



Sept. 14, 2026

Rescission of the Roadless Rule and Tribal Implications

Key takeaways

- On August 18, USDA filed a proposed rule rescinding the 2001 Roadless Rule, a regulation that prohibited most road construction and timber harvesting in almost 60 million acres of undisturbed National Forest System land.
- The rescission will likely have significant impacts on Tribal Nations. Areas covered by the Roadless Rule include ancestral homelands, sacred places, treaty-reserved resources, and culturally significant landscapes that remain integral to Tribal traditions and the exercise of Tribal sovereignty.
- The rescission does not automatically permit road construction, timber harvesting, or other development activities; rather, it eliminates a national-level prohibition on these activities and reverts development decisions to existing land management plans, local partnerships and agreements, and other applicable federal laws and regulations.
- As such, protection of Tribal resources and culturally important sites will depend on the extent to which Tribal governments are consulted about changes, their ability to be involved in planning and decision-making, and the chances to include Indigenous knowledge and Tribal priorities in forest management. These aspects will play a crucial role in how former Inventoried Road Areas are handled and whether Tribes' rights, resources, and priorities are safeguarded.
- Interested Tribal governments may submit public comments by Oct. 6, 2026 at 11:59 pm at <https://www.regulations.gov/document/FS-2025-0001-223869> or by mail to Director, Ecosystem Management Coordination, 201 14th Street SW, Mailstop 1108, Washington, DC 20250-1124.



Introduction

On August 18, USDA filed a proposed rule to rescind the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule (“Roadless Rule” or “Rule”)¹, a contentious regulation that limited development of primitive areas in the National Forest System (NFS). Finalized during the Clinton Administration in January 2001, the Rule was intended to protect and preserve 58 million acres of national forest land— known as Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs) —from most roadbuilding and logging. These lands are largely undeveloped and comprise approximately 30 percent of NFS land.²

Since its inception, the Roadless Rule has proved controversial.³ Proponents of the Rule have argued that it is necessary to protect these undeveloped and largely undisturbed forest areas, safeguarding wildlife habitat, biodiversity, endangered or threatened species, clean water, and other irreplaceable natural resources.⁴ Supporters of rescission have argued that the Roadless Rule unnecessarily limits economic opportunity, including timber harvesting, while making it more difficult for the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) to effectively manage national forests to reduce risk and severity of wildfires.⁵

The rescission of the Roadless Rule is of significant interest to Tribal Nations. Areas covered by the Roadless Rule include ancestral homelands, sacred places, treaty-reserved resources, and culturally significant landscapes that remain integral to Tribal traditions and the exercise of Tribal sovereignty. The rescission of the Roadless Rule could have significant impacts on treaty rights and intents, Tribal co-management, and natural, traditional, and cultural resources. Indeed, USDA’s own Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) acknowledges that that fully rescinding the Roadless Rule has the “greatest potential for adverse effects”⁶ and that there could be “long-term negative effects on cultural resources”.⁷ The majority of Tribal feedback on the proposal

¹ USDA, August 2026, “USDA acts to remove roadless rule restrictions that exacerbate rising wildfire risk”, <https://www.usda.gov/about-usda/news/press-releases/2026/08/18/usda-acts-remove-roadless-rule-restrictions-exacerbate-rising-wildfire-risk>.

² Congressional Research Service, August 2020, “Forest Service Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs)”, <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46504#ifn77>.

³ Congressional Research Service, August 2020, “Forest Service Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs)”, <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46504#ifn77>.

⁴ Defenders of Wildlife, “The Roadless Rule”, <https://defenders.org/roadless-rule>.

⁵ American Forest Resource Council, August 2026, “AFRC Supports Forest Service Proposal to Rescind 2001 Roadless Rule”, <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46504#ifn77>.

⁶ USDA, August 2026, “2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule Rescission: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)”, <https://www.regulations.gov/document/FS-2025-0001-224064>, p. 203

⁷ DEIS, p. 195.



during consultations has been negative,⁸ with the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) and other Tribal organizations issuing statements opposing the rescission.^{9,10}

This policy brief reviews the USDA's Proposed Rule and Draft EIS and discusses potential impacts on Tribal Nations, including impacts on treaty rights and interests, natural resources, traditional and cultural resources, wildfire management, and Tribal co-management. This analysis is intended to support Tribal Nations and Tribal organizations who may be interested in submitting formal comments on the Roadless Rule rescission.

Proposed Changes

In June 2025, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Brooke Rollins [announced](#) the USDA's cancellation of the Roadless Rule.¹¹ The Secretary argued that the rule excessively limited road construction, reconstruction, and timber harvest, all of which are necessary for fire prevention and timber production.¹² Additionally, the USDA asserted that lifting the prohibitions will stimulate job creation and economic growth in rural America.¹³ The USDA described the proposed change as providing greater flexibility for responsible officials, allowing them to tailor management decisions according to local resource conditions and community needs.¹⁴ The proposal also aligns with the Administration's broader deregulatory policy under Executive Order 14192, *Unleashing Prosperity Through Deregulation*¹⁵ and supports increasing timber harvest on federal lands under Executive Order 14225, *Immediate Expansion of American Timber Production*.¹⁶

A proposed rule implementing the rescission was published in August 2026.¹⁷ The proposed rescission would remove subpart B of 36 C.F.R. part 294 and eliminate the Roadless Rule's nationwide restrictions on road construction, road reconstruction, and timber harvesting within

⁸ Tribal Summary Impact Statement Proposed Rule to Rescind the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule, Forest Service – U.S. Department of Agriculture, August 20, 2026, <https://www.regulations.gov/document/FS-2025-0001-224068>, p. 2,

⁹ The Wilderness Society, August 2020, "NCAI and TWS condemn the administration's proposal to rescind the Roadless Rule", <https://www.wilderness.org/articles/press-release/ncai-and-tws-condemn-administrations-proposal-rescind-roadless-rule>.

¹⁰ Roadless Rule Tribal Hub, <https://www.roadlessrule-tribal-hub.org/>.

¹¹ USDA, Secretary Rollins Rescinds Roadless Rule, Eliminating Impediment to Responsible Forest Management, June 23, 2025, [Secretary Rollins Rescinds Roadless Rule, Eliminating Impediment to Responsible Forest Management | USDA](#)

¹² *Id.*

¹³ National Policy Summary Analysis: Rescission of the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, July 2025, [National Policy Summary Analysis](#)

¹⁴ Tribal Summary Impact Statement, p. 1.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 5.

¹⁶ Executive Order 14225, March 2025, "Immediate Expansion of American Timber Production", <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/03/immediate-expansion-of-american-timber-production/>.

¹⁷ USDA, August 2026, "USDA acts to remove roadless rule restrictions that exacerbate rising wildfire risk", <https://www.usda.gov/about-usda/news/press-releases/2026/08/18/usda-acts-remove-roadless-rule-restrictions-exacerbate-rising-wildfire-risk>.



Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs). An IRA is an administrative designation used by the National Forest Service to identify lands with undeveloped conditions which are subject to special management.¹⁸ While no strict criteria determine what constitutes an IRA, many of these areas exhibit common characteristics, often referred to as "roadless characteristics."¹⁹ Examples include high-quality or undisturbed soil, clean water or air, sources of public drinking water, a diverse range of plant and animal species, and natural landscapes that maintain high scenic quality.²⁰ IRAs make up about one-third of all NFS lands, most of which are located in the western half of the country.²¹

Rescission of the Roadless Rule would not independently authorize road construction, timber harvesting, mineral development, or other ground-disturbing activities within former IRAs. Instead, management of those lands would revert primarily to existing land management plans, together with other applicable federal laws, regulations, and agency policies.²² Under the current Rule, provisions of individual land management plans are superseded where the Roadless Rule imposes more restrictive requirements.²³ Removing the Rule would eliminate the nationwide regulatory floor and allow activities permitted by the applicable land management plan to proceed, subject to other project-specific legal and administrative requirements.²⁴ The practical effects of USDA's proposed action would therefore depend on existing land management plans and whether, where, and to what extent agencies subsequently authorize road construction, timber harvest, fuels treatments, mineral development, or other activities within former IRAs.²⁵

Considerations for Tribal Nations

Potential Impact to Tribal Rights and Interests

¹⁸ Congressional Research Service, Forest Service Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs), Aug. 28, 2020, at 2,9. [Forest Service Inventoried Roadless Areas \(IRAs\)](#)

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *Id.* at 9-10; *See also* 36 CFR 294.11 (2001) ("The 2001 Roadless Rule identified the following features that often characterize or are present within inventoried roadless areas: (1) high quality or undisturbed soil, water, and air; (2) sources of public drinking water; (3) diversity of plant and animal communities; (4) habitat for threatened, endangered, proposed, candidate, and sensitive species and for those species dependent on large, undisturbed areas of land; (5) primitive, semi-primitive nonmotorized and semi-primitive motorized classes of dispersed recreation; (6) reference landscapes; (7) natural appearing landscapes with high scenic quality; (8) traditional cultural properties and sacred sites; and (9) other locally identified unique characteristics.").

²¹ *Id.* at 10.

²² *Id.*

²³ *See* 36 CFR 294.14(b) (2001); 66 FR 3273.

²⁴ Tribal Summary, *supra* note 8, at 5.

²⁵ DEIS at p. 34.



Potential impacts for Tribes extend beyond protecting discrete cultural resource sites. NFS lands provide access to forest products, clean water, biodiversity, subsistence materials, sacred sites, and other resources associated with treaty rights and traditional cultural practices.²⁶ The Forest Service acknowledges its legal responsibilities derived from the Constitution, treaties, federal laws, regulations, and policies to protect and preserve inherent Tribal rights.²⁷ Accordingly, the significance of rescission for Tribes depends not only on whether sites are physically disturbed, but also on how changes in access, ecological conditions, and landscape character affect the continued exercise of Tribal rights and practices.

Road construction and timber harvest within former IRAs could affect access to treaty-reserved resources, sacred sites, ancestral trails, cultural forestscapes, and other culturally significant areas.²⁸ Development may also alter the quiet, solitude, natural soundscapes, and visual integrity necessary for some ceremonies and religious practices.²⁹ Conversely, new roads may improve Tribal access to some culturally significant or interpretive sites, although increased public access could also contribute to overuse or degradation.³⁰

Ecological changes may likewise affect the exercise of Tribal rights and traditional practices because the usability of treaty resources depends on the continued quantity, quality, and ecological integrity of fish, game, plants, water, and other resources.³¹ Sedimentation and hydrological changes may affect fisheries, habitat fragmentation may affect game populations, and invasive plants may displace native species used for food, medicine, and ceremony.³² Timber harvest may also alter cultural forestscapes cultivated for particular species or spiritual purposes, undermining cultural continuity and spiritual wellbeing.³³ Road construction could fragment culturally important landscapes or sacred sites.³⁴ These impacts may accumulate over time, and increased machinery, human presence, and landscape modification may affect ceremonial practices and sacred landscapes even where individual resources are not physically destroyed.³⁵

²⁶ DEIS at p. 197.

²⁷ *Id.*

²⁸ DEIS at p. 201-02.

²⁹ DEIS at p. 202.

³⁰ *Id.*

³¹ *Id.*

³² *Id.*

³³ *Id.*

³⁴ Indigenous Law & Policy Center White Paper, August 2026, "The Tribal Administrative Record on the Roadless Rule", <https://turtletalk.blog/wp-content/uploads/2026/08/the-tribal-administrative-record-on-the-roadless-rule.pdf>.

³⁵ *Id.*

Tribal Co-Management

Beyond its effects on Tribal resources, the shift toward forest-level and site-specific decision-making may increase the practical significance of Tribal co-stewardship and other forms of Tribal involvement in management of former IRAs. Under the existing Rule, nationwide restrictions against road construction and timber harvest apply regardless of whether an affected Tribe participates in an individual forest-planning or project-level decision. Following rescission, management outcomes would depend more heavily on applicable land management plans and subsequent agency decisions. Tribal participation in those processes and incorporation of Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) into planning and project design may consequently become more important to protecting treaty resources, cultural landscapes, and other Tribal interests.³⁶

At the same time, increased management flexibility may present opportunities for Tribal co-stewardship. Depending on the applicable land management plan and subsequent management decisions, increased flexibility could create additional opportunities to incorporate Tribal priorities and knowledge into management of former IRAs. For example, increased flexibility in vegetation, habitat, and fuels management may provide opportunities to incorporate Tribal priorities and TEK into management of former IRAs.

The opportunities for co-management or Tribal input will depend largely on the Tribe's interest and capacity to participate in regional- or forest-level management planning and decision-making, as well as the capacity and interest of State and Regional Foresters and Forest Supervisors to work with Tribes. The ongoing USDA reorganization may complicate matters, as the Department is currently planning to eliminate long-standing USFS' Regional Office structure and relocate staff.³⁷ Due to these administrative changes, Tribal Nations may find negotiating new co-management agreements or participating in forest management planning more difficult.

These potential opportunities should be distinguished from consultation requirements.

Consultation may help identify, avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts associated with proposed

³⁶ DEIS at p. 202 ("Projects that fail to integrate Indigenous knowledge into planning and design risk overlooking cultural sensitivities, ecological insights, and sustainable practices that could mitigate disturbance.).

³⁷ Indigenous Food and Agriculture Initiative, April 2026, "IFAI Analysis – Forest Service Announces Reorganization Details", <https://indigenousfoodandag.com/policy-briefing/usda-reorg-details/>.



actions, while sustained Tribal involvement earlier in planning may influence the management objectives and alternatives from which those actions emerge. As rescission shifts greater responsibility to forest-level and site-specific decision-making, the timing and extent of Tribal participation may therefore become particularly consequential.

Wildfire and Fuels Management

Wildfire management illustrates one of the central trade-offs of rescission. For Tribal communities in fire-prone environments, rescission may enable increased fire management activities such as hazardous fuel removal and prescribed burns that reduce the frequency or severity of fires, or reduce the risk of fires spreading from USFS lands to Tribal land. The rescission may allow increased use of cultural burning in areas where the Rule previously prohibited the practice, but where land management plans permit it.³⁸ Roads can improve wildfire response by reducing travel time to newly discovered ignitions, expanding the types of firefighting resources that can be deployed, improving firefighter access and safety, and potentially serving as fire breaks during initial or extended attack.³⁹ Additional travel time in roadless areas may reduce overall fire-control efficiency relative to more accessible NFS lands.⁴⁰ USDA has also argued that rescinding the roadless rule will support increased hazardous fuels removal, reducing the frequency and severity of wildfires.⁴¹

Increased human access may make wildfire management more efficient, but it may also increase the possibility of wildfire ignition risk. Human-caused wildfire ignitions are associated with proximity to roads.⁴² The proportion of human-caused fires in IRAs and wilderness areas is less than half that observed on other NFS lands,⁴³ and this difference is attributed, at least in part, to limitations on public access.⁴⁴ Consequently, additional roads could facilitate fuels management and wildfire suppression while also increasing human presence and therefore the potential

³⁸ For further discussion on cultural burning in NFS lands as hazardous fuels management, *see* Andrew Avitt, Tribal and Indigenous Fire Tradition, Forest Service – USDA, Nov. 16, 2021, [Tribal and Indigenous Fire Tradition | US Forest Service](#).

³⁹ DEIS at p. 96 (citations omitted).

⁴⁰ DEIS at p. 97.

⁴¹ Proposed Rule at p. 3.

⁴² DEIS at p. 89-90 (citations omitted).

⁴³ DEIS at p. 89 (“[I]gnition density is approximately four times greater on other NFS lands compared to the potentially affected IRAs and wilderness. Most of this difference is due to the greater density of human-caused ignitions within other NFS lands. Among fires with causes determined, 77 percent [9.1 million acres] and 74 percent [8.5 million acres] were reported as naturally ignited in wilderness areas and potentially affected IRAs, respectively. In contrast, the majority (57 percent) [22.4 million acres] of fires with cause determinations on other NFS lands were reported as human caused.”).

⁴⁴ DEIS at p. 105.



frequency of human-caused ignitions.⁴⁵ Tribes may wish to consider these competing interests in contemplating how the Rule's rescission may impact their specific forestlands.

Natural Resource and Ecological Impacts

Many Tribal Nations have raised concerns about the ecological health of their ancestral homelands following the rescission of the Rule.⁴⁶ IRAs include areas used by Tribes for subsistence and other cultural, ceremonial, and treaty-reserved purposes, including the hunting and gathering of traditional or culturally significant foods, medicines, minerals, plants, and animals. Tribes in more remote regions may rely on IRAs for subsistence hunting, fishing, and gathering to supplement limited access to conventional sources of food.⁴⁷ Rescission may allow logging or road construction, reducing the availability of these traditional resources due to erosion, disruption of wildlife habitats, interruption of migratory patterns, and the loss of forested land.⁴⁸

In addition, ground disturbance for road construction and other currently prohibited activities presents a particular risk for introducing and spreading invasive species that may threaten or displace plants or wildlife that are culturally significant for Tribal Nations. Machinery can transport new seeds, plant material, and mycological life into newly disturbed areas, and invasive species may also spread following repeated disturbance or intense wildfire.⁴⁹ Beyond changes in vegetation composition, invasive species may degrade wildlife habitat through the introduction of disease and displace culturally significant native plants that Tribes use for food, medicine, and ceremonial purposes.

These ground-disturbing activities may also affect soil and water resources, again potentially jeopardizing the habitat of culturally important plants and animals. Roads are a significant human-caused source of soil and water disturbance in forested environments, particularly during initial construction.⁵⁰ Although some impacts diminish as vegetation becomes reestablished and soils stabilize, others may persist where roads destabilize landforms or require continued

⁴⁵ See generally Fire and Fuels Management, Conclusion - DEIS at p. 105.

⁴⁶ Tribal Summary, *supra* note 8.

⁴⁷ <https://www.thinkglobalhealth.org/article/survival-subsistence-and-food-sovereignty-alaska>

⁴⁸ *Id.* at 3.

⁴⁹ DEIS at p. 106-07.

⁵⁰ DEIS at PDF pg. 115.



maintenance.⁵¹ Because potentially affected IRAs generally have high water quality, increased development could create additional risks of erosion, sedimentation, and altered hydrology.⁵² These effects have implications beyond individual IRAs because national forests contribute approximately 15 percent of the nation's runoff.⁵³

Changes in vegetation, water quality, and habitat connectivity may, in turn, affect biodiversity. Affected IRAs provide habitat for more than 300 threatened, endangered, and proposed species and, because of their comparatively low levels of human disturbance, may provide refuges for species affected by activities in more heavily roaded areas.⁵⁴ Increased management access could facilitate habitat restoration and species management,⁵⁵ while additional road construction and timber harvest could cause habitat degradation, fragmentation, barriers to migration, and increased disturbance across terrestrial and aquatic habitats.⁵⁶

Cultural and Historic Resources

Increased timber harvesting and road construction could disturb Tribal cultural and historical resources, including sacred sites, cultural landscapes, and natural resources. The cultural-resource implications of rescission extend beyond archaeological sites and historic structures. Cultural resources within IRAs may include sacred sites, cultural landscapes, traditional cultural places, and land, water, minerals, plants, and animals important to Tribes.⁵⁷ Increased timber harvest and road construction could directly disturb these resources, contribute to erosion affecting cultural sites, or alter the visual and physical character of culturally significant landscapes.⁵⁸ Increased public access to previously remote sites, including to culturally important locations and sacred sites, may also increase risks of vandalism, looting, inadvertent damage, and disturbance from vehicle and foot traffic.⁵⁹ These changes may also affect culturally important landscapes and places where solitude and limited public access contribute to Tribal cultural or ceremonial use.⁶⁰

⁵¹ *Id.*

⁵² *Id.*

⁵³ DEIS at p. 119.

⁵⁴ DEIS at p. 133, 140.

⁵⁵ DEIS at p. 150.

⁵⁶ *Id.*

⁵⁷ DEIS at p. 193; *see also* Forest Service Manual 2360.5 and 54 U.S.C. 300308.

⁵⁸ DEIS at p. 196.

⁵⁹ DEIS at p. 196.

⁶⁰ DEIS at p. 193.



Rescission would not eliminate existing environmental review, cultural-resource compliance, or Tribal consultation requirements.⁶¹ Early and regular Tribal consultation helps inform project design and avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts on Tribally important cultural landscapes, sacred sites, and traditional cultural places.⁶² Because rescission would shift more management decisions to forest-level and site-specific processes, these protections and the timing of Tribal involvement may become increasingly important where future activities are proposed within former IRAs.

Social and Economic Impacts

Rescission could create economic opportunities for Tribal Nations through increased timber harvest, mineral development, oil and gas development, recreation access, restoration, and other management activities. Forest products and outdoor recreation both support substantial employment and economic activity in communities surrounding NFS lands.⁶³ However, it is difficult to estimate the economic benefit, and the Forest Service cannot quantify recreation visits or associated spending specifically within IRAs.⁶⁴

Economic effects are unlikely to be uniform. Increased resource development and management may benefit some Tribal communities, while changes to wildlife habitat, recreation, culturally significant resources, or subsistence opportunities may impose social and economic costs on others. For Tribes, economic implications may also arise from effects on treaty-reserved hunting and fishing, traditional-resource use, and Tribal resource-management activities. The magnitude and distribution of these effects will depend on subsequent forest- and project-level decisions.

National Forest System Roads and Infrastructure

Increased road construction would add to an already substantial NFS infrastructure burden. The Forest Service maintains approximately 368,000 miles of roads,⁶⁵ with existing maintenance needs that already substantially exceed available funding. The Forest Service estimates that it needs approximately \$1.6 billion to cover annual maintenance needs for existing roads, but only

⁶¹ DEIS at p. 195.

⁶² DEIS at p. 196-97.

⁶³ DEIS at PDF pg. 215.

⁶⁴ DEIS at PDF pg. 220.

⁶⁵ DEIS at p. 35.



has \$270 million in infrastructure maintenance funding.⁶⁶ Passenger-car roads and bridges in particular have accumulated an estimated \$6.9 billion deferred-maintenance backlog.⁶⁷

Additional permanent roads stemming from this rescission could therefore create significant long-term construction and maintenance obligations for an agency that is already struggling with limited resources. As the USDA anticipates cooperative financing for road construction,⁶⁸ Tribes may be asked to contribute to the maintenance of both new roads and reconstruction activities.⁶⁹

Additional roads may also provide management benefits by improving access for fuels treatments, habitat restoration, recreation, emergency response, and other activities. The practical impact will therefore depend on the location, purpose, permanence, public accessibility, and maintenance requirements of any roads subsequently authorized.

Public comment period, Tribal consultations, and next steps

The public comment period on the Proposed Rule and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on rescinding the 2001 Roadless rule closes on Oct. 6, 2026 at 11:59 pm. Interested Tribal governments may submit comments online at <https://www.regulations.gov/> (docket number FS-2025-0001) or by mail to Director, Ecosystem Management Coordination, 201 14th Street SW, Mailstop 1108, Washington, DC 20250-1124.

USDA also states that it will conduct consultations throughout the rulemaking process.

Regardless, Tribal Nations may also request additional consultations on the rescission through USDA's Office of Tribal Relations. To date, USDA has received 64 requests for government-to-government consultations; USDA has held 29 consultations so far.⁷⁰ However, while USDA notes in its Draft EIS that Tribal governments generally opposed rescission during consultations,

⁶⁶ *Id.* at p. 42.

⁶⁷ *Id.* at p. 43. This figure does not include high-clearance vehicle accessible roads.

⁶⁸ *Id.* at p. 45 ("Financing for construction of roads could be accomplished by appropriated funds, requirements on purchasers of national forest timber and other products, by cooperative financing with other public agencies, and with private agencies or persons.").

⁶⁹ See Roads, Forest Service - US Department of Agriculture, [Roads | US Forest Service](#) ("Many other roads that provide access to the national forests and grasslands are maintained and operated by other jurisdictions such as state, local and tribal governments. The Forest Service works closely with these agencies, as well as the [Federal Highway Administration](#), to manage and maintain roads.").

⁷⁰ Federal Register, August 2026, "Special Areas; Roadless Area Conservation", <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2026/08/20/2026-16965/special-areas-roadless-area-conservation>.



it has not yet made available a broader summary of consultation comments or described how input was considered or integrated into the Proposed Rule.⁷¹

Following the public comment period, USDA will issue a Final Rule and EIS. The Final Rule's preamble will include consideration and responses to public comments, including those submitted by Tribal Nations.

⁷¹ Singel, Wenona, Sept. 2026, "Roadless Rule Update: What the Forest Service's 29 Tribal Consultations Establish, and What Tribes Still Cannot See", <https://turtletalk.blog/2026/09/02/roadless-rule-update-what-the-forest-services-29-tribal-consultations-establish-and-what-tribes-still-cannot-see/>.