



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

October 27-28, 2020

Virtual Meeting – Hosted by OSC via ZOOM

Introductions

Commission Members present: Alan Prouty, Alex Irby, Bill Higgins, Bob Cope, Brad Gilbert, Dan Dinning, Jim Caswell, Billy Barquin, Michael Gibson, Peter Stegner, Elt Hasbrouck, Dale Harris.

Forest Service: Brian Riggers, Amy Barker, Jim DeMaagd, Neal Cox, Andy Brunelle, Ron Tipton, Julie Schaefer, Keith Lannom, Catherine Blackwell, Chris Moyer, Teresa Mclung, Sara Daugherty, Zach Schull, Karen Ritland.

Idaho State: John Richards, Jace Hogg, Tara Ball (IDFG).

Others: Mark Kilmer, Mike Hanna, Mitch Silvers.

SECTION I: Welcome and Business Meeting – October 27

Welcome and Introductions:

- Welcome, did introductions. 39 present (some FS people in and out). See above.

Review/Approve 10/1-2 and 12/19 2020 notes:

- Motion to approve 10/1 and 12/19 notes. Seconded. Passed.

IRC Statute Update:

- Legislature had 5 things to achieve with amendment. Revised duties, make it clear that OSC are to provide staff support for IRC, provide for membership changes, revise provisions regarding meetings, provide for annual report. Law became effective July 1. Transitioned from 15 members to 12. Rick Johnson resigned, Dale stepped aside. Everyone else re-appointed by term. Also approved funding for operations -- \$15,000. There is also a new State Coordinator
-

position with OSC – Jace Hogg. OSC has a webpage – on OSC site under planning tab – go to Commission. Dale and Jim are continuing to work with John Richards on annual report to house and senate resource committees. They will send it out to commissioners for review prior to finalizing. Dale will stay on as ex-officio to help Jim with institutional knowledge of the rule and application of the rule. Mike Hanna acknowledged Dale’s involvement and the appreciation of Jim Risch with all the work and friendship from Dale over the years. With change in membership there is a need for election of Officers. John Richards followed up on Jim’s discussion re: OSC role and said they are here to support in any way possible. Brad Gilbert also added his praise to Dale for the years of great work and help over the years from RACNAC through development of rule and specifically his efforts with State of Idaho coordination. Jonathan also added his support and thanks on behalf of all Idaho Conservation League members.

Election of Officers:

- Open with call for nominations for Chair. Cope nominated Jim Caswell. Jonathan seconded. No other nominations. Vote was unanimous. Jim is Chair.
- Vice Chair. Alan nominated Michael Gibson. Brad Seconded. No other nominations. Vote was unanimous. Michael is Vice-Chair.

Add-in: Jim introduced Keith to discuss change in position for Roadless Coordinator. Keith said the last year at Orogrande Dave and Keith had a discussion about where responsibilities lie. Dave asked Keith if R1 would be interested in R4 having the coordination lead. Keith said, “sure, we’d like that”. He made the agreement at that time. Then R4 hired Amy Barker and Chris Moyer to do the work. Chris Moyer introduced himself. Amy introduced herself. Jim has had one conference call with Amy and will do more to get up to speed. Jonathan asked if there was any coordination between FS and IRC on the switch in positions. Nobody answered.

Update on IRA Guidance Papers:

- Brian went through guidance papers on sharepoint. All commissioners want to share this information. Michael suggested sharing through Office 365. Commission will discuss how to make this accessible. Jim said one of the concerns he has had is that it takes a lot more time and energy than people realize to stay up to speed with this and keep the information accurate and he’s concerned people may not realize the amount of work it takes.

Update on MOU and Litigation:

- MOU was signed in early May 2020. Updates the old and outlines roles of State and FS. Litigation update to be provided by Doug Herzog during Caribou-Targhee project presentations.

Update on Activities Tracking Spreadsheet:

- Brian showed project tracking spreadsheet and current numbers. Jonathan asked why numbers in columns didn’t add up to total. Brian will check and get back to commission. Jonathan discussed the estimate in FEIS of how much timber harvest might be accomplished under the

rule – the FEIS used assumptions for analysis of effects that there would be approximately 1000 acres per year. He reiterated that we need to be aware of activities proposed and not exceeding that. Brian checked on numbers – “Hazardous Fuels Outside CPZ” and “TESP” didn’t copy add function – they added 453 and 50 acres respectively. There was also a 0 left off Salmon Challis project changing number from 256 acres from 2562 acres. Brian made the corrections.

Section II: Project Updates and New Projects

Non-Timber, Roads or Minerals Small Projects

The following Table provides a summary of new small projects that have ***no tree cutting, road construction/reconstruction, or mineral activities***. Projects that include any of these activities are addressed individually below the table.

<i>Forest/IRA/Theme</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Activity</i>	<i>Notes</i>
Caribou-Targhee/Paris Peak/BCR	Bloomington Corrals	Build corrals on disturbed site; < 2 acres	Already disturbed from campground
Salmon-Challis/Jureano/BCR	Trail Creek Trail Reroute	Reroute 0.5 miles of single track trail around private property	

Discussion

- Brian presented. No discussion.

Senator Risch called in and had the following to share:

He wanted to say first and foremost thanks to Dale Harris for everything he’s done for the State of Idaho. He’s been there since the beginning with a great attitude and cooperation. He said Dale and Jim were very influential in getting the Rule done and the people of the state owe a debt of gratitude for what they’ve done. Jim said the way this process was done collaboratively was a huge success and has led to many movements following it since then. He’s had people from all over tell him how they’ve copied what was done with the Idaho Rule – like the Idaho Sage Grouse Initiative. Work was groundbreaking and again, thank you. Also, thanks to everyone else that has been on the commission. The only thing he would add is that it’s only as good as our ability to keep it working and following the intent and that we’re doing well at it and it keeps a lot of people out of court and saves a lot of money. We need to be diligent and keep making it useful. Jim Caswell said thanks to Jim for stopping in.

Michael Gibson wanted to let people know that TU just launched their Legacy Report that includes a big section on the Idaho Roadless Rule. He’ll put it up on the screen for people to access.

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.

(Since we were running ahead of schedule, Payette folks weren't on yet so Caribou Targhee presented first – see notes below).

Payette National Forest

Project: South Fork Restoration and Access Management Plan (RAMP)		
District: Krassel	Roadless Area: Secesh/Needles/Caton Lake/Cottontail Point/Pilot Peak	
Status: Scoping Completed 7/24/17; Draft EA published 04/19. Draft DN received 9 objections. ORO sent back for re-issue of DN.	Table Location: Table 2	Project Lead: Caleb Zurstadt
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
<p>Project Summary: 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 – decommissioning of 143 miles of unauthorized roads is being considered; 9.2 miles of non-motorized trail is being converted to motorized trail in recommended Wilderness; 11.5 miles of Trail 076 is being reconstructed; 0.3 miles of unauthorized road is being converted to Trail Open to All Vehicles (note: the 0.3 mile TOV was dropped in EA, but still exists in briefing paper). Provide camping and parking facilities and reduce dispersed recreation impacts. Tree cutting will be necessary for construction of new trails and parking/camping areas. Nine objections were received and ORO sent back for re-issue of DN.</p> <p>September-October 2020 Draft DN2 presents Alternative D as preferred for the road decommissioning and Little Buckhorn ATV trail system. A final Decision for 14 other actions will be the same as presented in the original December 2019 Draft DN, except No Action on the South Fork Road FRTA easement (Valley County formally withdrew request). Concurrent issuance of two Final DN's anticipated this winter upon completion of ESA consultation on the project in its entirety. Pilot Peak Spring Trail decision is deferred.</p>		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes: <u>XX</u> Exception: 294.24(c)(1)(vii)	No
<p>Commission Discussion: Caleb Zurstadt presented the project. Last update was October 2019. Most of the discussion then was around the TOV and at that time they had planned to choose the no action alternative to leave that 0.2 miles out of the proposal. Now they are going to split the decisions so they could have the 14 “non-controversial” actions into one and go ahead with the final and they have the no action for Pilot Peak Spring Access Road in this package, so the Pilot access is out. The remaining only includes a few actions in IRA and they are currently working on that. So, the bottom line is it's pretty much done without changing the access trail to a TOV. Jim asked if the Pilot Spring is</p>		

on hold and Caleb said yes. He said it will still be there and the public will continue to drive it unless the district decides to block it. Elt said he was just there and it's a scary road to get there. Caleb said the dashed line is a non-motorized trail that has become a de facto trailhead for the outfitter and others so they are trying to figure a long-term solution for a turn around. Dan asked if the little spur could just be designated. The road is cherry-stemmed already, but nobody knows why the spur was not included. They think it might be that the FS built the road to get access for water for the Lookout. Jim suggested if it's that important to have the road they should consider doing a boundary change to include it as a cherry stem and make it not roadless anymore.

Action Requested: None

Project: Stibnite Gold

District: Krassel	Roadless Area: Burnt Log, Black Lake, Meadow Creek, Caton Lake, Horse Heaven	
--------------------------	---	--

Status: Substantive changes to design and reclamation of on-site facilities in Alt. 2. DEIS 12/19; FEIS expected May 2021	Table Location: Table 2	Project Lead: Kevin Knesek
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:

Project Summary: 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. Four action alternatives were developed and presented to the Commission in May 2019; however, the proponent proposed substantive changes to the design and reclamation of on-site facilities and support facilities to be considered as a modified Proposed Action, also in May 2019. As a result, a third revision of DEIS Chapter 2 was required. The Forest issued the Draft EIS in August, 2020 and expects to issue the Final ROD in May 2021.

Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes - XX Exception: _294.23(b)(iii); 294.24(c)(vii)___	No _____
--	---	-----------------

Commission Discussion: Sitka Pence gave presentation. Public comment closes tomorrow. Have over 8000 comments so far. Draft ROD expected May 2021. Final expected September 2021. Sitka doesn't think there are any substantive comments on roadless. Jim had some questions: As far as he understands Burnt Log road is being proposed and on track to allow some level of public use. Sitka said that's true and it's still classified as a temporary road. Jim has a concern over the situation around the proposed OHV trail. The commission has never been given a clear answer as to why they are proposing this. Why are they on a track to develop a trail to handle all vehicles. This is specifically

about the TOV. Jennifer Purvine addressed. This is the Meadow Creek Lookout OHV trail. That's as an alternative in Alternative 1. Elt added to this that when Stibnite was started the EFSF road was going to be closed so people in Yellow Pine weren't going to be able to go where they wanted. So they asked for this route. Jennifer said that was a component of alternative 1 – to address the fact that the public (Yellow Pine) wouldn't have easy access through the pit. It was included in alternative 2, but she said that was an oversight and it will get taken out of alternative 2 (because this alternative provides for access through the mine site). Jim said he is very concerned about this from the standpoint of allowing all vehicles, because it's essentially a road and that isn't allowed under the rule. Jonathan said the DEIS explains it well – it includes 3 miles of new construction as a road and TOV that's in the document. That's a road and it's not allowed. This is a back door way to get a road in that isn't allowed. Sitka said maybe this is something that needs to be discussed with leadership team on the Payette. It's in both alternatives. Elt asked if it's a UTV trail now or a road? Jennifer said she doesn't think there is anything there now – it's new construction. Jim said he just wants to know if we're really talking about a travelway that will accommodate all traffic because that is a road. Elt said he feels that you can take your ATV up the ATV trail and if you need to take a truck then you can take the long way around. Jim quoted the road definition in the Rule. He said that shouldn't accommodate all the things needed to drive larger vehicles up there. Jim thinks it's very disingenuous and not honest with the public. If you are planning an all weather road here, then you shouldn't have to worry about shared use on the Burntlog road. Jennifer said it's a component of one alternative and the maps are all in the packet. Dan Dinning asked if this is supposed to replace the public access to the Stibnite site. Jennifer reiterated that it was to allow a more northerly access to the east, so people wouldn't have to drive all the way south to go on Burntlog route. Dan asked if this was constructed would it be temporary? Jennifer said yes, it would be decommissioned after the mine is decommissioned – approximately 20 years – and it would not be part of the Forest Travel Plan. Jonathan asked where to find it on website. Jennifer said there is a link to StoryMap on the website. Jonathan recommended putting a hold on this and deciding later if they need to share concerns with the Governor regarding the construction of a trail open to all vehicles and that it doesn't meet the Idaho Roadless Rule. Jonathan also asked about the definition of a temporary road – By constructing Burntlog how is the FS able to allow public use of the road. Sitka addressed this and there was considerable discussion – the subject was left with considerable differences in opinion. Cope asked for more clarification on what exactly applies to the Roadless Rule and what applies to the 1872 mining law. Sitka offered to sit down with Brian and Amy to pull the briefing information that has already been put together and provide more clarity to the commission. Jim seconded that he would like this clarity. Jonathan had a final question – if the Burntlog route was constructed and open for public use wouldn't that need to be on the Forest Travel Plan. Jennifer said that no, it wouldn't be on the Forest Travel Map. Elt asked if the commission has the authority to say they don't want a full size vehicle route there. Jim said, no, all they can do is advise the governor and then the governor decides if he wants to pursue that. Michael said the briefing paper needs to be changed to use the correct exception. He also asked if 292.24(b) and then if (e) “only other options” is relevant – i.e., is 294.24(b) a hard stop? Jim said yes, that's about how it's been interpreted in the past. Alan asked if the Burntlog route was the main route to the mine. Sitka said it depends on the alternative.

Action Requested: Sitka will provide clarification

Project: Huckleberry Landscape Restoration Project

District: Council	Roadless Area: Rapid River, Indian Creek, and Hells Canyon/Seven Devils IRAs	
Status: Scoping Sep 2016; new ID Team; Alternatives developed; currently in analysis; DEIS April 2019; FEIS Dec 2019; ROD Feb 2020	Table Location: Table 2 (NEW)	Project Lead: Mark Fox
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Decision has been signed. Implementation update.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes – Exception: 294.24(a), 294.24(b)	No
Commission Discussion: Mark Fox called in to say the decision has been signed. No questions from Commission.		
Action Requested: None		

Project: Big Creek Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project		
District: Krassel	Roadless Area: Big Creek Fringe, Placer Creek, Smith Creek, Cottontail Point/Pilot Peak, and Secesh.	
Status: Scoping Beginning July 26, 2018	Table Location: Table 2 (NEW)	Project Lead: Patrick Schon
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: create and maintain an area of reduced fuel loading and continuity and wildfire risk on NFS lands. New alternative developed that dropped some IRA based on comments and lack of helicopter feasibility. Contains about 485 acres; 216 of this is commercial and the rest is thin, scatter and pile. CPZ was refined from the 1.5 mile circle to definable features on the ground. Treatment units around borders of private property with no infrastructure are still part of proposal.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes – Exception: 294.24(B)(1)(iii), 294.24(c)(1)(i)	No
Commission Discussion: Patrick Schon had to be in the field so Piper is presenting. There are no changes except that the BA has been submitted to FWS and NOAA. Jim asked if decision was expected this winter. Piper said yes. Jonathan asked if road construction was proposed. Laural said yes, there was a small section of temp road proposed for some of the stuff behind Edwardsburg. It is less than a mile. Jonathan asked where that is on the map. Laural said it is on the maps but just hard to see at this scale. It's on the SE corner near the private property section around the east side of Edwardsburg. But she can't see it on briefing packet either. She said the actual roads won't be finalized until implementation when timber gets out there and decides where they want to build the roads. Jonathan asked if there was fuel treatment proposed around uninhabited mining claims. The answer is yes and the reason is that the private property is under FS fire protection so if they might possibly build a structure in the future then we would have firefighters in there. Jonathan asked if these areas were classified as CPZ and the answer was that they were classified as ingress/egress. Jenny Blake came on and said they are now going to drop the temp road across Lick Creek because it's not profitable. That's the road that is in roadless so now it's out.		

Action Requested: None.

Project: East Fork South Fork RAMP

District: Krassel	Roadless Area: Caton Lake, Horse Heaven, Sugar Mountain, Meadow Creek, Secesh.	
Status: Initiated August 2019. Field reviews of Big Creek – Yellow Pine Collaborative proposal ongoing.	Table Location: Table 2 (NEW)	Project Lead: Joshua Simpson
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Determine Minimum Road System and open routes, improve watershed condition, provide ATV and motorcycle opportunities while minimizing resource impacts, and reduce dispersed camping and parking impacts. Includes Stibnite area. Proposed action currently being developed and expected by spring meeting.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception? Unknown	Yes – Exception:	No
Commission Discussion: Piper presented. This is the third of three areas they were directed to address from litigation on the Travel Plan. Right now they are working to verify the transportation analysis. This covers everything outside of Big Creek RAMP and South Fork RAMP. No questions from Commission		
Action Requested: None.		

Project: Rapid River Travel Management

District: New Meadows	Roadless Area: Rapid River.	
Status: Initiated Summer 2020, scoping is out.	Table Location: Table 2 (NEW)	Project Lead: Rita Bennett
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Reconcile differences between management direction for motorized and mechanized equipment within the WSR river corridor. Proposal is to classify all trails within Wild river corridor as non-motorized and non-mechanized and to conduct further analysis on trails outside the corridor but within IRA. A small number of trees may need to be cut for trail work.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes – Exception: 294.24(a)(2)	No
Commission Discussion: Jonathan said there are concerns to have some of the motorized and mechanized trails stopping at boundary and how to enforce. Michael also commented on the importance of Rapid River to anadromous fish and making sure it's protected. As far as commission is concerned, Rapid River IRA is WLR that isn't already designated as Recommended Wilderness – so he feels there is a discussion to be had about what effect re-opening these trails has on precluding future recommendation of this area in the future. Dan asked how many trails were in existence prior to		

Rapid River IRA designation. Erin thinks nearly all were. Erin said the comprehensive management plan didn't recognize the existing motorized use either. She said the strategy for managing the motorized is to identify turn arounds, but that enforcement is likely to be an issue.

Action Requested: None.

Motion to bring Stibnite, Big Creek and Rapid River projects forward to the next meeting. Motion Seconded. Motion passed.

Caribou-Targhee National Forest

Project: Dairy Syncline Mine, Reclamation Plan and Land Exchange		
District: Soda Springs	Roadless Area: Huckleberry Basin	
Status: DEIS Nov 2018; 90 day comment; FEIS Jul 2019; Final FS and BLM RODs signed in April 2020.	Table Location: Table 2	Project Lead: David Alderman (BLM)
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
<p>Project Summary: 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). The initial roadless boundary modification process is complete.</p>		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes Exception: <u>294.25(e)(1)</u>	No _____
<p>Commission Discussion: Alan asked if the boundary modification for the 640 acre process is done. Doug said it's a separate process and it goes through WO and has already been approved – only step left is to do the GIS work to update the maps.</p>		
Action Requested: None		

Project: East Palisades Hazardous Fuels Reduction		
District: Palisades	Roadless Area: Palisades	
	Table Location: Table 2	Project Lead: Deb Flowers

Status: No updates. Initial planning phase. 2018 field season collected additional data. Scoping now expected in 2021		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 <u> X </u> Exception: <u> </u> 294.23(b)(2)(i-iii); 294.23(d)(2); 294.24(a)(2); 294.24(c)(i, ii, v) <u> </u>	No <u> </u>
Commission Discussion: Billy asked about the history of this project and whether the CPZ was properly identified on this project. Doug said not much progress has been made on identification of CPZ for this project. Billy said that’s great because there’s a concern for CPZ creep if we’re including structures that aren’t really structures, etc. then we loose credibility. Jonathan said there was a CPZ in the first briefing and there were units in the outer zone and it’s not okay to just default to the outer zone without doing a site specific analysis for why it’s included. Elt asked how the \$300,000 grant to Bonneville County was used – was it successful? How much did they treat? Nobody had an answer for this. Elt will contact county commissioners and pass on to the commission.		
Action Requested: Elt to follow up with \$\$\$. Doug to follow up on CPZ.		

Project: Strawberry Forest Management Project		
District: Montpelier	Roadless Area: Williams Creek, Liberty Creek, Mink Creek	
Status: Scoping November 2019. EA and Draft DN released June 2020. Decision expected November 2020.	Table Location:	Project Lead: Michael Duncan Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Prescribed fire and jackpot burn on about 1250 acres within IRA as part of a larger project to reduce tree density, create new age-class, and reduce fuels to move the landscape closer to the desired conditions in the RFP. Some tree cutting would be necessary for site prep for burns. None of the treatments are in CPZ. No road construction or reconstruction within IRA		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes – <u> XX </u> Exception: <u> </u> 294.24 (1) (c) (vii)	No <u> </u>
Commission Discussion: Jonathan asked if any objection points related to roadless? Doug said no.		
Action Requested: None.		

Project: Graham Hollow Juniper Treatment		
District: Montpelier	Roadless Area: ?	
Status: Preparing to scope. Expect to implement in spring 2020.	Table Location:	Project Lead: Chase Scheffler
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Lop and scatter juniper on approximately 1382 acres. Using hand tools. Access is from existing roads and trails. No commercial.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes - XX Exception: 294.24 (c) (1) (vii)	No _____
Commission Discussion: Alex said he is happy to see that they aren't planning on burning too much because mule deer habitat has suffered from that on the C-T in the past.		
Action Requested: None		

Project: North Fork Tin Cup Stream Restoration		
District: Soda Springs	Roadless Area: Caribou City	
Status: Signed in 2020; begin implementation spring 2021	Table Location:	Project Lead: Lee Mabey
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Install posts and logs in North Tincup Creek to try to trap sediment and raise the streambed elevation to restore floodplain accessibility. Project will span approximately 5.4 miles and will utilize trees from IRA adjacent to the stream for the structures.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes - XX Exception: 294.24(c)(1)(vii)	No _____
Commission Discussion: Elt asked if beaver were already there or if they needed to be introduced? Doug said they are already there. Elt also asked if they were working with IDFG to restrict trapping for a few years so it could be successful. Doug said he didn't know if they had been but assumed they were coordinating.		
Action Requested: None.		

Project: South Valley Hazardous Fuels Reduction		
District: Teton Basin	Roadless Area: Garns Mountain and Palisades	
Status: Scoping July 2019. Decision expected December 2019	Table Location:	Project Lead: Deb Flowers
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Commercial thin (to average 50 square feet basal area) approximately 57 acres in BCR theme and 554 acres in FPSA theme (Wild and Scenic River Corridor) to reduce fuels and restore aspen stands. Prescribe burn approximately 2361 acres – conifers will be cut and scattered where necessary to facilitate prescribed burn. Up to 15 miles of fireline (30-200 feet wide) may be		

constructed within the IRA to contain the burn. Trees may need to be cut to construct the fireline. Approximately 2.5 miles of temporary road construction may be needed to access commercial thin units.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes – X X Exception: 294.23(2)(l,ii,iii); 294.24 (1) (c) (i, ii, iii)	No _____
Commission Discussion: Cope asked what the Douglas Fir beetle situation was. Billy said he drove through there a couple of years ago and it's not bad. Doug said he wasn't sure. Jonathan asked about past fuels treatment in the CPZ. Doug wasn't sure about the history but thought there probably was past activity and he could check in with district staff.		
Action Requested: Doug to check with district on past harvest in the CPZ and how they determined the CPZ. Also, what's proposed in the future and how does it all fit together.		

Motion to bring East Palisades, Graham Hollow and South Valley back to next meeting for update. Motion seconded. Motion passed.

Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest

Project: Clear Creek Integrated Restoration		
District: Moose Creek	Roadless Area: Clear Creek	
Status: FSEIS ready to publish	Table Location: 2	Project Lead: Karen Ritland
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Prescribed burn approximately 1400 acres within Clear Creek IRA as part of larger fuels and veg treatment project.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes _____ Exception: _	No __X__
Commission Discussion: No discussion		
Action Requested: None.		

Project: Forest Plan Revision		
District: All	Roadless Area: All	
Status: Preparing FEIS	Table Location:	Project Lead: Zach Peterson
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Analyzed four action alternatives in DEIS. Released in December 2019. A fifth alternative is being analyzed in FEIS. Preferred alternative to be announced in the future. 22,000		

comments were received on DEIS. 18% of these were related to IRA. FEIS release planned for spring 2021. Decision planned for fall 2021.

Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes _____ Exception: _____	No <u>X</u> _____
--	---	---------------------------------

Commission Discussion: Megan Lucas presented for Zach. DEIS went out in December. Thousands of comments – about 750 specific to Roadless. Going through and preparing FEIS. Plan to have out in spring (March/April). Dan asked about the process to ensure the final alternative does not conflict with the rule. Megan said she wasn't sure but the Forest Supervisor would be involved. She asked if there was a specific item they should be paying attention to? Dan said he didn't have anything in mind in particular. Jim referenced the 2012 letter from the Panhandle that guides people through to avoid developing things in the plan that are conflicting with the rule. Jonathan asked if there are issues with incompatibility with modifications that would specifically impact roadless. Megan said a lot of the controversy was around winter motorized use and what is/is not allowed in recommended wilderness and roadless areas. Alex said he sees a weakness in that during Forest Planning is the best time to make modifications to IRAs and it wasn't done. Cope said he doesn't see that the plan has a lot of room to adapt under adaptive management philosophy. Megan said part of that is because we're just looking at the roadless part in this briefing. If they do make any changes in the future it would require a Forest Plan amendment. Megan said they have specific objectives for doing restoration (harvest) in IRAs, but not much flexibility in terms of what's recommended for Wilderness.

Action Requested: None.

Project: Dixie Comstock

District: Red River	Roadless Area: Gospel Hump, Gospel Hump adjacent to Wilderness	
----------------------------	---	--

Status: .	Table Location: 2	Project Lead: Jennie Fischer
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:

Project Summary: IRC conducted field review in 2018 – see additional notes. Since then, 3 acres of aspen treatment have been dropped and hand thinning along Trail 220 was dropped because both activities were outside CPZ. Permanent parking has been added to project at the end of road 222D1 for first responders turn around and parking area. The parking area is inside Gospel Hump IRA and inside .5 mile CPZ.

Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes <u>X</u> _____ Exception: <u>294.23; 294.24</u>	No _____
--	---	-----------------

Commission Discussion: Items that have changed since last meeting are on the briefing paper. Jonathan asked if the only timber cutting was inside CPZs. Jennie said yes, that's where we stopped on field trip. Alex asked about the blowout ridge area and Jennie said yes, we changed that all to prescribed burning. Alan asked about the schedule for implementation. Jennie thinks the decision will be done within 2 years. Alan suggested that the commission should discuss how they can get some of these community protection projects sped up. He said he thinks the intent of the roadless rule was to make it so some of these projects could happen and how can the commission facilitate that? Jonathan asked about the activity along the road – Jennie said this is all outside IRA. Bill Higgins asked about the experience the forest has in this forest type – is the burning really possible? Jennie

said it will be based on when we have natural ignition and not needing to be in full suppression mode in a lot of the areas. Alex said he questions whether this will work. Dan asked if the prescribed burn area was originally planned for mechanical treatment. Jennie said yes. Dan asked why. Jennie said it was a combination of how much temporary road was required and what level of decision we wanted to make, as well as fuels people saying we could meet the objective with fire. Tom McLeod said he could address from fuel perspective. He said we could use existing trail, create black line in the fall off the ridge before weather comes in, then build off it with helicopters the next year, utilizing the natural features of the ridges.

Action Requested: None.

Project: Dead Laundry

District: North Fork		Roadless Area: Moose Mountain	
Status: Scoping occurred March 2020. Decision expected spring 2021		Table Location: 2	Project Lead: Andrew Skowlund
			Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Prescribed burning on about 1350 acres to improve forest health and reduce fuel loadings. Site prep and helicopter landing in IRA were dropped. Several comments related to IRA were received in scoping – see briefing paper.			
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes <u> X </u>	No _____	
	Exception: _294.24(c)(i)		
Commission Discussion: Andrew Skowlund updated. Jonathan said he appreciates the inclusion of scoping comments in the briefing paper. He also asked if N. Fk Ponderosa Pine and N. Fk. Aspen had roadless. They have already been briefed. He asked if Magruder project has been briefed. That one hasn't come before commission and Zo said the district is still deciding what to do. Dan asked if the "Our Approach" document referenced in the briefing was the one that we discussed in Boulder and Billy said yes it was.			
Action Requested: None.			

Project: South Fork Clearwater Mineral POOs

District: Red River, Salmon River		Roadless Area: Lick Point, West Meadow Creek, Dixie Summit-Nut Hill, West Fork Crooked River, Silver Creek-Pilot Knob	
Status: Preparing to Scope		Table Location: 2	Project Lead: Karen Ritland
			Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Process and approve 16 Plans of Operation for mining in the South Fork Clearwater River drainage. None of the proposed projects is currently in an IRA. Proposal is to address future POOs (which may be in IRAs) by developing procedures to approve the maximum number of operations possible under NEPA and then conduct further analysis only on projects outside the scope of the existing NEPA. Future proposals may include road construction or incidental timber			

harvest in IRAs associated with the POOs. Unit also proposes to map, prioritize, and close AML features, some of which may be in IRAs, that aren't identified yet.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes _____ Exception: _	No <u>X</u> _____
Commission Discussion: Jonathan asked if it was feasible that a programmatic could approve mineral exploration in roadless at some future date without disclosing where and when it might affect roadless? Quintin said the programmatic was designed to address mom and pop use and it really isn't designed to address larger things like mineral claims in roadless. They think they'll remove the opportunity to approve POOs in IRAs from the proposal. Brad asked if that meant there would need to be additional NEPA once a proposal is made? Quinten said if a project was substantially similar it wouldn't require new NEPA.		
Action Requested: None.		

Project: Green Horse		
District: Moose Creek	Roadless Area: O'Hara Falls and West Meadow Creek	
Status: Preparing EA and Draft DN for objections	Table Location: 2	Project Lead: Sara Daugherty
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Roadside hazard tree removal on approximately 178 acres along 9.4 miles of road. Intermediate harvest of dead and dying trees up to 150 feet from the road. Harvest by tractor and skyline. Approximately 268 acres of prescribed burning is also proposed. Road reconstruction is proposed on 1.2 miles of road within IRAs (road 2116 and road 2103).		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes <u>X</u> _____ Exception: _294.2(c)(1)(vii)	No _____
Commission Discussion: Zach Sweringon from IDFG said they have been involved with Forest Service to design these projects to increase forage for elk and moose. Alex commented that it was good IDFG and FS are working together. Bill asked if there was timber harvest in roadless. The briefing paper says there is 180 acres in roadless. Jonathan wanted to confirm that all the hazard tree removal was along open roads. Zo answered and said there are 3.4 miles of open road and 6 miles of closed or administrative use roads. Jonathan asked what the rationale for harvest along closed roads was – is it really a hazard if the roads are closed to the public. Zo said it was because of hazards to administrative use.		
Action Requested: None.		

Project: Lost Holly Prescribed Burn		
District: Lochsa-Powell	Roadless Area: North Lochsa Slope	
Status: Developing Proposed Action	Table Location: 2	Project Lead: Sara Daugherty
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Prescribed burn to restore successional stage in improve wildlife habitat.		

Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes _____ Exception: _	No ___X___
Commission Discussion: Brandon Knapton presented. Jim asked about timeframe. Brandon said decision is expected by end of 2021.		
Action Requested: None.		

Project: West Meadow Fuels		
District: Moose Creek and Red River	Roadless Area: West Meadow Creek	
Status: Developing Proposed Action	Table Location: 2	Project Lead: Sara Daughtery
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Prescribed burn to restore fire and create defensible space around forest infrastructure.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes _____ Exception:	No ___X___
Commission Discussion: No questions.		
Action Requested: None.		

Project: Race Cow		
District: Salmon River	Roadless Area: Salmon Face, Klopton Creek – Corral Creek	
Status: Preliminary Proposed Action developed; Preparing to Scope Fall 2020	Table Location: 2	Project Lead: Jennie Fischer, NEPA Team Leader
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Timber harvest on 775 acres along lower Salmon River and Snake River breaks and canyons. Of the 775 acres, 70 acres is commercial, intermediate harvest. The remainder is roadside fuel breaks (up to 300 feet from roads) and removal of encroaching conifers on grassland habitats. Approximately 6400 acres of prescribed burning is included.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes ___X___ Exception: _294.24(c)(i, iv, v)	No _____
Commission Discussion: Project is in development so is changing. Billy asked where the CPZ is. Jennie said they are along the river private property. Billy asked what they are going around – are there really structures there? Jennie said they are straight from Idaho Roadless Rule EIS. She said no activity is proposed in the CPZs. Jonathan asked if the roadside treatments are along roads that are open or closed to the public. Jennie said it's 28 acres and the roads are open to public travel. Alex said he sees regeneration along with harvest – what about regen in burn areas. He asked what are plans for weed control, especially after burns. Jeff Shinn said that's always a concern and that's why they kept the size of burn blocks small. And they have an active weed management program and they are very aware of it and it's part of their normal program of work. So it sounds like there shouldn't be any weeds there because they have it under control.		
Action Requested: None.		

Motion to bring Forest Plan Revision, South Fork Clearwater Mineral POOs, Race Cow, Green Horse and Dixie Comstock projects back to spring meeting for update. Motion Seconded and Passed.

Begin Day 2. All commissioners that were present yesterday are present today, except Bill Higgins who will call in later.

Jim introduced Mike Edmundson – interim Administrator of OSC. Mike has been with OSC for several years and has been working with fisheries. He’ll be here to help commission do their job. Jace Hogg is point man for OSC and will work directly with Jim. Excited about being part of this.

Idaho Panhandle National Forests

Project: Buckskin Saddle Integrated Restoration		
District: Sandpoint	Roadless Area: Schafer Peak; Packsaddle	
Status: Currently in objection period	Table Location: 2	Project Lead: Doug Nishek
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
<p>Project Summary: 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. Project specific CPZ was delineated and provided in this BP. Scoping complete – local residents generally supportive of project; other concerns/comments expressed were: opposition to commercial harvest in IRAs, would like to see motorized trails in IRA removed, would like to see expansion of IRA and “rewild” existing IRA, project would adversely affect wilderness characteristics, EIS is necessary.</p>		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes <u> X </u> Exception: <u> 294.24I(1)(I,iv,v) </u>	No _____
<p>Commission Discussion: Doug Nishek presented. Developing the site specific CPZ early was the big step that really helped them in project development in terms of roadless. The team really appreciated the involvement of roadless coordinator and roadless commission on this. Jonathan asked to walk through map to give a sense of which units are in roadless. Is there any shelterwood in roadless? Doug said yes, the light green on the map shows it. Jonathan asked for Brian’s interpretation of whether we have covered the objection point on analyzing effects to future wilderness recommendation. Brian said that it is his opinion that the effects on future wilderness recommendation need to be addressed and it is not sufficient to just say “we decided not to recommend this area in Forest Plan Revision so there are no effects to future wilderness recommendation”. The reason is that plan revision cycles are 15 years and effects on veg with regeneration type treatments last 30-40 years, so it will affect our recommendation in the next round</p>		

of revision and we need to acknowledge that in the NEPA. Dan Dinning asked if there was a case on this on the Clearwater. Jim asked Brian and Brian said that there was a case on the Caribou Targhee recently where we won because we did do the analysis and we followed the guidance paper on this topic that we developed over the last few years.

Action Requested: None.

Project: Westside

District: Bonners Ferry	Roadless Area: Selkirk, Kootenai Peak, White Mountain	
Status: Scoping occurred early 2020. Draft EA for comment expected fall 2020.	Table Location:	Project Lead: Jennifer Anderson
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Project proposes approximately 1300 acres of timber harvest and 4 miles of road construction in IRA. Approximately 1100 acres of timber harvest is commercial. Approximately 6.6 miles of new trail construction is proposed including 1.4 miles in the Selkirk IRA Wildland Recreation theme – trail construction would require harvest in the WLR theme under the “incidental to other activities not prohibited” exception. Approximately 1500 acres of prescribed burning in IRAs is also proposed. Four scoping comments addressed IRA and roadless contiguous to IRA.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes <u>XX</u> Exception: 294.23(c); 294.24(a)(1)(2); 294.24(c)(1)(ii, iv, v), 294.24(d)	No _____

Commission Discussion: Jennifer Anderson presented. They have added roads to the project – it was 18 miles and now it’s 30 miles. About 4 miles of that is in IRA. Jonathan asked about WUI vs. CPZ. The briefing paper talks about WUI and he’s wondering why we didn’t do CPZ instead. Jennifer said they looked at it from a “community at risk” standpoint and concluded that the CPZ wouldn’t go far enough. They didn’t think they could justify calling it a CPZ, especially in the White mountain area and so they didn’t want to go that way. Cope clarified that it’s in GFRG and CPZ harvest exception doesn’t apply to that. Jennifer said there is some BCR and they didn’t think they could justify calling it CPZ. Cope asked if they are decommissioning roads or just gating. Jennifer said they are decommissioning. Cope said they will need them in the future. Jennifer and Kevin said they agree but they couldn’t keep them on the system under CFLRP project and so that’s why they have to decommission, but they expect they will re-open them when they need them in the future. Kevin said they are also coordinating with BLM on some adjacent land work and also the refuge. Jonathan pointed out the provisions of the roadless rule do require full obliteration, even in the GFRG theme. Billy said he was involved with KVRI and he’s concerned about defining CPZ as something that it really isn’t – “CPZ creep”. He appreciates that the forest isn’t trying to call it CPZ when it really isn’t. Jim asked if the forest considered the issue of “significant risk” in the White Mountain home area. Jennifer said that they did consider that trying to find a way to justify the project. But it’s downslope through private timber company land that has already been cut so there aren’t any fuels and so there really isn’t a significant risk. Jonathan asked about some of the units that are adjacent to the Myrtle Creek project and if the unit prescriptions are the same as those they did in Myrtle? Jennifer said yes, they would be about the same. They want to tie all of those units together and then apply fire to give them a buffer for fire moving in from the south. Michael said this lies within the north priority land stewardship area. Dan said he is involved with KVRI and he wanted to commend the group for the proposal they came up with. Alex said he agrees with the analysis and wants to thank everyone.

Jennifer said we are done with scoping and received 13 comment letters – 3 were specific to roadless. They are expecting release of draft DN in Jan/Feb 2021.

Action Requested: None.

Motion to bring both Buckskin and Westside forward. Motion seconded. Motion approved.

Sawtooth National Forest

Project: Adam's Gulch Trail		
District: Ketchum	Roadless Area: Smoky Mountain	
Status: Moving into plan component analysis	Table Location: 2	Project Lead: Zach Schull
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Increase 0.5 miles of mountain bike trail (8-foot clearing width; 48-inch trail width) in IRA Primitive Theme using mini excavator. No tree removal required.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes _____ Exception: _____	No <u> X </u> _____
Commission Discussion: Brad asked why this wasn't in the short form format. Brian said briefing paper was already done and it's in PMTV and so he thought the commission might want to hear.		
Action Requested: None. b		

Salmon-Challis National Forest

Project: Forest Plan Revision		
District: All	Roadless Area: All	
Status: Moving into plan component analysis	Table Location: 2	Project Lead: Josh Milligan
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Develop new Forest Plans for 4.3 million acre combined Salmon NF and Challis NF based on 2012 Planning Rule. After feedback from public, looking at possibly developing two forest plans instead of one combined.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes _____ Exception: _____	No <u> X </u> _____
Commission Discussion: Jeff said they're making decision on how to move forward. Cope asked where we are going with it in terms of collaborative effort. Jeff said it's basically sit back and wait until forest decides if they will keep existing plan, develop each plan separately, or do FP		

amendments. Cope asked if it was a discussion with Chris French. Chris Moyer said Chuck is looking through comments and wants to have a conversation before Thanksgiving. Dan asked about OSC Federal Lands Coordinator – is that available to assist counties in developing the Forest Plans? John said they don't really have full details about what Jace will be doing, but they often share comments and expect to have an open dialogue. Dan said this was part of his expectation when we first talked about the position. John said he definitely thinks they can provide continuity and will be talking about it more.

Action Requested: None.

Project: Annie Rooney Salvage

District: Challis-Yankee Fork	Roadless Area: Camas Creek	
Status: Decision Signed July 2019. Currently under contract.	Table Location:	Project Lead: Erin Pierson Link to Project Briefing Paper:

Project Summary: 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.

Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes <u> X </u> Exception: <u> </u> 294.24(c)(1)(viii); 294.23 (d); 294.23(e) <u> </u>	No <u> </u>
--	--	-----------------------------

Commission Discussion: Jeff reiterated that there is no exception that allows for salvage under IRR so they used the “substantially altered” exception. Contract has been awarded but haven't begun logging yet. No questions from commission.

Action Requested: None.

Project: Williams Farm Bill

District: Salmon-Cobalt	Roadless Area: Deep Creek, Phelan, Perreau Creek	
Status: Decision memo signed January 2020. Not under contract yet.	Table Location:	Project Lead: Nathan Meyer Link to Project Briefing Paper:

Project Summary: 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.

Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes <u> X </u> Exception: <u> </u> 294.24(c)(1); 294.24(d)	No <u> </u>
--	--	-----------------------------

Commission Discussion: Combining this project with another Farm Bill project that didn't get a bid in hopes of getting a package bid. Dan asked if both of the unauthorized roads were there? Jeff said yes and then they are going to decommission them. Jonathan asked if they are looking at Appendix O relative to obliteration re: even if roads are currently on landscape they will need to be obliterated. Jeff said yes and they plan to decommission. Dan asked if obliteration meant that we don't need to get rid of every portion of the road. Jeff said that Appendix O is rooted in regulation and handbook where decommissioning comes through a suite of activities and the objective is to decommission from use and put it in a more natural condition.

Action Requested: None.

Project: Sheep Creek Vegetation Improvement

District: North Fork		Roadless Area: West Big Hole	
Status: Finalizing ESA consultation and preparing EA for objection phase.	Table Location:	Project Lead: Ken Gebhardt	
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:	
Project Summary: Commercial and non-commercial harvest, burning, etc. to improve vegetation. Temporary roads would likely be constructed. Very general description at this point. New P/N developed, focus is on fuel reduction and large tree retention.			
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes <u> X </u>	No _____	
	Exception: <u> </u> Numerous		
Commission Discussion: Includes a lot of sections of roadless rule – very complex because it has GFRG, BCR, FPSA, WUI, etc. EA is ready to go, waiting on consultation. Jim asked for timeline. Jeff said EA would probably go out around March 2021. There isn't any information in last briefing paper on what the activities are for this project. Jeff will get info to Brian to send out.			
Action Requested: Jeff to get updated briefing of activities to Brian to send to commission.			

Project: Bayhorse

District: Challis-Yankee Fork		Roadless Area: Squaw Creek	
Status: Currently out for comment.	Table Location:	Project Lead: David Morris	
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:	
Project Summary: Commercial and non-commercial harvest, burning, etc. to improve vegetation. Temporary roads would likely be constructed. Very general description at this point			
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes <u> X </u>	No _____	
	Exception: <u> </u> Numerous		
Commission Discussion: They will be doing maintenance of a road in IRA and then doing non-commercial thinning. They scoped in spring and it was confusing for public so they are going to re-scope – that's currently out. Jim said this briefing is lacking any specific information as well, so asked if they can do the same as for Sheep Creek.			
Action Requested: Jeff to get specific activity info to Brian to send to commission.			

Project: Eightmile Creek Stream Restoration		
District: Challis-Yankee Fork	Roadless Area: Challis Creek, Greylock, Squaw Creek	
Status: Project Complete	Table Location:	Project Lead: Jeff Huntman; Bart Gamett
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Stream and fish habitat restoration to include adding trees to approximately 1.4 miles of Eightmile Creek, obliterating 0.05 miles of user created road and two campsites in the floodplain along Eightmile Creek, and realigning approximately 0.25 miles of the East Eightmile Road (FSR 40901) outside the floodplain (new alignment is within IRA). Some trees used for stream restoration will come from 78 acres of Challis Creek and Greylock IRAs within project area.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes <u> X </u> Exception: 294.23(b); 294.24(c)(1)(iii,iv,vii).	No _____
Commission Discussion: They had planned to convert the road to ATV trail, but instead moved the road and part of that is in the IRA. Jonathan asked about the exception used and whether it was a system road. Yes it was a system road. Brad asked if they corrected the IRA boundary. Jeff said they didn't and probably should because now they've created a sliver of IRA on the other side of the road. Jim asked about that – they've basically removed some land from IRA. Brian said they should not change the boundary now that it has isolated the IRA piece because the rule allows for the road movement and if we go the next step then it sets a precedent and that's not the way the rule was intended – otherwise they wouldn't have provided for the exception.		
Action Requested: None.		

Project: Morgan Summit TSI		
District: Challis-Yankee Fork, Salmon-Cobalt	Roadless Area: Taylor Creek	
Status: Preparing to Scope	Table Location:	Project Lead: David Morris
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Hand fell and lop and scatter approximately 162 of lodgepole pine.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes <u> XX </u> Exception: <u> </u> 294.24(c)(1)(viii) <u> </u>	No _____
Commission Discussion: This is straight up TSI to increase growth. It's in Substantially Altered and that's the exception they will use. Jonathan asked for an aerial photo showing past harvest and juxtaposition because he's wondering whether it's the past road work that has created the substantially altered or whether it's the timber harvest. Jeff said they need to use substantially altered exception because it wouldn't meet any other exception as a straight forward TSI project. Jim asked if the units are on the boundary or out in the middle of the IRA. Jeff said they are on the edge. Jonathan asked if this is outside CPZ. Jeff said yes – there is no CPZ anywhere near. Elt asked why it's in front of the commission if it's not in roadless? Jeff said it is in the roadless, it's just in an area that was harvested and roaded in the past and can fall into Substantially Altered. Alex asked if the		

boundary should be changed. Brian said that boundary change shouldn't be pursued just because we want to do an activity that isn't allowed by the rule or we think it should be managed differently. There are exceptions in the rule that were put there specifically for this issue. Jim stated that he didn't think this area was going to be managed for commercial timber. Jeff said that was still to be determined. Jonathan brought up concerns similar to Annie Rooney in that we are using Substantially Altered when it really isn't appropriate – because what we're saying is that the current project wouldn't substantially alter the landscape but the same activity 32 years ago did, and continues to substantially alter the landscape. Billy asked if we are planning to use this for timber management, should this be roadless? He said that we need to address this. Jim said that he and Brian had this discussion prior to the meeting and Jim decided not to bring this up at this meeting. Jim said he has done research on this topic and it gets back to what Brian said about why substantially altered was created – and so it has to be nested in the RARE I and RARE II and then the reference to it in the Idaho Rule. Jonathan asked if there are system or non-system roads in the cutting units. Jeff said there are roads, but they're not system. Jim said they're skid trails. Cope asked if this was also intended to be a fuel break. Jeff said no that is not the intent, it's just TSI.

Action Requested: Jeff will send additional info to Brian to send to group.

Project: Big Creek Restoration (Fuels)		
District: Challis-Yankee Fork	Roadless Area: Lemhi Range	
Status: Development	Table Location:	Project Lead: Heath Perrine
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Prescribed burning on approximately 70,000 acres. Incidental tree cutting for hand line to control fire or to arrange fuels.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes <u> X </u> Exception: 294.24(c)(1)(vii) <u> </u>	No <u> X </u>
Commission Discussion: Similar to South Lost River. Straight prescribed burning. Jim asked on timing and NEPA. Jeff said it's going out for scoping in late-November. Decision will be in spring 2021. No questions.		
Action Requested: None.		

Project: North Zone Vegetation Improvement		
District: North Fork	Roadless Area: Numerous	
Status: Decision Signed.	Table Location:	Project Lead: Ken Gebhardt
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: This is a project to authorize all vegetation treatments and roadwork deemed necessary to meet district desires over the next 20 years. Harvest would occur on a maximum of 4000 acres per year and burning would occur on up to 20,000 acres per year. Activities would not occur in WLR or PMTV themes. See briefing paper for more details.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes <u> XX </u> Exception: <u> </u> Nearly all <u> </u>	No <u> X </u>

Commission Discussion: Billy asked if the CPZ delineations were done or if they are planning on doing that? Jeff didn't know but said he will check into it. Jim asked if they are talking about merchantable material? Jeff said some of them could be, and if they were they would use another decision to get that done. This is just for non-merchantable. There is probably some opportunity for post and pole and if that exists it will be pulled out and addressed separately. Jonathan asked if the general intent was to make sure there weren't substantially noticeable effects out 15 years. Jeff said the non-commercial nature would favor low impacts, but the actual impacts vary and there could be longer term impacts. Brad asked if that was steep. Jeff said yes, where the bundles of roads are on the Salmon Challis is the flatter country and where there aren't roads it's generally because it's steep. Jonathan asked what CE category? Jeff said Category 6.

Action Requested: None.

Project: Bellas Lake to Clear Lake Trail Construction

District: Lost River			Roadless Area: Pioneer Mountains		
Status: In Development		Table Location:		Project Lead: Phil McNeal	
				Link to Project Briefing Paper:	
Project Summary: Construct approximately 3 miles of new 24-inch tread non-motorized trail. In Wildland Recreation Theme.					
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Exception: <u>294.24(a)(2)</u>			
Commission Discussion: No questions.					
Action Requested: None.					

Project: South Lost River Restoration (Fuels)

District: Lost River			Roadless Area: King Mountain, Jumpoff Mountain, Wood Canyon		
Status: Decision expected July 2020		Table Location:		Project Lead: Allison Jackson	
				Link to Project Briefing Paper:	
Project Summary: Prescribed burning on approximately 95,000 acres. Incidental tree cutting for hand line to control fire or to arrange fuels.					
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Exception: <u>294.24(c)(1)(vii)</u>			
Commission Discussion: Mirror of Big Creek discussion. Decision has already been made but missed briefing commission due to cancellation of spring meeting due to COVID. Brad asked about polygon apart from everything else in upper left corner. Jeff didn't know. Alex asked if burning would be spring, fall, or what? Jeff said there was probably going to be some of all given the large size of the area.					
Action Requested: None.					

Motion to bring Morgan Summit, Forest Plan Revision, Sheep Creek, Bayhorse, Big Creek and North Zone Veg projects forward for update at spring meeting. Motion seconded. Motion passed.

Boise National Forest

Project: Lost Horse		
District: Cascade	Roadless Area: Peace Rock, Stony Meadows	
Status: Signed Decision Notice June 19, 2020. No activities have occurred in IRA to date. Containment line may start spring 2021	Table Location: 2	Project Lead: James Bishop
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: Reintroduce fire into portions of the IRA. Construct a fuel break (approximately 100 feet wide and 3 miles long) along the East Mountain Trail to serve as suppression containment line and minimize overhead safety concerns for both public and firefighters. Fuel break would include removing all snags with feller-buncher and hand thinning trees less than 8 inches DBH. Non-commercial. Also fell hazard trees and thin/prune along southern portion of FS trail 106. Prescribed burn approximately 912 acres plus non-commercial thin and burn approximately 40 acres of encroaching conifers in Lost Basin to restore meadow attributes. All activity is within PMTV theme outside CWPP boundary.		
Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes <u> X </u> Exception: 294.24(b)(ii, iii)	No _____
Commission Discussion: Signed decision on June 19, 2020. They revised the fuel break down to 50-60 foot containment line along the trail instead of 100 feet. There is also a change in the total length. Jonathan asked how mechanical thinning would occur. It would be with a feller buncher and then followed by chainsaws. No temporary road access.		
Action Requested: None.		

Project: Anderson Ranch Dam Raise		
District: Mountain Home	Roadless Area: House Mountain	
Status: DEIS has been released and comment period is closed.	Table Location: 2	Project Lead: Jeff Alexandar
		Link to Project Briefing Paper:
Project Summary: BOR is proposing to raise Anderson Ranch Dam 6 feet. FS proposes to modify a FRTA to Mountain Home Highway District to relocate a portion of the detour route on Cow Creek Road. This isn't in IRA. The area in IRA is a proposed material source for the dam raise. This site is part of a 1942 First Form Reclamation Withdrawal and doesn't require FS approval.		

Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?	Yes _____ Exception:	No <u>XX</u> _____
<p>Commission Discussion: Jim asked if the borrow sources are on National Forest or part of the reservoir and under BOR? Jonathan wanted just to get a sense of whether the reclamation withdrawal included borrow sources and if not is there an exception in the rule that would allow this? Jeff said the borrow site is within the withdrawal. They will not be doing anything outside withdrawal. Bill asked if there is a reclamation plan? Jeff said they haven't gone to that level of design yet but there would be reclamation developed. Most of the material would come from original pits they used when building the dam.</p>		
<p>Action Requested: None.</p>		

Motion to bring no projects forward for update at spring meeting. Motion seconded. Motion passed.

Public Comments/Discussion

No Public Comments

Jim captured two things that need to be discussed in the spring. He will work with Amy and Brian and OSC on them. The first is on the re-inventory. The other is around how long it takes to get to decisions.

Feedback

- Brad said Jonathan raises the question about a contradiction in our assessment of what constitutes substantially altered. Brad thinks we should discuss that. The topic is when and how long the effects of timber harvest last.
- Alex thanked Brian for his role over the last 5 years. He suggested the commission needs to figure out how they are going to work with Region 4 in the future.
- Jim asked Amy for an update on the NEPA regs for the FS that would help us get things done faster. Amy said CEQ released updates on NEPA regs. Every project that begins after September 14 2020 will have timing and page length requirements. Dan asked what happens if we don't meet the limits. Amy said she doesn't know and we will work to meet them. Elt asked if we can meet them given staff shortages. Amy said we have been told to meet them so we are required to meet them. Keith says we are working as fast or faster than we ever have and the RF will hold Forest Sups accountable. Elt asked why it would be any different than before. Chris said there are clear rules on when the clock starts so we can do a lot of work before the clock starts and game the system.

Motion to adjourn. Motion seconded. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned 12:20 p.m.