects, through the forest plan amendment and revision process, or through a combination of both.

Scoping and Public Participation

The public has been actively involved throughout this process since the President's initial announcement. Activities and opportunities have included a formal comment period, a series of 10 regional and national public meetings, and local meetings at each of the 127 National Forests and Grasslands headquarters. In addition, the agency has received over 80,000 comments on the issue of roadless area management through public involvement associated with the interim suspension of road construction in roadless areas.

A Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register on October 19, 1999 to initiate a 60-day scoping period during which comments were received. This has provided the Forest Service an opportunity to better understand the nature and scope of issues that need be addressed in this DEIS, and to identify the significant social and environmental issues related to the proposed rulemaking. These comments have influenced the nature and scope of the alternatives and the type of analysis conducted. Following publication of the proposed rule and this DEIS, the Forest Service will provide an additional opportunity for public involvement and comment. A final environmental impact statement (FEIS) and final rule is scheduled to be complete in the fall of 2000.

Rulemaking

Rulemaking is a process where agency procedures become formalized in regulations. It is subject to public comment and response by the agency under the federal Administrative Procedures Act. A proposed rule is published in the Federal Register and made available for public comment. That is followed by a final rule that responds to public comments and explains how those comments were used in developing the final rule.

While similar to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, it normally does not involve in-depth analysis of environmental effects. Where environmental effects are of concern with the proposed rule, NEPA will be integrated with the rulemaking. A DEIS will accompany the proposed rule and provide environmental, social, and economic information

to help the public better understand and respond to the proposed rule. A final EIS will accompany the final rule. In this way, environmental analysis will be integrated with the rulemaking process.

Other Ongoing and Related Planning Efforts

As a result of public comments received on the Interim Rule, the agency is now working on a regulation to improve management of the 380,000 mile Forest Service road system (36 CFR 212) (refer to Figure_). The road policy is designed to improve access to National Forests by making the existing road system safe, responsive to public needs, environmentally sound, affordable to American taxpayers, and efficient to manage.

This proposed Roadless Area Rule addresses the need to deal with the future conservation and enhancement of roadless areas. The President's proposal sets in motion a national dialogue to ensure that the values of roadless areas are conserved and carefully managed. While the proposed long-term road policy focuses on managing the existing road system, the roadless policy examines future management options for roadless areas. They are related, but separate, efforts. The road policy does address roadless areas in that it would require managers to undertake specific systematic analysis prior to building new roads in roadless areas.

In addition, the proposed Planning Rule (36 CFR 217 and 219) would revise the existing Forest Service forest planning regulations to make ecological sustainability the primary goal of National Forest System land management. It proposes to accomplish this by addressing resource issues at the appropriate national, regional, or local scale; through greater collaboration and problem solving with the public and other stakeholders; integrating science more effectively into planning; and making the planning process more responsive and adaptive to current problems and opportunities.

In terms of roadless areas, the proposed planning rule provides for identification of, and management for, unroaded values by means other than wilderness designation. It also defines *roadless* and *unroaded*. The proposed action of the roadless rule focuses on limiting road construction in roadless areas, assessing characteristics and values of inventoried roadless areas and other unroaded lands, and developing criteria for conserving and enhancing those characteristics and values.

As these public rulemakings proceed, the agency may choose to integrate and clarify certain provisions to ensure consistency, clarity, and effectiveness.

Figure _. Summary of Current Forest Service Proposals.

	Proposed Planning Rule	Proposed Road Policy	Roadless Proposal
		<i>(Interim Road Construction Suspension Policy)</i>	
Focus:	Ecosystem assessments & planning at various scales.	Road assessments at various scales coordinated with ecosystem assessments	Roadless Assessments and Management: Part 1. Analysis to determine long-term protection for roadless areas. Part 2. Process for assessing unroaded values & developing criteria for protecting and managing for unroaded values.
Applicability:	Applies to all NFS lands & resources.	Applies to all NFS lands & resources. Identifies opportunities/needs for needed and unneeded roads. Gives emphasis to: • Rehabilitating needed roads • Decommissioning unneeded roads • Carefully considering adding roads Integrates road analysis with forest plan amendments.	Applies to NFS roadless & unroaded areas.
Definitions:	Defines roadless and unroaded.	Uses definitions for roadless and unroaded from Proposed Planning Rule. Defines <i>road</i> , <i>classified road</i> , and <i>unclassified road</i> .	Uses the same definitions as the Proposed Planning Rule and the road policy.
Relationship to Roadless:	Provides for identification of, and management for, unroaded values other than wilderness.	Provides transition criteria for roadless areas until plan amendment.	Proposes long-term protection for unroaded and roadless areas and their values.
Decision process established under Rule	Plan decisions through NEPA.	Road management decisions through NEPA, transition EIS by Regional Foresters.	Roadless Area decisions through NEPA.
Process to establish Rule	Final Rule using regulatory process	Final Rule using regulatory process.	EIS and Final Rule using regulatory process

Issues Considered

The following issues are derived from indepth and extensive comments received from individuals, groups, organizations, and other government agencies during this planning process, as well as from other related scoping efforts associated with the proposed planning rule, interim roads rule, and proposed transportation policy.

Access: Limiting road construction and reconstruction or other management actions in roadless areas may impact delivery of goods, services, and activities that these areas might otherwise provide. Perceived negative impacts include but are not limited to: inability to adequately protect public health (natural disaster response, toxics removal, smoke management, trash dumping), safety (fire suppression, property protection, search and rescue) and law enforcement. It could hamper access to private lands and inholdings, limit use by the disabled, and increase risks at the wildland/urban interface. It could also limit or increase the cost of some activities such as logging, livestock grazing, off-highway vehicle (OHV) recreation, ski area development, and oil and gas development. Others feel limiting access is appropriate and long overdue, and that effects on these activities is acceptable when weighed against the perceived benefits of limited access. Positive inputs include improved habitats for fish and wildlife, buffers against invasive species, protection of drinking water supplies, more opportunities for dispersed recreation, etc.

Roads over 50" Wide: Confusion exists over the disposition of many miles of roads and trails over 50" wide. The new road definitions of *classified* and *unclassified* leaves many former low maintenance level Forest Development Roads and Trails in the *unclassified* category, limiting their availability for maintenance funds and increasing the probability of decommissioning. Many OHV users feel this will limit their access to remote areas and negate agreements with local Forest Service officials on management of these travelways. Lack of maintenance could lead to erosion, sedimentation, and similar environmental effects. Others feel limiting OHV access to remote areas is needed, citing environmental effects of OHV use on soil, water, fish, wildlife, and similar resources. Others believe the Forest Service road system is already too huge and that many miles of road should be closed. Others argue the agency should build no new roads at all until they diminish the existing 8.4 billion backlog on road reconstruction and maintenance.

Scientific Sufficiency: Disagreement exists on the scientific sufficiency of the information the proposed action is based upon. Some feel more data and analysis is required to determine the effects of this action. Others feel that overwhelming scientific evidence exists on the effects of roads on the environment and the proposed action is therefore appropriate.

Exemptions: Considerable disagreement exists on allowing exemptions from the proposed action. Some feel exemptions similar to those in the Interim Roads rule for the Tongass NF, the area of the Northwest Forest Plan, and other recent planning efforts, are appropriate. Others feel no exemptions are appropriate for an action of this significance and the proposed action should apply equally to all National Forest lands. Others believe a transition period should be allowed for those plans most recently amended.

Wilderness: A wide range of perceptions exists on this issue. Some feel the proposed action will limit access and lead to managing roadless areas as *de facto* wilderness. They believe this will limit many management options, constituting a violation of the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act and the National Forest Management Act. Others feel managing areas as *de facto* wilderness is entirely appropriate and some support eventual formal designation into the wilderness system. Still others find the roadless designation provides a welcome compromise position between formal wilderness and general multiple use management, protecting many values unique to roadless areas while still allowing a wide variety of uses.

Environmental Effects: The proposed action may have a variety of effects on physical and biological resources.

Perceived positive effects include:

- *Water Resources:* water quality maintained to meet state standards, consistent quantity delivery, runoff timing that maintains base flows and reduces flood peaks
- *Soil Resources:* soil loss/sedimentation rates within normal ranges, soils meeting quality and productivity standards
- *Air Resources:* air quality and visibility goals maintained
- *Wildlife/Fisheries:* habitat fragmentation reduced, connectivity and biodiversity maintained, species stronghold and viability provided, quality stream habitat maintained
- *Invasives:* introduction of invasive plant and animal species reduced
- *Proposed, Endangered & Threatened Species:* habitat of proposed, endangered, and threatened species protected
- *Forest Health:* intact healthy forests left by limiting development activities
- *Fire Prevention:* fewer roads may limit the incidence of person-caused fires and arson

Perceived negative effects include:

- *Fire Prevention:* reduced access may limit fuel loading reduction methods, resulting in more severe fires
- *Fire Suppression:* reduced access may hamper fire suppression efforts, resulting in larger and more severe fires and related negative on-site and off-site effects
- *Forest Health:* reduced access may limit available options to manage insect, disease, and other forest health problems
- *Use Shifts:* Limiting various land uses in roadless areas may shift use to other roaded federal land or onto other ownerships.

Local Involvement: Disagreement exists concerning the effect of the proposed action on local involvement in decision-making. Some feel the proposed action will reduce local involvement, with the following effects:

- Negate time-intensive agreements on forest plans and local projects
- Undermine local trust between the Forest Service and local entities

Others believe the long time controversial nature of the Roadless debate lends itself to national resolution.

Dependent Communities: Many feel the proposed action may have significant impacts, both economically and socially, on local communities that depend on use of National Forest System lands. Impacts could include lost job income, reduced employment opportunities, reduced payments to counties in lieu of taxes with effects on local schools and infrastructure. Others believe these effects will be limited and that local communities can rapidly offset these effects with other employment and income opportunities generated through protection of roadless areas and the values they represent.

Clinton Presidential Records Automated Records Management System [EMAIL]

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Hex Dump file is not in a recognizable format, has been incorrectly decoded or is damaged.

File Name: p_v1207616_cea_html_3.txt

Attachment Number: [no name]

ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

Scope of the National Prohibitions

1. Should the rule prohibit certain activities in inventoried roadless areas? These could include:
 - a. Road construction and reconstruction in inventoried roadless areas.
 - b. Road construction and road reconstruction in inventoried roadless areas and timber sales conducted through a commercial timber sale contract.
 - c. Any motorized use of inventoried roadless areas as well as timber sales conducted through a commercial timber sale contract.
 - d. All activities that do not maintain or enhance inventoried roadless area values and characteristics.
2. Should the prohibitions in 1 a-d (above) apply to other unroaded areas?
3. Should the rule reclassify inventoried roadless areas currently in a protected status to a more permissive status?
4. No change in current policy

Further protection of roadless areas through local forest planning.

1. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Identify ecological values and characteristics of unroaded and inventoried roadless areas through analysis at the forest plan and/or project levels. Ensure those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities are prohibited within unroaded areas that possess these values.
2. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Through analysis at the forest plan and/or project level, identify ecological values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas and other roadless areas that are at least 1,000 acres in size and contiguous to other federal unroaded areas of 5,000 acres or greater, wilderness areas, or wild river corridors. Ensure that those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities within these areas are prohibited.
3. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Through analysis at the forest plan and/or project level, identify ecological

values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas and all other unroaded areas of at least 1,000 acres. Ensure that those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities within these areas are prohibited.

4. No change in current policy.

Exemptions/Transitions

1. Exemptions.

- a. Exempt the Tongass National Forest because of the unique geographic, social, and economic conditions in the region.
- b. Exempt the Tongass and other recently revised forest plans because they incorporate new information and more recent science in their management plans.¹

2. Transitions.

- a. Allow the Tongass National Forest to transition into compliance with the roadless area rulemaking over a 5-10 year period.
 - b. Allow the Tongass and all other National Forests with recently revised management plans to transition into the roadless rulemaking over a 5-10 year period.
3. Given its unique social, ecological, and economic conditions, allow for a different set of rules to apply for the Tongass.
 4. None.

¹ Similar to rationale in the interim rule prohibiting road construction in most roadless areas of the NFS. This rationale could also be integrated into III.1.a.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Sandra F. Daigle (CN=Sandra F. Daigle/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-DEC-1999 12:36:58.00

SUBJECT: If you see Steve Braun, please tell him Sandy has the NAPM release

TO: Yu-Chin Chen (CN=Yu-Chin Chen/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William H. Gillespie (CN=William H. Gillespie/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Warren A. Herold (CN=Warren A. Herold/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria A. Greenfield (CN=Victoria A. Greenfield/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Susan P. Clements (CN=Susan P. Clements/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven N. Braun (CN=Steven N. Braun/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen F. Lin (CN=Stephen F. Lin/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah L. Rosen (CN=Sarah L. Rosen/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sandra F. Daigle (CN=Sandra F. Daigle/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rosalind V. Rasin (CN=Rosalind V. Rasin/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Noah Y. Weisberger (CN=Noah Y. Weisberger/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael J. Brien (CN=Michael J. Brien/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary Fibich (CN=Mary Fibich/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary E. Jones (CN=Mary E. Jones/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary A. Thomas (CN=Mary A. Thomas/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Martin N. Baily (CN=Martin N. Baily/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark N. Levine (CN=Mark N. Levine/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa D. Branch (CN=Lisa D. Branch/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda A. Reilly (CN=Linda A. Reilly/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leigh L. Linden (CN=Leigh L. Linden/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kathryn L. Shaw (CN=Kathryn L. Shaw/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karin A. Braack (CN=Karin A. Braack/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie M. Meyers (CN=Julie M. Meyers/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph E. Aldy (CN=Joseph E. Aldy/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John L. Goldie (CN=John L. Goldie/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John G. Fernald (CN=John G. Fernald/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John C. Williams (CN=John C. Williams/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason A. Bernstein (CN=Jason A. Bernstein/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James M. Treadway (CN=James M. Treadway/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Francine P. Obermiller (CN=Francine P. Obermiller/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas V. Almond (CN=Douglas V. Almond/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles F. Stone (CN=Charles F. Stone/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Catherine H. Furlong (CN=Catherine H. Furlong/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carol L. Capece (CN=Carol L. Capece/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Amorosi (CN=Brian A. Amorosi/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Audrey Choi (CN=Audrey Choi/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrew R. Feldman (CN=Andrew R. Feldman/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alice H. Williams (CN=Alice H. Williams/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-DEC-1999 15:37:18.00

SUBJECT: Memo reporting Union Meetings

TO: Karen Tramontano (CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Martin N. Baily (CN=Martin N. Baily/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here is a draft of a memo the CEA could send to you and Gene. We could
also send portions of it to other cabinet members if you think its a
good idea. Please let me know what you think we should do ===== ATTACHMENT 1
=====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D87]ARMS27123811P.046 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

Memorandum to Karen Tramontano

From Martin Baily, Robert Lawrence

Subject: Draft for comments of a Memorandum to be sent to the NEC on the Manufacturing Task Force.

This memorandum provides a report to the National Economic Council from the meetings held at CEA, starting in July 1999, with economists and policy analysts from the AFL-CIO. Labor, Commerce, USTR, and Treasury also participated in the meetings. The initial meetings were devoted to sharing our understanding of the state of the manufacturing sector and its importance to the economy. We then explored a number of policy options to strengthen the sector.

We were able to reach agreement on several issues about the manufacturing sector. Most significantly, we agreed that to understand manufacturing employment it is necessary to distinguish between long run trends, which are heavily driven by factors such as productivity growth and demand patterns, and the more recent negative impact of the Asian crisis and slower economic growth abroad, which has contributed to recent job loss. We could all agree, therefore, that since 1998 trade has had a negative impact on employment, but that over long time periods other factors are also important.

We also shared views on why manufacturing is important to the economy: its role as a source of high-wage jobs for blue-collar workers, the spillovers generated from manufacturing R&D and the important role for manufacturing in productivity growth and international competition.

In the second set of meetings we turned to discussions of policies to aid the manufacturing sector. In particular, our union colleagues identified seven policy issues that were of the highest priority.

Safeguards. Union economists have expressed concern about the ability of industries to obtain swift and certain relief under Section 201 of the Trade Act. Specific concerns relate to:

- (1) Problems in defining the scope of an industry;
- (2) The organizational and expense problems faced by industries with large numbers of small firms in bringing a case;
- (3) The standard of causation required – the US standard is tougher than that actually required by WTO rules;
- (4) The need to demonstrate a plan for adjustment relief in cases where industries may have already experienced considerable adjustment;
- (5) The fact that the special surge mechanism under NAFTA only permits the restoration of tariffs to previous levels rather than to a level required to stem the injury cause by NAFTA imports.

Offsets. Of particular concern to aerospace workers is the use of agreements to localize component production to boost sales. The first problem relates to gathering information. In particular, sales are often lost by second and third tier suppliers that are hard to track. The second problem is what can be done about the practice. Bilateral (an agreement with the EU) and multilateral approaches (the possibility of dealing with offsets as a trade-related investment measure in the WTO or an agreement at the OECD) were advocated.

Tax treatment of multinational enterprises. The tax system contains several measures, which are said to bias US firms to invest abroad. In particular, the unions would like to see a repeal of the foreign tax credit and its replacement by a deduction. In the absence of this radical measure they advocate the following alternatives:

(1) Repeal of foreign tax deferral.

-- Currently, firms pay foreign taxes only when dividends are remitted. This represents a preference over domestic profits, which are paid upon accrual.

(2) Restrict the use of foreign tax credit baskets--eliminate the practice of offsetting taxes paid in low tax countries with taxes paid in high tax countries.

(3) Set a maximum rate for the foreign tax credit at the US rate of 35 percent.

(4) Replace the system of arms-length transfer pricing with the allocation of profits on the basis of sales.

(5) Ensure international consistency of the reporting status of branches and affiliates.

(6) Address (and limit) state level tax competition.

(7) Establish a commission of enquiry to look at the tax system and tax treaties.

Training. In their presentation, the union analysts voiced concern about the inadequate commitment of resources to training. They were critical of moves to devolve authority for training to the states and to privatize the oversight of training programs. They felt that the current WARN system (which provides notice of mass layoffs) was weak and that the notice period should be extended to at least 90 days. They expressed concerns about assessment and counseling offered by the Employment service, calling for counseling with a permanent case manager and peer support. They decried the use of for-profit institutions as counselors, called for better labor market information for workers and advocated child care, transportation and relocation assistance. They emphasized the need for funding for BLS programs to ensure the continued collection of statistics on mass layoffs and dislocated workers. They proposed performance standards and improved accountability for firms providing subsidized on-the-job training. They support union and worker involvement in the design and evaluation of training programs. They called for short-term public service jobs. They advocated consideration of an expansion of unemployment benefits to provide income support (rather than simply vouchers) for workers who are seeking training.

Finance. Concern was expressed about the ability of the manufacturing sector to raise capital, with particular problems facing small and medium sized firms. Noting that price earnings ratios are far lower for manufacturing firms than for the market as a whole, they argue that the cost of capital facing these firms is therefore higher—there is an anti-manufacturing bias in the capital

markets. It was proposed that the Federal Government should undertake a study of the issue of capital access for manufacturing companies.

Enforcement of Trade Agreements. The concerns here fell into two categories. The first was a general concern that some foreign governments effectively nullify trade agreements. In particular, agreements with Japan were said to be too vague. It was argued that quantitative standards (e.g. specific market shares) need to be agreed upon. The second concern was about labor standards provisions. One idea is to sign trade agreements obligating countries to enforce their own labor standards in addition to core labor standards. A variety of other suggestions for changes in legislation are included in the position paper that accompanied the presentation.

The Impact of Environmental Provisions on Competitiveness. Concerns about the impact of environmental regulations on investment and international competition – i.e. the need for a level playing field were expressed. It was argued that while meeting environmental standards is not very costly on average, it can be very costly in some industries, such as the steel industry. The unions argued that a more level playing field would be achieved through the use of a system of countervailing duties to offset differentials in costs of complying with pollution regulations.

The opportunity to discuss these policy proposals was very helpful to the CEA and other agency participants and gave us a clearer picture of the positions of the union policy analysts and the reasons behind their positions. We urge you to review the ideas developed in the meetings and we would be happy to discuss them with you in greater detail.

Administration Attendees at AFL-CIO Meetings

Martin Baily, CEA
Robert Lawrence, CEA
Kathryn Shaw, CEA
Audrey Choi, CEA
Janet Yellen, CEA
Rebecca Blank, CEA
Nouriel Roubini, CEA
David Bier, OVP
Karen Tramontano, WH
Robert Shapiro, Commerce
Jonathan Orszag, Commerce
Jeri Jensen-Moran, Commerce
Andrew Samet, Labor
Jorge Perez-Lopez, Labor
William Samuels, Labor
Harry Holzer, Labor
Ed Montgomery, Labor

David Wilcox, Treasury
Robert Cumby, Treasury
Harry Grubert, Treasury
Lael Brainard, NEC
Tom Kalil, NEC
Dorothy Robyn, NEC
Michael Daum, NEC
Rick Samans, NEC
Ian Bowles, CEQ/NSC
David Walters, USTR

**Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System
[EMAIL] and Tape Restoration Project [Email]**

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies a responsive email, already made available within another collection.

Collection: 2013-0306-F

Bucket: CEA

Creation Date: 1999-12-30

Subject: Admin AFL-CIO Attendees

Creator: Lisa D. Branch

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Conroy_Scott ("Conroy_Scott/wo"@fs.fed.us [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-DEC-1999 18:43:08.00

SUBJECT: Forw[2]: Interagency meeting agenda.

TO: Thomas Brumm (CN=Thomas Brumm/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Donald R. Arbuckle (CN=Donald R. Arbuckle/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter.Coppelman@usdoj.gov (Peter.Coppelman@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gary_D_Frazer@fws.gov (Gary_D_Frazer@fws.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

From: Conroy_Scott/wo@sv2wo

Subject: Forw: Interagency meeting agenda.

To: phil_allard@blm.gov, llinden@cea.eop.gov, rlawrence@cea.eop.gov,
john.watts@usdoj.gov, louise.milkman@usdoj.gov, peter.coppelman@usdoj.gov,
suriano.elaine@epa.gov, sanderson.dick@epa.gov, jfurnish/wo@sv2wo,
cwood/wo@sv2wo, mconnolly/wo@sv2wo, sconroy/wo@sv2wo, jriber/wo@sv2wo,
Craig.Johnson@noaa.gov, Don.Knowles@noaa.gov, Art.Jeffers@noaa.gov,
Donna.Brewer@noaa.gov, jere.glover@sba.gov, tcroote@omb.eop.gov,
darbuckle@omb.eop.gov, Jeremy.Anderson@usda.gov, bmyrick@usda.gov,
Jennifer.Smith@sba.gov, Anne.Kennedy@usda.gov, jschaub@usda.gov,
dbice@usda.gov, john_fay@fws.gov, gary_frazier@fws.gov, A.West@usda.gov,
hdiazsoltero/wo@sv2wo, Dinah_Bear@ceq.eop.gov, Thomas_Brum@ceq.eop.gov,
aferlo/wo@sv2wo, Stuart_R._Kasdin@omb.eop.gov,
Elwood_Holstein@omb.eop.gov, tmuir@ostp.eop.gov, rbierbaum@ostp.eop.gov

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="Boundary_(ID_fkIEqD/BC5qk9m4wf4iMsA)"

Attached is the draft final chapter 1 in .rtf and .doc formats for 1/3/00
meeting. Enclosed in the

forwarded message from Chris Wood are the interagency meeting agenda and
draft

alternatives document in .doc and .rtf formats. EPA alternatives input
document

will be faxed.

Please call Scott Conroy if you do not receive fax 703-605-5136. See you
in the
next Millennium!

- deis_chapter1.entire_DS_12.30.1999.rtf.rtf - deis_chapter1.entire_DS_12.30.1999.docFrom:
Wood_Chris/wo@sv2wo

Subject: Interagency meeting agenda.

To: Conroy_Scott/wo@sv2wo

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="Boundary_(ID_tQQQnkFFX9kkK2fDLGhG8g)"

Attached is the agenda for the Roadless Interagency team meeting to be held

Monday, January

3, 2000, from 2-4. Thanks, Chris

INTERAGENCY REVIEW TEAM MEETING AGENDA

January 3, 2000, 2-4pm

Location: USDA Forest Service, Chief's conference room, 2d floor, corner of

14th and Independence Avenues, SW, Washington, DC (no clearance required to enter building).

Purpose of the meeting: 1) overview public scoping and agency outreach efforts

2) close discussion of Chapter One 3) begin discussion of alternatives to be analyzed.

Expected outcomes: Closure on the issue of the purpose and need for agency action. Initiate

in-depth discussions of range of alternatives. If time allows, begin discussion

of alternatives that might be analyzed in detail. This meeting will likely cover both technical and policy aspects of the roadless rulemaking.

I. Overview of public scoping and outreach. Chris Wood and Steve Marshall

II. Discussion on Chapter One -- Scott Conroy and Chris Wood

III. Alternatives discussion -- Conroy, Wood, Julia

Next meeting: Please note that the next meeting will be held on January 10, 2000, from 2-4pm in

the Chief's conference room, USDA Forest Service. Meeting topics will include

alternatives analyzed in detail and those considered but not analyzed in detail.

Happy New Year!

- alternatives.rtf - alternatives.doc===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

{\rtf1\ansi\ansicpg1252\uc1 \deff0\deflang1033\deflangfe1033{\fonttbl{\f0\froma

Clinton Presidential Records Automated Records Management System [EMAIL]

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Hex Dump file is not in a recognizable format, has been incorrectly decoded or is damaged.

File Name: p_z1207706_cea_html_1.txt

Attachment Number: alternatives.rtf

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR ROADLESS AREA CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT WITHIN THE NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

Chapter 1. Purpose of and Need for Action

Introduction

This chapter describes the underlying purpose and need to which the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service is responding in developing this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and proposed rule to conserve and enhance roadless areas within the 192 million acre National Forest System (NFS). Alternatives for managing the roadless portions of NFS lands, including the proposed action and no action, are analyzed and displayed in this DEIS.

The proposed rule is designed to achieve two objectives. First, from a national level, it would immediately prohibit certain activities that compromise the values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas. Second, it would provide procedures and criteria for evaluating, conserving, and enhancing the values of inventoried roadless and other NFS unroaded areas.

Background

Many areas of the National Forest System remain unroaded for a variety of reasons, including rugged terrain, environmental sensitivity, controversy associated with roadless entries, market demands, and other socio-economic conditions. In 1979, the Forest Service completed an inventory of roadless areas for their wilderness character and value through the Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE II). Since then, Congress designated some areas in that inventory as wilderness. Others were released for a variety of management activities, including some activities that allow for road construction. A large number of the RARE II areas still remain roadless.

During the RARE II evaluation, only areas that met criteria for wilderness were considered. For the purpose of the wilderness review, roadless areas were required to "be of sufficient size as to make predictable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition." Among other factors, this included a general size threshold of 5,000 acres¹. Some RARE II areas not designated as wilderness were developed according to subsequent forest plan decisions. Controversy over the remaining unroaded areas on NFS lands has increased due to the values associated with their important social and ecological characteristics. President Clinton emphasized these values in his remarks on the George Washington and Jefferson National Forest on October 13, 1999:

[W]ithin our national forests there are large parcels of land that don't contain roads of any kind, and in most cases, never have....these areas represent some of the last,

¹ Roadless areas in the East did not have to meet this acreage requirement, but were evaluated against other criteria identified in Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 1909.12, Chapter 7.

best, unprotected wildland anywhere in our nation. They offer unparalleled opportunities for hikers, hunters, and anglers. They're absolutely critical to the survival of many endangered species...and I think it's worth pointing out they are also very often a source of clear and fresh water for countless communities.

In spite of the extensive RARE II inventory and subsequent roadless area evaluations conducted for the Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP, or forest plans) during the 1970s and 1980s, controversy associated with the management of inventoried roadless and some other unroaded areas remains high.

In addition, there is a heightened awareness of the many values of roadless areas other than wilderness. These values take on added significance in the face of increasing development of other parts of the landscape. For example, in the U.S. nearly 16 million acres of forest, cropland, and open space were converted to urban and other uses between 1992 and 1997. The average conversion rate for those five years – 3.2 million acres per year – is more than twice the rate of 1.4 million acres per year recorded from 1982 to 1992. These values include solitude, refuges for rare species of wildlife and fish, bulwarks against invasive species, reference areas for research, source areas for drinking water, high biological diversity, dispersed recreation opportunities, and relatively undisturbed landscapes.

There are also increasing environmental and budgetary concerns about the advisability of new road construction in roadless areas. With more than 380,000 miles of roads in the NFS transportation system, the Agency's annual funding is sufficient to maintain only about 17 percent of these roads to federal and state safety and environmental standards. The Forest Service estimates an \$8.4 billion backlog on road maintenance and reconstruction on existing Forest Service roads.

To respond to these concerns, in February 1999, the agency temporarily suspended road construction and reconstruction in certain unroaded areas for 18 months while reviewing and revising the regulations governing the management of the NFS transportation system. In the course of this rulemaking effort (also known as the Interim Rule), the Forest Service received over 80,000 public comments, most addressing the need for more roadless area protection. In addition, the Agency has received extensive and unprecedented comment related to roadless areas while conducting scoping for the proposed Rule for NFS Land and Resource Management Planning (36 CFR Parts 217 and 219).

In the 23 years since enactment of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), all national forests and grasslands have completed their initial forest plans. Twelve units have already completed their regularly scheduled revisions; the remaining 115 plans are scheduled for revision by 2010. This comprehensive unit-by-unit planning process has established forest level public involvement and resource analysis and procedures for land use allocation decisions. However, national controversies, litigation, and congressional interest, over roadless area management remain widespread.

The Underlying Need

This action is needed for several compelling reasons: 1) the continuing loss of open space and fragmentation of forest land, 2) road construction and reconstruction, and other activities in inventoried roadless and certain other unroaded areas can compromise roadless values, 3) national controversy concerning roadless area management continues to generate costly and time consuming appeals and litigation, and 4) the budgetary constraints related to road management have significant environmental consequences and impacts on other Agency priorities.

Road construction and reconstruction activities, for example, can alter resource conditions and cause substantial ecological impacts, such as stream sedimentation, noxious weed invasion, and wildlife habitat fragmentation. Roads can alter human use patterns and affect recreation experiences. Similar effects could occur in previously roaded areas, but constructing a new road in an undeveloped area can have a disproportionate level of impact. Appropriate road maintenance can mitigate some of these effects. However, present and foreseeable funding is expected to be only a small fraction of the total needed to meet environmental and safety standards. Although the agency has taken significant steps to clarify and improve road management priorities and practices through the proposed Road Policy (36 CFR 212), this effort does not by itself conserve or enhance the resource values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas.

In addition, the remaining roadless areas on NFS lands are disproportionately important to the relatively small percentage of the U.S. land base they occupy. New scientific information from the Columbia River Basin – an area that comprises x states and y million acres, and 2% of the entire National Forest System – demonstrates their ecological significance. For example; the draft Interior Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Plan found:

- “The existence of unroaded areas is by far the most valuable output from Forest Service and BLM administered lands in the Basin” (47% of the value outputs today, 41% in the year 2045.)
- Over 70% of the 94 key wildlife species in the basin (species of focus) are negatively affected by one or more of the factors associated with road construction.
- About 60% of the best remaining aquatic habitats in the basin (aquatic strongholds) are found within roadless or very low road density lands.

Many of the remaining roadless areas are found in headwater areas with steep slopes. Road construction makes these areas more susceptible to increased erosion, landslides, and slope failure. Road construction can allow entry of invasive species, increased incidence of person-caused fire, disrupt important habitat connectivity, and otherwise compromise the values and characteristics that make roadless areas ecologically unique and socially important.

Road construction or reconstruction is associated with a host of Forest Service management activities, from wildland fire fighting to timber harvest. Road construction, however, tends to be more costly in unroaded areas than elsewhere because of their remoteness and often rugged terrain, increasing the potential for disproportionately higher environmental degradation and construction and maintenance costs.

Areas without roads have inherent values and characteristics that are increasingly scarce and highly desirable for the social, economic, and ecological values they represent. Under present management policies, maintenance of areas with these values cannot be assured for future generations. In an increasingly developed landscape, these values will become more and more important with the passage of time.

The Purpose

The purpose of this proposed rule is to conserve and enhance the values associated with roadless areas. To accomplish this objective, national direction for the conservation and enhancement of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas is necessary. Some issues best lend themselves to resolution at the national level while others, due to their site-specific nature, are better resolved through local forest and activity planning.

Therefore, the proposed rule is divided into two parts. Part 1 would prohibit certain activities that pose the greatest threats to inventoried roadless areas from a national level due to the continuing unresolved national controversy. Part 2 relies upon the Agency's forest planning process to implement a consistent set of criteria and procedures to conserve and enhance important social and ecological values and characteristics of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas. This is consistent with President Clinton's direction to Secretary of Agriculture Glickman dated October 13, 1999:

[I] have determined that it is in the best interest of our Nation...to provide strong and lasting protection for these forests...Specifically, I direct the Forest Service to develop, and propose for public comment, regulations to provide appropriate long-term protection for most or all of these currently inventoried "roadless" areas, and to determine whether such protection is warranted for any smaller "roadless" areas not yet inventoried.

Separating the appropriate national level prohibition against certain activities in inventoried roadless areas instituted by Part 1 from the procedural action described in Part 2 is a logical outcome of two years of public comment, scientific analysis, and agency deliberation related to roadless areas and other road management issues. As the draft planning rule states, certain issues require national attention, and others lend themselves to resolution at a local level. Experience gained from twenty-three years of forest planning, the Interim Rule, the proposed Planning Regulations, and the proposed Forest Service Road Policy provides a solid foundation for actions included in the proposed Roadless Rule.

The purpose of Part 2 is to assure that values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas are considered, conserved, and enhanced through agency management. To accomplish this, the Agency proposes to define criteria and establish procedures to identify and consider the social, economic, and ecological characteristics and values of roadless and other unroaded areas that should be maintained, restored, or enhanced through forest planning. President Clinton emphasized this in his remarks on the George Washington and Jefferson National Forest on October 13, 1999:

[I]t is very important to point out that we are not trying to turn the national forests into museums. Even as we strengthen protections, the majority of our forests will continue to be responsibly managed for sustainable timber production and other activities... environmental protection and economic growth can, and must, go hand in hand.

Part 2 focuses on the identification and evaluation of roadless characteristics and values at the local level for several vital reasons: 1) two decades of forest planning demonstrates, and the draft planning regulations anticipate, that certain issues are most appropriately resolved at the local level, 2) the specific nature, type, extent, and quality of many roadless area characteristics and related public uses are often unique to a particular location, and 3) there are no comprehensive national inventories of unroaded areas less than 5,000 acres in size and their characteristics from which to conduct an objective analysis.

The Proposed Action

In response to Presidential direction, the Forest Service is proposing a rule that would conserve and enhance roadless areas and the values associated with unroaded landscapes in the 192 million acre National Forest System. This proposed rule would effectively and responsibly balance the equally important needs of (1) prohibiting certain activities that could most threaten the conservation of inventoried roadless areas and (2) defining criteria and establishing procedures to identify and consider the social, economic, and ecological characteristics and values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas that should be maintained or enhanced through forest planning.

Inventoried roadless areas considered in this analysis have been identified from three primary sources. First, inventories of roadless areas conducted for forest plans usually provide the most accurate and up to date data. Second, more recent agency inventories including those associated with forest plan revision and amendments and other regional analyses, such as the Southern Appalachian Assessment, offer a more comprehensive and up-to-date view of roadless areas within a given geographic region. Finally, in the absence of more recent data, the original 1979 RARE II inventory is used. Specific inventoried roadless areas included in this proposal are listed and displayed on maps in Appendix A.

If adopted, Part 1 of the proposed rule would prohibit road construction and reconstruction on approximately 50 million acres of inventoried roadless areas, subject to valid existing rights and public health and safety requirements. Those portions of inventoried roadless areas subsequently found to contain existing classified (system) roads may not be subject

to these prohibitions upon completion of a specified forest level analysis as previous road construction and development may have already altered their roadless characteristics.

Part 2 of the proposed rule would identify consistent procedures and criteria that national forests and grasslands would use in forest plan and activity level planning processes for the following purposes: 1) to analyze those portions of inventoried roadless areas containing existing classified roads not subject to the prohibition described in Part 1; and 2) to determine appropriate management direction to conserve and enhance ecological and social values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas. Before decisions are made regarding development or use, a specified analysis of roadless values would be required. This analysis could occur at the forest level for individual projects, through the forest plan amendment and revision process, or through a combination of both.

Scoping and Public Participation

The public has been actively involved throughout this process since the President's initial announcement. Activities and opportunities have included a formal comment period, a series of 10 regional and national public meetings, and local meetings at each of the 127 National Forests and Grasslands headquarters. In addition, the agency has received over 80,000 comments on the issue of roadless area management through public involvement associated with the interim suspension of road construction in roadless areas.

A Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register on October 19, 1999 to initiate a 60-day scoping period during which comments were received. This has provided the Forest Service an opportunity to better understand the nature and scope of issues that need be addressed in this DEIS, and to identify the significant social and environmental issues related to the proposed rulemaking. These comments have influenced the nature and scope of the alternatives and the type of analysis conducted. Following publication of the proposed rule and this DEIS, the Forest Service will provide an additional opportunity for public involvement and comment. A final environmental impact statement (FEIS) and final rule is scheduled to be complete in the fall of 2000.

Rulemaking

Rulemaking is a process where agency procedures become formalized in regulations. It is subject to public comment and response by the agency under the federal Administrative Procedures Act. A proposed rule is published in the Federal Register and made available for public comment. That is followed by a final rule that responds to public comments and explains how those comments were used in developing the final rule.

While similar to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, it normally does not involve in-depth analysis of environmental effects. Where environmental effects are of concern with the proposed rule, NEPA will be integrated with the rulemaking. A DEIS will accompany the proposed rule and provide environmental, social, and economic information

to help the public better understand and respond to the proposed rule. A final EIS will accompany the final rule. In this way, environmental analysis will be integrated with the rulemaking process.

Other Ongoing and Related Planning Efforts

As a result of public comments received on the Interim Rule, the agency is now working on a regulation to improve management of the 380,000 mile Forest Service road system (36 CFR 212) (refer to Figure_). The road policy is designed to improve access to National Forests by making the existing road system safe, responsive to public needs, environmentally sound, affordable to American taxpayers, and efficient to manage.

This proposed Roadless Area Rule addresses the need to deal with the future conservation and enhancement of roadless areas. The President's proposal sets in motion a national dialogue to ensure that the values of roadless areas are conserved and carefully managed. While the proposed long-term road policy focuses on managing the existing road system, the roadless policy examines future management options for roadless areas. They are related, but separate, efforts. The road policy does address roadless areas in that it would require managers to undertake specific systematic analysis prior to building new roads in roadless areas.

In addition, the proposed Planning Rule (36 CFR 217 and 219) would revise the existing Forest Service forest planning regulations to make ecological sustainability the primary goal of National Forest System land management. It proposes to accomplish this by addressing resource issues at the appropriate national, regional, or local scale; through greater collaboration and problem solving with the public and other stakeholders; integrating science more effectively into planning; and making the planning process more responsive and adaptive to current problems and opportunities.

In terms of roadless areas, the proposed planning rule provides for identification of, and management for, unroaded values by means other than wilderness designation. It also defines *roadless* and *unroaded*. The proposed action of the roadless rule focuses on limiting road construction in roadless areas, assessing characteristics and values of inventoried roadless areas and other unroaded lands, and developing criteria for conserving and enhancing those characteristics and values.

As these public rulemakings proceed, the agency may choose to integrate and clarify certain provisions to ensure consistency, clarity, and effectiveness.

Figure _. Summary of Current Forest Service Proposals.

	Proposed Planning Rule	Proposed Road Policy	Roadless Proposal
		<i>(Interim Road Construction Suspension Policy)</i>	
Focus:	Ecosystem assessments & planning at various scales.	Road assessments at various scales coordinated with ecosystem assessments	Roadless Assessments and Management: Part 1. Analysis to determine long-term protection for roadless areas. Part 2. Process for assessing unroaded values & developing criteria for protecting and managing for unroaded values.
Applicability:	Applies to all NFS lands & resources.	Applies to all NFS lands & resources. Identifies opportunities/needs for needed and unneeded roads. Gives emphasis to: • Rehabilitating needed roads • Decommissioning unneeded roads • Carefully considering adding roads Integrates road analysis with forest plan amendments.	Applies to NFS roadless & unroaded areas.
Definitions:	Defines roadless and unroaded.	Uses definitions for roadless and unroaded from Proposed Planning Rule. Defines <i>road</i> , <i>classified road</i> , and <i>unclassified road</i> .	Uses the same definitions as the Proposed Planning Rule and the road policy.
Relationship to Roadless:	Provides for identification of, and management for, unroaded values other than wilderness.	Provides transition criteria for roadless areas until plan amendment.	Proposes long-term protection for unroaded and roadless areas and their values.
Decision process established under Rule	Plan decisions through NEPA.	Road management decisions through NEPA, transition EIS by Regional Foresters.	Roadless Area decisions through NEPA.
Process to establish Rule	Final Rule using regulatory process	Final Rule using regulatory process.	EIS and Final Rule using regulatory process

Clinton Presidential Records Automated Records Management System [EMAIL]

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Hex Dump file is not in a recognizable format, has been incorrectly decoded or is damaged.

File Name: p_z1207706_cea_html_3.txt

Attachment Number: [no name]

Issues Considered

The following issues are derived from indepth and extensive comments received from individuals, groups, organizations, and other government agencies during this planning process, as well as from other related scoping efforts associated with the proposed planning rule, interim roads rule, and proposed transportation policy.

Access: Limiting road construction and reconstruction or other management actions in roadless areas may impact delivery of goods, services, and activities that these areas might otherwise provide. Perceived negative impacts include but are not limited to: inability to adequately protect public health (natural disaster response, toxics removal, smoke management, trash dumping), safety (fire suppression, property protection, search and rescue) and law enforcement. It could hamper access to private lands and inholdings, limit use by the disabled, and increase risks at the wildland/urban interface. It could also limit or increase the cost of some activities such as logging, livestock grazing, off-highway vehicle (OHV) recreation, ski area development, and oil and gas development. Others feel limiting access is appropriate and long overdue, and that effects on these activities is acceptable when weighed against the perceived benefits of limited access. Positive inputs include improved habitats for fish and wildlife, buffers against invasive species, protection of drinking water supplies, more opportunities for dispersed recreation, etc.

Roads over 50" Wide: Confusion exists over the disposition of many miles of roads and trails over 50" wide. The new road definitions of *classified* and *unclassified* leaves many former low maintenance level Forest Development Roads and Trails in the *unclassified* category, limiting their availability for maintenance funds and increasing the probability of decommissioning. Many OHV users feel this will limit their access to remote areas and negate agreements with local Forest Service officials on management of these travelways. Lack of maintenance could lead to erosion, sedimentation, and similar environmental effects. Others feel limiting OHV access to remote areas is needed, citing environmental effects of OHV use on soil, water, fish, wildlife, and similar resources. Others believe the Forest Service road system is already too huge and that many miles of road should be closed. Others argue the agency should build no new roads at all until they diminish the existing 8.4 billion backlog on road reconstruction and maintainence.

Scientific Sufficiency: Disagreement exists on the scientific sufficiency of the information the proposed action is based upon. Some feel more data and analysis is required to determine the effects of this action. Others feel that overwhelming scientific evidence exists on the effects of roads on the environment and the proposed action is therefore appropriate.

Exemptions: Considerable disagreement exists on allowing exemptions from the proposed action. Some feel exemptions similar to those in the Interim Roads rule for the Tongass NF, the area of the Northwest Forest Plan, and other recent planning efforts, are appropriate. Others feel no exemptions are appropriate for an action of this significance and the proposed action should apply equally to all National Forest lands. Others believe a transition period should be allowed for those plans most recently amended.

Wilderness: A wide range of perceptions exists on this issue. Some feel the proposed action will limit access and lead to managing roadless areas as *de facto* wilderness. They believe this will limit many management options, constituting a violation of the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act and the National Forest Management Act. Others feel managing areas as *de facto* wilderness is entirely appropriate and some support eventual formal designation into the wilderness system. Still others find the roadless designation provides a welcome compromise position between formal wilderness and general multiple use management, protecting many values unique to roadless areas while still allowing a wide variety of uses.

Environmental Effects: The proposed action may have a variety of effects on physical and biological resources.

Perceived positive effects include:

- *Water Resources:* water quality maintained to meet state standards, consistent quantity delivery, runoff timing that maintains base flows and reduces flood peaks
- *Soil Resources:* soil loss/sedimentation rates within normal ranges, soils meeting quality and productivity standards
- *Air Resources:* air quality and visibility goals maintained
- *Wildlife/Fisheries:* habitat fragmentation reduced, connectivity and biodiversity maintained, species stronghold and viability provided, quality stream habitat maintained
- *Invasives:* introduction of invasive plant and animal species reduced
- *Proposed, Endangered & Threatened Species:* habitat of proposed, endangered, and threatened species protected
- *Forest Health:* intact healthy forests left by limiting development activities
- *Fire Prevention:* fewer roads may limit the incidence of person-caused fires and arson

Perceived negative effects include:

- *Fire Prevention:* reduced access may limit fuel loading reduction methods, resulting in more severe fires
- *Fire Suppression:* reduced access may hamper fire suppression efforts, resulting in larger and more severe fires and related negative on-site and off-site effects
- *Forest Health:* reduced access may limit available options to manage insect, disease, and other forest health problems
- *Use Shifts:* Limiting various land uses in roadless areas may shift use to other roaded federal land or onto other ownerships.

Local Involvement: Disagreement exists concerning the effect of the proposed action on local involvement in decision-making. Some feel the proposed action will reduce local involvement, with the following effects:

- Negate time-intensive agreements on forest plans and local projects
- Undermine local trust between the Forest Service and local entities

Others believe the long time controversial nature of the Roadless debate lends itself to national resolution.

Dependent Communities: Many feel the proposed action may have significant impacts, both economically and socially, on local communities that depend on use of National Forest System lands. Impacts could include lost job income, reduced employment opportunities, reduced payments to counties in lieu of taxes with effects on local schools and infrastructure. Others believe these effects will be limited and that local communities can rapidly offset these effects with other employment and income opportunities generated through protection of roadless areas and the values they represent.

ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

Scope of the National Prohibitions

1. Should the rule prohibit certain activities in inventoried roadless areas? These could include:
 - a. Road construction and reconstruction in inventoried roadless areas.
 - b. Road construction and road reconstruction in inventoried roadless areas and timber sales conducted through a commercial timber sale contract.
 - c. Any motorized use of inventoried roadless areas as well as timber sales conducted through a commercial timber sale contract.
 - d. All activities that do not maintain or enhance inventoried roadless area values and characteristics.
2. Should the prohibitions in 1 a-d (above) apply to other unroaded areas?
3. Should the rule reclassify inventoried roadless areas currently in a protected status to a more permissive status?
4. No change in current policy

Further protection of roadless areas through local forest planning.

1. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Identify ecological values and characteristics of unroaded and inventoried roadless areas through analysis at the forest plan and/or project levels. Ensure those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities are prohibited within unroaded areas that possess these values.
2. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Through analysis at the forest plan and/or project level, identify ecological values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas and other roadless areas that are at least 1,000 acres in size and contiguous to other federal unroaded areas of 5,000 acres or greater, wilderness areas, or wild river corridors. Ensure that those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities within these areas are prohibited.
3. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Through analysis at the forest plan and/or project level, identify ecological

values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas and all other unroaded areas of at least 1,000 acres. Ensure that those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities within these areas are prohibited.

4. No change in current policy.

Exemptions/Transitions

1. Exemptions.

- a. Exempt the Tongass National Forest because of the unique geographic, social, and economic conditions in the region.
- b. Exempt the Tongass and other recently revised forest plans because they incorporate new information and more recent science in their management plans.¹

2. Transitions.

- a. Allow the Tongass National Forest to transition into compliance with the roadless area rulemaking over a 5-10 year period.
- b. Allow the Tongass and all other National Forests with recently revised management plans to transition into the roadless rulemaking over a 5-10 year period.

3. Given its unique social, ecological, and economic conditions, allow for a different set of rules to apply for the Tongass.

4. None.

¹ Similar to rationale in the interim rule prohibiting road construction in most roadless areas of the NFS. This rationale could also be integrated into III.1.a.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Catherine H. Furlong (CN=Catherine H. Furlong/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-DEC-1999 11:45:51.00

SUBJECT: Historical Income Tables from March CPS

TO: Yu-Chin Chen (CN=Yu-Chin Chen/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William H. Gillespie (CN=William H. Gillespie/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Warren A. Herold (CN=Warren A. Herold/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria A. Greenfield (CN=Victoria A. Greenfield/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Susan P. Clements (CN=Susan P. Clements/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven N. Braun (CN=Steven N. Braun/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen F. Lin (CN=Stephen F. Lin/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah L. Rosen (CN=Sarah L. Rosen/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sandra F. Daigle (CN=Sandra F. Daigle/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rosalind V. Rasin (CN=Rosalind V. Rasin/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Noah Y. Weisberger (CN=Noah Y. Weisberger/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael J. Brien (CN=Michael J. Brien/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary Fibich (CN=Mary Fibich/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary E. Jones (CN=Mary E. Jones/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary A. Thomas (CN=Mary A. Thomas/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Martin N. Baily (CN=Martin N. Baily/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark N. Levine (CN=Mark N. Levine/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa D. Branch (CN=Lisa D. Branch/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda A. Reilly (CN=Linda A. Reilly/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leigh L. Linden (CN=Leigh L. Linden/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kathryn L. Shaw (CN=Kathryn L. Shaw/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karin A. Braack (CN=Karin A. Braack/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie M. Meyers (CN=Julie M. Meyers/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph E. Aldy (CN=Joseph E. Aldy/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John L. Goldie (CN=John L. Goldie/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John G. Fernald (CN=John G. Fernald/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John C. Williams (CN=John C. Williams/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason A. Bernstein (CN=Jason A. Bernstein/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James M. Treadway (CN=James M. Treadway/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Francine P. Obermiller (CN=Francine P. Obermiller/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas V. Almond (CN=Douglas V. Almond/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles F. Stone (CN=Charles F. Stone/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Catherine H. Furlong (CN=Catherine H. Furlong/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carol L. Capece (CN=Carol L. Capece/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Amorosi (CN=Brian A. Amorosi/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Audrey Choi (CN=Audrey Choi/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrew R. Feldman (CN=Andrew R. Feldman/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alice H. Williams (CN=Alice H. Williams/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Courtesy of the Census Bureau, I have a printed copy of ALL of the historical summary tables on income for families, households, and persons--as well as the experimental measures.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Conroy_Scott ("Conroy_Scott/wo"@fs.fed.us [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-DEC-1999 18:42:15.00

SUBJECT: Forw[2]: Interagency meeting agenda.

TO: Thomas Brumm (CN=Thomas Brumm/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Donald R. Arbuckle (CN=Donald R. Arbuckle/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter.Coppelman@usdoj.gov (Peter.Coppelman@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gary_D_Frazer@fws.gov (Gary_D_Frazer@fws.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

From: Conroy_Scott/wo@sv2wo

Subject: Forw: Interagency meeting agenda.

To: phil_allard@blm.gov, llinden@cea.eop.gov, rlawrence@cea.eop.gov,
john.watts@usdoj.gov, louise.milkman@usdoj.gov, peter.coppelman@usdoj.gov,
suriano.elaine@epa.gov, sanderson.dick@epa.gov, jfurnish/wo@sv2wo,
cwood/wo@sv2wo, mconnolly/wo@sv2wo, sconroy/wo@sv2wo, jrifer/wo@sv2wo,
Craig.Johnson@noaa.gov, Don.Knowles@noaa.gov, Art.Jeffers@noaa.gov,
Donna.Brewer@noaa.gov, jere.glover@sba.gov, tcroote@omb.eop.gov,
darbuckle@omb.eop.gov, Jeremy.Anderson@usda.gov, bmyrick@usda.gov,
Jennifer.Smith@sba.gov, Anne.Kennedy@usda.gov, jschaub@usda.gov,
dbice@usda.gov, john_fay@fws.gov, gary_frazier@fws.gov, A.West@usda.gov,
hdiazsoltero/wo@sv2wo, Dinah_Bear@ceq.eop.gov, Thomas_Brum@ceq.eop.gov,
aferlo/wo@sv2wo, Stuart_R._Kasdin@omb.eop.gov,
Elwood_Holstein@omb.eop.gov, tmuir@ostp.eop.gov, rbierbaum@ostp.eop.gov

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="Boundary_(ID_IBCgIqMgBf0xjB5y+kPFpQ)"

Attached is the draft final chapter 1 in .rtf and .doc formats for 1/3/00

meeting. Enclosed in the

forwarded message from Chris Wood are the interagency meeting agenda and
draft

alternatives document in .doc and .rtf formats. EPA alternatives input
document

will be faxed.

Please call Scott Conroy if you do not receive fax 703-605-5136. See you
in the

next Millennium!

- deis_chapter1.entire_DS_12.30.1999.rtf.rtf - deis_chapter1.entire_DS_12.30.1999.docFrom:
Wood_Chris/wo@sv2wo

Subject: Interagency meeting agenda.

To: Conroy_Scott/wo@sv2wo

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="Boundary_(ID_O6tBcDfuzz3+x6YHZhhwzA)"

Attached is the agenda for the Roadless Interagency team meeting to be held

Monday, January

3, 2000, from 2-4. Thanks, Chris

INTERAGENCY REVIEW TEAM MEETING AGENDA

January 3, 2000, 2-4pm

Location: USDA Forest Service, Chief's conference room, 2d floor, corner of

14th and Independence Avenues, SW, Washington, DC (no clearance required to enter building).

Purpose of the meeting: 1) overview public scoping and agency outreach efforts

2) close

discussion of Chapter One 3) begin discussion of alternatives to be analyzed.

Expected outcomes: Closure on the issue of the purpose and need for agency action. Initiate

in-depth discussions of range of alternatives. If time allows, begin discussion

of alternatives that

might be analyzed in detail. This meeting will likely cover both technical and

policy

aspects of the roadless rulemaking.

I. Overview of public scoping and outreach. Chris Wood and Steve Marshall

II. Discussion on Chapter One -- Scott Conroy and Chris Wood

III. Alternatives discussion -- Conroy, Wood, Julia

Next meeting: Please note that the next meeting will be held on January 10, 2000, from 2-4pm in

the Chief's conference room, USDA Forest Service. Meeting topics will include

alternatives

analyzed in detail and those considered but not analyzed in detail.

Happy New Year!

- alternatives.rtf - alternatives.doc===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

{\rtf1\ansi\ansicpg1252\uc1 \deff0\deflang1033\deflangfe1033{\fonttbl{\f0\froma

Clinton Presidential Records Automated Records Management System [EMAIL]

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Hex Dump file is not in a recognizable format, has been incorrectly decoded or is damaged.

File Name: p_a1207672_cea_html_1.txt

Attachment Number: alternatives.rtf

Clinton Presidential Records Automated Records Management System [EMAIL]

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Hex Dump file is not in a recognizable format, has been incorrectly decoded or is damaged.

File Name: p_a1207672_cea_html_3.txt

Attachment Number: [no name]

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR ROADLESS AREA CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT WITHIN THE NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

Chapter 1. Purpose of and Need for Action

Introduction

This chapter describes the underlying purpose and need to which the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service is responding in developing this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and proposed rule to conserve and enhance roadless areas within the 192 million acre National Forest System (NFS). Alternatives for managing the roadless portions of NFS lands, including the proposed action and no action, are analyzed and displayed in this DEIS.

The proposed rule is designed to achieve two objectives. First, from a national level, it would immediately prohibit certain activities that compromise the values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas. Second, it would provide procedures and criteria for evaluating, conserving, and enhancing the values of inventoried roadless and other NFS unroaded areas.

Background

Many areas of the National Forest System remain unroaded for a variety of reasons, including rugged terrain, environmental sensitivity, controversy associated with roadless entries, market demands, and other socio-economic conditions. In 1979, the Forest Service completed an inventory of roadless areas for their wilderness character and value through the Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE II). Since then, Congress designated some areas in that inventory as wilderness. Others were released for a variety of management activities, including some activities that allow for road construction. A large number of the RARE II areas still remain roadless.

During the RARE II evaluation, only areas that met criteria for wilderness were considered. For the purpose of the wilderness review, roadless areas were required to "be of sufficient size as to make predictable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition." Among other factors, this included a general size threshold of 5,000 acres¹. Some RARE II areas not designated as wilderness were developed according to subsequent forest plan decisions. Controversy over the remaining unroaded areas on NFS lands has increased due to the values associated with their important social and ecological characteristics. President Clinton emphasized these values in his remarks on the George Washington and Jefferson National Forest on October 13, 1999:

[W]ithin our national forests there are large parcels of land that don't contain roads of any kind, and in most cases, never have...these areas represent some of the last,

¹ Roadless areas in the East did not have to meet this acreage requirement, but were evaluated against other criteria identified in Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 1909.12, Chapter 7.

best, unprotected wildland anywhere in our nation. They offer unparalleled opportunities for hikers, hunters, and anglers. They're absolutely critical to the survival of many endangered species...and I think it's worth pointing out they are also very often a source of clear and fresh water for countless communities.

In spite of the extensive RARE II inventory and subsequent roadless area evaluations conducted for the Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP, or forest plans) during the 1970s and 1980s, controversy associated with the management of inventoried roadless and some other unroaded areas remains high.

In addition, there is a heightened awareness of the many values of roadless areas other than wilderness. These values take on added significance in the face of increasing development of other parts of the landscape. For example, in the U.S. nearly 16 million acres of forest, cropland, and open space were converted to urban and other uses between 1992 and 1997. The average conversion rate for those five years – 3.2 million acres per year – is more than twice the rate of 1.4 million acres per year recorded from 1982 to 1992. These values include solitude, refuges for rare species of wildlife and fish, bulwarks against invasive species, reference areas for research, source areas for drinking water, high biological diversity, dispersed recreation opportunities, and relatively undisturbed landscapes.

There are also increasing environmental and budgetary concerns about the advisability of new road construction in roadless areas. With more than 380,000 miles of roads in the NFS transportation system, the Agency's annual funding is sufficient to maintain only about 17 percent of these roads to federal and state safety and environmental standards. The Forest Service estimates an \$8.4 billion backlog on road maintenance and reconstruction on existing Forest Service roads.

To respond to these concerns, in February 1999, the agency temporarily suspended road construction and reconstruction in certain unroaded areas for 18 months while reviewing and revising the regulations governing the management of the NFS transportation system. In the course of this rulemaking effort (also known as the Interim Rule), the Forest Service received over 80,000 public comments, most addressing the need for more roadless area protection. In addition, the Agency has received extensive and unprecedented comment related to roadless areas while conducting scoping for the proposed Rule for NFS Land and Resource Management Planning (36 CFR Parts 217 and 219).

In the 23 years since enactment of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), all national forests and grasslands have completed their initial forest plans. Twelve units have already completed their regularly scheduled revisions; the remaining 115 plans are scheduled for revision by 2010. This comprehensive unit-by-unit planning process has established forest level public involvement and resource analysis and procedures for land use allocation decisions. However, national controversies, litigation, and congressional interest, over roadless area management remain widespread.

The Underlying Need

This action is needed for several compelling reasons: 1) the continuing loss of open space and fragmentation of forest land, 2) road construction and reconstruction, and other activities in inventoried roadless and certain other unroaded areas can compromise roadless values, 3) national controversy concerning roadless area management continues to generate costly and time consuming appeals and litigation, and 4) the budgetary constraints related to road management have significant environmental consequences and impacts on other Agency priorities.

Road construction and reconstruction activities, for example, can alter resource conditions and cause substantial ecological impacts, such as stream sedimentation, noxious weed invasion, and wildlife habitat fragmentation. Roads can alter human use patterns and affect recreation experiences. Similar effects could occur in previously roaded areas, but constructing a new road in an undeveloped area can have a disproportionate level of impact. Appropriate road maintenance can mitigate some of these effects. However, present and foreseeable funding is expected to be only a small fraction of the total needed to meet environmental and safety standards. Although the agency has taken significant steps to clarify and improve road management priorities and practices through the proposed Road Policy (36 CFR 212), this effort does not by itself conserve or enhance the resource values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas.

In addition, the remaining roadless areas on NFS lands are disproportionately important to the relatively small percentage of the U.S. land base they occupy. New scientific information from the Columbia River Basin – an area that comprises x states and y million acres, and 2% of the entire National Forest System – demonstrates their ecological significance. For example; the draft Interior Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Plan found:

- “The existence of unroaded areas is by far the most valuable output from Forest Service and BLM administered lands in the Basin” (47% of the value outputs today, 41% in the year 2045.)
- Over 70% of the 94 key wildlife species in the basin (species of focus) are negatively affected by one or more of the factors associated with road construction.
- About 60% of the best remaining aquatic habitats in the basin (aquatic strongholds) are found within roadless or very low road density lands.

Many of the remaining roadless areas are found in headwater areas with steep slopes. Road construction makes these areas more susceptible to increased erosion, landslides, and slope failure. Road construction can allow entry of invasive species, increased incidence of person-caused fire, disrupt important habitat connectivity, and otherwise compromise the values and characteristics that make roadless areas ecologically unique and socially important.

Road construction or reconstruction is associated with a host of Forest Service management activities, from wildland fire fighting to timber harvest. Road construction, however, tends to be more costly in unroaded areas than elsewhere because of their remoteness and often rugged terrain, increasing the potential for disproportionately higher environmental degradation and construction and maintenance costs.

Areas without roads have inherent values and characteristics that are increasingly scarce and highly desirable for the social, economic, and ecological values they represent. Under present management policies, maintenance of areas with these values cannot be assured for future generations. In an increasingly developed landscape, these values will become more and more important with the passage of time.

The Purpose

The purpose of this proposed rule is to conserve and enhance the values associated with roadless areas. To accomplish this objective, national direction for the conservation and enhancement of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas is necessary. Some issues best lend themselves to resolution at the national level while others, due to their site-specific nature, are better resolved through local forest and activity planning.

Therefore, the proposed rule is divided into two parts. Part 1 would prohibit certain activities that pose the greatest threats to inventoried roadless areas from a national level due to the continuing unresolved national controversy. Part 2 relies upon the Agency's forest planning process to implement a consistent set of criteria and procedures to conserve and enhance important social and ecological values and characteristics of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas. This is consistent with President Clinton's direction to Secretary of Agriculture Glickman dated October 13, 1999:

[I] have determined that it is in the best interest of our Nation...to provide strong and lasting protection for these forests...Specifically, I direct the Forest Service to develop, and propose for public comment, regulations to provide appropriate long-term protection for most or all of these currently inventoried "roadless" areas, and to determine whether such protection is warranted for any smaller "roadless" areas not yet inventoried.

Separating the appropriate national level prohibition against certain activities in inventoried roadless areas instituted by Part 1 from the procedural action described in Part 2 is a logical outcome of two years of public comment, scientific analysis, and agency deliberation related to roadless areas and other road management issues. As the draft planning rule states, certain issues require national attention, and others lend themselves to resolution at a local level. Experience gained from twenty-three years of forest planning, the Interim Rule, the proposed Planning Regulations, and the proposed Forest Service Road Policy provides a solid foundation for actions included in the proposed Roadless Rule.

The purpose of Part 2 is to assure that values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas are considered, conserved, and enhanced through agency management. To accomplish this, the Agency proposes to define criteria and establish procedures to identify and consider the social, economic, and ecological characteristics and values of roadless and other unroaded areas that should be maintained, restored, or enhanced through forest planning. President Clinton emphasized this in his remarks on the George Washington and Jefferson National Forest on October 13, 1999:

[I]t is very important to point out that we are not trying to turn the national forests into museums. Even as we strengthen protections, the majority of our forests will continue to be responsibly managed for sustainable timber production and other activities... environmental protection and economic growth can, and must, go hand in hand.

Part 2 focuses on the identification and evaluation of roadless characteristics and values at the local level for several vital reasons: 1) two decades of forest planning demonstrates, and the draft planning regulations anticipate, that certain issues are most appropriately resolved at the local level, 2) the specific nature, type, extent, and quality of many roadless area characteristics and related public uses are often unique to a particular location, and 3) there are no comprehensive national inventories of unroaded areas less than 5,000 acres in size and their characteristics from which to conduct an objective analysis.

The Proposed Action

In response to Presidential direction, the Forest Service is proposing a rule that would conserve and enhance roadless areas and the values associated with unroaded landscapes in the 192 million acre National Forest System. This proposed rule would effectively and responsibly balance the equally important needs of (1) prohibiting certain activities that could most threaten the conservation of inventoried roadless areas and (2) defining criteria and establishing procedures to identify and consider the social, economic, and ecological characteristics and values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas that should be maintained or enhanced through forest planning.

Inventoried roadless areas considered in this analysis have been identified from three primary sources. First, inventories of roadless areas conducted for forest plans usually provide the most accurate and up to date data. Second, more recent agency inventories including those associated with forest plan revision and amendments and other regional analyses, such as the Southern Appalachian Assessment, offer a more comprehensive and up-to-date view of roadless areas within a given geographic region. Finally, in the absence of more recent data, the original 1979 RARE II inventory is used. Specific inventoried roadless areas included in this proposal are listed and displayed on maps in Appendix A.

If adopted, Part 1 of the proposed rule would prohibit road construction and reconstruction on approximately 50 million acres of inventoried roadless areas, subject to valid existing rights and public health and safety requirements. Those portions of inventoried roadless areas subsequently found to contain existing classified (system) roads may not be subject

to these prohibitions upon completion of a specified forest level analysis as previous road construction and development may have already altered their roadless characteristics.

Part 2 of the proposed rule would identify consistent procedures and criteria that national forests and grasslands would use in forest plan and activity level planning processes for the following purposes: 1) to analyze those portions of inventoried roadless areas containing existing classified roads not subject to the prohibition described in Part 1; and 2) to determine appropriate management direction to conserve and enhance ecological and social values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas. Before decisions are made regarding development or use, a specified analysis of roadless values would be required. This analysis could occur at the forest level for individual projects, through the forest plan amendment and revision process, or through a combination of both.

Scoping and Public Participation

The public has been actively involved throughout this process since the President's initial announcement. Activities and opportunities have included a formal comment period, a series of 10 regional and national public meetings, and local meetings at each of the 127 National Forests and Grasslands headquarters. In addition, the agency has received over 80,000 comments on the issue of roadless area management through public involvement associated with the interim suspension of road construction in roadless areas.

A Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register on October 19, 1999 to initiate a 60-day scoping period during which comments were received. This has provided the Forest Service an opportunity to better understand the nature and scope of issues that need be addressed in this DEIS, and to identify the significant social and environmental issues related to the proposed rulemaking. These comments have influenced the nature and scope of the alternatives and the type of analysis conducted. Following publication of the proposed rule and this DEIS, the Forest Service will provide an additional opportunity for public involvement and comment. A final environmental impact statement (FEIS) and final rule is scheduled to be complete in the fall of 2000.

Rulemaking

Rulemaking is a process where agency procedures become formalized in regulations. It is subject to public comment and response by the agency under the federal Administrative Procedures Act. A proposed rule is published in the Federal Register and made available for public comment. That is followed by a final rule that responds to public comments and explains how those comments were used in developing the final rule.

While similar to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, it normally does not involve in-depth analysis of environmental effects. Where environmental effects are of concern with the proposed rule, NEPA will be integrated with the rulemaking. A DEIS will accompany the proposed rule and provide environmental, social, and economic information

to help the public better understand and respond to the proposed rule. A final EIS will accompany the final rule. In this way, environmental analysis will be integrated with the rulemaking process.

Other Ongoing and Related Planning Efforts

As a result of public comments received on the Interim Rule, the agency is now working on a regulation to improve management of the 380,000 mile Forest Service road system (36 CFR 212) (refer to Figure_). The road policy is designed to improve access to National Forests by making the existing road system safe, responsive to public needs, environmentally sound, affordable to American taxpayers, and efficient to manage.

This proposed Roadless Area Rule addresses the need to deal with the future conservation and enhancement of roadless areas. The President's proposal sets in motion a national dialogue to ensure that the values of roadless areas are conserved and carefully managed. While the proposed long-term road policy focuses on managing the existing road system, the roadless policy examines future management options for roadless areas. They are related, but separate, efforts. The road policy does address roadless areas in that it would require managers to undertake specific systematic analysis prior to building new roads in roadless areas.

In addition, the proposed Planning Rule (36 CFR 217 and 219) would revise the existing Forest Service forest planning regulations to make ecological sustainability the primary goal of National Forest System land management. It proposes to accomplish this by addressing resource issues at the appropriate national, regional, or local scale; through greater collaboration and problem solving with the public and other stakeholders; integrating science more effectively into planning; and making the planning process more responsive and adaptive to current problems and opportunities.

In terms of roadless areas, the proposed planning rule provides for identification of, and management for, unroaded values by means other than wilderness designation. It also defines *roadless* and *unroaded*. The proposed action of the roadless rule focuses on limiting road construction in roadless areas, assessing characteristics and values of inventoried roadless areas and other unroaded lands, and developing criteria for conserving and enhancing those characteristics and values.

As these public rulemakings proceed, the agency may choose to integrate and clarify certain provisions to ensure consistency, clarity, and effectiveness.

Figure _. Summary of Current Forest Service Proposals.

	Proposed Planning Rule	Proposed Road Policy	Roadless Proposal
		<i>(Interim Road Construction Suspension Policy)</i>	
Focus:	Ecosystem assessments & planning at various scales.	Road assessments at various scales coordinated with ecosystem assessments	Roadless Assessments and Management: Part 1. Analysis to determine long-term protection for roadless areas. Part 2. Process for assessing unroaded values & developing criteria for protecting and managing for unroaded values.
Applicability:	Applies to all NFS lands & resources.	Applies to all NFS lands & resources. Identifies opportunities/needs for needed and unneeded roads. Gives emphasis to: • Rehabilitating needed roads • Decommissioning unneeded roads • Carefully considering adding roads Integrates road analysis with forest plan amendments.	Applies to NFS roadless & unroaded areas.
Definitions:	Defines roadless and unroaded.	Uses definitions for roadless and unroaded from Proposed Planning Rule. <i>Defines road, classified road, and unclassified road.</i>	Uses the same definitions as the Proposed Planning Rule and the road policy.
Relationship to Roadless:	Provides for identification of, and management for, unroaded values other than wilderness.	Provides transition criteria for roadless areas until plan amendment.	Proposes long-term protection for unroaded and roadless areas and their values.
Decision process established under Rule	Plan decisions through NEPA.	Road management decisions through NEPA, transition EIS by Regional Foresters.	Roadless Area decisions through NEPA.
Process to establish Rule	Final Rule using regulatory process	Final Rule using regulatory process.	EIS and Final Rule using regulatory process

Issues Considered

The following issues are derived from indepth and extensive comments received from individuals, groups, organizations, and other government agencies during this planning process, as well as from other related scoping efforts associated with the proposed planning rule, interim roads rule, and proposed transportation policy.

Access: Limiting road construction and reconstruction or other management actions in roadless areas may impact delivery of goods, services, and activities that these areas might otherwise provide. Perceived negative impacts include but are not limited to: inability to adequately protect public health (natural disaster response, toxics removal, smoke management, trash dumping), safety (fire suppression, property protection, search and rescue) and law enforcement. It could hamper access to private lands and inholdings, limit use by the disabled, and increase risks at the wildland/urban interface. It could also limit or increase the cost of some activities such as logging, livestock grazing, off-highway vehicle (OHV) recreation, ski area development, and oil and gas development. Others feel limiting access is appropriate and long overdue, and that effects on these activities is acceptable when weighed against the perceived benefits of limited access. Positive inputs include improved habitats for fish and wildlife, buffers against invasive species, protection of drinking water supplies, more opportunities for dispersed recreation, etc.

Roads over 50" Wide: Confusion exists over the disposition of many miles of roads and trails over 50" wide. The new road definitions of *classified* and *unclassified* leaves many former low maintenance level Forest Development Roads and Trails in the *unclassified* category, limiting their availability for maintenance funds and increasing the probability of decommissioning. Many OHV users feel this will limit their access to remote areas and negate agreements with local Forest Service officials on management of these travelways. Lack of maintenance could lead to erosion, sedimentation, and similar environmental effects. Others feel limiting OHV access to remote areas is needed, citing environmental effects of OHV use on soil, water, fish, wildlife, and similar resources. Others believe the Forest Service road system is already too huge and that many miles of road should be closed. Others argue the agency should build no new roads at all until they diminish the existing 8.4 billion backlog on road reconstruction and maintainence.

Scientific Sufficiency: Disagreement exists on the scientific sufficiency of the information the proposed action is based upon. Some feel more data and analysis is required to determine the effects of this action. Others feel that overwhelming scientific evidence exists on the effects of roads on the environment and the proposed action is therefore appropriate.

Exemptions: Considerable disagreement exists on allowing exemptions from the proposed action. Some feel exemptions similar to those in the Interim Roads rule for the Tongass NF, the area of the Northwest Forest Plan, and other recent planning efforts, are appropriate. Others feel no exemptions are appropriate for an action of this significance and the proposed action should apply equally to all National Forest lands. Others believe a transition period should be allowed for those plans most recently amended.

Wilderness: A wide range of perceptions exists on this issue. Some feel the proposed action will limit access and lead to managing roadless areas as *de facto* wilderness. They believe this will limit many management options, constituting a violation of the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act and the National Forest Management Act. Others feel managing areas as *de facto* wilderness is entirely appropriate and some support eventual formal designation into the wilderness system. Still others find the roadless designation provides a welcome compromise position between formal wilderness and general multiple use management, protecting many values unique to roadless areas while still allowing a wide variety of uses.

Environmental Effects: The proposed action may have a variety of effects on physical and biological resources.

Perceived positive effects include:

- *Water Resources:* water quality maintained to meet state standards, consistent quantity delivery, runoff timing that maintains base flows and reduces flood peaks
- *Soil Resources:* soil loss/sedimentation rates within normal ranges, soils meeting quality and productivity standards
- *Air Resources:* air quality and visibility goals maintained
- *Wildlife/Fisheries:* habitat fragmentation reduced, connectivity and biodiversity maintained, species stronghold and viability provided, quality stream habitat maintained
- *Invasives:* introduction of invasive plant and animal species reduced
- *Proposed, Endangered & Threatened Species:* habitat of proposed, endangered, and threatened species protected
- *Forest Health:* intact healthy forests left by limiting development activities
- *Fire Prevention:* fewer roads may limit the incidence of person-caused fires and arson

Perceived negative effects include:

- *Fire Prevention:* reduced access may limit fuel loading reduction methods, resulting in more severe fires
- *Fire Suppression:* reduced access may hamper fire suppression efforts, resulting in larger and more severe fires and related negative on-site and off-site effects
- *Forest Health:* reduced access may limit available options to manage insect, disease, and other forest health problems
- *Use Shifts:* Limiting various land uses in roadless areas may shift use to other roaded federal land or onto other ownerships.

Local Involvement: Disagreement exists concerning the effect of the proposed action on local involvement in decision-making. Some feel the proposed action will reduce local involvement, with the following effects:

- Negate time-intensive agreements on forest plans and local projects
- Undermine local trust between the Forest Service and local entities

Others believe the long time controversial nature of the Roadless debate lends itself to national resolution.

Dependent Communities: Many feel the proposed action may have significant impacts, both economically and socially, on local communities that depend on use of National Forest System lands. Impacts could include lost job income, reduced employment opportunities, reduced payments to counties in lieu of taxes with effects on local schools and infrastructure. Others believe these effects will be limited and that local communities can rapidly offset these effects with other employment and income opportunities generated through protection of roadless areas and the values they represent.

ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

Scope of the National Prohibitions

1. Should the rule prohibit certain activities in inventoried roadless areas? These could include:
 - a. Road construction and reconstruction in inventoried roadless areas.
 - b. Road construction and road reconstruction in inventoried roadless areas and timber sales conducted through a commercial timber sale contract.
 - c. Any motorized use of inventoried roadless areas as well as timber sales conducted through a commercial timber sale contract.
 - d. All activities that do not maintain or enhance inventoried roadless area values and characteristics.
2. Should the prohibitions in 1 a-d (above) apply to other unroaded areas?
3. Should the rule reclassify inventoried roadless areas currently in a protected status to a more permissive status?
4. No change in current policy

Further protection of roadless areas through local forest planning.

1. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Identify ecological values and characteristics of unroaded and inventoried roadless areas through analysis at the forest plan and/or project levels. Ensure those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities are prohibited within unroaded areas that possess these values.
2. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Through analysis at the forest plan and/or project level, identify ecological values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas and other roadless areas that are at least 1,000 acres in size and contiguous to other federal unroaded areas of 5,000 acres or greater, wilderness areas, or wild river corridors. Ensure that those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities within these areas are prohibited.
3. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Through analysis at the forest plan and/or project level, identify ecological

values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas and all other unroaded areas of at least 1,000 acres. Ensure that those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities within these areas are prohibited.

4. No change in current policy.

Exemptions/Transitions

1. Exemptions.

- a. Exempt the Tongass National Forest because of the unique geographic, social, and economic conditions in the region.
- b. Exempt the Tongass and other recently revised forest plans because they incorporate new information and more recent science in their management plans.¹

2. Transitions.

- a. Allow the Tongass National Forest to transition into compliance with the roadless area rulemaking over a 5-10 year period.
 - b. Allow the Tongass and all other National Forests with recently revised management plans to transition into the roadless rulemaking over a 5-10 year period.
3. Given its unique social, ecological, and economic conditions, allow for a different set of rules to apply for the Tongass.
 4. None.

¹ Similar to rationale in the interim rule prohibiting road construction in most roadless areas of the NFS. This rationale could also be integrated into III.1.a.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	R. Baldwin to R. Lawrence, re Nominations (9 pages)	12/30/1999	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System
CEA (Robert Z. Lawrence)
OA/Box Number: 950000

FOLDER TITLE:

[12/28/1999 - 12/31/1999]

2014-0316-F

wr10770

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mary Fibich (CN=Mary Fibich/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-DEC-1999 15:08:56.00

SUBJECT: Reminder

TO: Yu-Chin Chen (CN=Yu-Chin Chen/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William H. Gillespie (CN=William H. Gillespie/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Warren A. Herold (CN=Warren A. Herold/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria A. Greenfield (CN=Victoria A. Greenfield/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Susan P. Clements (CN=Susan P. Clements/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven N. Braun (CN=Steven N. Braun/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen F. Lin (CN=Stephen F. Lin/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah L. Rosen (CN=Sarah L. Rosen/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sandra F. Daigle (CN=Sandra F. Daigle/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rosalind V. Rasin (CN=Rosalind V. Rasin/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Noah Y. Weisberger (CN=Noah Y. Weisberger/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael J. Brien (CN=Michael J. Brien/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary Fibich (CN=Mary Fibich/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary E. Jones (CN=Mary E. Jones/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary A. Thomas (CN=Mary A. Thomas/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Martin N. Baily (CN=Martin N. Baily/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark N. Levine (CN=Mark N. Levine/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa D. Branch (CN=Lisa D. Branch/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda A. Reilly (CN=Linda A. Reilly/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leigh L. Linden (CN=Leigh L. Linden/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kathryn L. Shaw (CN=Kathryn L. Shaw/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karin A. Braack (CN=Karin A. Braack/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie M. Meyers (CN=Julie M. Meyers/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph E. Aldy (CN=Joseph E. Aldy/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John L. Goldie (CN=John L. Goldie/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John G. Fernald (CN=John G. Fernald/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John C. Williams (CN=John C. Williams/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason A. Bernstein (CN=Jason A. Bernstein/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James M. Treadway (CN=James M. Treadway/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Francine P. Obermiller (CN=Francine P. Obermiller/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas V. Almond (CN=Douglas V. Almond/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles F. Stone (CN=Charles F. Stone/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Catherine H. Furlong (CN=Catherine H. Furlong/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carol L. Capece (CN=Carol L. Capece/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Amorosi (CN=Brian A. Amorosi/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Audrey Choi (CN=Audrey Choi/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrew R. Feldman (CN=Andrew R. Feldman/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alice H. Williams (CN=Alice H. Williams/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Please don't forget to completely power down your PC before leaving for
the weekend.

Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mary Fibich (CN=Mary Fibich/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-DEC-1999 14:55:52.00

SUBJECT: Mail back-ups

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Lisa D. Branch (CN=Lisa D. Branch/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Susan suggested I forward this to you. Earlier this week, Leigh Linden came up with this solution, but when queried about it, IS&T gave us the solution that I previously sent to you.

If you prefer this, try clicking on File, Export,. But please read Leigh's e-mail because he addresses how to handle attachments.

----- Forwarded by Mary Fibich/CEA/EOP on 12/30/99 02:52 PM -----

Leigh L. Linden

12/28/99 12:59:55 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Susan P. Clements/CEA/EOP@EOP, Mary Fibich/CEA/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: Mail back-ups

I talked to Yu-Chin and she said that she had already decided to export all of her mail to a text file. I've played around with it and you can save every message in a folder to a text file. It doesn't save the attachments, but there is a line in the message indicating the name of the attachment. So, one can create another folder on the C: drive and place the text file containing all the messages from the notes folder along with each attachment. Not an ideal solution, but it will work in a pinch.

Sorry to create any problems,
Leigh

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Conroy_Scott ("Conroy_Scott/wo"@fs.fed.us [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-DEC-1999 18:17:33.00

SUBJECT: Forw[2]: Interagency meeting agenda.

TO: Thomas Brumm (CN=Thomas Brumm/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Donald R. Arbuckle (CN=Donald R. Arbuckle/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter.Coppelman@usdoj.gov (Peter.Coppelman@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gary_D_Frazer@fws.gov (Gary_D_Frazer@fws.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

From: Conroy_Scott/wo@sv2wo

Subject: Forw: Interagency meeting agenda.

To: phil_allard@blm.gov, llinden@cea.eop.gov, rlawrence@cea.eop.gov,
john.watts@usdoj.gov, louise.milkman@usdoj.gov, peter.coppleman@usdoj.gov,
suriano.elaine@epa.gov, sanderson.dick@epa.gov, jfurnish/wo@sv2wo,
cwood/wo@sv2wo, mconnolly/wo@sv2wo, sconroy/wo@sv2wo, jriber/wo@sv2wo,
Craig.Johnson@noaa.gov, Don.Knowles@noaa.gov, Art.Jeffers@noaa.gov,
Donna.Brewer@noaa.gov, jere.glover@sba.gov, tcroote@omb.eop.gov,
darbuckle@omb.eop.gov, Jeremy.Anderson@usda.gov, bmyrick@usda.gov,
Jennifer.Smith@sba.gov, Anne.Kennedy@usda.gov, jschaub@usda.gov,
dbice@usda.gov, john_fay@fws.gov, gary_frazier@fws.gov, A.West@usda.gov,
hdiazsoltero/wo@sv2wo, Dinah_Bear@ceq.eop.gov, Thomas_Brum@ceq.eop.gov,
aferlo/wo@sv2wo, Stuart_R._Kasdin@omb.eop.gov,
Elwood_Holstein@omb.eop.gov, tmuir@ostp.eop.gov, rbierbaum@ostp.eop.gov

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="Boundary_(ID_uZpvUA/+3UXbRGVUXO385Q)"

Attached is the draft final chapter 1 in .rtf and .doc formats for 1/3/00
meeting. Enclosed in the

forwarded message from Chris Wood are the interagency meeting agenda and
draft

alternatives document in .doc and .rtf formats. EPA alternatives input
document

will be faxed.

Please call Scott Conroy if you do not receive fax 703-605-5136. See you
in the

next Millennium!

- deis_chapter1.entire_DS_12.30.1999.rtf.rtf - deis_chapter1.entire_DS_12.30.1999.doc
From: Wood_Chris/wo@sv2wo

Subject: Interagency meeting agenda.
To: Conroy_Scott/wo@sv2wo
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="Boundary_(ID_WnFqK8OoWSejxRq+QHwuNw)"
Attached is the agenda for the Roadless Interagency team meeting to be held
Monday, January
3, 2000, from 2-4. Thanks, Chris

INTERAGENCY REVIEW TEAM MEETING AGENDA

January 3, 2000, 2-4pm

Location: USDA Forest Service, Chief's conference room, 2d floor, corner
of
14th and Independence Avenues, SW, Washington, DC (no
clearance required to enter building).

Purpose of the meeting: 1) overview public scoping and agency outreach
efforts
2) close
discussion of Chapter One 3) begin discussion of alternatives to be
analyzed.

Expected outcomes: Closure on the issue of the purpose and need for agency
action. Initiate
in-depth discussions of range of alternatives. If time allows, begin
discussion
of alternatives that
might be analyzed in detail. This meeting will likely cover both
technical and
policy
aspects of the roadless rulemaking.

I. Overview of public scoping and outreach. Chris Wood and Steve
Marshall

II. Discussion on Chapter One -- Scott Conroy and Chris Wood

III. Alternatives discussion -- Conroy, Wood, Julia

Next meeting: Please note that the next meeting will be held on January 10,
2000, from 2-4pm in
the Chief's conference room, USDA Forest Service. Meeting topics will
include
alternatives
analyzed in detail and those considered but not analyzed in detail.

Happy New Year!

- alternatives.rtf - alternatives.doc===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

{\rtf1\ansi\ansicpg1252\uc1 \deff0\deflang1033\deflangfe1033{\fonttbl{\f0\froma

Clinton Presidential Records Automated Records Management System [EMAIL]

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Hex Dump file is not in a recognizable format, has been incorrectly decoded or is damaged.

File Name: p_g1206642_cea_html_1.txt

Attachment Number: alternatives.rtf

Clinton Presidential Records Automated Records Management System [EMAIL]

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Hex Dump file is not in a recognizable format, has been incorrectly decoded or is damaged.

File Name: p_g1206642_cea_html_3.txt

Attachment Number: [no name]

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR ROADLESS AREA CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT WITHIN THE NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

Chapter 1. Purpose of and Need for Action

Introduction

This chapter describes the underlying purpose and need to which the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service is responding in developing this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and proposed rule to conserve and enhance roadless areas within the 192 million acre National Forest System (NFS). Alternatives for managing the roadless portions of NFS lands, including the proposed action and no action, are analyzed and displayed in this DEIS.

The proposed rule is designed to achieve two objectives. First, from a national level, it would immediately prohibit certain activities that compromise the values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas. Second, it would provide procedures and criteria for evaluating, conserving, and enhancing the values of inventoried roadless and other NFS unroaded areas.

Background

Many areas of the National Forest System remain unroaded for a variety of reasons, including rugged terrain, environmental sensitivity, controversy associated with roadless entries, market demands, and other socio-economic conditions. In 1979, the Forest Service completed an inventory of roadless areas for their wilderness character and value through the Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE II). Since then, Congress designated some areas in that inventory as wilderness. Others were released for a variety of management activities, including some activities that allow for road construction. A large number of the RARE II areas still remain roadless.

During the RARE II evaluation, only areas that met criteria for wilderness were considered. For the purpose of the wilderness review, roadless areas were required to "be of sufficient size as to make predictable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition." Among other factors, this included a general size threshold of 5,000 acres¹. Some RARE II areas not designated as wilderness were developed according to subsequent forest plan decisions. Controversy over the remaining unroaded areas on NFS lands has increased due to the values associated with their important social and ecological characteristics. President Clinton emphasized these values in his remarks on the George Washington and Jefferson National Forest on October 13, 1999:

[W]ithin our national forests there are large parcels of land that don't contain roads of any kind, and in most cases, never have...these areas represent some of the last,

¹ Roadless areas in the East did not have to meet this acreage requirement, but were evaluated against other criteria identified in Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 1909.12, Chapter 7.

best, unprotected wildland anywhere in our nation. They offer unparalleled opportunities for hikers, hunters, and anglers. They're absolutely critical to the survival of many endangered species...and I think it's worth pointing out they are also very often a source of clear and fresh water for countless communities.

In spite of the extensive RARE II inventory and subsequent roadless area evaluations conducted for the Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP, or forest plans) during the 1970s and 1980s, controversy associated with the management of inventoried roadless and some other unroaded areas remains high.

In addition, there is a heightened awareness of the many values of roadless areas other than wilderness. These values take on added significance in the face of increasing development of other parts of the landscape. For example, in the U.S. nearly 16 million acres of forest, cropland, and open space were converted to urban and other uses between 1992 and 1997. The average conversion rate for those five years – 3.2 million acres per year – is more than twice the rate of 1.4 million acres per year recorded from 1982 to 1992. These values include solitude, refuges for rare species of wildlife and fish, bulwarks against invasive species, reference areas for research, source areas for drinking water, high biological diversity, dispersed recreation opportunities, and relatively undisturbed landscapes.

There are also increasing environmental and budgetary concerns about the advisability of new road construction in roadless areas. With more than 380,000 miles of roads in the NFS transportation system, the Agency's annual funding is sufficient to maintain only about 17 percent of these roads to federal and state safety and environmental standards. The Forest Service estimates an \$8.4 billion backlog on road maintenance and reconstruction on existing Forest Service roads.

To respond to these concerns, in February 1999, the agency temporarily suspended road construction and reconstruction in certain unroaded areas for 18 months while reviewing and revising the regulations governing the management of the NFS transportation system. In the course of this rulemaking effort (also known as the Interim Rule), the Forest Service received over 80,000 public comments, most addressing the need for more roadless area protection. In addition, the Agency has received extensive and unprecedented comment related to roadless areas while conducting scoping for the proposed Rule for NFS Land and Resource Management Planning (36 CFR Parts 217 and 219).

In the 23 years since enactment of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), all national forests and grasslands have completed their initial forest plans. Twelve units have already completed their regularly scheduled revisions; the remaining 115 plans are scheduled for revision by 2010. This comprehensive unit-by-unit planning process has established forest level public involvement and resource analysis and procedures for land use allocation decisions. However, national controversies, litigation, and congressional interest, over roadless area management remain widespread.

The Underlying Need

This action is needed for several compelling reasons: 1) the continuing loss of open space and fragmentation of forest land, 2) road construction and reconstruction, and other activities in inventoried roadless and certain other unroaded areas can compromise roadless values, 3) national controversy concerning roadless area management continues to generate costly and time consuming appeals and litigation, and 4) the budgetary constraints related to road management have significant environmental consequences and impacts on other Agency priorities.

Road construction and reconstruction activities, for example, can alter resource conditions and cause substantial ecological impacts, such as stream sedimentation, noxious weed invasion, and wildlife habitat fragmentation. Roads can alter human use patterns and affect recreation experiences. Similar effects could occur in previously roaded areas, but constructing a new road in an undeveloped area can have a disproportionate level of impact. Appropriate road maintenance can mitigate some of these effects. However, present and foreseeable funding is expected to be only a small fraction of the total needed to meet environmental and safety standards. Although the agency has taken significant steps to clarify and improve road management priorities and practices through the proposed Road Policy (36 CFR 212), this effort does not by itself conserve or enhance the resource values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas.

In addition, the remaining roadless areas on NFS lands are disproportionately important to the relatively small percentage of the U.S. land base they occupy. New scientific information from the Columbia River Basin – an area that comprises x states and y million acres, and 2% of the entire National Forest System – demonstrates their ecological significance. For example; the draft Interior Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Plan found:

- “The existence of unroaded areas is by far the most valuable output from Forest Service and BLM administered lands in the Basin” (47% of the value outputs today, 41% in the year 2045.)
- Over 70% of the 94 key wildlife species in the basin (species of focus) are negatively affected by one or more of the factors associated with road construction.
- About 60% of the best remaining aquatic habitats in the basin (aquatic strongholds) are found within roadless or very low road density lands.

Many of the remaining roadless areas are found in headwater areas with steep slopes. Road construction makes these areas more susceptible to increased erosion, landslides, and slope failure. Road construction can allow entry of invasive species, increased incidence of person-caused fire, disrupt important habitat connectivity, and otherwise compromise the values and characteristics that make roadless areas ecologically unique and socially important.

Road construction or reconstruction is associated with a host of Forest Service management activities, from wildland fire fighting to timber harvest. Road construction, however, tends to be more costly in unroaded areas than elsewhere because of their remoteness and often rugged terrain, increasing the potential for disproportionately higher environmental degradation and construction and maintenance costs.

Areas without roads have inherent values and characteristics that are increasingly scarce and highly desirable for the social, economic, and ecological values they represent. Under present management policies, maintenance of areas with these values cannot be assured for future generations. In an increasingly developed landscape, these values will become more and more important with the passage of time.

The Purpose

The purpose of this proposed rule is to conserve and enhance the values associated with roadless areas. To accomplish this objective, national direction for the conservation and enhancement of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas is necessary. Some issues best lend themselves to resolution at the national level while others, due to their site-specific nature, are better resolved through local forest and activity planning.

Therefore, the proposed rule is divided into two parts. Part 1 would prohibit certain activities that pose the greatest threats to inventoried roadless areas from a national level due to the continuing unresolved national controversy. Part 2 relies upon the Agency's forest planning process to implement a consistent set of criteria and procedures to conserve and enhance important social and ecological values and characteristics of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas. This is consistent with President Clinton's direction to Secretary of Agriculture Glickman dated October 13, 1999:

[I] have determined that it is in the best interest of our Nation...to provide strong and lasting protection for these forests...Specifically, I direct the Forest Service to develop, and propose for public comment, regulations to provide appropriate long-term protection for most or all of these currently inventoried "roadless" areas, and to determine whether such protection is warranted for any smaller "roadless" areas not yet inventoried.

Separating the appropriate national level prohibition against certain activities in inventoried roadless areas instituted by Part 1 from the procedural action described in Part 2 is a logical outcome of two years of public comment, scientific analysis, and agency deliberation related to roadless areas and other road management issues. As the draft planning rule states, certain issues require national attention, and others lend themselves to resolution at a local level. Experience gained from twenty-three years of forest planning, the Interim Rule, the proposed Planning Regulations, and the proposed Forest Service Road Policy provides a solid foundation for actions included in the proposed Roadless Rule.

The purpose of Part 2 is to assure that values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas are considered, conserved, and enhanced through agency management. To accomplish this, the Agency proposes to define criteria and establish procedures to identify and consider the social, economic, and ecological characteristics and values of roadless and other unroaded areas that should be maintained, restored, or enhanced through forest planning. President Clinton emphasized this in his remarks on the George Washington and Jefferson National Forest on October 13, 1999:

[I]t is very important to point out that we are not trying to turn the national forests into museums. Even as we strengthen protections, the majority of our forests will continue to be responsibly managed for sustainable timber production and other activities... environmental protection and economic growth can, and must, go hand in hand.

Part 2 focuses on the identification and evaluation of roadless characteristics and values at the local level for several vital reasons: 1) two decades of forest planning demonstrates, and the draft planning regulations anticipate, that certain issues are most appropriately resolved at the local level, 2) the specific nature, type, extent, and quality of many roadless area characteristics and related public uses are often unique to a particular location, and 3) there are no comprehensive national inventories of unroaded areas less than 5,000 acres in size and their characteristics from which to conduct an objective analysis.

The Proposed Action

In response to Presidential direction, the Forest Service is proposing a rule that would conserve and enhance roadless areas and the values associated with unroaded landscapes in the 192 million acre National Forest System. This proposed rule would effectively and responsibly balance the equally important needs of (1) prohibiting certain activities that could most threaten the conservation of inventoried roadless areas and (2) defining criteria and establishing procedures to identify and consider the social, economic, and ecological characteristics and values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas that should be maintained or enhanced through forest planning.

Inventoried roadless areas considered in this analysis have been identified from three primary sources. First, inventories of roadless areas conducted for forest plans usually provide the most accurate and up to date data. Second, more recent agency inventories including those associated with forest plan revision and amendments and other regional analyses, such as the Southern Appalachian Assessment, offer a more comprehensive and up-to-date view of roadless areas within a given geographic region. Finally, in the absence of more recent data, the original 1979 RARE II inventory is used. Specific inventoried roadless areas included in this proposal are listed and displayed on maps in Appendix A.

If adopted, Part 1 of the proposed rule would prohibit road construction and reconstruction on approximately 50 million acres of inventoried roadless areas, subject to valid existing rights and public health and safety requirements. Those portions of inventoried roadless areas subsequently found to contain existing classified (system) roads may not be subject

to these prohibitions upon completion of a specified forest level analysis as previous road construction and development may have already altered their roadless characteristics.

Part 2 of the proposed rule would identify consistent procedures and criteria that national forests and grasslands would use in forest plan and activity level planning processes for the following purposes: 1) to analyze those portions of inventoried roadless areas containing existing classified roads not subject to the prohibition described in Part 1; and 2) to determine appropriate management direction to conserve and enhance ecological and social values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas. Before decisions are made regarding development or use, a specified analysis of roadless values would be required. This analysis could occur at the forest level for individual projects, through the forest plan amendment and revision process, or through a combination of both.

Scoping and Public Participation

The public has been actively involved throughout this process since the President's initial announcement. Activities and opportunities have included a formal comment period, a series of 10 regional and national public meetings, and local meetings at each of the 127 National Forests and Grasslands headquarters. In addition, the agency has received over 80,000 comments on the issue of roadless area management through public involvement associated with the interim suspension of road construction in roadless areas.

A Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register on October 19, 1999 to initiate a 60-day scoping period during which comments were received. This has provided the Forest Service an opportunity to better understand the nature and scope of issues that need be addressed in this DEIS, and to identify the significant social and environmental issues related to the proposed rulemaking. These comments have influenced the nature and scope of the alternatives and the type of analysis conducted. Following publication of the proposed rule and this DEIS, the Forest Service will provide an additional opportunity for public involvement and comment. A final environmental impact statement (FEIS) and final rule is scheduled to be complete in the fall of 2000.

Rulemaking

Rulemaking is a process where agency procedures become formalized in regulations. It is subject to public comment and response by the agency under the federal Administrative Procedures Act. A proposed rule is published in the Federal Register and made available for public comment. That is followed by a final rule that responds to public comments and explains how those comments were used in developing the final rule.

While similar to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, it normally does not involve in-depth analysis of environmental effects. Where environmental effects are of concern with the proposed rule, NEPA will be integrated with the rulemaking. A DEIS will accompany the proposed rule and provide environmental, social, and economic information

to help the public better understand and respond to the proposed rule. A final EIS will accompany the final rule. In this way, environmental analysis will be integrated with the rulemaking process.

Other Ongoing and Related Planning Efforts

As a result of public comments received on the Interim Rule, the agency is now working on a regulation to improve management of the 380,000 mile Forest Service road system (36 CFR 212) (refer to Figure_). The road policy is designed to improve access to National Forests by making the existing road system safe, responsive to public needs, environmentally sound, affordable to American taxpayers, and efficient to manage.

This proposed Roadless Area Rule addresses the need to deal with the future conservation and enhancement of roadless areas. The President's proposal sets in motion a national dialogue to ensure that the values of roadless areas are conserved and carefully managed. While the proposed long-term road policy focuses on managing the existing road system, the roadless policy examines future management options for roadless areas. They are related, but separate, efforts. The road policy does address roadless areas in that it would require managers to undertake specific systematic analysis prior to building new roads in roadless areas.

In addition, the proposed Planning Rule (36 CFR 217 and 219) would revise the existing Forest Service forest planning regulations to make ecological sustainability the primary goal of National Forest System land management. It proposes to accomplish this by addressing resource issues at the appropriate national, regional, or local scale; through greater collaboration and problem solving with the public and other stakeholders; integrating science more effectively into planning; and making the planning process more responsive and adaptive to current problems and opportunities.

In terms of roadless areas, the proposed planning rule provides for identification of, and management for, unroaded values by means other than wilderness designation. It also defines *roadless* and *unroaded*. The proposed action of the roadless rule focuses on limiting road construction in roadless areas, assessing characteristics and values of inventoried roadless areas and other unroaded lands, and developing criteria for conserving and enhancing those characteristics and values.

As these public rulemakings proceed, the agency may choose to integrate and clarify certain provisions to ensure consistency, clarity, and effectiveness.

Figure _. Summary of Current Forest Service Proposals.

	Proposed Planning Rule	Proposed Road Policy <i>(Interim Road Construction Suspension Policy)</i>	Roadless Proposal
Focus:	Ecosystem assessments & planning at various scales.	Road assessments at various scales coordinated with ecosystem assessments	Roadless Assessments and Management: Part 1. Analysis to determine long-term protection for roadless areas. Part 2. Process for assessing unroaded values & developing criteria for protecting and managing for unroaded values.
Applicability:	Applies to all NFS lands & resources.	Applies to all NFS lands & resources. Identifies opportunities/needs for needed and unneeded roads. Gives emphasis to: • Rehabilitating needed roads • Decommissioning unneeded roads • Carefully considering adding roads Integrates road analysis with forest plan amendments.	Applies to NFS roadless & unroaded areas.
Definitions:	Defines roadless and unroaded.	Uses definitions for roadless and unroaded from Proposed Planning Rule. Defines <i>road</i> , <i>classified road</i> , and <i>unclassified road</i> .	Uses the same definitions as the Proposed Planning Rule and the road policy.
Relationship to Roadless:	Provides for identification of, and management for, unroaded values other than wilderness.	Provides transition criteria for roadless areas until plan amendment.	Proposes long-term protection for unroaded and roadless areas and their values.
Decision process established under Rule	Plan decisions through NEPA.	Road management decisions through NEPA, transition EIS by Regional Foresters.	Roadless Area decisions through NEPA.
Process to establish Rule	Final Rule using regulatory process	Final Rule using regulatory process.	EIS and Final Rule using regulatory process

Issues Considered

The following issues are derived from indepth and extensive comments received from individuals, groups, organizations, and other government agencies during this planning process, as well as from other related scoping efforts associated with the proposed planning rule, interim roads rule, and proposed transportation policy.

Access: Limiting road construction and reconstruction or other management actions in roadless areas may impact delivery of goods, services, and activities that these areas might otherwise provide. Perceived negative impacts include but are not limited to: inability to adequately protect public health (natural disaster response, toxics removal, smoke management, trash dumping), safety (fire suppression, property protection, search and rescue) and law enforcement. It could hamper access to private lands and inholdings, limit use by the disabled, and increase risks at the wildland/urban interface. It could also limit or increase the cost of some activities such as logging, livestock grazing, off-highway vehicle (OHV) recreation, ski area development, and oil and gas development. Others feel limiting access is appropriate and long overdue, and that effects on these activities is acceptable when weighed against the perceived benefits of limited access. Positive inputs include improved habitats for fish and wildlife, buffers against invasive species, protection of drinking water supplies, more opportunities for dispersed recreation, etc.

Roads over 50" Wide: Confusion exists over the disposition of many miles of roads and trails over 50" wide. The new road definitions of *classified* and *unclassified* leaves many former low maintenance level Forest Development Roads and Trails in the *unclassified* category, limiting their availability for maintenance funds and increasing the probability of decommissioning. Many OHV users feel this will limit their access to remote areas and negate agreements with local Forest Service officials on management of these travelways. Lack of maintenance could lead to erosion, sedimentation, and similar environmental effects. Others feel limiting OHV access to remote areas is needed, citing environmental effects of OHV use on soil, water, fish, wildlife, and similar resources. Others believe the Forest Service road system is already too huge and that many miles of road should be closed. Others argue the agency should build no new roads at all until they diminish the existing 8.4 billion backlog on road reconstruction and maintainence.

Scientific Sufficiency: Disagreement exists on the scientific sufficiency of the information the proposed action is based upon. Some feel more data and analysis is required to determine the effects of this action. Others feel that overwhelming scientific evidence exists on the effects of roads on the environment and the proposed action is therefore appropriate.

Exemptions: Considerable disagreement exists on allowing exemptions from the proposed action. Some feel exemptions similar to those in the Interim Roads rule for the Tongass NF, the area of the Northwest Forest Plan, and other recent planning efforts, are appropriate. Others feel no exemptions are appropriate for an action of this significance and the proposed action should apply equally to all National Forest lands. Others believe a transition period should be allowed for those plans most recently amended.

Wilderness: A wide range of perceptions exists on this issue. Some feel the proposed action will limit access and lead to managing roadless areas as *de facto* wilderness. They believe this will limit many management options, constituting a violation of the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act and the National Forest Management Act. Others feel managing areas as *de facto* wilderness is entirely appropriate and some support eventual formal designation into the wilderness system. Still others find the roadless designation provides a welcome compromise position between formal wilderness and general multiple use management, protecting many values unique to roadless areas while still allowing a wide variety of uses.

Environmental Effects: The proposed action may have a variety of effects on physical and biological resources.

Perceived positive effects include:

- *Water Resources:* water quality maintained to meet state standards, consistent quantity delivery, runoff timing that maintains base flows and reduces flood peaks
- *Soil Resources:* soil loss/sedimentation rates within normal ranges, soils meeting quality and productivity standards
- *Air Resources:* air quality and visibility goals maintained
- *Wildlife/Fisheries:* habitat fragmentation reduced, connectivity and biodiversity maintained, species stronghold and viability provided, quality stream habitat maintained
- *Invasives:* introduction of invasive plant and animal species reduced
- *Proposed, Endangered & Threatened Species:* habitat of proposed, endangered, and threatened species protected
- *Forest Health:* intact healthy forests left by limiting development activities
- *Fire Prevention:* fewer roads may limit the incidence of person-caused fires and arson

Perceived negative effects include:

- *Fire Prevention:* reduced access may limit fuel loading reduction methods, resulting in more severe fires
- *Fire Suppression:* reduced access may hamper fire suppression efforts, resulting in larger and more severe fires and related negative on-site and off-site effects
- *Forest Health:* reduced access may limit available options to manage insect, disease, and other forest health problems
- *Use Shifts:* Limiting various land uses in roadless areas may shift use to other roaded federal land or onto other ownerships.

Local Involvement: Disagreement exists concerning the effect of the proposed action on local involvement in decision-making. Some feel the proposed action will reduce local involvement, with the following effects:

- Negate time-intensive agreements on forest plans and local projects
- Undermine local trust between the Forest Service and local entities

Others believe the long time controversial nature of the Roadless debate lends itself to national resolution.

Dependent Communities: Many feel the proposed action may have significant impacts, both economically and socially, on local communities that depend on use of National Forest System lands. Impacts could include lost job income, reduced employment opportunities, reduced payments to counties in lieu of taxes with effects on local schools and infrastructure. Others believe these effects will be limited and that local communities can rapidly offset these effects with other employment and income opportunities generated through protection of roadless areas and the values they represent.

ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

Scope of the National Prohibitions

1. Should the rule prohibit certain activities in inventoried roadless areas? These could include:
 - a. Road construction and reconstruction in inventoried roadless areas.
 - b. Road construction and road reconstruction in inventoried roadless areas and timber sales conducted through a commercial timber sale contract.
 - c. Any motorized use of inventoried roadless areas as well as timber sales conducted through a commercial timber sale contract.
 - d. All activities that do not maintain or enhance inventoried roadless area values and characteristics.
2. Should the prohibitions in 1 a-d (above) apply to other unroaded areas?
3. Should the rule reclassify inventoried roadless areas currently in a protected status to a more permissive status?
4. No change in current policy

Further protection of roadless areas through local forest planning.

1. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Identify ecological values and characteristics of unroaded and inventoried roadless areas through analysis at the forest plan and/or project levels. Ensure those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities are prohibited within unroaded areas that possess these values.
2. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Through analysis at the forest plan and/or project level, identify ecological values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas and other roadless areas that are at least 1,000 acres in size and contiguous to other federal unroaded areas of 5,000 acres or greater, wilderness areas, or wild river corridors. Ensure that those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities within these areas are prohibited.
3. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Through analysis at the forest plan and/or project level, identify ecological

values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas and all other unroaded areas of at least 1,000 acres. Ensure that those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities within these areas are prohibited.

4. No change in current policy.

Exemptions/Transitions

1. Exemptions.

- a. Exempt the Tongass National Forest because of the unique geographic, social, and economic conditions in the region.
- b. Exempt the Tongass and other recently revised forest plans because they incorporate new information and more recent science in their management plans.¹

2. Transitions.

- a. Allow the Tongass National Forest to transition into compliance with the roadless area rulemaking over a 5-10 year period.
- b. Allow the Tongass and all other National Forests with recently revised management plans to transition into the roadless rulemaking over a 5-10 year period.

3. Given its unique social, ecological, and economic conditions, allow for a different set of rules to apply for the Tongass.

4. None.

¹ Similar to rationale in the interim rule prohibiting road construction in most roadless areas of the NFS. This rationale could also be integrated into III.1.a.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Conroy_Scott ("Conroy_Scott/wo"@fs.fed.us [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-DEC-1999 17:52:51.00

SUBJECT: Forw[2]: Interagency meeting agenda.

TO: Thomas Brumm (CN=Thomas Brumm/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Donald R. Arbuckle (CN=Donald R. Arbuckle/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter.Coppelman@usdoj.gov (Peter.Coppelman@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gary_D_Frazer@fws.gov (Gary_D_Frazer@fws.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

From: Conroy_Scott/wo@sv2wo

Subject: Forw: Interagency meeting agenda.

To: phil_allard@blm.gov, llinden@cea.eop.gov, rlawrence@cea.eop.gov,
john.watts@usdoj.gov, louise.milkman@usdoj.gov, peter.coppleman@usdoj.gov,
suriano.elaine@epa.gov, sanderson.dick@epa.gov, jfurnish/wo@sv2wo,
cwood/wo@sv2wo, mconnolly/wo@sv2wo, sconroy/wo@sv2wo, jriber/wo@sv2wo,
Craig.Johnson@noaa.gov, Don.Knowles@noaa.gov, Art.Jeffers@noaa.gov,
Donna.Brewer@noaa.gov, jere.glover@sba.gov, tcroote@omb.eop.gov,
darbuckle@omb.eop.gov, Jeremy.Anderson@usda.gov, bmyrick@usda.gov,
Jennifer.Smith@sba.gov, Anne.Kennedy@usda.gov, jschaub@usda.gov,
dbice@usda.gov, john_fay@fws.gov, gary_frazier@fws.gov, A.West@usda.gov,
hdiazsoltero/wo@sv2wo, Dinah_Bear@ceq.eop.gov, Thomas_Brum@ceq.eop.gov,
aferlo/wo@sv2wo, Stuart_R._Kasdin@omb.eop.gov,
Elwood_Holstein@omb.eop.gov, tmuir@ostp.eop.gov, rbierbaum@ostp.eop.gov

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="Boundary_(ID_FEVL8s6R48RtpnEOheuXUw)"

Attached is the draft final chapter 1 in .rtf and .doc formats for 1/3/00

meeting. Enclosed in the

forwarded message from Chris Wood are the interagency meeting agenda and
draft

alternatives document in .doc and .rtf formats. EPA alternatives input
document

will be faxed.

Please call Scott Conroy if you do not receive fax 703-605-5136. See you
in the

next Millennium!

- deis_chapter1.entire_DS_12.30.1999.rtf.rtf - deis_chapter1.entire_DS_12.30.1999.docFrom:
Wood_Chris/wo@sv2wo

Subject: Interagency meeting agenda.

To: Conroy_Scott/wo@sv2wo

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="Boundary_(ID_HE1dLXXArvf7nhzAuvRXfQ)"

Attached is the agenda for the Roadless Interagency team meeting to be held Monday, January

3, 2000, from 2-4. Thanks, Chris

INTERAGENCY REVIEW TEAM MEETING AGENDA

January 3, 2000, 2-4pm

Location: USDA Forest Service, Chief's conference room, 2d floor, corner of 14th and Independence Avenues, SW, Washington, DC (no clearance required to enter building).

Purpose of the meeting: 1) overview public scoping and agency outreach efforts
2) close discussion of Chapter One 3) begin discussion of alternatives to be analyzed.

Expected outcomes: Closure on the issue of the purpose and need for agency action. Initiate in-depth discussions of range of alternatives. If time allows, begin discussion of alternatives that might be analyzed in detail. This meeting will likely cover both technical and policy aspects of the roadless rulemaking.

I. Overview of public scoping and outreach. Chris Wood and Steve Marshall

II. Discussion on Chapter One -- Scott Conroy and Chris Wood

III. Alternatives discussion -- Conroy, Wood, Julia

Next meeting: Please note that the next meeting will be held on January 10, 2000, from 2-4pm in the Chief's conference room, USDA Forest Service. Meeting topics will include alternatives analyzed in detail and those considered but not analyzed in detail.

Happy New Year!

- alternatives.rtf - alternatives.doc===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

{\rtf1\ansi\ansicpg1252\uc1 \deff0\deflang1033\deflangfe1033{\fonttbl{\f0\froma

Clinton Presidential Records Automated Records Management System [EMAIL]

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Hex Dump file is not in a recognizable format, has been incorrectly decoded or is damaged.

File Name: p_71204397_cea_html_1.txt

Attachment Number: alternatives.rtf

Clinton Presidential Records Automated Records Management System [EMAIL]

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Hex Dump file is not in a recognizable format, has been incorrectly decoded or is damaged.

File Name: p_71204397_cea_html_3.txt

Attachment Number: [no name]

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR ROADLESS AREA CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT WITHIN THE NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

Chapter 1. Purpose of and Need for Action

Introduction

This chapter describes the underlying purpose and need to which the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service is responding in developing this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and proposed rule to conserve and enhance roadless areas within the 192 million acre National Forest System (NFS). Alternatives for managing the roadless portions of NFS lands, including the proposed action and no action, are analyzed and displayed in this DEIS.

The proposed rule is designed to achieve two objectives. First, from a national level, it would immediately prohibit certain activities that compromise the values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas. Second, it would provide procedures and criteria for evaluating, conserving, and enhancing the values of inventoried roadless and other NFS unroaded areas.

Background

Many areas of the National Forest System remain unroaded for a variety of reasons, including rugged terrain, environmental sensitivity, controversy associated with roadless entries, market demands, and other socio-economic conditions. In 1979, the Forest Service completed an inventory of roadless areas for their wilderness character and value through the Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE II). Since then, Congress designated some areas in that inventory as wilderness. Others were released for a variety of management activities, including some activities that allow for road construction. A large number of the RARE II areas still remain roadless.

During the RARE II evaluation, only areas that met criteria for wilderness were considered. For the purpose of the wilderness review, roadless areas were required to "be of sufficient size as to make predictable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition." Among other factors, this included a general size threshold of 5,000 acres¹. Some RARE II areas not designated as wilderness were developed according to subsequent forest plan decisions. Controversy over the remaining unroaded areas on NFS lands has increased due to the values associated with their important social and ecological characteristics. President Clinton emphasized these values in his remarks on the George Washington and Jefferson National Forest on October 13, 1999:

[W]ithin our national forests there are large parcels of land that don't contain roads of any kind, and in most cases, never have...these areas represent some of the last,

¹ Roadless areas in the East did not have to meet this acreage requirement, but were evaluated against other criteria identified in Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 1909.12, Chapter 7.

best, unprotected wildland anywhere in our nation. They offer unparalleled opportunities for hikers, hunters, and anglers. They're absolutely critical to the survival of many endangered species...and I think it's worth pointing out they are also very often a source of clear and fresh water for countless communities.

In spite of the extensive RARE II inventory and subsequent roadless area evaluations conducted for the Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP, or forest plans) during the 1970s and 1980s, controversy associated with the management of inventoried roadless and some other unroaded areas remains high.

In addition, there is a heightened awareness of the many values of roadless areas other than wilderness. These values take on added significance in the face of increasing development of other parts of the landscape. For example, in the U.S. nearly 16 million acres of forest, cropland, and open space were converted to urban and other uses between 1992 and 1997. The average conversion rate for those five years – 3.2 million acres per year – is more than twice the rate of 1.4 million acres per year recorded from 1982 to 1992. These values include solitude, refuges for rare species of wildlife and fish, bulwarks against invasive species, reference areas for research, source areas for drinking water, high biological diversity, dispersed recreation opportunities, and relatively undisturbed landscapes.

There are also increasing environmental and budgetary concerns about the advisability of new road construction in roadless areas. With more than 380,000 miles of roads in the NFS transportation system, the Agency's annual funding is sufficient to maintain only about 17 percent of these roads to federal and state safety and environmental standards. The Forest Service estimates an \$8.4 billion backlog on road maintenance and reconstruction on existing Forest Service roads.

To respond to these concerns, in February 1999, the agency temporarily suspended road construction and reconstruction in certain unroaded areas for 18 months while reviewing and revising the regulations governing the management of the NFS transportation system. In the course of this rulemaking effort (also known as the Interim Rule), the Forest Service received over 80,000 public comments, most addressing the need for more roadless area protection. In addition, the Agency has received extensive and unprecedented comment related to roadless areas while conducting scoping for the proposed Rule for NFS Land and Resource Management Planning (36 CFR Parts 217 and 219).

In the 23 years since enactment of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), all national forests and grasslands have completed their initial forest plans. Twelve units have already completed their regularly scheduled revisions; the remaining 115 plans are scheduled for revision by 2010. This comprehensive unit-by-unit planning process has established forest level public involvement and resource analysis and procedures for land use allocation decisions. However, national controversies, litigation, and congressional interest, over roadless area management remain widespread.

The Underlying Need

This action is needed for several compelling reasons: 1) the continuing loss of open space and fragmentation of forest land, 2) road construction and reconstruction, and other activities in inventoried roadless and certain other unroaded areas can compromise roadless values, 3) national controversy concerning roadless area management continues to generate costly and time consuming appeals and litigation, and 4) the budgetary constraints related to road management have significant environmental consequences and impacts on other Agency priorities.

Road construction and reconstruction activities, for example, can alter resource conditions and cause substantial ecological impacts, such as stream sedimentation, noxious weed invasion, and wildlife habitat fragmentation. Roads can alter human use patterns and affect recreation experiences. Similar effects could occur in previously roaded areas, but constructing a new road in an undeveloped area can have a disproportionate level of impact. Appropriate road maintenance can mitigate some of these effects. However, present and foreseeable funding is expected to be only a small fraction of the total needed to meet environmental and safety standards. Although the agency has taken significant steps to clarify and improve road management priorities and practices through the proposed Road Policy (36 CFR 212), this effort does not by itself conserve or enhance the resource values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas.

In addition, the remaining roadless areas on NFS lands are disproportionately important to the relatively small percentage of the U.S. land base they occupy. New scientific information from the Columbia River Basin – an area that comprises x states and y million acres, and 2% of the entire National Forest System – demonstrates their ecological significance. For example; the draft Interior Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Plan found:

- “The existence of unroaded areas is by far the most valuable output from Forest Service and BLM administered lands in the Basin” (47% of the value outputs today, 41% in the year 2045.)
- Over 70% of the 94 key wildlife species in the basin (species of focus) are negatively affected by one or more of the factors associated with road construction.
- About 60% of the best remaining aquatic habitats in the basin (aquatic strongholds) are found within roadless or very low road density lands.

Many of the remaining roadless areas are found in headwater areas with steep slopes. Road construction makes these areas more susceptible to increased erosion, landslides, and slope failure. Road construction can allow entry of invasive species, increased incidence of person-caused fire, disrupt important habitat connectivity, and otherwise compromise the values and characteristics that make roadless areas ecologically unique and socially important.

Road construction or reconstruction is associated with a host of Forest Service management activities, from wildland fire fighting to timber harvest. Road construction, however, tends to be more costly in unroaded areas than elsewhere because of their remoteness and often rugged terrain, increasing the potential for disproportionately higher environmental degradation and construction and maintenance costs.

Areas without roads have inherent values and characteristics that are increasingly scarce and highly desirable for the social, economic, and ecological values they represent. Under present management policies, maintenance of areas with these values cannot be assured for future generations. In an increasingly developed landscape, these values will become more and more important with the passage of time.

The Purpose

The purpose of this proposed rule is to conserve and enhance the values associated with roadless areas. To accomplish this objective, national direction for the conservation and enhancement of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas is necessary. Some issues best lend themselves to resolution at the national level while others, due to their site-specific nature, are better resolved through local forest and activity planning.

Therefore, the proposed rule is divided into two parts. Part 1 would prohibit certain activities that pose the greatest threats to inventoried roadless areas from a national level due to the continuing unresolved national controversy. Part 2 relies upon the Agency's forest planning process to implement a consistent set of criteria and procedures to conserve and enhance important social and ecological values and characteristics of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas. This is consistent with President Clinton's direction to Secretary of Agriculture Glickman dated October 13, 1999:

[I] have determined that it is in the best interest of our Nation...to provide strong and lasting protection for these forests...Specifically, I direct the Forest Service to develop, and propose for public comment, regulations to provide appropriate long-term protection for most or all of these currently inventoried "roadless" areas, and to determine whether such protection is warranted for any smaller "roadless" areas not yet inventoried.

Separating the appropriate national level prohibition against certain activities in inventoried roadless areas instituted by Part 1 from the procedural action described in Part 2 is a logical outcome of two years of public comment, scientific analysis, and agency deliberation related to roadless areas and other road management issues. As the draft planning rule states, certain issues require national attention, and others lend themselves to resolution at a local level. Experience gained from twenty-three years of forest planning, the Interim Rule, the proposed Planning Regulations, and the proposed Forest Service Road Policy provides a solid foundation for actions included in the proposed Roadless Rule.

The purpose of Part 2 is to assure that values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas are considered, conserved, and enhanced through agency management. To accomplish this, the Agency proposes to define criteria and establish procedures to identify and consider the social, economic, and ecological characteristics and values of roadless and other unroaded areas that should be maintained, restored, or enhanced through forest planning. President Clinton emphasized this in his remarks on the George Washington and Jefferson National Forest on October 13, 1999:

[I]t is very important to point out that we are not trying to turn the national forests into museums. Even as we strengthen protections, the majority of our forests will continue to be responsibly managed for sustainable timber production and other activities... environmental protection and economic growth can, and must, go hand in hand.

Part 2 focuses on the identification and evaluation of roadless characteristics and values at the local level for several vital reasons: 1) two decades of forest planning demonstrates, and the draft planning regulations anticipate, that certain issues are most appropriately resolved at the local level, 2) the specific nature, type, extent, and quality of many roadless area characteristics and related public uses are often unique to a particular location, and 3) there are no comprehensive national inventories of unroaded areas less than 5,000 acres in size and their characteristics from which to conduct an objective analysis.

The Proposed Action

In response to Presidential direction, the Forest Service is proposing a rule that would conserve and enhance roadless areas and the values associated with unroaded landscapes in the 192 million acre National Forest System. This proposed rule would effectively and responsibly balance the equally important needs of (1) prohibiting certain activities that could most threaten the conservation of inventoried roadless areas and (2) defining criteria and establishing procedures to identify and consider the social, economic, and ecological characteristics and values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas that should be maintained or enhanced through forest planning.

Inventoried roadless areas considered in this analysis have been identified from three primary sources. First, inventories of roadless areas conducted for forest plans usually provide the most accurate and up to date data. Second, more recent agency inventories including those associated with forest plan revision and amendments and other regional analyses, such as the Southern Appalachian Assessment, offer a more comprehensive and up-to-date view of roadless areas within a given geographic region. Finally, in the absence of more recent data, the original 1979 RARE II inventory is used. Specific inventoried roadless areas included in this proposal are listed and displayed on maps in Appendix A.

If adopted, Part 1 of the proposed rule would prohibit road construction and reconstruction on approximately 50 million acres of inventoried roadless areas, subject to valid existing rights and public health and safety requirements. Those portions of inventoried roadless areas subsequently found to contain existing classified (system) roads may not be subject

to these prohibitions upon completion of a specified forest level analysis as previous road construction and development may have already altered their roadless characteristics.

Part 2 of the proposed rule would identify consistent procedures and criteria that national forests and grasslands would use in forest plan and activity level planning processes for the following purposes: 1) to analyze those portions of inventoried roadless areas containing existing classified roads not subject to the prohibition described in Part 1; and 2) to determine appropriate management direction to conserve and enhance ecological and social values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas. Before decisions are made regarding development or use, a specified analysis of roadless values would be required. This analysis could occur at the forest level for individual projects, through the forest plan amendment and revision process, or through a combination of both.

Scoping and Public Participation

The public has been actively involved throughout this process since the President's initial announcement. Activities and opportunities have included a formal comment period, a series of 10 regional and national public meetings, and local meetings at each of the 127 National Forests and Grasslands headquarters. In addition, the agency has received over 80,000 comments on the issue of roadless area management through public involvement associated with the interim suspension of road construction in roadless areas.

A Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register on October 19, 1999 to initiate a 60-day scoping period during which comments were received. This has provided the Forest Service an opportunity to better understand the nature and scope of issues that need be addressed in this DEIS, and to identify the significant social and environmental issues related to the proposed rulemaking. These comments have influenced the nature and scope of the alternatives and the type of analysis conducted. Following publication of the proposed rule and this DEIS, the Forest Service will provide an additional opportunity for public involvement and comment. A final environmental impact statement (FEIS) and final rule is scheduled to be complete in the fall of 2000.

Rulemaking

Rulemaking is a process where agency procedures become formalized in regulations. It is subject to public comment and response by the agency under the federal Administrative Procedures Act. A proposed rule is published in the Federal Register and made available for public comment. That is followed by a final rule that responds to public comments and explains how those comments were used in developing the final rule.

While similar to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, it normally does not involve in-depth analysis of environmental effects. Where environmental effects are of concern with the proposed rule, NEPA will be integrated with the rulemaking. A DEIS will accompany the proposed rule and provide environmental, social, and economic information

to help the public better understand and respond to the proposed rule. A final EIS will accompany the final rule. In this way, environmental analysis will be integrated with the rulemaking process.

Other Ongoing and Related Planning Efforts

As a result of public comments received on the Interim Rule, the agency is now working on a regulation to improve management of the 380,000 mile Forest Service road system (36 CFR 212) (refer to Figure_). The road policy is designed to improve access to National Forests by making the existing road system safe, responsive to public needs, environmentally sound, affordable to American taxpayers, and efficient to manage.

This proposed Roadless Area Rule addresses the need to deal with the future conservation and enhancement of roadless areas. The President's proposal sets in motion a national dialogue to ensure that the values of roadless areas are conserved and carefully managed. While the proposed long-term road policy focuses on managing the existing road system, the roadless policy examines future management options for roadless areas. They are related, but separate, efforts. The road policy does address roadless areas in that it would require managers to undertake specific systematic analysis prior to building new roads in roadless areas.

In addition, the proposed Planning Rule (36 CFR 217 and 219) would revise the existing Forest Service forest planning regulations to make ecological sustainability the primary goal of National Forest System land management. It proposes to accomplish this by addressing resource issues at the appropriate national, regional, or local scale; through greater collaboration and problem solving with the public and other stakeholders; integrating science more effectively into planning; and making the planning process more responsive and adaptive to current problems and opportunities.

In terms of roadless areas, the proposed planning rule provides for identification of, and management for, unroaded values by means other than wilderness designation. It also defines *roadless* and *unroaded*. The proposed action of the roadless rule focuses on limiting road construction in roadless areas, assessing characteristics and values of inventoried roadless areas and other unroaded lands, and developing criteria for conserving and enhancing those characteristics and values.

As these public rulemakings proceed, the agency may choose to integrate and clarify certain provisions to ensure consistency, clarity, and effectiveness.

Figure _. Summary of Current Forest Service Proposals.

	Proposed Planning Rule	Proposed Road Policy	Roadless Proposal
		<i>(Interim Road Construction Suspension Policy)</i>	
Focus:	Ecosystem assessments & planning at various scales.	Road assessments at various scales coordinated with ecosystem assessments	Roadless Assessments and Management: Part 1. Analysis to determine long-term protection for roadless areas. Part 2. Process for assessing unroaded values & developing criteria for protecting and managing for unroaded values.
Applicability:	Applies to all NFS lands & resources.	Applies to all NFS lands & resources. Identifies opportunities/needs for needed and unneeded roads. Gives emphasis to: • Rehabilitating needed roads • Decommissioning unneeded roads • Carefully considering adding roads Integrates road analysis with forest plan amendments.	Applies to NFS roadless & unroaded areas.
Definitions:	Defines roadless and unroaded.	Uses definitions for roadless and unroaded from Proposed Planning Rule. Defines <i>road</i> , <i>classified road</i> , and <i>unclassified road</i> .	Uses the same definitions as the Proposed Planning Rule and the road policy.
Relationship to Roadless:	Provides for identification of, and management for, unroaded values other than wilderness.	Provides transition criteria for roadless areas until plan amendment.	Proposes long-term protection for unroaded and roadless areas and their values.
Decision process established under Rule	Plan decisions through NEPA.	Road management decisions through NEPA, transition EIS by Regional Foresters.	Roadless Area decisions through NEPA.
Process to establish Rule	Final Rule using regulatory process	Final Rule using regulatory process.	EIS and Final Rule using regulatory process

Issues Considered

The following issues are derived from indepth and extensive comments received from individuals, groups, organizations, and other government agencies during this planning process, as well as from other related scoping efforts associated with the proposed planning rule, interim roads rule, and proposed transportation policy.

Access: Limiting road construction and reconstruction or other management actions in roadless areas may impact delivery of goods, services, and activities that these areas might otherwise provide. Perceived negative impacts include but are not limited to: inability to adequately protect public health (natural disaster response, toxics removal, smoke management, trash dumping), safety (fire suppression, property protection, search and rescue) and law enforcement. It could hamper access to private lands and inholdings, limit use by the disabled, and increase risks at the wildland/urban interface. It could also limit or increase the cost of some activities such as logging, livestock grazing, off-highway vehicle (OHV) recreation, ski area development, and oil and gas development. Others feel limiting access is appropriate and long overdue, and that effects on these activities is acceptable when weighed against the perceived benefits of limited access. Positive inputs include improved habitats for fish and wildlife, buffers against invasive species, protection of drinking water supplies, more opportunities for dispersed recreation, etc.

Roads over 50" Wide: Confusion exists over the disposition of many miles of roads and trails over 50" wide. The new road definitions of *classified* and *unclassified* leaves many former low maintenance level Forest Development Roads and Trails in the *unclassified* category, limiting their availability for maintenance funds and increasing the probability of decommissioning. Many OHV users feel this will limit their access to remote areas and negate agreements with local Forest Service officials on management of these travelways. Lack of maintenance could lead to erosion, sedimentation, and similar environmental effects. Others feel limiting OHV access to remote areas is needed, citing environmental effects of OHV use on soil, water, fish, wildlife, and similar resources. Others believe the Forest Service road system is already too huge and that many miles of road should be closed. Others argue the agency should build no new roads at all until they diminish the existing 8.4 billion backlog on road reconstruction and maintainence.

Scientific Sufficiency: Disagreement exists on the scientific sufficiency of the information the proposed action is based upon. Some feel more data and analysis is required to determine the effects of this action. Others feel that overwhelming scientific evidence exists on the effects of roads on the environment and the proposed action is therefore appropriate.

Exemptions: Considerable disagreement exists on allowing exemptions from the proposed action. Some feel exemptions similar to those in the Interim Roads rule for the Tongass NF, the area of the Northwest Forest Plan, and other recent planning efforts, are appropriate. Others feel no exemptions are appropriate for an action of this significance and the proposed action should apply equally to all National Forest lands. Others believe a transition period should be allowed for those plans most recently amended.

Wilderness: A wide range of perceptions exists on this issue. Some feel the proposed action will limit access and lead to managing roadless areas as *de facto* wilderness. They believe this will limit many management options, constituting a violation of the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act and the National Forest Management Act. Others feel managing areas as *de facto* wilderness is entirely appropriate and some support eventual formal designation into the wilderness system. Still others find the roadless designation provides a welcome compromise position between formal wilderness and general multiple use management, protecting many values unique to roadless areas while still allowing a wide variety of uses.

Environmental Effects: The proposed action may have a variety of effects on physical and biological resources.

Perceived positive effects include:

- *Water Resources:* water quality maintained to meet state standards, consistent quantity delivery, runoff timing that maintains base flows and reduces flood peaks
- *Soil Resources:* soil loss/sedimentation rates within normal ranges, soils meeting quality and productivity standards
- *Air Resources:* air quality and visibility goals maintained
- *Wildlife/Fisheries:* habitat fragmentation reduced, connectivity and biodiversity maintained, species stronghold and viability provided, quality stream habitat maintained
- *Invasives:* introduction of invasive plant and animal species reduced
- *Proposed, Endangered & Threatened Species:* habitat of proposed, endangered, and threatened species protected
- *Forest Health:* intact healthy forests left by limiting development activities
- *Fire Prevention:* fewer roads may limit the incidence of person-caused fires and arson

Perceived negative effects include:

- *Fire Prevention:* reduced access may limit fuel loading reduction methods, resulting in more severe fires
- *Fire Suppression:* reduced access may hamper fire suppression efforts, resulting in larger and more severe fires and related negative on-site and off-site effects
- *Forest Health:* reduced access may limit available options to manage insect, disease, and other forest health problems
- *Use Shifts:* Limiting various land uses in roadless areas may shift use to other roaded federal land or onto other ownerships.

Local Involvement: Disagreement exists concerning the effect of the proposed action on local involvement in decision-making. Some feel the proposed action will reduce local involvement, with the following effects:

- Negate time-intensive agreements on forest plans and local projects
- Undermine local trust between the Forest Service and local entities

Others believe the long time controversial nature of the Roadless debate lends itself to national resolution.

Dependent Communities: Many feel the proposed action may have significant impacts, both economically and socially, on local communities that depend on use of National Forest System lands. Impacts could include lost job income, reduced employment opportunities, reduced payments to counties in lieu of taxes with effects on local schools and infrastructure. Others believe these effects will be limited and that local communities can rapidly offset these effects with other employment and income opportunities generated through protection of roadless areas and the values they represent.

ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

Scope of the National Prohibitions

1. Should the rule prohibit certain activities in inventoried roadless areas? These could include:
 - a. Road construction and reconstruction in inventoried roadless areas.
 - b. Road construction and road reconstruction in inventoried roadless areas and timber sales conducted through a commercial timber sale contract.
 - c. Any motorized use of inventoried roadless areas as well as timber sales conducted through a commercial timber sale contract.
 - d. All activities that do not maintain or enhance inventoried roadless area values and characteristics.
2. Should the prohibitions in 1 a-d (above) apply to other unroaded areas?
3. Should the rule reclassify inventoried roadless areas currently in a protected status to a more permissive status?
4. No change in current policy

Further protection of roadless areas through local forest planning.

1. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Identify ecological values and characteristics of unroaded and inventoried roadless areas through analysis at the forest plan and/or project levels. Ensure those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities are prohibited within unroaded areas that possess these values.
2. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Through analysis at the forest plan and/or project level, identify ecological values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas and other roadless areas that are at least 1,000 acres in size and contiguous to other federal unroaded areas of 5,000 acres or greater, wilderness areas, or wild river corridors. Ensure that those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities within these areas are prohibited.
3. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Through analysis at the forest plan and/or project level, identify ecological

values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas and all other unroaded areas of at least 1,000 acres. Ensure that those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities within these areas are prohibited.

4. No change in current policy.

Exemptions/Transitions

1. Exemptions.

- a. Exempt the Tongass National Forest because of the unique geographic, social, and economic conditions in the region.
- b. Exempt the Tongass and other recently revised forest plans because they incorporate new information and more recent science in their management plans.¹

2. Transitions.

- a. Allow the Tongass National Forest to transition into compliance with the roadless area rulemaking over a 5-10 year period.
- b. Allow the Tongass and all other National Forests with recently revised management plans to transition into the roadless rulemaking over a 5-10 year period.

3. Given its unique social, ecological, and economic conditions, allow for a different set of rules to apply for the Tongass.

4. None.

¹ Similar to rationale in the interim rule prohibiting road construction in most roadless areas of the NFS. This rationale could also be integrated into III.1.a.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Conroy_Scott ("Conroy_Scott/wo"@fs.fed.us [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-DEC-1999 18:18:34.00

SUBJECT: Forw[2]: Interagency meeting agenda.

TO: Thomas Brumm (CN=Thomas Brumm/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert Z. Lawrence (CN=Robert Z. Lawrence/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Donald R. Arbuckle (CN=Donald R. Arbuckle/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter.Coppelman@usdoj.gov (Peter.Coppelman@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gary_D_Frazer@fws.gov (Gary_D_Frazer@fws.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

From: Conroy_Scott/wo@sv2wo

Subject: Forw: Interagency meeting agenda.

To: phil_allard@blm.gov, linden@cea.eop.gov, rlawrence@cea.eop.gov,
john.watts@usdoj.gov, louise.milkman@usdoj.gov, peter.coppleman@usdoj.gov,
suriano.elaine@epa.gov, sanderson.dick@epa.gov, jfurnish/wo@sv2wo,
cwood/wo@sv2wo, mconnolly/wo@sv2wo, sconroy/wo@sv2wo, jriber/wo@sv2wo,
Craig.Johnson@noaa.gov, Don.Knowles@noaa.gov, Art.Jeffers@noaa.gov,
Donna.Brewer@noaa.gov, jere.glover@sba.gov, tcroote@omb.eop.gov,
darbuckle@omb.eop.gov, Jeremy.Anderson@usda.gov, bmyrick@usda.gov,
Jennifer.Smith@sba.gov, Anne.Kennedy@usda.gov, jschaub@usda.gov,
dbice@usda.gov, john_fay@fws.gov, gary_frazier@fws.gov, A.West@usda.gov,
hdiazsoltero/wo@sv2wo, Dinah_Bear@ceq.eop.gov, Thomas_Brum@ceq.eop.gov,
aferlo/wo@sv2wo, Stuart_R_Kasdin@omb.eop.gov,
Elwood_Holstein@omb.eop.gov, tmuir@ostp.eop.gov, rbierbaum@ostp.eop.gov

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="Boundary_(ID_3H9gx07cHCEWpqRi+UJmSQ)"

Attached is the draft final chapter 1 in .rtf and .doc formats for 1/3/00
meeting. Enclosed in the

forwarded message from Chris Wood are the interagency meeting agenda and
draft

alternatives document in .doc and .rtf formats. EPA alternatives input
document

will be faxed.

Please call Scott Conroy if you do not receive fax 703-605-5136. See you
in the

next Millennium!

- deis_chapter1.entire_DS_12.30.1999.rtf.rtf - deis_chapter1.entire_DS_12.30.1999.docFrom:
Wood_Chris/wo@sv2wo

Subject: Interagency meeting agenda.

To: Conroy_Scott/wo@sv2wo

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="Boundary_(ID_Zn5R8YZn0IeER6TkWMeB3w)"

Attached is the agenda for the Roadless Interagency team meeting to be held Monday, January

3, 2000, from 2-4. Thanks, Chris

INTERAGENCY REVIEW TEAM MEETING AGENDA

January 3, 2000, 2-4pm

Location: USDA Forest Service, Chief's conference room, 2d floor, corner of 14th and Independence Avenues, SW, Washington, DC (no clearance required to enter building).

Purpose of the meeting: 1) overview public scoping and agency outreach efforts
2) close discussion of Chapter One 3) begin discussion of alternatives to be analyzed.

Expected outcomes: Closure on the issue of the purpose and need for agency action. Initiate in-depth discussions of range of alternatives. If time allows, begin discussion of alternatives that might be analyzed in detail. This meeting will likely cover both technical and policy aspects of the roadless rulemaking.

I. Overview of public scoping and outreach. Chris Wood and Steve Marshall

II. Discussion on Chapter One -- Scott Conroy and Chris Wood

III. Alternatives discussion -- Conroy, Wood, Julia

Next meeting: Please note that the next meeting will be held on January 10, 2000, from 2-4pm in the Chief's conference room, USDA Forest Service. Meeting topics will include alternatives analyzed in detail and those considered but not analyzed in detail.

Happy New Year!

- alternatives.rtf - alternatives.doc===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

{\rtf1\ansi\ansicpg1252\uc1 \deff0\deflang1033\deflangfe1033{\fonttbl{\f0\froma

Clinton Presidential Records Automated Records Management System [EMAIL]

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Hex Dump file is not in a recognizable format, has been incorrectly decoded or is damaged.

File Name: p_z1206670_cea_html_1.txt

Attachment Number: alternatives.rtf

Clinton Presidential Records Automated Records Management System [EMAIL]

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Hex Dump file is not in a recognizable format, has been incorrectly decoded or is damaged.

File Name: p_z1206670_cea_html_3.txt

Attachment Number: [no name]

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR ROADLESS AREA CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT WITHIN THE NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

Chapter 1. Purpose of and Need for Action

Introduction

This chapter describes the underlying purpose and need to which the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service is responding in developing this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and proposed rule to conserve and enhance roadless areas within the 192 million acre National Forest System (NFS). Alternatives for managing the roadless portions of NFS lands, including the proposed action and no action, are analyzed and displayed in this DEIS.

The proposed rule is designed to achieve two objectives. First, from a national level, it would immediately prohibit certain activities that compromise the values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas. Second, it would provide procedures and criteria for evaluating, conserving, and enhancing the values of inventoried roadless and other NFS unroaded areas.

Background

Many areas of the National Forest System remain unroaded for a variety of reasons, including rugged terrain, environmental sensitivity, controversy associated with roadless entries, market demands, and other socio-economic conditions. In 1979, the Forest Service completed an inventory of roadless areas for their wilderness character and value through the Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE II). Since then, Congress designated some areas in that inventory as wilderness. Others were released for a variety of management activities, including some activities that allow for road construction. A large number of the RARE II areas still remain roadless.

During the RARE II evaluation, only areas that met criteria for wilderness were considered. For the purpose of the wilderness review, roadless areas were required to "be of sufficient size as to make predictable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition." Among other factors, this included a general size threshold of 5,000 acres¹. Some RARE II areas not designated as wilderness were developed according to subsequent forest plan decisions. Controversy over the remaining unroaded areas on NFS lands has increased due to the values associated with their important social and ecological characteristics. President Clinton emphasized these values in his remarks on the George Washington and Jefferson National Forest on October 13, 1999:

[W]ithin our national forests there are large parcels of land that don't contain roads of any kind, and in most cases, never have...these areas represent some of the last,

¹ Roadless areas in the East did not have to meet this acreage requirement, but were evaluated against other criteria identified in Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 1909.12, Chapter 7.

best, unprotected wildland anywhere in our nation. They offer unparalleled opportunities for hikers, hunters, and anglers. They're absolutely critical to the survival of many endangered species...and I think it's worth pointing out they are also very often a source of clear and fresh water for countless communities.

In spite of the extensive RARE II inventory and subsequent roadless area evaluations conducted for the Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP, or forest plans) during the 1970s and 1980s, controversy associated with the management of inventoried roadless and some other unroaded areas remains high.

In addition, there is a heightened awareness of the many values of roadless areas other than wilderness. These values take on added significance in the face of increasing development of other parts of the landscape. For example, in the U.S. nearly 16 million acres of forest, cropland, and open space were converted to urban and other uses between 1992 and 1997. The average conversion rate for those five years – 3.2 million acres per year – is more than twice the rate of 1.4 million acres per year recorded from 1982 to 1992. These values include solitude, refuges for rare species of wildlife and fish, bulwarks against invasive species, reference areas for research, source areas for drinking water, high biological diversity, dispersed recreation opportunities, and relatively undisturbed landscapes.

There are also increasing environmental and budgetary concerns about the advisability of new road construction in roadless areas. With more than 380,000 miles of roads in the NFS transportation system, the Agency's annual funding is sufficient to maintain only about 17 percent of these roads to federal and state safety and environmental standards. The Forest Service estimates an \$8.4 billion backlog on road maintenance and reconstruction on existing Forest Service roads.

To respond to these concerns, in February 1999, the agency temporarily suspended road construction and reconstruction in certain unroaded areas for 18 months while reviewing and revising the regulations governing the management of the NFS transportation system. In the course of this rulemaking effort (also known as the Interim Rule), the Forest Service received over 80,000 public comments, most addressing the need for more roadless area protection. In addition, the Agency has received extensive and unprecedented comment related to roadless areas while conducting scoping for the proposed Rule for NFS Land and Resource Management Planning (36 CFR Parts 217 and 219).

In the 23 years since enactment of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), all national forests and grasslands have completed their initial forest plans. Twelve units have already completed their regularly scheduled revisions; the remaining 115 plans are scheduled for revision by 2010. This comprehensive unit-by-unit planning process has established forest level public involvement and resource analysis and procedures for land use allocation decisions. However, national controversies, litigation, and congressional interest, over roadless area management remain widespread.

The Underlying Need

This action is needed for several compelling reasons: 1) the continuing loss of open space and fragmentation of forest land, 2) road construction and reconstruction, and other activities in inventoried roadless and certain other unroaded areas can compromise roadless values, 3) national controversy concerning roadless area management continues to generate costly and time consuming appeals and litigation, and 4) the budgetary constraints related to road management have significant environmental consequences and impacts on other Agency priorities.

Road construction and reconstruction activities, for example, can alter resource conditions and cause substantial ecological impacts, such as stream sedimentation, noxious weed invasion, and wildlife habitat fragmentation. Roads can alter human use patterns and affect recreation experiences. Similar effects could occur in previously roaded areas, but constructing a new road in an undeveloped area can have a disproportionate level of impact. Appropriate road maintenance can mitigate some of these effects. However, present and foreseeable funding is expected to be only a small fraction of the total needed to meet environmental and safety standards. Although the agency has taken significant steps to clarify and improve road management priorities and practices through the proposed Road Policy (36 CFR 212), this effort does not by itself conserve or enhance the resource values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas.

In addition, the remaining roadless areas on NFS lands are disproportionately important to the relatively small percentage of the U.S. land base they occupy. New scientific information from the Columbia River Basin – an area that comprises x states and y million acres, and 2% of the entire National Forest System – demonstrates their ecological significance. For example; the draft Interior Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Plan found:

- “The existence of unroaded areas is by far the most valuable output from Forest Service and BLM administered lands in the Basin” (47% of the value outputs today, 41% in the year 2045.)
- Over 70% of the 94 key wildlife species in the basin (species of focus) are negatively affected by one or more of the factors associated with road construction.
- About 60% of the best remaining aquatic habitats in the basin (aquatic strongholds) are found within roadless or very low road density lands.

Many of the remaining roadless areas are found in headwater areas with steep slopes. Road construction makes these areas more susceptible to increased erosion, landslides, and slope failure. Road construction can allow entry of invasive species, increased incidence of person-caused fire, disrupt important habitat connectivity, and otherwise compromise the values and characteristics that make roadless areas ecologically unique and socially important.

Road construction or reconstruction is associated with a host of Forest Service management activities, from wildland fire fighting to timber harvest. Road construction, however, tends to be more costly in unroaded areas than elsewhere because of their remoteness and often rugged terrain, increasing the potential for disproportionately higher environmental degradation and construction and maintenance costs.

Areas without roads have inherent values and characteristics that are increasingly scarce and highly desirable for the social, economic, and ecological values they represent. Under present management policies, maintenance of areas with these values cannot be assured for future generations. In an increasingly developed landscape, these values will become more and more important with the passage of time.

The Purpose

The purpose of this proposed rule is to conserve and enhance the values associated with roadless areas. To accomplish this objective, national direction for the conservation and enhancement of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas is necessary. Some issues best lend themselves to resolution at the national level while others, due to their site-specific nature, are better resolved through local forest and activity planning.

Therefore, the proposed rule is divided into two parts. Part 1 would prohibit certain activities that pose the greatest threats to inventoried roadless areas from a national level due to the continuing unresolved national controversy. Part 2 relies upon the Agency's forest planning process to implement a consistent set of criteria and procedures to conserve and enhance important social and ecological values and characteristics of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas. This is consistent with President Clinton's direction to Secretary of Agriculture Glickman dated October 13, 1999:

[I] have determined that it is in the best interest of our Nation...to provide strong and lasting protection for these forests...Specifically, I direct the Forest Service to develop, and propose for public comment, regulations to provide appropriate long-term protection for most or all of these currently inventoried "roadless" areas, and to determine whether such protection is warranted for any smaller "roadless" areas not yet inventoried.

Separating the appropriate national level prohibition against certain activities in inventoried roadless areas instituted by Part 1 from the procedural action described in Part 2 is a logical outcome of two years of public comment, scientific analysis, and agency deliberation related to roadless areas and other road management issues. As the draft planning rule states, certain issues require national attention, and others lend themselves to resolution at a local level. Experience gained from twenty-three years of forest planning, the Interim Rule, the proposed Planning Regulations, and the proposed Forest Service Road Policy provides a solid foundation for actions included in the proposed Roadless Rule.

The purpose of Part 2 is to assure that values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas are considered, conserved, and enhanced through agency management. To accomplish this, the Agency proposes to define criteria and establish procedures to identify and consider the social, economic, and ecological characteristics and values of roadless and other unroaded areas that should be maintained, restored, or enhanced through forest planning. President Clinton emphasized this in his remarks on the George Washington and Jefferson National Forest on October 13, 1999:

[I]t is very important to point out that we are not trying to turn the national forests into museums. Even as we strengthen protections, the majority of our forests will continue to be responsibly managed for sustainable timber production and other activities... environmental protection and economic growth can, and must, go hand in hand.

Part 2 focuses on the identification and evaluation of roadless characteristics and values at the local level for several vital reasons: 1) two decades of forest planning demonstrates, and the draft planning regulations anticipate, that certain issues are most appropriately resolved at the local level, 2) the specific nature, type, extent, and quality of many roadless area characteristics and related public uses are often unique to a particular location, and 3) there are no comprehensive national inventories of unroaded areas less than 5,000 acres in size and their characteristics from which to conduct an objective analysis.

The Proposed Action

In response to Presidential direction, the Forest Service is proposing a rule that would conserve and enhance roadless areas and the values associated with unroaded landscapes in the 192 million acre National Forest System. This proposed rule would effectively and responsibly balance the equally important needs of (1) prohibiting certain activities that could most threaten the conservation of inventoried roadless areas and (2) defining criteria and establishing procedures to identify and consider the social, economic, and ecological characteristics and values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas that should be maintained or enhanced through forest planning.

Inventoried roadless areas considered in this analysis have been identified from three primary sources. First, inventories of roadless areas conducted for forest plans usually provide the most accurate and up to date data. Second, more recent agency inventories including those associated with forest plan revision and amendments and other regional analyses, such as the Southern Appalachian Assessment, offer a more comprehensive and up-to-date view of roadless areas within a given geographic region. Finally, in the absence of more recent data, the original 1979 RARE II inventory is used. Specific inventoried roadless areas included in this proposal are listed and displayed on maps in Appendix A.

If adopted, Part 1 of the proposed rule would prohibit road construction and reconstruction on approximately 50 million acres of inventoried roadless areas, subject to valid existing rights and public health and safety requirements. Those portions of inventoried roadless areas subsequently found to contain existing classified (system) roads may not be subject

to these prohibitions upon completion of a specified forest level analysis as previous road construction and development may have already altered their roadless characteristics.

Part 2 of the proposed rule would identify consistent procedures and criteria that national forests and grasslands would use in forest plan and activity level planning processes for the following purposes: 1) to analyze those portions of inventoried roadless areas containing existing classified roads not subject to the prohibition described in Part 1; and 2) to determine appropriate management direction to conserve and enhance ecological and social values of inventoried roadless and other unroaded areas. Before decisions are made regarding development or use, a specified analysis of roadless values would be required. This analysis could occur at the forest level for individual projects, through the forest plan amendment and revision process, or through a combination of both.

Scoping and Public Participation

The public has been actively involved throughout this process since the President's initial announcement. Activities and opportunities have included a formal comment period, a series of 10 regional and national public meetings, and local meetings at each of the 127 National Forests and Grasslands headquarters. In addition, the agency has received over 80,000 comments on the issue of roadless area management through public involvement associated with the interim suspension of road construction in roadless areas.

A Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register on October 19, 1999 to initiate a 60-day scoping period during which comments were received. This has provided the Forest Service an opportunity to better understand the nature and scope of issues that need be addressed in this DEIS, and to identify the significant social and environmental issues related to the proposed rulemaking. These comments have influenced the nature and scope of the alternatives and the type of analysis conducted. Following publication of the proposed rule and this DEIS, the Forest Service will provide an additional opportunity for public involvement and comment. A final environmental impact statement (FEIS) and final rule is scheduled to be complete in the fall of 2000.

Rulemaking

Rulemaking is a process where agency procedures become formalized in regulations. It is subject to public comment and response by the agency under the federal Administrative Procedures Act. A proposed rule is published in the Federal Register and made available for public comment. That is followed by a final rule that responds to public comments and explains how those comments were used in developing the final rule.

While similar to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, it normally does not involve in-depth analysis of environmental effects. Where environmental effects are of concern with the proposed rule, NEPA will be integrated with the rulemaking. A DEIS will accompany the proposed rule and provide environmental, social, and economic information

to help the public better understand and respond to the proposed rule. A final EIS will accompany the final rule. In this way, environmental analysis will be integrated with the rulemaking process.

Other Ongoing and Related Planning Efforts

As a result of public comments received on the Interim Rule, the agency is now working on a regulation to improve management of the 380,000 mile Forest Service road system (36 CFR 212) (refer to Figure_). The road policy is designed to improve access to National Forests by making the existing road system safe, responsive to public needs, environmentally sound, affordable to American taxpayers, and efficient to manage.

This proposed Roadless Area Rule addresses the need to deal with the future conservation and enhancement of roadless areas. The President's proposal sets in motion a national dialogue to ensure that the values of roadless areas are conserved and carefully managed. While the proposed long-term road policy focuses on managing the existing road system, the roadless policy examines future management options for roadless areas. They are related, but separate, efforts. The road policy does address roadless areas in that it would require managers to undertake specific systematic analysis prior to building new roads in roadless areas.

In addition, the proposed Planning Rule (36 CFR 217 and 219) would revise the existing Forest Service forest planning regulations to make ecological sustainability the primary goal of National Forest System land management. It proposes to accomplish this by addressing resource issues at the appropriate national, regional, or local scale; through greater collaboration and problem solving with the public and other stakeholders; integrating science more effectively into planning; and making the planning process more responsive and adaptive to current problems and opportunities.

In terms of roadless areas, the proposed planning rule provides for identification of, and management for, unroaded values by means other than wilderness designation. It also defines *roadless* and *unroaded*. The proposed action of the roadless rule focuses on limiting road construction in roadless areas, assessing characteristics and values of inventoried roadless areas and other unroaded lands, and developing criteria for conserving and enhancing those characteristics and values.

As these public rulemakings proceed, the agency may choose to integrate and clarify certain provisions to ensure consistency, clarity, and effectiveness.

Figure _. Summary of Current Forest Service Proposals.

	Proposed Planning Rule	Proposed Road Policy	Roadless Proposal
		<i>(Interim Road Construction Suspension Policy)</i>	
Focus:	Ecosystem assessments & planning at various scales.	Road assessments at various scales coordinated with ecosystem assessments	Roadless Assessments and Management: Part 1. Analysis to determine long-term protection for roadless areas. Part 2. Process for assessing unroaded values & developing criteria for protecting and managing for unroaded values.
Applicability:	Applies to all NFS lands & resources.	Applies to all NFS lands & resources. Identifies opportunities/needs for needed and unneeded roads. Gives emphasis to: • Rehabilitating needed roads • Decommissioning unneeded roads • Carefully considering adding roads Integrates road analysis with forest plan amendments.	Applies to NFS roadless & unroaded areas.
Definitions:	Defines roadless and unroaded.	Uses definitions for roadless and unroaded from Proposed Planning Rule. Defines <i>road</i> , <i>classified road</i> , and <i>unclassified road</i> .	Uses the same definitions as the Proposed Planning Rule and the road policy.
Relationship to Roadless:	Provides for identification of, and management for, unroaded values other than wilderness.	Provides transition criteria for roadless areas until plan amendment.	Proposes long-term protection for unroaded and roadless areas and their values.
Decision process established under Rule	Plan decisions through NEPA.	Road management decisions through NEPA, transition EIS by Regional Foresters.	Roadless Area decisions through NEPA.
Process to establish Rule	Final Rule using regulatory process	Final Rule using regulatory process.	EIS and Final Rule using regulatory process

Issues Considered

The following issues are derived from indepth and extensive comments received from individuals, groups, organizations, and other government agencies during this planning process, as well as from other related scoping efforts associated with the proposed planning rule, interim roads rule, and proposed transportation policy.

Access: Limiting road construction and reconstruction or other management actions in roadless areas may impact delivery of goods, services, and activities that these areas might otherwise provide. Perceived negative impacts include but are not limited to: inability to adequately protect public health (natural disaster response, toxics removal, smoke management, trash dumping), safety (fire suppression, property protection, search and rescue) and law enforcement. It could hamper access to private lands and inholdings, limit use by the disabled, and increase risks at the wildland/urban interface. It could also limit or increase the cost of some activities such as logging, livestock grazing, off-highway vehicle (OHV) recreation, ski area development, and oil and gas development. Others feel limiting access is appropriate and long overdue, and that effects on these activities is acceptable when weighed against the perceived benefits of limited access. Positive inputs include improved habitats for fish and wildlife, buffers against invasive species, protection of drinking water supplies, more opportunities for dispersed recreation, etc.

Roads over 50" Wide: Confusion exists over the disposition of many miles of roads and trails over 50" wide. The new road definitions of *classified* and *unclassified* leaves many former low maintenance level Forest Development Roads and Trails in the *unclassified* category, limiting their availability for maintenance funds and increasing the probability of decommissioning. Many OHV users feel this will limit their access to remote areas and negate agreements with local Forest Service officials on management of these travelways. Lack of maintenance could lead to erosion, sedimentation, and similar environmental effects. Others feel limiting OHV access to remote areas is needed, citing environmental effects of OHV use on soil, water, fish, wildlife, and similar resources. Others believe the Forest Service road system is already too huge and that many miles of road should be closed. Others argue the agency should build no new roads at all until they diminish the existing 8.4 billion backlog on road reconstruction and maintainence.

Scientific Sufficiency: Disagreement exists on the scientific sufficiency of the information the proposed action is based upon. Some feel more data and analysis is required to determine the effects of this action. Others feel that overwhelming scientific evidence exists on the effects of roads on the environment and the proposed action is therefore appropriate.

Exemptions: Considerable disagreement exists on allowing exemptions from the proposed action. Some feel exemptions similar to those in the Interim Roads rule for the Tongass NF, the area of the Northwest Forest Plan, and other recent planning efforts, are appropriate. Others feel no exemptions are appropriate for an action of this significance and the proposed action should apply equally to all National Forest lands. Others believe a transition period should be allowed for those plans most recently amended.

Wilderness: A wide range of perceptions exists on this issue. Some feel the proposed action will limit access and lead to managing roadless areas as *de facto* wilderness. They believe this will limit many management options, constituting a violation of the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act and the National Forest Management Act. Others feel managing areas as *de facto* wilderness is entirely appropriate and some support eventual formal designation into the wilderness system. Still others find the roadless designation provides a welcome compromise position between formal wilderness and general multiple use management, protecting many values unique to roadless areas while still allowing a wide variety of uses.

Environmental Effects: The proposed action may have a variety of effects on physical and biological resources.

Perceived positive effects include:

- *Water Resources:* water quality maintained to meet state standards, consistent quantity delivery, runoff timing that maintains base flows and reduces flood peaks
- *Soil Resources:* soil loss/sedimentation rates within normal ranges, soils meeting quality and productivity standards
- *Air Resources:* air quality and visibility goals maintained
- *Wildlife/Fisheries:* habitat fragmentation reduced, connectivity and biodiversity maintained, species stronghold and viability provided, quality stream habitat maintained
- *Invasives:* introduction of invasive plant and animal species reduced
- *Proposed, Endangered & Threatened Species:* habitat of proposed, endangered, and threatened species protected
- *Forest Health:* intact healthy forests left by limiting development activities
- *Fire Prevention:* fewer roads may limit the incidence of person-caused fires and arson

Perceived negative effects include:

- *Fire Prevention:* reduced access may limit fuel loading reduction methods, resulting in more severe fires
- *Fire Suppression:* reduced access may hamper fire suppression efforts, resulting in larger and more severe fires and related negative on-site and off-site effects
- *Forest Health:* reduced access may limit available options to manage insect, disease, and other forest health problems
- *Use Shifts:* Limiting various land uses in roadless areas may shift use to other roaded federal land or onto other ownerships.

Local Involvement: Disagreement exists concerning the effect of the proposed action on local involvement in decision-making. Some feel the proposed action will reduce local involvement, with the following effects:

- Negate time-intensive agreements on forest plans and local projects
- Undermine local trust between the Forest Service and local entities

Others believe the long time controversial nature of the Roadless debate lends itself to national resolution.

Dependent Communities: Many feel the proposed action may have significant impacts, both economically and socially, on local communities that depend on use of National Forest System lands. Impacts could include lost job income, reduced employment opportunities, reduced payments to counties in lieu of taxes with effects on local schools and infrastructure. Others believe these effects will be limited and that local communities can rapidly offset these effects with other employment and income opportunities generated through protection of roadless areas and the values they represent.

ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

Scope of the National Prohibitions

1. Should the rule prohibit certain activities in inventoried roadless areas? These could include:
 - a. Road construction and reconstruction in inventoried roadless areas.
 - b. Road construction and road reconstruction in inventoried roadless areas and timber sales conducted through a commercial timber sale contract.
 - c. Any motorized use of inventoried roadless areas as well as timber sales conducted through a commercial timber sale contract.
 - d. All activities that do not maintain or enhance inventoried roadless area values and characteristics.
2. Should the prohibitions in 1 a-d (above) apply to other unroaded areas?
3. Should the rule reclassify inventoried roadless areas currently in a protected status to a more permissive status?
4. No change in current policy

Further protection of roadless areas through local forest planning.

1. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Identify ecological values and characteristics of unroaded and inventoried roadless areas through analysis at the forest plan and/or project levels. Ensure those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities are prohibited within unroaded areas that possess these values.
2. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Through analysis at the forest plan and/or project level, identify ecological values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas and other roadless areas that are at least 1,000 acres in size and contiguous to other federal unroaded areas of 5,000 acres or greater, wilderness areas, or wild river corridors. Ensure that those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities within these areas are prohibited.
3. Based on a national framework developed through the rulemaking process, develop procedures and criteria for further forest plan level protection of roadless areas. Through analysis at the forest plan and/or project level, identify ecological

values and characteristics of inventoried roadless areas and all other unroaded areas of at least 1,000 acres. Ensure that those values are considered *or* not degraded by agency actions, *or* that certain activities within these areas are prohibited.

4. No change in current policy.

Exemptions/Transitions

1. Exemptions.

- a. Exempt the Tongass National Forest because of the unique geographic, social, and economic conditions in the region.
- b. Exempt the Tongass and other recently revised forest plans because they incorporate new information and more recent science in their management plans.¹

2. Transitions.

- a. Allow the Tongass National Forest to transition into compliance with the roadless area rulemaking over a 5-10 year period.
- b. Allow the Tongass and all other National Forests with recently revised management plans to transition into the roadless rulemaking over a 5-10 year period.

3. Given its unique social, ecological, and economic conditions, allow for a different set of rules to apply for the Tongass.
4. None.

¹ Similar to rationale in the interim rule prohibiting road construction in most roadless areas of the NFS. This rationale could also be integrated into III.1.a.