



# 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 1-2, 2019

Nez Perce Clearwater National Forest, Supervisors Office

### Introductions

**Commission Members present:** Alan Prouty, Alex Irby, Bill Higgins, Bob Cope (via VTC), Brad Gilbert, Dan Dinning, Jim Caswell, Billy Barquin, Michael Gibson, Peter Stegner.

**Forest Service:** Brian Riggers, Julie Schaefer, Dave Rosenkrance, Keith Lannom, Kurt Steele.

**Idaho State:** Pete Katsilometes

**Others:** Rob Mason, Sid Smith, Mitch Silvers, Mike Hanna, Katie Bilodeau, Judy Boyle, Gary McFarlane, Skip Brandt.

### SECTION I: Orogrande Field Trip – October 1

---

Participants met at the Crooked River/Highway 14 junction and travelled to the Orogrande project area. District Ranger Terry Nevius, Acting Forest Supervisor Kurt Steele, and Fuels AFMO Tom McLeod led the review, providing background information regarding implementation of the project.

The first stop was at Orogrande Campground #1, where we looked at harvest in the unit across the road. Several local property owners expressed their views of the project – primarily support for the FS implementing the harvest around private property, with some concern over how long the project planning took. There was some discussion over the harvest; no big issues brought up.

The next stop was at the bottom of the temporary road with the switchback. We walked up the road to the switchback. Several discussion points arose at this location. There was some question over the exact location of the IRA and the harvest unit. Tom shared background information on the decision to use the road and construct the switchback versus coming in from the other side. There was some

---

concern over whether the road complied with the Idaho Roadless Rule since the contract only required decommissioning of a portion of it above the switchback and the IRR states that all temporary roads must include a decommissioning provision as part of the contract. The remainder was left in place to facilitate burning and future removal of the user created road beyond the switchback. Kurt followed up and assured people that the decision included decommissioning of the entire temporary road and that it would be completed through a separate contract later. There was also some discussion about the BMPs on the road not being effective and allowing erosion to occur at several places on the road. Terry said they would have someone go out to fix the water bars the next day.

There was no interest in walking to the end of the road to look at the remainder of the unit and burning. We concluded the field review at this stop.

## **SECTION I: Welcome and Business Meeting – October 2**

---

### **Welcome, Introductions and Recap Yesterday**

- Jim Caswell opened the meeting. Alan Prouty led the meeting after general business discussion due to Jim becoming ill and needing to leave.
- Kurt updated the group on information he reviewed regarding the road with switch back. The road is to be obliterated and was excluded from timber sale contract – it was left to complete burning and decommission the remaining unauthorized road that wasn't used.
- The plan is to let an acquisitions contract to obliterate temp roads that were not part of the timber sale contract
- Roads still on landscape will be obliterated after timber sale and associated activities
- If obliterated up to the gate, another road would have needed to be built to obliterate additional temp roads. A service contract will be created to obliterate these roads all at once
- The Rule states that the responsibility for obliterating temp roads must be part of the project.
- Project was not a stewardship; it was a timber sale.
- Definition of project – refer to the NEPA document for implementation activities
- County and State intervened to see project through litigation
- Other project discussions: Dixie-Comstock and Newsome -- is Newsome an official community? Pilot Knob Roadless area, one of the most restrictive themes borders right up to the community land owners. This is Tribal Special Area.

### **Review and Approve May 28-29, 2019 Meeting Notes**

- A motion was made and seconded. The May 2019 minutes were approved.
- Pete informed the group that Sam Eaton is still working on establishing a place for Idaho Roadless Commission notes on the State of Idaho website.

### **State Updates (Caswell/Katsilometes):**

- Update on Commission Vacancies (Caswell): Currently 13 commissioners and 2 vacancies. There are 2 applications in the governor office. Cindy Regal - Teton County

Commissioner is an applicant. Elt Hasbrouck, another County Commissioner, has also applied.

- MOU update (Caswell/Katsilometes): Working with FS to update; expires in December. Sam has agreed to develop some language and forward to the Region. FS is reviewing changes. Should have this complete prior to the existing MOU expiring. Sets structure for state and Forest Service relationship.
- Cost Share Agreement (Caswell): 10 years old, Agency put \$20,000 in 2009 and added more a couple years later. Not clear on how much commission would cost as it formed. Costs needed for travel, etc. Rather than add more, suggestion to use the money available. About \$9,000 left in September; the 5 years agreement is to be reauthorized every year; is now 2 years funds with changes to congress; agreement cannot roll over and goes back to the Treasury. There is no funding for operations, including travel. Working on solution for next meeting. Rationale for reason to put money, funds were provided by the WO; Forest Service currently doesn't have funding. Not just this commission that can't be funded by the Forest Service, including collaborative groups. This is a State commission, not a Federal responsibility, so FS probably shouldn't be funding. OSC is following up as to funding; perhaps one avenue is funding through the legislative appropriation process. Draft proposal for legislation to get appropriated money may be an option for resolution. Suggestion to coordinate with the State for funding; most of the cost is travel. Some are funded by their own organizations. Around \$3,000 annually following State per diem for travel costs

#### **Update on Activities Tracking Spreadsheet (Riggers):**

- At the last meeting Brian presented the spreadsheet, which is a compilation of all activities approved in the roadless areas – to track activities over time. The information is from IRA Briefing Papers that come through Brian as part of the IRC process. These briefing papers include proposed acres of harvest, road miles, mining activities, etc. The acres, miles, etc may change when the NEPA decision is signed – this spreadsheet doesn't track that change, so there is probably some difference between what is proposed and what is eventually signed. There can also be a change between what gets implemented on the ground vs. what was authorized in NEPA. As of the last meeting, the spreadsheet showed just under 15,000 acres proposed for harvest since 2008. That number is currently about 16,490 acres. But there may be some adjustments that need to be made due to last minute changes in briefing papers.
- Brian had someone look into signed decisions to compare to numbers that are presented in briefing papers to see how much difference there is and get a sense of whether briefing papers are an accurate way to track activity. In the limited number we've looked at so far (only one forest because it's very time consuming), it appears that numbers in briefing papers and decisions are similar.
- The tracking spreadsheet was sent to Forest Environmental Coordinators to validate accuracy over a year ago – very few changes were noted.

- The IRR FEIS and our responses to comments consistently referenced 15,000 acres as the amount of harvest we expected to do, through exceptions, over the next 15 years. This was an assumption we had to make to complete the effects analysis in the EIS and to be able to give people an idea of how much harvest we expected – there were numerous comments/questions on this topic during the NEPA process. This number was derived from individual unit estimates of proposed and foreseeable harvest acres within Roadless Areas when the IRR was being developed.
- One of the big issues is how to define “timber harvest”. The IRR defines timber harvest in a footnote within the rule as “cutting of trees that have commercial value”. However, the exceptions for timber harvest are for “any cutting, sale or removal of timber”. Brian believes that the intent is that the acres that were assumed to be harvested over the life of the plan were acres of commercial harvest (i.e., where the timber was sold) because this is what the numbers from the units were most likely based on. The difference in “commercial” versus “cutting, sale or removal” may be the source of a lot of the confusion in the spreadsheet.
- Commissioner asked what is the number of acres where actual timber harvest has occurred?
- Cutting of timber may include creating access to mining activities – some of these plans include harvest with commercial and noncommercial value.
- Brian is planning to compile a report reflecting 10 years of implementing the Rule, using the spreadsheet for activities.
- There is some concern on the Commission that if acreage assumptions in the FEIS are used to restrict implementation then that would be a problem. Brian responded that the FS is obligated to stay within what we analyzed in the NEPA analysis or do a changed condition analysis to see if the assumptions are still accurate. He said the 15,000 acres is not an objective or limitation specifically – the important part is the trend and making sure Regional Foresters are aware of where we sit relative to the FEIS.
- A request was made to go through the projects individually to confirm commercial timber harvest and share the spreadsheet. Brian said he could send the spreadsheet to everyone right now, but make sure you all understand that it is still being worked on and is likely to change. Everyone agreed that separating commercial from non-commercial would be a good thing to do. Brian and Jim were going to discuss this and get back to commission.
- There was discussion over where the numbers come from. Brian said they are from briefing papers, and these are all shared with the commission, everyone has them. Brian to send the commission the tracking table of acres in Roadless
- It was noted that these numbers are important if they are affecting the regional foresters’ decisions and how many of those acres are actually affecting Roadless characteristics
- Agenda item for next meeting: look at commercial/timber harvest that has occurred in IRA’s since the Idaho Roadless Rule. Brian will look into how to accomplish this.
- Overall, the objective is to develop a monitoring/status report to have a consistent look at the roadless program over the years.

- It was suggested that the monitoring report could include economic benefit to Counties. This could be tough, since economics is not part of our briefing materials, and differentiating between IRA/non-IRA within a project might be difficult.

### Status of Guidance Papers (Riggers):

- At the spring 2019 meeting in Coeur D'Alene, Brian presented the guidance papers for discussion
- Comments from commission members have been incorporated, including recommendations about clarifying CPZ and WUI, clarifications on level of project and forest plan revision CPZ, wilderness, etc..
- Brian is developing a Sharepoint site to house guidance documents
- The CPZ edits were about defining the difference between CPZ and WUI, based on Cope's suggestion from spring meeting. This was a good improvement to the CPZ paper.
  - There was some discussion over the letter from delegates to WO – response from WO was unclear. The question was about recommended wilderness – what are the steps to follow when revision is complete?
  - Principles from 2012 letter stated that once revision is done, roadless area would be managed as recommended wilderness and align the Rule with the plan. Are we doing that?
  - Roadless rule set up management structure, should be an alignment of outcomes of forest plan revisions – should be consistent.

### Other Administrative Items (Caswell):

- A question was asked as to how people know about the meetings
- Meetings are noticed: it is posted on the State website and the hosting unit front door
- Agenda is sent out to large list
- Should be a dedicated site on the Governor's website for these postings; currently not up yet
- People are not able to find these postings currently
- We are working on improving our notices of have these meetings
- The Forest Service has a website for Roadless, but it has not been updated in at least 18 months. The person updating the website is no longer in place. The website was being updated, but now with IRC following the State process we can't post notes until they are approved at the next meeting. May just have to live with this process.
- Recommendation to post to Forest Service website and the state should do the same with minutes
- With 6 months in between meetings, ask for projects 6 weeks out... with 4 months of project coming in, may be short timeframes. It may be better to have an inaccurate

agenda rather than nothing. Brian does not manage the Forest Service website, IRC has no way to manage the State website. Work with Sam and Brian to straighten out.

- It's ok to post draft notes for project records, mark as draft
- Follow-up on Roadless Commission website in the Governor's office;
  - How are meetings noticed?
  - Repository of documents
  - Notification of local officials.
  - What to do with the USDA Roadless website?
  - Look at setting up R-1 and R-4 webpages?
- Can USFS provide a summary about the outcome of the project? Not looking for a "thesis", but just overview of what was accomplished/outcome.
- Discussion about whether USFS can provide a summary of commercial acres associated with projects in IRA's.

## 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.

<b><i>Forest/IRA/Theme</i></b>	<b><i>Project</i></b>	<b><i>Activity</i></b>	<b><i>Notes</i></b>
Payette/Cottontail/Pilot Peak & Adjacent Cottontail/Pilot Peak/PMTV	Rugged Ridge O&G	Add two assigned sites for outfitter/guide operations.	Near IRA boundary – may be outside or in FCRNRW
Payette/Numerous IRAs	Taylor Outfitting DBA McCall Angler SUP	Replace SUP for outfitter/guide angling that terminated in 2018	
Salmon-Challis/Lemhi Range/BCR	Basin Lake Dam/Res and McNutt Cr. Ditch, Ditch Bill Easements	Grant Ditch Bill Easements for R&L Bean Ranch on Basin Reservoir and McNutt Cr. diversion and ditch	Ditch Bill – non-discretionary.
Salmon-Challis/White Knob/BCR	Alder Cr. Fence	Construct 250 feet of fence to better manage livestock	
Sawtooth/Numerous	Sawtooth O&G	Approve SUP for O&G hunting	

### Discussion

- None.

## 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; Draft EA published 04/19. DN expected 04/20	<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 – 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.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes: <u>XX</u></b> <b>Exception:</b> 294.24(c)(1)(vii)	<b>No</b>
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: Has collaborative been involved? A: Yes, Big Creek Yellow Pine collaborative developed proposed action.  Q: How did you reconcile comments from IRC that bringing unauthorized road on the system as a TOV was the same as new road construction? A: It's still part of the proposal – waiting to hear comments from public.  <u>Discussion:</u> IRC would like to have this brought back to spring meeting for update – curious as to how unauthorized road kept available for motorized travel will be handled in Final EA and Decision.		
<b>Action Requested:</b> Bring back for update.		



<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>
<p><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. 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 and cooperating agencies will be reviewing a preliminary DEIS in October and a DEIS is to be published around the end of December 2019. The FEIS and Draft ROD are to be published in August 2020, and a final ROD around the end of calendar year 2020.</p>		
<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> _____
<p><b>Commission Discussion:</b></p> <p><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?</p> <p>Q: The new RAMP project (SFEF RAMP) adjacent to the area includes the project area – will it coordinate with routes in this project?</p> <p>A: We will be looking at this for the proposed action. Not clear on how to address the road in Stibnite project, but it is on our radar.</p> <p>Note: At the spring 2019 meeting there was agreement for a small group (Jim Caswell, Dave, Tim Kastning (Fulcher), Jonathan and Brian Riggers) to provide a summary of the rule and mining law with respect to the burntlog route for minerals and public access. This group has not gotten together to discuss so far. Is this still necessary?</p>		
<b>Action Requested:</b> Is small group still warranted? Bring back to next meeting for update.		

**Project:** 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 Dec 2019; ROD Feb 2020	<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: Q: Were there any comments on roadless activities from scoping? A: Yes, there were questions about how roadless was analyzed and a request to update analysis using 9 roadless characteristics. Q: How are you analyzing roadless characteristics? A: Originally used wilderness characteristics from handbook; updating with 9 roadless characteristics for the 3 IRAs. Q: What is the theme? A: Primitive and BCR		
<b>Action Requested:</b> None		

<b>Project:</b> Big Creek Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project		
<b>District:</b> Krassel	<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> 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. 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.		
<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>
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: Do you still feel you meet the community protection objectives and P/N after dropping units? A: Yes, it still achieves objectives.		

Q: We are still a little unclear on final proposal – what actions will be taken and how many acres/volume will be removed in IRA.

A: Decision is expected in June 2020 – we will bring back with updated changes and reflect activities in roadless more clearly.

**Action Requested:** Bring back to spring meeting.

**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:**

Q: Why is the cherry stem at Thunder Mountain included?

A: It’s part of the district that has system roads and other restoration work. Surrounded by Wilderness. This area has not been incorporated into any other travel management decisions.

Discussion: We need to be cognizant of what we ask to be brought back for an update so that we don’t get back to where every project is brought back just because we’re curious about how it’s going.

Discussion: Mixing treatments within and outside roadless in Briefing papers can be confusing. Is there a way we can be more clear on what’s proposed in IRA and relevant to IRC discussions? Specifically, one member requested that we include line items in BP to reflect commercial harvest in IRA and keep this information updated with briefing papers as it’s adjusted. This led to more discussion on the activities tracking spreadsheet. There was discussion about completing an implementation report to show activities that have occurred in IRA since it was signed. This should include all activities and would also need to include some form of monitoring (maybe of a subset of projects) to determine if acres and activities were implemented as laid out in Decisions. There was discussion and confirmation that IRC wants to see all projects in IRA, not just those involving harvest.

**Action Requested:** Bring back to spring meeting for update. Follow through on reviewing project decisions to update tracking spreadsheet. Brian will work on this and develop for commission review and discussion prior to spring meeting.

**Motion to bring SFRAMP, Stibnite, Big Creek, and EFSF RAMP, 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; Final ROD expected March 2020	<b>Table Location:</b> Table 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> David Alderman (BLM)
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<p><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). The initial roadless boundary modification process is complete.</p>		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <b>Exception:</b> <u>294.25(e)(1)</u>	<b>No</b> _____
<p><b>Commission Discussion:</b>  Q: Does the state have any role in the boundary modification process?  A: The rule provides a modification process and that has been updated with a detailed process guidance paper. This has not been used yet. The state’s avenue for involvement is through the IRC and these briefing processes.</p>		
<b>Action Requested:</b> Bring back to spring meeting for update.		

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

224 acres, both in BCR. Up to 3 miles of temporary road construction in BCR. Requires easement through private property for access.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>Exception:</b> 294.23(b)(2)(i-iii); 294.23(d)(2); 294.24(a)(2); 294.24(c)(i, ii, v)_	<b>No</b> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: Have you done the CPZ delineation, following the CPZ process? This was discussed at last meeting, specifically how the 1.5 miles is necessary given steep slopes, etc. A: Working on it and will present at spring meeting.		
<b>Action Requested:</b> Bring back to spring meeting. Follow up on scoping comments.		

<b>Project:</b> Bridge Creek Forest Management Plan		
<b>District:</b> Soda Springs	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Caribou City and Snow Creek	
<b>Status:</b> initial planning phase Scoping- Fall 2019; Decision expected early 2020	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Kevin Norrgard
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> 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</b> - <b>XX</b> <b>Exception:</b> 294.23(2); 294.24 (1) (c) (i, iv, v, viii)	<b>No</b> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> None		
<b>Action Requested:</b> None		

<b>Project:</b> Ephraim Aspen		
<b>District:</b> Montpelier	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Gannett-Spring Creek	
<b>Status:</b> Scoping ended August 15. Decision expected in October.	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Mike Duncan
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> 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</b> - <b>XX</b>	<b>No</b> _____

	<b>Exception:</b> 294.24(c)(1)(iv); 294.24 (d)	
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> None		
<b>Action Requested:</b> None		

<b>Project:</b> Flatiron Wildlife Habitat Improvement		
<b>District:</b> Palisades	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Bear Creek	
<b>Status:</b> Scoping July 2019. Decision expected December 2019	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Martell Gibbons
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> 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>Exception:</b> 294.23(2); 294.24 (1) (c) (i, ii, iv)	<b>No</b> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: Were there any issues raised during scoping relative to IRA? A: Nothing specific to IRA – impacts to wildlife and visuals were brought up. Q: Cutting trees 12-16 inches is in briefing – do these have commercial value? Was the intent to avoid commercial? A: Wasn’t intended to avoid commercial and there is 158 acres of commercial. Probably has to do with density but will follow up on question.		
<b>Action Requested:</b> None		

<b>Project:</b> Strawberry Forest Management Project		
<b>District:</b> Montpelier	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Williams Creek, Liberty Creek, Mink Creek	
<b>Status:</b> Scoping November 2019.	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Michael Duncan
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> 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		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes – XX</b>  <b>Exception:</b> 294.24 (1) (c) (vii)	<b>No</b> _____

**Commission Discussion:**

Discussion: Commission noted the nice job on the briefing paper and appreciates readable maps and highlights in yellow.

**Action Requested:** Bring back to spring meeting.

**Motion to bring Dairy Syncline, East Palisades and Strawberry projects back to next meeting for update. Motion seconded. Motion passed.**

## Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest

<b>Project:</b> Forest Plan Revision		
<b>District:</b> All	<b>Roadless Area:</b> All	
<b>Status:</b> Next comment period December 2019. FEIS and Draft ROD expected Feb 2021	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Zach Peterson
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<p><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.</p>		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> _____ <b>Exception:</b> _____	<b>No</b> <u>  X  </u> _____
<p><b>Commission Discussion:</b>  Q: Will OSC or Governor's Office be notified of comment periods?  A: Yes, OSC and many members of IRC are on mailing list. There will be many venues for comment.  Q: Are changes to IRAs being proposed?  A: No. Changes to IRAs cannot be made through Forest Plan Revision – it would be a separate process.  Q: What IRAs are being newly proposed for Wilderness?  A: No real new areas not currently in WLR except Meadow.  Discussion: Pete will be reviewing DEIS and will touch base with IRC and Sam to help bridge th gap between DEIS and comment period. IRC will want to have a special meeting to review the DEIS and decide if there are any comments hat need to be submitted.  Q: Have you had Nez Perce tribal involvement?  A: Yes, they are cooperating agency, have had extensive involvement.  Comment: IRC has appreciated the open process of this plan revision effort.</p>		
<b>Action Requested:</b> Bring back to spring meeting for update.		

<b>Project:</b> Dixie Comstock		
<b>District:</b> Red River	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Gospel Hump, Gospel Hump adjacent to Wilderness	
<b>Status:</b> Scoping to begin winter 2019.	<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. Current proposal is for about 1 mile temp road and some harvest both in and outside of cpz. Project size in IRA has been reduced but still meets intent.		
<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> Q: Why are helicopter units proposed when not necessary? A: Helicopter units are used when road impacts to other resources are high. This will be included in scoping. Q: Is private land treatment and shared stewardship being looked at early in process? A: Yes. Q: Are temp roads on private land identified? A: Yes, where we expect cooperative treatment, and this will be part of analysis. Maps will be available once proposed action is ready for scoping.		
<b>Action Requested:</b> Bring back to spring meeting for update.		

<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 505 of vegetation treatment, 356 of which is in IRA. Treatment includes cutting and slashing of fuels, pile and/or broadcast burning within FPSA theme (65 acres) and broadcast burn only on 440 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> <u>  </u>	<b>No</b> <u>X</u> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> None		
<b>Action Requested:</b> None		

**Project:** Lolo Insect and Disease



<b>District:</b> North Fork		<b>Roadless Area:</b> Eldorado Creek	
<b>Status:</b> Signed Decision		<b>Table Location:</b> 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> Sara Daugherty
			<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> The original project had harvest proposed in IRA along National Historic Landmark Corridor. 2015 fires burned some of the proposed units. Fire season and other projects/priorities caused planning delays. Roadless harvest was ultimately dropped due to public, tribal, and other organization concerns and the fact that insect/disease and fire made the units all salvage. At the time of decision, it was not felt that use of the exception for timber harvest could be justified since insect and disease had already played out.			
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> _____	<b>No</b> <u>X</u> _____	
	<b>Exception:</b> _		
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> There was some discussion about R1 policy towards moving forward with timber removal (especially commercial) in BCR—utilizing permissions for “maintain/restore ecosystem comp” and “reduce risk of uncharacteristic wildfire”. Also discussion on the length of time required for planning and some folks felt like opportunity was lost – that this is prime forest land on both sides of the road and should be managed. This brought up discussion of whether the roadless rule is “working” and concern that FS is only treating in CPZs and that boundaries are being treated as no entry barriers. There was some discussion about the Lochsa and Moose Creek RD looking at forest health opportunities in BCR theme areas.			
<b>Action Requested:</b> None			

<b>Project:</b> East Saddle			
<b>District:</b> North Fork		<b>Roadless Area:</b> Bighorn-Weitas, Hoodoo, Moose Mountain	
<b>Status:</b> Signed July 2019		<b>Table Location:</b> 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> Andrew Skowlund
			<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> This project was presented last meeting and had commercial harvest proposed in IRA. All harvest in IRA was changed to prescribed burning (approximately 400 acres) in the decision. Total Rx burn in IRA is approximately 3000 acres. No temp roads.			
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> _____	<b>No</b> <u>X</u> _____	
	<b>Exception:</b> _		
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> None.			
<b>Action Requested:</b> None.			

<b>Project:</b> North Fork Aspen 2	
<b>District:</b> North Fork	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Mallard-Larkins, Meadow Creek-Upper North Fork, Rawhide

<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> Fell mature aspen in 13 clones and slash competing conifers to increase aspen. Total of 168 acres. 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)(iv)  </u>	<b>No</b> <u>        </u>
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> None.		
<b>Action Requested:</b> None.		

<b>Project:</b> Black Skull Landscape Burn		
<b>District:</b> North Fork	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Mallard-Larkins	
<b>Status:</b> Preparing to Scope	<b>Table Location:</b> 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> Theodore Peterson <b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Prescribed burning over 70,000 acres to be implemented over 5-10 year period through spring/summer and fall burns. Actual ignition acres approximately 22,000.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>Exception:</b> <u>  294.24(c)(iv)  </u>	<b>No</b> <u>        </u>
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: Were there any other treatment options considered – for example cutting? A: We haven't seen as good of response to saw treatment as we have to burning (e.g., Middle Black project). Also, many of the areas are remote and they aren't commercially viable.		
<b>Action Requested:</b> None.		

<b>Project:</b> Dead Laundry		
<b>District:</b> North Fork	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Moose Mountain	
<b>Status:</b> Scoping November 2019; Decision expected spring 2020.	<b>Table Location:</b> 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> Andrew Skowlund <b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Prescribed burning on about 2000 acres to improve forest health and reduce fuel loadings. Commercial harvest of 73 acre linear fuel break via helicopter yarding – likely within cpz. There may also be some slashing for site prep for burn.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>Exception:</b> <u>  294.24(c)(i)  </u>	<b>No</b> <u>        </u>
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Would like an update to see how project develops especially with respect to timber removal.		
<b>Action Requested:</b> Bring back to spring meeting for update.		

**Motion to bring Forest Plan Revision, Dixie Comstock, and Dead Laundry projects back to spring meeting for update. Motion Seconded and Passed.**

## 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. 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.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>Exception:</b> <u>  294.24I(1)(I,iv,v)  </u>	<b>No</b> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> None		
<b>Action Requested:</b> Bring back to spring meeting for update.		

<b>Project:</b> Westside -- <b>NOTE- NOT BRIEFED; PUT ON HOLD UNTIL SPRING MTG.</b>		
<b>District:</b>	<b>Roadless Area:</b>	
<b>Status:</b>	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b>
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b>		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> _____ <b>Exception:</b>	<b>No</b> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b>		
<b>Action Requested:</b>		

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

## Sawtooth National Forest

<b>Project:</b> Free Gold Trailhead		
<b>District:</b> Fairfield	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Lime Creek	
<b>Status:</b> Moving into plan component analysis	<b>Table Location:</b> 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> Steve Frost
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> This project involves construction of an ATV and Nordic skiing trailhead including parking, restrooms, and signage. A new trail bridge will also be constructed next to the trailhead. Parking currently occurs on private property and there is no other location for the trailhead. This was originally part of the Soldier Creek Restoration project. Scoping has been generally supportive.		
<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> None		
<b>Action Requested:</b> None		

## 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. After feedback from public, looking at possibly developing two forest plans instead of one combined.		
<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: Will there be discussion on IRA theme or boundary changes as part of revision? A: Has not been discussed at this time, however everyone is aware that there are line/boundary issues on the forest.		
<b>Action Requested:</b> Bring back to spring meeting for update.		

<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 Hunteman
			<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. Since last meeting scoping has been completed. Comments were received on IRA. Western Watersheds Project has concerns with IRA and use of Cat Ex.			
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>		<b>Yes</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>Exception:</b> 294.24(b)(1)(ii, iv); 294.24(b)(2)(i-v); 294.24(c)(1)(v, vi); 294.24(c)(2); 294.26(a,c)	<b>No</b> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> None.			
<b>Action Requested:</b> None.			

<b>Project:</b> Annie Rooney Salvage			
<b>District:</b> Challis-Yankee Fork		<b>Roadless Area:</b> Camas Creek	
<b>Status:</b> Decision Signed July 2019. Open for bid – closes in October		<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)	<b>No</b> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: The 75 acres proposed for harvest was in a CPZ – why not use that exception for harvest? A: It’s important to be honest about the objective of the project – this is a salvage project. Q: What does “Substantially Altered” mean (see memo from Jonathan Oppenheimer). Does this question need further discussion by the Commission? A: The district resource specialist and LO made the determination. It’s based on the specific conditions of the project, not a defined set of yes/no answers. Q: If there was harvest in the area before the roadless rule, why was it classified as roadless? Road could have been cherry-stemmed out. Q: Is it really just salvage/reforestation only? Nothing about ecosystem health? Couldn’t you also consider that removing fire killed trees is also fuels reduction?			

Q: Do visible stumps on the landscape really eliminate roadless character? Is this what FS is stating? Need to be consistent on how we are saying harvest alters roadless because we haven't been saying this about proposed project effects.

Q: What is the criteria today on including an area like this in roadless?

Q: Forest Service needs to be consistent on substantially altered by timber harvest.

A: Proposed activities now do not count as substantially altered – activities can be substantially noticeable in the short term. There will be a certain amount of subjectivity with decision makers – this can't be eliminated given different conditions across the state. For projects in CPZ, roadless character may not be the primary concern – the analysis includes the effects and the decision maker weighs the tradeoffs.

**Action Requested:** Bring back to spring meeting for update – inform commission if there is litigation. Commission would like to continue discussion on the use of permission 294.24(c)(viii) and the meaning of “substantially altered” for future projects, even though decision has already been made on this project.

**Project: Williams Farm Bill**

<b>District:</b> Salmon-Cobalt		<b>Roadless Area:</b> Deep Creek, Phelan, Perreau Creek	
<b>Status:</b> Proposed action and analysis early FY 2020	<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); 294.24(d)	<b>No</b> <u>        </u>	
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> None.			
<b>Action Requested:</b> Bring back to spring meeting for update – would like update on acres, including acres of commercial timber removal in IRA.			

**Project: Colson Cobalt #2 Mineral Exploration**

<b>District:</b> Salmon-Cobalt		<b>Roadless Area:</b> Long Tom	
<b>Status:</b> Decision Signed.	<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> <u>        </u> <b>Exception:</b> <u>  </u>	<b>No</b> <u>  X  </u>	
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> None.			

**Action Requested:** None.

<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. New P/N developed, focus is on fuel reduction and large tree retention.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>Exception:</b> <u>  </u> Numerous	<b>No</b> <u>        </u>
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Interested in commercial harvest in IRA and how project is progressing.		
<b>Action Requested:</b> Bring back to spring meeting for update.		

<b>Project:</b> Bayhorse		
<b>District:</b> Challis-Yankee Fork	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Squaw Creek	
<b>Status:</b> Developing Proposed Action – should be completed by September 30, 2019. Summer field trip with BLM was conducted in August, 2019.	<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>  </u> Numerous	<b>No</b> <u>        </u>
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: Where is this project on forest priority list? A: Plan to complete based on schedule above, work in with other projects.		
<b>Action Requested:</b> None. (likely oversight – bring back to spring meeting for update per BR).		

<b>Project:</b> Eightmile Creek Stream Restoration		
<b>District:</b> Challis-Yankee Fork	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Challis Creek, Greylock, Squaw Creek	
<b>Status:</b> Finalizing Proposed Action. <i>Note: Realignment changed from ATV trail to Road since Fall IRC Briefing</i>	<b>Table Location:</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Jeff Huntman; Bart Gamett
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>

<b>Project Summary:</b> 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.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>Exception:</b> 294.23(b); 294.24(c)(1)(iii,iv,vii).	<b>No</b> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: What is the connection between ATV trail, fish habitat restoration, and wood in stream? A: In order to keep the ATV trail and decommission the road we need to build the new trail in the IRA (NOTE: This has been changed since the fall meeting to realignment of the existing road – not an ATV trail).		
<b>Action Requested:</b> Bring back to spring meeting for update and to see scoping comments.		

**Motion to bring Forest Plan Revision, Annie Rooney (if litigated), Williams Farm Bill, Sheep Creek, Bayhorse, and Eightmile projects forward for update at spring meeting. Motion seconded. Motion passed.**

## Boise National Forest

<b>Project:</b> Sage Hen Integrated Restoration		
<b>District:</b> Emmett	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Snowbank	
<b>Status:</b> Developing Purpose and Need and Proposed Action	<b>Table Location:</b> 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> John Riling, Tera Little
		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> Activities within IRA would likely include prescribed burning on up to 12,000 acres and rehabilitating and blocking access to unauthorized routes. Trees may be cut for firelines or to block access. No commercial removal.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>Exception:</b> 294.24(b)(iv,v)_	<b>No</b> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> None.		
<b>Action Requested:</b> None.		

<b>Project:</b> Lost Horse		
<b>District:</b> Cascade	<b>Roadless Area:</b> Peace Rock, Stony Meadows	
	<b>Table Location:</b> 2	<b>Project Lead:</b> James Bishop



<b>Status:</b> NFMA, pre-scoping. Scoping is planned for October 2019.		<b>Link to Project Briefing Paper:</b>
<b>Project Summary:</b> 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.		
<b>Does Proposed Activity require use of an Exception?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>Exception:</b> 294.24(b)(ii, iii)	<b>No</b> _____
<b>Commission Discussion:</b> Q: Does this meet the intent of rule permissions in Primitive theme – to construct fuel break in the middle of IRA where there is no CPZ or community? Doesn't seem to meet the "maintain or restore ecosystem characteristics" or the "reduce risk of fire to community" exceptions being used. A: Is there a different permission we should use? Maybe we could use "incidental to" permission? Discussion: Incidental to permission is used for things trail clearing, handlines, minor slashing for prep for burn, etc.. It's not incidental when the activity itself is the cutting or the unit. There was discussion and general agreement on commission that fuel break in primitive them not near any community or municipal water source was not what the intent of allowances for timber harvest were about. The commission had concerns with this part of the project and asked the forest to reconsider these activities and provide an update at the spring meeting.		
<b>Action Requested:</b> Bring back to spring meeting for update.		

**Motion to bring Lost Horse project forward for update at spring meeting. Motion seconded. Motion passed.**

## Public Comments/Discussion

### Feedback

- Mike Hanna asked for copy of the activities tracking spreadsheet. Brian will send him an electronic copy.
- Good to have some folks from Orogrande at field trip – good support.
- IRC supports moving quickly on Dixie Comstock and Newsome projects.
- Would like to see monitoring of project implementation in roadless and impacts on roadless characteristics as this is a key aspect of how the rule is being implemented – what actually gets done on the ground and there is broad recognition that project aspects change from briefing paper to decision to implementation.
- Thanks to Alan for volunteering to lead the meeting in Jim and Dale's absence.

- Remind everyone to continue to look at the big picture – IRR is a great example of collaborative work.

***Motion to adjourn. Motion seconded. Motion passed.***

***Meeting adjourned 3:00 p.m.***