



# IDAHO ROADLESS COMMISSION

ESTABLISHED 2008

JAMES CASWELL  
CHAIRMAN

DALE HARRIS  
VICE CHAIRMAN

SAM EATON  
IDAHO GOVERNOR'S  
OFFICE COUNSEL

BRIAN RIGGERS  
US FOREST SERVICE  
COORDINATOR

## Idaho Roadless Commission Meeting

### NOTES

May 28-29, 2019

Idaho Panhandle National Forests, Supervisors Office

### Introductions

**Commission Members present:** Alan Prouty, Alex Irby, Bill Higgins, Bob Cope, Brad Gilbert, Dale Harris, Dan Dinning, Jim Caswell, Jonathan Oppenheimer, Billy Barquin, and Michael Gibson

**Forest Service:** Brian Riggers, Leanne Marten, Julie Schaefers, Dave Rosenkrance

**Idaho State:** Sam Eaton

**Others:** Neil Harris, Sid Smith, Brad Smith, Mitch Silvers, Mike Hanna, Friends of the Clearwater – Gary Macfarlane and Katie Bilodeau, Karen Roeder, Kim Kastning,

### SECTION I: Welcome and Business Meeting

---

#### Welcome and Introductions

- Jim Riley resigned from committee effective today, and will be vacating this meeting early. Riley encouraged the group to look at a broader picture of the forests.

#### Review and Approve October 29-30, 2018 Meeting Notes

- A motion was made and seconded. The October 2018 minutes were approved.
- It was discussed that we need a place on the State website to post draft meeting minutes, with a disclosure that the notes are in draft format.

## State Updates

- MOU between FS and State, please send any suggestions or corrections to Sam Eaton.
- Commission vacancies, there are three now with Riley resigning, please send name suggestions to Sam Eaton at least in the next month, with the goal to have all vacancies filled by the Fall 2019 Idaho Roadless meeting.
  - It was suggested to consider city employees or county clerks as possible candidates.
- We are pulling the Idaho Roadless website onto the Idaho Governor's website.

## Summary of Friends of Clearwater IRA Report

- We recognize that roadless areas have different values and as forests go through forest plan revisions, and management implications can occur. We may put different objectives in those roadless areas in different planning cycles, but we will not change the objective of maintaining roadless characteristics that IRAs were established for and we won't violate any prohibitions in the rule.
- Harvest acres in spreadsheets refers to any "cut, sale or removal", but In the FEIS of the IRA, (pg. 95) timber harvest is defined as "harvest of trees with commercial value". This is what we think the 15,000 acres of harvest estimate used in the FEIS is based on. Of our eight forests in ID that have IRA's, it can add up quick. We've done activities in 33,000 acres, but the "commercial value" acres is somewhere closer to 10,000.
- Effects of logging roadless areas and which exceptions we use, we often use the improving forest health, ecosystem compositions, and changing conditions. We need to look closely at whether this is applicable in terms of natural processes and make sure it's not used as a "catch all" when other exceptions don't apply.
- If we do timber harvests in IRA's, the effects of future wilderness consideration is generally considered, but the decision of how detailed this analysis should be is dependent on the potential for effects and the existing condition of the IRA – so we don't over-analyze just to say we did it.
- Updating the FS inventory of IRAs under Forest Plan revision. Brian Riggers stressed that although we may inventory IRA acres in forests, there is no official change.
  - There was much discussion between Katie and Brian about units dropped on a project on the B-D Forest in MT.
  - Gary M. discussed his thoughts on how the FS changed the policy and the language of IRA with respect to logging those areas that could be considered for wilderness.
  - 2012 Planning Rule or National Cohesive Fire Strategy: Cope mentioned the need for using these two important rules in helping us reduce risk and manage resources.
- When logging in roadless areas, Jonathan shared about how the commission should consider how leaving stumps in the IRA can jeopardize characteristics.

## Guidance Paper Overview

Leanne Marten

- Led a discussion with how we plan to give disclosure on our NEPA guidance documents, especially as we embark on Idaho Shared Stewardship work ahead.
- We prioritize our work based on our objectives and the type of activities to help our employees as they preform activities. We do adhere to the Idaho Roadless Rule, and we do not avoid areas to do NEPA in solely because it is roadless. We do priority work at the scale needed to meet our NEPA laws and to meet objectives. We are not changing laws or policies.
  - Barquin asked questions on if IRA units get dropped not only to just drop units, but that perhaps that the agency can't afford the additional analysis that is needed in a roadless area. Leanne continued with how the FS has new EADM policies moving forward in an effort be more focused and reduce the unnecessary analysis.

## Commission Role in Guidance Paper Review

- Last summer, we had a 10-year “check-in” on Idaho Roadless Rule – the commission desired a bigger role in development of guidance papers, how it applies and work on these deeper conversation as an advisory board so that we are all on the same page.
  - If any commission member has any suggested edits for any of these guidance documents, please provide those individual edits to Brian Riggers and/or Sam Eaton as soon as you can.
  - Leanne clarified that these are internal, “guidance” papers that have been used for many years to assist FS employees. These are not open for public comment, they are simply being provided as requested by this commission.

## Presentation and Discussion of Papers

- 1) How to Identify and Delineate a CPZ
  - The CPZ for treating vegetation near communities is one half-mile around communities and then we need to analyze to determine if the additional one mile is valid.
  - Questions to ask: is there a community, is there a community at risk, determine boundary of at-risk community, and map the CPZ from the boundary using the protocol in this paper.
  - It was asked to have the term “excepted” versus “permissions” on several of these guidance documents with respect to treatments in CPZ.
    - ❖ Brian referenced several places in the IRR that discusses them in terms of exceptions and permissions.
  - There was a discussion on how we may have slowed implementation of projects near CPZ because we focus too much on roadless character, instead of meeting needs of the CPZ. Leanne provided additional feedback how the FS employees simply do the analysis

to inform the decision maker, and it is the line officer that takes into account all factors like analysis, social, economic and all factors into account for making a NEPA decision.

- ❖ It was asked how the District level makes decision or analysis on determining the CPZ. Leanne answered that it varies by forest, some District Rangers have checkpoint meetings with Forest Supervisors, and the decision is at the forest level. Other forests will bring questions to the level of Riggers and L. Marten, depending upon the issues raised. In summary, the goal is to keep the decision at the lowest level.
  - ❖ Barquin expressed similar concern from before, not adding additional chapters for IDT's at District levels of additional analysis. Leanne stated how there are many conversations involved at all levels of NEPA routinely and repetitive in an effort to reach all audiences such as IDT's.
  - ❖ Cope suggested to explain the differences between CPZ vs WUI as they are defined at a county level and on IRR websites.
  - ❖ Jonathan was seeking clarification on development sites, such as does that include FS bunkhouse defined as a CPZ? Brian said there isn't necessarily a clear guidance on every example of all situations considered, but the intent is centered around "community", not "structure".
- Comment from Brad Smith rarely does a project map ever demonstrate condition class 3, rather it is just a circle area. Brian agreed that we could definitely need to improve on that for a specific CPZ map and over time we will improve on defining ridges, steep slopes to address this concern.
    - D. Dinning countered that we only do this type of CPZ defining if there is a project.

## 2) How to Analyze Effects for Projects in IRA

- EADM – focus analyses on relevant issues, provide support to specialists not familiar with IRA and provide consistency across the region
- Describe relevant IRR prohibitions and exceptions
- Describe Forest Plan direction and existing conditions
- Conduct analysis for each of wilderness attributes
- Conduct analysis for each of roadless characteristics (9 total)
- Analyze cumulative effects
- Summarize regulatory consistency
- Conclusion – taking a "hard look" approach in the NEPA process

Discussion:

- There was varying discussion on if natural characteristics are in a CPZ and if restoration treatments occurred in a CPZ, it would have no effect on natural, roadless characteristics.

## 3) Use of Unauthorized Roads in IRA

- As discussed on a project from the Salmon-Challis NF, can we use an unauthorized road (U-road) in an IRA to do a veg treatment/activities?
- U-roads can't be used for MVU or maintained or converted to NSF roads
- "Authorized temp road" on prism may be allowed, depending upon theme and project
- MVU use on U-roads is prohibited excepted for "limited admin use by the FS," this can include project use in their current condition.
  - ❖ It was suggested to have some clarity on the guidance steps of this guidance document, namely step #1 and #4.
  - ❖ Decommissioning roads discussion: temp roads built in MA6 general forest, still need to be decommissioned within three years to minimize effects.

#### 4) NEPA for Unroaded Lands Contiguous to IRA

- How do we manage these areas neighboring IRA's that are unroaded?
- Roadless expanse includes both inventoried roadless area and unroaded lands contiguous to roadless area.
- Identify unroaded adjacent polygons, at least 100 acres and at least ½ mile span between roads
- Consider contributions to roadless characteristics
- Develop rationale for inclusion/exclusion
- Develop map of Roadless Expanse
- The rationale is to do analysis once, considering effects for both IRR and unroaded areas at the same time instead of doing them separate. This follows the EADM movement.
  - It was suggested to have the guidance document state to include an introductory paragraph that sets the context of every one of these guidance papers, such as "what does the Forest Plan state and why are you doing this project?"
  - Brian R. also shared that these documents are for NEPA analysis guidance papers.
  - Some regions refer to these unroaded areas as: Areas without roads=(AWOR)
  - Dan Dinning shared his concerns on lack of consistency between forests and regions on this matter. Leanne replied with some of the consistencies are due to different decision-makers and how they utilize the analysis provided, and decision-makers still have discretion in their decisions.

#### 5) NEPA Analysis of Potential for Future Recommended Wilderness

- Effects of some activities can last longer than planning cycle – must disclose effects to future opportunities
- Provide support and consistency across regions/rules
- There is confusion with forest planning vs. project planning on wilderness recommendations.
- Determine if area supports Wilderness Characteristics or if activity has potential to change those characteristics.
  - Barquin's interpretation, again has concerns that this guidance document appears as a planning document. He continues on how FACA rules state (Ch. 70) that it should not be forest planning, like re-doing our forest planning process?

He is concerned of the additional work this make cause and that for doing analysis on any project (such as on the IPNF with a new Forest Plan), that it appears they are supposed to find what could be future, potential wilderness.

- Leanne responded that in our analysis response can be as little as a few statements that we did our NEPA processes, and that it is not our intent of doing future planning efforts.
- Brian R. continued that we are not recommending wilderness and we are not going through the Wilderness Inventory, Evaluation, Assessment and Recommendation process required in Forest Planning, we are simply doing NEPA analysis and a disclosure stating any effects that could have potential effects for a substantial time period that could affect future opportunities for considering wilderness recommendations in the next forest planning cycle.
- Discussion – (Leanne) stated that we are required to make any disclosures on any impacts on a landscape, and because we disclosed it, it helps the decision maker complete an informed decision. Even if there are impacts that could be lasting, the decision maker can still move forward and document that those items were considered, but provide reasons why it's important to still move forward.

#### 6) Wilderness Recommendations and Forest Planning

- Confusion over whether themes limit Wilderness (WZ) consideration in Forest Planning
- Confusion over whether additional restrictions can be put on IRA's
- Confusion over whether Forest Plan language necessitates theme changes
- Under 2012 Planning Rule, all lands will be considered for WZ if under this rule
  - Current theme does not limit consideration.
  - Additional restrictions may be applied through Forest Plan – this does not change IRR.
  - Changing IRR themes is not necessary.
  - There was some concern that clarification is needed on how this is stated in the guidance document – how Forest Plans can override IRR, and there are inconsistencies with this interpretation. There was also discussion on how the commission has been here before with the 2012 letter signed by F. Kruger and IPNF Forest Plan Revision.
  - Brad Smith, suggested that this very issue will occur on the Nez-Clear NF Forest Plan Revision and we should get a handle of this issue. Suggests comment period in Federal Register, and dually do a notice to public and to notify we may amend rule to align the plan.

#### 7) Summary of Remaining Papers

- It was asked to have the 2012 letter(s) signed by Faye Kruger be distributed to the Commission for reference.

### Options/Desire for Summer Field Review

---

- Two possibilities for field trip include looking at mastification vs. commercial harvest, or go look at Oragrand in July?
- Another possibility is do a meeting in Grangeville and field trip concurrently. A quorum needs to be present.

### **Public Comments/Discussion**

#### **Feedback**

- Cope, would it be beneficial to do an Idaho Roadless Rule training at a SO level?
- Julie replied that we need more NEPA Analysis training for incorporating the IRR.
- Motion to adjourn. Seconded. Meeting adjourn at 4:20 p.m.

### **May 29, 2019**

#### **Feedback from Yesterday**

- Commission members appreciated the work put into the guidance papers

## Section II: Project Updates and New Projects

---

### Non-Timber, Roads or Minerals Small Projects

There is a table in your binder that is a Summary of New Small Projects. This template is intended to allow us to efficiently address projects that have no tree cutting, road construction/reconstruction, or mineral activities. All other projects will continue to use the full briefing paper format. Commissioners can request any project using this short format to be redone using the long format if there are additional questions or concerns that aren't addressed adequately. Following is a Summary of New Small Projects:

<b>Forest/IRA/Theme</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Sawtooth/Fifth Fork Rock Creek/PMTV; GFRG	Black Hills Prescribed Burn	Prescribed burn on approximately 6800 acres mountain brush/aspens/conifer	No slashing needed
Sawtooth/Numerous IRAs	Smoky Mountain Outfitter O&G Permit Reissuance	Re-issue permit for big game hunting	
Salmon-Challis/Numerous IRAs	Land-based O&G Authorizations	Re-issue permits for 10 land-based O&G operations	
Salmon-Challis/King Mountain/BCR	Pine Creek Fence	Construct 1.2 miles barbed wire fence	
Payette/Hells Canyon/Seven Devils Scenic/PMTV; FPSA	Eastern Oregon University Rec Event	Authorize outdoor student orientation program	
Payette/Patrick Butte/BCR	Hazard Creek Drift Fence	Reconstruct 0.2 miles of 4-wire let down fence	
Payette/Needles, Seecesh/BCR, PMTV, WLR	Payette Powder Guides Permit Reissuance	Re-issue SUP for guided backcountry ski and snowshoe trips.	Travel to yurts via snowmobile
Payette, Nez Perce Clearwater/Rapid River/PMTV, FPSA	Rapid River Prescribed Burning	Prescribed fire on approximately 7000 acres of grassland and mixed conifer stands	No slashing needed

### Discussion

---



- Rapid River Project, question if all was WLR area vs Primitive.
- Move to carry forward Sage Hen Project for review at next Commission Meeting. It was asked if there be a briefing paper forthcoming. Brian R stated yes one will be sent to all of Commission.
  - There was discussion about giving notice to the public regarding this project and the open meeting law in Idaho.
  - Brian R will research the timing needs of this project, and then the Commission will continue on with notice to the public and a conference call to proceed.

***The motion to move projects forward is complete, we will now proceed with Individual Projects.***

### Individual Projects by Forest:

Following are the generally larger, individual projects. These projects may or may not require the use of an exception under the Idaho Roadless Rule.

### Payette National Forest

<b>Project:</b> South Fork Restoration and Access Management Plan (RAMP)		
<b>District:</b> Krassel	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Secesh/Needles/Caton Lake/Cottontail Point/Pilot Peak	
<b>Status:</b> Scoping Completed 7/24/17; EA in prep – expected draft EA in Winter 2018; Objections Fall 2019, Decision Winter 2020	<b>Table Location:</b> Table 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> Caleb Zurstadt
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Determine the Minimum Road System and what routes will be open for public motor vehicle use. Improve watershed condition through road decommissioning, storm risk reduction, and maintenance of roads, trails, and dispersed use. Provide motorized ATV and motorcycle loop trails – this will likely include adding motorized trails in IRA. Provide camping and parking facilities and reduce dispersed recreation impacts. Tree cutting will be necessary for construction of new trails and parking/camping areas.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes:</b> <u>XX</u> <b>Exception:</b> 294.24(c)(1)(vii)	<b>No</b>
<b>Commission Discussion:</b>		
Q: Are there any maintenance of roads in IRA's? A: Correct, no maintenance		
Q: Late summer is when you expect the NEPA doc? A: We expect to have draft DN by late summer to start objection period. We are currently going through all of the comments		
Q: Are any trails open to full sized vehicles? A: Yes, there is one (0.3 mi in Cottontail Peak IRA)		

Q: Currently is that system road being converted?

A: It is currently a U-road that will be converted to a road. There is also a fire lookout on a high ridge, hunters commonly use this road and the spring. They are proposing to do a trail open to all users.

Q: Is it outside of CPZ?

A: yes

Q: Why don't you put that on your road inventory?

A: Is this an opportunity to redraw the boundary?

Q: Dinning, did the road predate the road as a roadless area?

A: Most likely, we couldn't track down any history of the road but it's been there a long time.

Q: What is the need for the road?

A: Recreation access to the spring and for the fire lookout to use spring as well.

Q: What was the method to bring it onto the road system

A: Modification of IRR, redraw boundary, do travel planning to put on NF road system

Discussion: is there a collaborative?

A: Yes, and they didn't provide any recommendation on this specific route

Q: Will this require a forest plan amendment?

A: Pg. 4 of briefing paper, Alt B – this is a nuance with our FP standards, we have no new road construction and in a previous project where we had U-roads converting to trails. Because of the effects of converting a road to a trail are similar, we wanted to be transparent and do a site-specific amendment for this standard to describe the effects.

Discussion: the IRR still remains in place, it would override the forest plan amendment. There was confusion on the definitions of what is a road is versus what is a trail and the different types of trails. There was concern that this is inconsistent with the use of the trail with respect to the IRR. It was suggest to drop the 0.3 miles and leave as-is, or do a rule modification, which might not be worth the effort due to a small size.

Reply from Payette: there will be no public motorized access for that 0.3 miles to the spring.

Q: Are there any resources at risk?

A: that is correct

Q: Is this a BCR?

A: Yes BCR, Primitive. Will have to get back to you on that.

Q: Where is the lookout in relation to the spring?

A: The lookout is the very end of the road, by Pilot Peak Road (pg. 9 of briefing document) The spring is another ¼ mile from the lookout. (Map on pg. 12 shows it better).

Discussion: You should square it up to the 2008 Letter from Harv and use of motorized vehicles, so it's not a back-door way to construct roads in IRA's. There was also comments that it could be administrative use with limited trips for FS utilizing it for the lookout.

Motion to put on record that the Commission believes the decision to convert an unauthorized road to a trail open for all users, including motorized, does not meet the IRR. Motion seconded and passed.

**Action Requested:** The Commission believes the proposal to convert an unauthorized road to a trail for all motorized use (TOV), does not meet the Idaho Roadless rule.

<b>Project:</b> Stibnite Gold		
<b>District:</b> Krassel	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Burnt Log, Black Lake, Meadow Creek, Caton Lake, Horse Heaven	
<b>Status:</b> Substantive changes to design and reclamation of on-site facilities in Alt. 2. DEIS 12/19; FEIS 8/20; ROD 12/20	<b>Table Location:</b> Table 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> Piper Goessel
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Approve a plan for occupancy and use of NFS lands for activities incident to mining. Activities would likely include expansion of Yellow Pine Pit, temporarily eliminating public access on NFSR 50-412, and development of mine access/by-pass route (referred to as the “Burntlog Route”). The Burntlog route would likely include re-alignment, new construction of connecting road, re-construction of the “old Thunder Mountain road”, and new construction down to the planned main mine gate near the head of the East Fork South Fork Salmon River. Approximately 14 miles of the planned route could be within IRAs. New segments of Burntlog Route would be decommissioned as part of reclamation plan, however soil-nail walls would be left on approximately 1.5 miles – these portions may not be fully recontoured. Approximately 500 acres of tree removal in mine waste and stockpile areas and 215 acres along utility and road corridors would occur. The company is also proposing a 2.6 mile motorized trail from Horse Heaven to Meadow Creek.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes - XX</b> <b>Exception:</b> _294.23(b)(iii); 294.24(c )(vii)_	<b>No</b> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b>		
<u>Discussion:</u> The Idaho Roadless Commission, concerns with construction of Burntlog route. Additional issue is access for the mine, are there other options of where that route can go?		
Q: Is the Alt 2 map consistent with the proposed changes coming?		
A: Yes, the only non-consistent area are the units outside of the IRR		
Q: The rule doesn’t address or allow for recreation access associated with mining?		
A: 1872 law does allow for reasonable mining access. Is building road part of the mining project, is it necessary mitigation for a new road for recreation access as well?		
Q: Why is this difficult to build road in a complex project, and why are we not going through the rule making process (updating road system, IRR boundary change, public access and updated maps)?		
Are they building new roads for public access?		
Q: Is it permissible in the IRR to build new roads, so we don’t have public access and mining access traveling on the same road?		
A: There could be a provision for public safety		
Q: Can the FS road construct roads in IRR under the 1872 mining law?		
A: The FS would not be constructing the route, ( <i>described Fed Reg 294.25b</i> ). The road would be on the landscape for several decades, will need a FP amendment to redefine temporary road. Will not be doing travel planning to consider it a permanent road or a roadless boundary modification.		
<u>Discussion:</u> the concern is the construction of a road, are we meeting the intent of the law that it can be built for recreation purposes because the mining claim will use the road already there.		
Motion to consider the Commission’s interests of 1872 mining law, Jim Caswell, Dave, Tim Kastning (Fulcher), Jonathan and Brian Riggers to provide a summary of this mining law, how it fits in the rule so that the commission make a more informed stand on this project.		

Tim Kastning comment, knows this area very well. He was a proponent of this road.

**Action Requested:** Small group will meet and report back to the Commission.

<b>Project:</b> Huckleberry Landscape Restoration Project		
<b>District:</b> Council	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Rapid River, Indian Creek, and Hells Canyon/Seven Devils IRAs	
<b>Status:</b> Scoping Sep 2016; new ID Team; Alternatives developed; currently in analysis; DEIS April 2019; FEIS Sep 2019; ROD Nov 2019	<b>Table Location:</b> Table 2 (NEW)	<b>Project Lead:</b> Mark Fox
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Vegetation treatments including non-commercial, commercial, meadow restoration, Whitebark pine restoration, fuel breaks and Rx burn. Soil treatments include road decommissioning and storage. Fisheries improvements include culvert replacements, road relocations and road graveling. Wildlife habitat and recreation improvements are included.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes – Exception:</b> 294.24(a), 294.24(b)	<b>No</b>
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Discussion: Suggested them to change wording in rules referenced, prohibited vs. permitted Q: No commercial harvest right? A: Yes, just some prescribed natural burning where we do thinning, near whitebark pine.		
<b>Action Requested:</b>		

<b>Project:</b> Big Creek Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project		
<b>District:</b> Council	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Big Creek Fringe, Placer Creek, Smith Creek, Cottontail Point/Pilot Peak, and Secesh.	
<b>Status:</b> Scoping Beginning July 26, 2018	<b>Table Location:</b> Table 2 (NEW)	<b>Project Lead:</b> Justin Pappani, Joshua Simpson
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> create and maintain an area of reduced fuel loading and continuity and wildfire risk on NFS lands. Approximately 2,250 acres of mechanical treatments consisting of commercial and non-commercial thinning, using tractor, jammer or skyline systems, or mastication. Approximately 550 acres of non-commercial thinning within Riparian Conservation Areas using hand treatments and pile burning. Approximately 7,800 acres of natural fuel prescribed fire burn blocks. Based on Scoping Comments we've added 1,084 of mechanical thinning, split out 939 acres of mastication or hand treatment, and 522 acres of hand thinning within harvest EAs.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes – Exception:</b> 294.24(B)(1)(iii), 294.24(c)(1)(i)	<b>No</b>

**Commission Discussion:**

Q: Is the temp road on your map actually on the roadless?

A: It's close to boundary and access is minimal

Q: In BCR, are you doing mechanical treatments?

A: Potential for some mechanical in both BCR and Primitive units.

Q: Some on our concerns fuels reduction in unoccupied parcels of private land, what is the exception of the rule you are applying?

A: That is in our purposed action and draft EA, 294.24(b) and 294.24(c) were referenced. If it borders Rx fire, we'd need to do thinning along those roads. Currently if we had to do structure protection or defend the mine, we could not properly defend it in its current state.

Q: If there is no CPZ on this unoccupied private parcel and we are asked to defend it for fire, are these rule exceptions referenced correctly? Not sure a mining claim meets an at-risk community definition.

A: I may need to research it further for you and what exceptions we are meeting, specifically to unoccupied land parcels and if these private owners are doing their own fuels reduction.

Q: The map on figure 2, there is a process to make a buffer in the CPZ of a 1 ½ instead of just ½ mile.

A: The county designates that it should be 1 ½ buffer. Brian Riggers will work with you to proceed.

**Action Requested:** Brian Riggers will follow-up with team on the process of using the full 1 ½ mile buffer around a CPZ.

**Motion to bring projects forward to the next meeting. Motion Seconded. Motion passed.**

## Caribou-Targhee National Forest

<b>Project:</b> Dairy Syncline Mine, Reclamation Plan and Land Exchange		
<b>District:</b> Soda Springs	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Huckleberry Basin	
<b>Status:</b> DEIS Nov 2018; 90 day comment; FEIS Jul 2019; ROD Oct 2019	<b>Table Location:</b> Table 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> David Alderman (BLM)
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> JR Simplot Company has submitted plans for a proposed open pit phosphate mine at the Dairy Syncline Phosphate Lease Area under the 1920 Mineral Leasing Act. Lease #28115 was issued 12/27/2000 and Lease #0258 was issued 10/25/1949. A portion of the proposed mine would occur within the Huckleberry Basin IRA, both on and off existing Federal mineral leases. Approximately 0.5 miles of new road construction (0.1 on lease and 0.4 off lease) would occur for mine access. Surface use and occupancy would also occur (949 acres on lease and 350 acres off lease). A land exchange is proposed to accommodate a tailings pond necessary for mine development (tailings ponds cannot be authorized on NFS lands (36 CFR 251.54(e)(1)(ix)). The land exchange would include approximately 640 acres – a modification to the Idaho Roadless Rule would be required (alternatives that do not exchange land within the IRA and an option which exchanges 160 acres within the IRA are also being evaluated in the EIS).		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes Exception:</b> <u>294.25(e)(1)</u>	<b>No</b> _____

**Commission Discussion:**

Q: Is the proposal to do a modification of the IRR, part of the FEIS or is separate?

A: We can't make that decision in the ROD, it requires its own decision and comment period. We do however hope to run those two comment periods concurrently.

**Action Requested:****Project:** East Palisades Hazardous Fuels Reduction**District:** Palisades**Roadless Area:** Palisades**Status:** No updates. Initial planning phase. 2018 field season collected additional data. Scoping fall 2019.**Table Location:** Table 2**Project Lead:** Deb Flowers**Link to Project Briefing Paper:**

**Project Summary:** Hazardous fuels reduction on 3435 acres within IRA. Approximately 3000 acres are prescribed burn. Fire lines constructed in WLR theme under "incidental to" exception on an estimated 187 acres. Group selection (regen) on about 167 acres (no reserve trees) and thinning on 224 acres, both in BCR. Up to 3 miles of temporary road construction in BCR. Requires easement through private property for access.

**Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?**Yes X

**Exception:** 294.23(b)(2)(i-iii);  
294.23(d)(2); 294.24(a)(2);  
294.24(c)(i, ii, v)

No \_\_\_\_\_

**Commission Discussion:**

Q: Did they utilize the CPZ guidance paper?

A: Yes we used it and did look at what looks like beyond the ½ mile of the CPZ

Q: Are there any roads being build?

A: Yes, see page 5

Q: Still trying to understand that CPZ boundary, and that the boundary contradicts the county

A: The area some steep ridges in this area

**Discussion:** suggestion to sustain steep slopes can affect fire management, and that the 1 ½ buffer is necessary

**Action Requested:** It was suggested the IDT further explain to sustain how steep slopes can affect fire management near the CPZ, and that the 1 ½ buffer is necessary

**Project:** Bridge Creek Forest Management Plan**District:** Soda Springs**Roadless Area:** Caribou City and Snow Creek**Status:** initial planning phase Scoping- Fall 2019; Decision expected early 2020**Table Location:****Project Lead:** Kevin Norrgard**Link to Project Briefing Paper:**

**Project Summary:** treat approximately 11,000 acres over next 10 to 15 years in the BCFMP project area. The project area may be split into several smaller projects that have different focuses (e.g. burning vs mechanical) as we move through the planning process. It is proposed that 9,000 to 10,000

of the treatments take place within one of the two IRAs. There are two general vegetation treatments being proposed within IRA. The treatments have been designed to address the purpose and need, to improve the overall condition of the forested ecosystem.

<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes - XX</b>  <b>Exception:</b> 294.23(2); 294.24 (1) (c) (i, iv, v, viii)	<b>No</b> _____
--	---	-----------------

**Commission Discussion:**  
 Q: Is the temp road you are using, are you intended on decommissioning it?  
 A: Yes, it is currently a U-road. After the project, it will be decommissioned.  
**Action Requested:**

**Project: Ephraim Aspen**

<b>District:</b> Montpelier	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Gannett-Spring Creek	
<b>Status:</b> Preparing to Scope	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Mike Duncan <b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>

**Project Summary:** treat approximately 1700 acres of forested vegetation to regenerate aspen and mountain brush communities. Approximately 350 acres will be slashed before broadcast burning and 450 acres will have conifer understory hand felled with some jackpot burning. There would also be 5 acres of mastication along a fence to prevent burning the fence.

<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes - XX</b>  <b>Exception:</b> 294.24(c)(1)(iv); 294.24 (d)	<b>No</b> _____
--	---	-----------------

**Commission Discussion:**  
 Q:  
 A:  
**Action Requested:**

**Project: Flatiron Wildlife Habitat Improvement**

<b>District:</b> Palisades	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Bear Creek	
<b>Status:</b> Scoping July 2019	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Martell Gibbons <b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>

**Project Summary:** Treat approximately 1500 acres to improve wildlife habitat – approximately 400 acres are in the IRA. Commercial thin (to average 50 square feet basal area) approximately 158 acres in BCR theme and slash/burn approximately 250 acres (mostly BCR – 31 acres are FPSA). Slashing will include junipers up to 20” (diameter root collar) and conifers up to 16” DBH. A 10-foot wide saw line with 1-2 foot scratch line will be constructed in IRA for fireline. Approximately ½ mile of temporary road construction is proposed.

<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes - XX</b>	<b>No</b> _____
--	-----------------	-----------------

	<b>Exception:</b> 294.23(2); 294.24 (1) (c) (i, ii, iv)	
<b>Commission Discussion:</b>		
Q: In this case are they referring to CPZ as WUI?		
A: No		
Q: Is most of that temp road outside of the CPZ?		
A: Most of it is outside of the CPZ, but ½ mile section will be in the roadless area		
<b>Action Requested:</b>		

**Motion to bring all 5 projects forward. Motion seconded. Motion passed.**

**Discussion on motion:**

## Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest

<b>Project:</b> Forest Plan Revision		
<b>District:</b> All	<b>Roadless Area:</b> All	
<b>Status:</b>	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Zach Peterson
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Framed up Alternatives after a series of Collaboration meetings that were well attended. We've framed Alternatives that we will be carrying into analysis – range of "No Additional Recommended Wilderness" to a "Substantial Amount of Wilderness" and the Roadless Areas have remained static, no changes. We've been working with groups to resolve specific issues and concerns, with the largest concern being how Recommended Wilderness Areas would affect over-snow motorized and trail maintenance. Alternatives have different geographic areas and within those alternatives there are differences in how what would be non-conforming uses if they went to recommended wilderness and what would happen. We also have the Roadless Rule language and how that governs the management, recognizing that FPR doesn't supersede the IRR.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> _____ <b>Exception:</b> _____	<b>No</b> <u><b>X</b></u> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b>		
Q:		
A:		
<b>Action Requested:</b>		

<b>Project:</b> Dixie Comstock		
<b>District:</b> Red River	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Gospel Hump, Gospel Hump adjacent to Wilderness	
<b>Status:</b>	<b>Table Location:</b> 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> Jennie Fischer
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>



<b>Project Summary:</b> Previously briefed – public meetings and additional analysis has been completed and a suggested alternative has been received from CBC. There is internal discussion continuing on this project and it may change over the next few months. Communities in and around Dixie are being considered, with potential actions being reviewed. There are multiple authorities within the Rule and different delegated authorities.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>X</u> <b>Exception:</b> <u>294.23; 294.24</u>	<b>No</b> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> <u>Suggestion:</u> to collaborate with community and collaboratives early and often.		
<b>Action Requested:</b>		

<b>Project:</b> Hisloc Fuels Reduction		
<b>District:</b> Lochsa-Powell	<b>Roadless Area:</b> North Lochsa Slope; Lochsa Face	
<b>Status:</b> Preparing to Scope	<b>Table Location:</b> 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> Sara Daugherty
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Proposes 522 of vegetation treatment, 356 of which is in IRA. Treatment includes cutting and slashing of fuels, pile and/or broadcast burning within FPSA theme (271 acres) and broadcast burn only on 119 acres in PMTV theme. No roads. Does not require exception for timber.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> _____ <b>Exception:</b> _____	<b>No</b> <u>X</u> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: Portion within Primitive is only Rx burning A: Yes, the burning will only be near the historic buildings. The FPSA is near the Wild and Scenic Areas.		
<b>Action Requested:</b>		

<b>Project:</b> North Fork Ponderosa Pine Restoration		
<b>District:</b> North Fork	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Pot Mountain; Mallard-Larkins	
<b>Status:</b> Preparing to Scope	<b>Table Location:</b> 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> Mike Pruss
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Proposes cutting small diameter ladder fuels on 96 acres. Fuels will be piled and burned prior to broadcast burn. Approximately 2000 acres of broadcast burn within IRA. No roads.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>X</u> <b>Exception:</b> <u>294.24( c)(1)(iii); 294.24( c)(1)(iv)</u>	<b>No</b> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: What is timing?		

A: In our small NEPA process, possibly as early as July 2019 and implement by late summer. The burning is dictated by smoke clearance and weather. It is not gone out for scoping yet, we wanted the IRR Commission feedback first. We are still awaiting Heritage component.

Discussion: will this be improving winter range habitat?

A: The purpose is wildlife-centric, our fire officials and wildlife specialists have worked jointly.

**Action Requested:**

**One project not on agenda was briefly presented, the first named “North Fork Aspen 2” doing some aspen stand restoration. No action was taken on this briefing. The forest can continue to move forward on the project to meet necessary timelines.**

- If these added projects need to be signed before the fall 2019 ID Roadless meeting, then we can add them to our conference call and continue on with our official processes of public notification.
- It was noted that Region 1 has recently implemented specific timelines to complete EIS’s, EA’s and CE’s within 9 months or less.

**Motion to bring 3 projects forward, excluding No. Fork Ponderosa Pine Restoration**

**Discussion on motion:**

- **Second for discussion: CE’s could be held up and need a decision soon.**
- **Leave HisLoc, however it hasn’t been scoped.**
- **The following projects will move forward: all of them but No. Fork Ponderosa Pine Restoration**

## Idaho Panhandle National Forests

<b>Project:</b> Buckskin Saddle Integrated Restoration		
<b>District:</b> Sandpoint	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Schafer Peak; Packsaddle	
<b>Status:</b> Proposed Action 5/19; Draft Decision 2/20	<b>Table Location:</b> 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> Dave Cobb
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Within the IRA, there are approximately 215 acres of shelterwood and 117 acres of improvement cuts proposed. All yarding is ground based to existing roads. An additional 331 acres of slashing for whitebark pine restoration is proposed. Road 2711 would be reconstructed – this road bisects the two IRAs but is outside IRA. Approximately 1977 acres of prescribed burning would occur within IRAs. 1.7 miles of hiking trail would be reconstructed for mountain bikes and 18.8 miles of motorized trail within IRA would be reconstructed.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>Exception:</b> <u>  294.24I(1)(l,iv,v)  </u>	<b>No</b> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b>		

Q: Is there anyone that knows anywhere in Idaho where general forest would be in the IRA?

A: The forest plan designation states MA6, general forest

Q: Natural fuel burning, is that the same as prescribed burning.....same terminology?

A: it is prescribed fire, with a different ignition

Q: Did the CPZ go beyond 1 ½ mile?

A: We would have to get back to you, and see if there is one area that was slightly outside

Q: How to address regen harvest?

A: We are retaining some aspen, and large trees due to dying off Doug Fir and Grand Fir

Q: Are those motorized trails near Schaefer Peak on MVU map?

A: Yes

Q: What is the Improvement Cut?

A: This commercial thinning of Grand Fir and Doug Fir

A: Pruning is thinning to whitebark pine

Q: PFC has been involved, are you coordinating with Clark Fork Delta Restoration?

A: I'm not sure if we have or have needed to coordinate with them.

Q: Impressed with size of the project, how long has had it taken to develop the proposal?

A: We've been gathering field data since couple summers. We've been getting together as a team for at least a year, and has been super focused since January. We've had an open house with the community of Clark Fork, ID and may have another public meeting also in Clark Fork in the coming weeks to finalize our purposed actions based on their comments.

Q: In terms of complexity, are their other projects on the IPNF that were similar?

A: Not at the time

**Action Requested:** (1) Cobb will get back commission on the specific size of the buffer outside of CPZ

***Motion to bring project forward. Motion seconded. Motion approved.***

***Discussion on motion:***

# Salmon-Challis National Forest

<b>Project:</b> Forest Plan Revision		
<b>District:</b> All	<b>Roadless Area:</b> All	
<b>Status:</b> Moving into plan component analysis	<b>Table Location:</b> 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> Josh Milligan
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Develop new Forest Plan for 4.3 million acre combined Salmon NF and Challis NF based on 2012 Planning Rule.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> _____ <b>Exception:</b> _____	<b>No</b> <u><b>X</b></u> _____
<p><b>Commission Discussion:</b>            Q: What is the timeline?            A: Late fall, early winter for the purposed action:            Q: are you taking questions:            A: yes, that is when we'll start the scoping process. We are currently working with the public with various collaboration.</p>		
<b>Action Requested:</b>		

<b>Project:</b> Salmon Challis Conifer Encroachment		
<b>District:</b> All	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Numerous	
<b>Status:</b> NEPA	<b>Table Location:</b> 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> Jeff Huntman
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> authorize approximately 142,000 acres of conifer removal in sagebrush step within IRAs, incorporating 22 roadless areas and 2 themes – BCR and Primitive. Hand labor, use of existing roads. Girdling, lop and scatter or if heavy fuels it would be thin, pile and burn. Firewood collection may be allowed from existing roads. No temporary roads, reconstruction, or maintenance.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u><b>X</b></u> _____ <b>Exception:</b> 294.24; 294.26	<b>No</b> _____
<p><b>Commission Discussion:</b>            Q: Are these Sage Grouse areas?            A: Yes, our emphasis was for expanding encroachment areas?            Q: Are you treating in Primitive? It's premature to not have maps.            A: We can get those maps to you if they didn't make the package, they are large files.            Q: Timber cutting in primitive, and in BCR for personal admin uses            A: We added that to acknowledge that some public get firewood there            Q: For the exceptions you listed, double check those exceptions            Q: Are you removing large Doug Fir?</p>		

A: This is mostly all removal done by hand, so we would have to rescale our project if we have to a large amount by hand.

Q: Are you doing an EIS or EA?

A: We are doing a CE

Discussion: We have not seen a CE of this magnitude in size, but that is a NEPA decision not roadless.

Q: Did you have comments based on size and ability to maintain roadless characteristics

A: We will factor that in when we do our analysis.

Q: Roads in project area are system roads, no U-roads?

A: No, we are planning all system roads for travel. We do have level 1 roads that are drivable, which in many cases are a stored road.

Q: Did you disclose in scoping you'd be using a CE?

A: Generally as a forest we preliminary state that what tool our project may fall under, a CE in this case.

**Action Requested:** (1) IDT is to double check their exceptions listed

### **Project:** Bear Creek Stream Restoration

**District:** Lost River

**Roadless Area:** White Knob

**Status:** NEPA; Decision expected August 2019.

**Table Location:**

**Project Lead:** Bart Gamett

**Link to Project Briefing Paper:**

**Project Summary:** Construct 1.1 miles of new road (15-foot wide; level 2) along Bear Creek, inside IRA (0.9 miles) but outside floodplain. Remove 1.0 mile of existing road (including 1 bridge and 1 culvert)(same design standard as proposed road) that is currently outside IRA but in the floodplain. Also, remove fence, corrals and other structures associated with cow camp at confluence of Bear Creek and Death Canyon Creek.

**Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?**

**Yes**   X  

**Exception:** 294.23( b)(1)(i, iv,v); 294.24( c)(1)(vii)

**No** \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Commission Discussion:**

Q: Is the cow camp being used?

A: Yes, my understanding is that we'll find a new home for those facilities

Q: is that part of the Copper Basin?

A: If it's not right in, it's very close

Q: Is the road construction consistent with the rule?

A: Yes

Q: What is the access to the cow camp?

A: Copper Basin is the main road, and has a high need of interest with multiple users.

**Action Requested:**

<b>Project:</b> Annie Rooney Salvage		
<b>District:</b> Challis-Yankee Fork	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Camas Creek	
<b>Status:</b> Beginning Analysis	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Erin Pierson
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Salvage harvest (from 2018 fire) on approximately 75 acres of dead and imminently dead Douglas fir. Approximately 0.3 miles of temporary road would be used (using an existing unauthorized road prism) and decommissioned following harvest. A commercial timber sale in the area was sold in 1986; road work was also completed at that time.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>Exception:</b> 294.24( c)(1)(viii); 294.23 (d); 294.23(e) <u>  </u>	<b>No</b> <u>          </u>
<b>Commission Discussion:</b>		
Q: Can you talk about the current road conditions that extends southern boundary of IRR area?		
A: One road on north side is within in the IRA it is a level 2 road, the one on the south is not in IRR. We also have a couple of unauthorized roads in the IRA.		
Q: Can you explain the table of altered portions of roadless area, how much of area is altered?		
A: 75 acres in the IRR, is in the 1986 footprint of old timber sale and still visible.		
Q: Why did we put this area in an IRR if the timber harvest is still so visible?		
A: This was an area that has been discussed about doing a boundary modification due the visible harvest scars. The boundary modifications need to occur during forest plan revision.		
Q: What makes this project different, what was done on the landscape that we have looked at other projects that had skid marks, stumps, etc.?		
<u>Discussion:</u> several members talked about no need to talk about roadless character within a CPZ, should be secondary. Are we analyzing these consistently and effectively in all projects? The rule allows these activities within the CPZ. This project was substantially altered <i>before</i> , was it intended to be designated as IRR?		
A: No exemption for timber harvest or salvage unless you are in an area that is altered, is our interpretation. In 2009 we looked into a “substantial exception,” and we didn’t move forward because we had other exceptions to look at.		
Q: what was the prescription in 1986?		
A: it was a shelterwood cut		
<u>Discussion:</u> there was much discussion and debate on if this instance was a substantial alteration or not. Also added was that this commission can simply advise the decision maker.		
Q: In the table, 41 acres of the project area is natural-appearing.....how do we say it’s “substantially altered?”		
A: Exceptions to ROS, and what the overall landscape should look like. We are stating that in those cases of retention, they are not meeting their current ROS. ( <i>We really focused on 34 acres</i> ).		
A: It isn’t in the jurisdiction for the commission to designate substantial altered or not.		
<u>Discussion:</u> Much discussion about never being here before, and that the timing of this project is as soon as next week because it is a salvage sale and is only waiting upon SHPO.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ It was suggested to have a field trip very soon with the collaborative</li> <li>➤ If the rule makes it permissible, the decision-maker can make that stand.</li> <li>➤ Some members are worried about setting a precedence that in one project we are maintaining roadless character and in a project like this, we are saying a shelterwood logged area 33 years ago doesn’t meet road characters and should be removed from IRR?</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ It would have been beneficial to have more pictures and information provided of the substantial alteration. The team has some pictures, but they are similar to the picture provided in briefing.</li> <li>➤ It was suggested to discuss at the next meeting on providing a guidance document to the Governor’s Office on their interpretation of what substantial alteration so we can be consistent on how this is applied on IRA’s. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Jonathan would like to see briefing papers and additional instances of projects of other examples used to distinguish what “substantial” looks like. Leanne responded that it truly varies on a case-by-case basis.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ There is disagreement on assessment with whether it affects roadless characteristics.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Action Requested:</b> Jonathan will put into writing his request of clarification of setting precedence to the Commission co-chairs.</p>

<b>Project:</b> Williams Farm Bill		
<b>District:</b> Salmon-Cobalt	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Deep Creek, Phelan, Perreau Creek	
<b>Status:</b> Developing Proposed Action	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Nathan Meyer
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Currently includes approximately 1400 acres of harvest in IRA, along with 885 acres of prescribed burns to manage forest structure and species composition. Approximately 3 miles of unauthorized roads and roads that have previously been decommissioned and converted to trails would be used, and an additional 2 miles of temporary new road would be constructed.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>Exception:</b> <u>  </u> 294.24( c)(1); <u>  </u> 294.24(d)	<b>No</b> <u>          </u>
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> <u>Discussion:</u> This area west of Salmon, this won’t be our only project like this. Jessie Creek will be another. Q: In the general forest, is it consistent of the road decommissioning with the IRR? A: Yes, we plan to rehab the temp roads back to their existing state prior to project.		
<b>Action Requested:</b>		

<b>Project:</b> Bonanza Exploration Drilling		
<b>District:</b> Salmon-Cobalt	<b>Roadless Area:</b> West Panther Creek	
<b>Status:</b> Scoping completed	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Julie Hopkins
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Helicopter drilling on pads constructed from dimensional lumber on historic roadbeds. Six drillpads and 9 holes are proposed. Incidental camp facilities for temp workers.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>          </u> <b>Exception:</b> <u>  </u>	<b>No</b> <u>  X  </u>
<b>Commission Discussion:</b>		

Q:
A:
<b>Action Requested:</b>

<b>Project: Colson Cobalt #2 Mineral Exploration</b>		
<b>District:</b> Salmon-Cobalt	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Long Tom	
<b>Status:</b> Completing Analysis	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Julie Hopkins <b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Exploration drilling on 11 pads. Access by temp roads and helicopter (including approximately 0.9 miles new temp construction).		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> _____ <b>Exception:</b> _____	<b>No</b> ___ <b>X</b> ___
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: Are these mining projects all gold? A: These are for copper and cobalt Q: Are all the green triangles on the map, helipads? A: most of the 11 pads are accessed by helicopter, the rest via temp roads Q: On page 3 of the map, there are FPSA is Wild Scenic Area. Those 2 green triangles closest to the river, are they in IRR? A: Yes Q: It appears that there are over 20 triangle pads A: It could be that they listed all helicopter possible drilling sites.		
<b>Action Requested:</b> It helps to have legible maps, especially with the helipads reference		

<b>Project: USGS Borah Trench Seismic Research</b>		
<b>District:</b> Challis-Yankee Fork; Lost River	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Pahsimeroi	
<b>Status:</b> Internal scoping complete; awaiting cultural clearance	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Julie Hopkins <b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Dig four trenches at two sites and take soil samples, reclaim. Access via existing road and overland travel (approximately 1 mile total).		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> _____ <b>Exception:</b> _____	<b>No</b> ___ <b>X</b> ___
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: Why can't they drill? A: I can't answer that Q: There isn't any road access needed? A: correct Q: There is no tree cutting with trenches or access?		



A: no, there are no trees in there  
**Action Requested:** Include something in the restoration of the excavator tract

<b>Project:</b> Daughtery Gulch Vegetation		
<b>District:</b> Challis-Yankee Fork	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Squaw Creek	
<b>Status:</b> Decision expected 9/19; CE	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Riley Rhoades
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Prescribed burning on approximately 1000 acres. No pre-treatment. Minor amount of trees may need to be cut for fireline or Rx control measures.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>Exception:</b> <u>  294.24( c)(1)(vii)  </u>	<b>No</b> <u>          </u>
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: A:		
<b>Action Requested:</b>		

<b>Project:</b> Sheep Creek Vegetation Improvement		
<b>District:</b> North Fork	<b>Roadless Area:</b> West Big Hole	
<b>Status:</b> Developing Proposed Action	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Ken Gebhardt
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Commercial and non-commercial harvest, burning, etc. to improve vegetation. Temporary roads would likely be constructed. Very general description at this point		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>Exception:</b> <u>  Numerous  </u>	<b>No</b> <u>          </u>
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: Is harvest outside of IRA, what is ballpark? A: Mostly 80% outside of IRA, so there could be a 200 acres or so in IRR Q: FPSA, is that the Wild and Scenic areas? A: It's the Continental Divide Trail and Lewis & Clark Nat'l Scenic trail Q: Scoping now? A: Decision hoping for January 2020 <u>Discussion:</u> in 1960's there were some ground fuels leftover from helicopter harvest that the team wants to address.		
<b>Action Requested:</b> (1) Send restrictions on Continental Divide Trail and Lewis & Clark Nat'l Scenic trail visual quality objectives of this project to Commission, requested by D. Dinning		

<b>Project:</b> Wino Basin Vegetation	
<b>District:</b> Challis-Yankee Fork	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Pahsimeroi Mountain

<b>Status:</b> Decision expected 9/19; CE	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Riley Rhoades <b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Prescribed burning on approximately 1000 acres. No pre-treatment. Minor amount of trees may need to be cut for fireline or Rx control measures.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>Exception:</b> <u>  294.24( c)(1)(vii)  </u>	<b>No</b> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: A:		
<b>Action Requested:</b>		

<b>Project:</b> Bayhorse		
<b>District:</b> Challis-Yankee Fork	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Squaw Creek	
<b>Status:</b> Developing Proposed Action	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> David Morris <b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Commercial and non-commercial harvest, burning, etc. to improve vegetation. Temporary roads would likely be constructed. Very general description at this point		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>Exception:</b> <u>  Numerous  </u>	<b>No</b> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: Is this a CPZ project? What is treatment in IRR? A: It will not be a harvest in that area, it could be hand thinning and fire in some areas to improve defensible space. Q: So the exception would be incidental, like slashing before Rx burning A: Closer to town is pile and burning, implement Rx burning toward Squaw Creek side. Q: What about significant risk, outside the CPZ? A: No we haven't clarified exactly all of our opportunities		
<b>Action Requested:</b>		

**Motion to bring 7 of 12 projects forward:**

**Discussion on motion:**

- **Projects moving forward include:** Forest Plan Revision, Salmon-Chalis Conifer, Andy Rooney outcome, Sheep Creek Veg, Bay Horse, Williams Farm Bill, Colson Cobalt
- **Motion seconded. Motion passed.**

### Public Comments/Discussion

## Feedback

- Nez-Clear NF, Lowell insect/disease treatment project within an IRA. Bill Higgins requested that this project should have put in front of the ID Roadless Commission and wants to know the rationale. Brian Riggers will follow-up on what the decision was.
  - Sharing this information wasn't a requirement, it was more of a request for information sharing.
  - When units get pulled out of a project, we as a commission need to understand the rationale of why units are dropped.
- Jonathan suggested to establish a working group on how many acres we have analyzed within our 10<sup>th</sup> year of the IRR? What actually happens on the ground?
- Agenda item, include spreadsheet/table from Brian and discuss this working group option at the next meeting.
- Next meeting date, that planning will be Brian Riggers working with schedules of R1 and R4 Regional Forester calendars, and work with co-chairs on a final date. Leanne Marten will have two new Deputy Regional Foresters by then.

***Motion to adjourn***

***Second. Motion passed.***

***Meeting adjourned 1:26 p.m.***