Governor's Roadless Commission

Idaho Roadless Rule

James L. Caswell, Chair (208-365-7420) jlcaswell@q.com

Dale R. Harris, Vice-Chair (406- 240-2809) dharris@bigsky.net

Boise National Forest, Supervisors Office

November 10, 2015

NOTES

Attendees: Jim Caswell, Dale Harris, Brian Riggers, Jonathan Oppenheimer, Bill Higgins, Alex Irby, Nora Rasure, Bob Cope, Steve Hadley, Dave McGraw, Alan Prouty, Leanne Marten, Dan Dinning, Patty Perry, Anne Davy, Jim Riley, Rick Johnson, Scott Stouder

Visitors: Mark Bethke (Director of Planning, Region 4), Holly Endersby, Mike Roach (US Senator James Risch's Office), Mitch Silvers (US Senator Mike Crapo's Office), Jim Case (Boise National Forest), Jim Hawkins (Custer County Resource Advisory Group)

Welcome and Introductions

Commission Business

Both Regional Foresters are with us this morning and we appreciate their contribution of time. It's a testament to the relationship we've built over time.

As of November 16th, Anne Davy will be on detail for approximately 4 months. During her absence, Brian Riggers from Region 1 will support the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair. We appreciate your support.

General Updates and Reminders since November Meeting

September field trip on the Salmon-Challis NF

Fire season interrupted a good portion of attendees, with three able to attend a two-day trip for the Rainey Creek Project. Roads were the focus on day 1. This was hosted by the County. Day 2 visited the watershed above the city of Salmon.

On-Forest Idaho Roadless Training

There are three forests remaining, and we have received good reception and feedback on our training. The Rule is new to staff on several of the Forests and they are appreciative of the experience.

Protocols and Public Input

The concern is that if the public has comment for the Commission, or has input on a project, that they be allowed to do so during the presentation of the project as opposed to at the end of the meeting. We have reviewed the Protocols and received feedback from Commission Members and we should be able to accommodate public comment along the way.

We have the flexibility within the Protocols to accommodate this without a formal change. Commission members will be requested to assist in time management during these public input sessions.

Process for Forests to provide updates

Our Agenda is becoming quite full with 23 new projects today and 19 updates. We anticipate this trend to continue climbing. We recognize that Projects brought to the Commission are typically one of three categories: 1) the Rule does not apply, 2) the Rule does apply, but the project is minor in scope and there are no concerns from the Commission, and 3) the Rule does apply, and one or more Commission members would like to have updates and further discussion at future meetings. In an effort to improve the efficiency of our semi-annual meetings and allow time for focused topic discussion, we proposed the following regarding project briefings at future meetings:

For those projects we do not have jurisdiction over (for instance, a road accessing a mining project covered by the Mining Law) we should hear about it once and it should then go to the Summary Table. You can then track it though the Summary until a Decision is made and moves to the Implementation page. This puts the burden on the Roadless Coordinator to ensure updated tables through meeting dates and you can inquire about status.

The second screen is for those projects that are more minor in scope – for example, Aspen Retention Projects on the Caribou-Targhee. These are new and we will hear of them today for the first time. Both of these, being minor in scope, can be tracked with their Plan and Scope; they are straightforward. If there are no concerns, they can go onto the Summary and you can track them from there. There would be no need to bring them forward a second time.

The third screen would be for large scale projects that are complex and require nuances of the Rule to be considered; for instance, a road that requires a discussion surrounding a possible modification. These types of projects would be brought back for review at the next Commission meeting.

At the end of every set of Project Briefings, the Commission Chair will ask which projects we will want to see at the next meeting. The remainder will go into the Summary (they all do anyway) and if you are interested, track it through the summary. Any Commission member can request a project be brought back for briefing at any time. The Roadless Coordinator will facilitate this. In addition, the Roadless Coordinator will notify the Chair of any changed conditions with projects not being briefed that may require discussion at the next meeting. That would cut at least 15 projects off the Agenda today.

In your binder is a copy of the recent Summary Tables. Table 1 includes Projects with NEPA completed. Table 2 includes Projects in the Scoping phase. Tables 3 and 4 include completed and ongoing Corrections and Modifications, respectively.

Comments:

- If there are significant changes to the project, e.g. Aspen Regeneration which changes to a road modification, that should trigger an additional review.
    - That would be the responsibility of the Coordinator to discuss with the Chairman to review any that are questionable.
- Regarding the origins of this Commission, we were never designed to be a micro-management panel. We are to ensure projects meet the letter and the intent of the Rule.
- We were charged to look at the Rule itself to see if it needed amendments or interpretations. We initially said that we would review what the FS asked us to input on and needed clarification on – not every project.
- If somewhere in the process – Aspen Regeneration – there is a legal challenge raised through the process of objections – if we said that it meets the intent of the Rule - how does that fall into the process? Would it be our responsibility if it was challenged by the Rule?
    - Our role should be to make recommendations. That isn't our purview - that is a legal challenge the Governor's Office should make.
    - On that basis, I would take issue with using the word "jurisdiction"
        - Okay, it's outside the purview of the rule
- Have there been any challenges in the last 7 years?
    - We've had objections, but no litigation on the Rule. We've had objections because "The Idaho Roadless Rule doesn't allow that"; not that our advisory position has been in error.
- In those cases where there is an objection, if it has come before this Commission, is it helpful to the FS?
    - In our response we will note how often it has been brought in front of the Commission and what the Commission's recommendation was. Often times the objection is regarding analysis and how much of it has occurred.
- Is the Roadless Commission adding value to the Forest Service decision making framework?
    - For example, we had a boundary modification issue and the discussion here one year ago helped to position us on how to move through the process. This is where the Commission adds value. The Commission brings perspective to the conversation.

    - Implementation of the Rule is what we are here for. A trailhead issue that needed our clarification is a great example. Those that are perplexing are going to require more time, naturally. It has to be done on a project level. If something isn't clear in the Rule, it has to be applied at a project level. Those will rise to the top naturally.
    - We are charged to ensure the project meets the letter and intent of the Rule and that is our charge.
    - We review every proposal whether it is covered by the Rule or not because it shares information with the various interests of what is going on. Otherwise, you wouldn't be aware unless you are tracking the project. We have a way of knowing, long-term, how the Rule is being used and what is occurring on the Roadless Areas. That is valuable.
- Does the Forest Service receive enough feedback from the Rangers who have a project that falls into a grey-area and they bring it forward? Would it be appropriate to notify us of changes if there was some sort of trigger mechanism?
    - We rely on the Commission Staff to give us feedback on the appropriateness of that type of change.
- Is there a way to establish a smaller Committee to perform an initial review to decide which projects warrant review by the Commission?
    - At the end of a Forest presentation of 7 projects we will ask which projects the Commission wants to hear at the next meeting?
        - For example, two projects that are not finished and have had considerable conversation would remain on the next agenda. Another project smaller in scope, such as a trail, we should hear about it at the first meeting and if you have further concerns bring it forward for the next agenda.
        - There are a significant number of new projects, those will be heard from today and not need review again – should they need further review, someone needs to bring it forward.
    - If a project has a timing issue (such as salvage) and if the scope changes the aspect of the project, that should be brought forward.

All those in favor – none opposed

Rulemaking for corrections and modifications

From a policy perspective, this is one place we have added a lot of value to the discussion with the support and help of the Regional Foresters. We have been able to make our concerns known to the Chief's Office. There are policy developments in play, where full blown Rule Making does not need to be in play for a "page number change."

Over the past month, we worked on a draft letter (put past RF's) where we would like a process for Corrections that includes a 30-day Public Review similar to the 2001 process in the Washington Office. Corrections are generally minor changes such as typos and mapping issues, but would also include boundary adjustments to conform to Executive proclamations or Congressional designations (such as designation of a roadless area as Wilderness). Modifications would have a 45-day Public Review and would have a Federal Register posting. We have a draft outline of the process developed and the Deputy Regional Foresters are reviewing it. Region 1 and 4 are determining who will take the lead. It will be a 2-3 month process to review and obtain signature from the Chief. We will then have a clear path forward. That process will also require review by Office of General Counsel (OGC) in Washington D.C.

Our request of the Chief is to sign a letter which says "here is the process we want you to follow" for changes. It is likely that we will receive directives at some point, but those will take a longer period of time to obtain. Then, some changes and modifications can move quicker.

Gibson Jack was an example of a simple Boundary Modification. We fell into the Rule Making process (long and drawn out) where we must brief, draft a Federal Register Notice to make corrections, make further briefings to Washington DC including Communication and Civil Rights Plans. We were two years into the process before the Notice would even be published. We discussed with the Chief that the process should be designed better, be simpler and quicker.

> ***Action Item: The Roadless Coordinator will continue to move this process forward as quickly as possible and will update the Commission as appropriate.***

The Rule provides discretion to the Chief as to whether he needs to go through Rule Making for Modifications. This guidance can come from the public and then through OGC and then it is up to the Chief to use their discretion to sign it or go through Rule Making – dependent upon the sensitivity of the issue.

We defaulted to Rule Making every time and political and economic issues continued to bump us off priorities. This shouldn't take more than a couple of months to finish.

- We may wish to repeat training after Planning Rules have been finalized.
- Did this change during the Nez Perce Clearwater Planning Process as early adopters?
    - *There may be turnovers on the Team, but the training was recently completed and was conducted over one year ago as well. We have been engaged and been there three different times.*

Project Updates and New Projects

Sawtooth National Forest

New Project: Redfish 210 Post-Insect Outbreak Fuels Project

Comments:

- *Is this complete?*
  - We are implementing this fall – thinning and patch cuts. Roadless will be the last thing completed in 2017.
- *This project does not need to return to the Commission. If anyone is interested in the follow up, they can review the Summary.*

New Project: Salmon River Headwaters Road 215/Replace with Trail

Comments:

- *This project was implemented this summer and is completed. This project does not need to return to the Commission. If anyone is interested in the follow up, they can review the Summary.*

New Project: Over Snow Travel Management, Fairfield RD

Comments:

- *This does not fall into our purview and is outside the Scope of the Rule.*
- *This project does not need to return to the Commission. If anyone is interested in the follow up, they can review the Summary.*

New Project: Stanley Basin Grazing

Comments:

- *What does AMP mean?* Allotment Management Plan
- *There is no timber cutting associated?* Correct
- *This project does not need to return to the Commission. If anyone is interested in the follow up, they can review the Summary.*

New Project: Minidoka Motorized Trail Revision

Comments:

- *Is the trail is designated as ATV?* Both trails.
- *With the 15 miles, are trails are already there?* Most of them are. There is 1 mile proposed as new construction, the remainder exists but not designated as open.
- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

New Project: Boise and Sawtooth NFs Invasive Plant Treatments EIS

Comments:

- *Is this part of the Cooperative Weed Management Association (CWMA) or is this unilateral?* They are a hugely important partner but this is for treatment on the National Forest, so we need to update our analysis.
- *Weed spraying needs to come before the Commission?* Not under the purview of the Rule, but is occurring in the Roadless Area.
- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

New Project: Administrative Correction – Newly Designated Wilderness

Comments:

- The process paper we are putting together speaks specifically to these types of designations. Colorado also has Congressional designations to make, so we are hoping for a discussion surrounding the Boundary Correction for those areas overlaid with Wilderness. Wilderness is more restrictive and would override any Roadless.
- *Were there any partial areas incorporated?*
    - There were bits and pieces that were left out – it did not entirely replace some of the existing Roadless Area.
- *Why would we need to do anything? The next logical step is to make it Recommended Wilderness forcing them to review it?*
    - *The Wilderness Act, since both are within the Act, does it not address what happens when you convert an area to Wilderness?* No. There was no language in the legislation.
- *The question should be surrounding the pieces – but if you adjust the boundary to account for what is left of Roadless (outside of Wilderness) and if it's less than 5,000 acres, what do you do with it?*

- You could have 200 acre bit of Roadless adjacent to Wilderness still considered Roadless. The name could change.
- Management schemes for the FS could change. Those pieces may be managed or incorporated into another Roadless Area.

- *Do we go through a correction process adjusting the acreage for the IRA? Would they no longer be IRA if they are now Wilderness?* The bigger question is whether we stack up corrections and then in 2020 come back and make a larger correction.
- *The Salmon Challis is undergoing a Forest Plan Revision and I'm assuming they will have further changes?* Hopefully, with this process now, we can see the value of bundling and going through Rule Making – but the whole idea of Rule Making is to move forward quickly. In bureaucratic terms, it could be done in 6 months which is lightning speed.
- One process would be that GIS would update map layers. Delineate on the map why there is a significant reduction of acreage, in addition to what is posted in the Federal Register.
- *Do these Administrative Corrections generate a cost to the taxpayer? What is the Official Document?* It's the document at the back of your binder, and it has a chart outlining the Draft Federal Register and Final Notice which changes it.
- *We need to perform the corrections?* Yes, subtracting out the acres now Wilderness and reduce the various themes by those acres and we would say that those pieces retain their current theme (regardless of size).
  - Yes, we would work with the Region and the WO to move this forward.
  - If legislation had addressed this it would be a timesaver.
  - We will not have the final boundaries within 3 years for the final Forest Plan. The RO is working through final boundaries and legal descriptions. We suggest starting the process but wait until the legal boundaries are defined.
- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

New Project: Copasetic Mine

Comments:

- *Is this proposed as a CE?* No this is an EA.
- *What theme is this?* Back Country Restoration
- *There are some requirements in the FP under the Sawtooth for minerals development and those requirements are not overtaken by the Roadless Rule – those requirements remain even after the Roadless Rule is superimposed.* For our purpose today, no.
- *According to the RR, the Smokey Mountains are under the Primitive theme?* We understand the theme to be Back Country Restoration. This would be a GIS exercise and the project area showed us Back Country Restoration. There is a both Back Country Restoration and Primitive. It's a larger area which is not unusual to have more than one theme.
- *The Rule does not apply to this project. Project does not need to come back to Commission.*

New Project: Faulkner Grazing

Comments:

- *The Rule does not apply to this project. Project does not need to come back to Commission.*

Sawtooth Projects to carry forward to Next Commission Meeting:

- Invasive Plan EIS
- Administrative Corrections for Sawtooth
- Any new projects

Boise National Forest

Randy Hayman, Forest Planner

Update: Boise River Feasibility Study

Comments:

- *I presume you are working with Fish & Game as this is migratory corridor for Mule Deer?* Yes, we have the Corps of Engineers and DOR. They have an agreement with Idaho Dept. of Fish & Game and US Fish & Wildlife Service regarding issues under wildlife Facilitation Act which is an integral part.
- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

Update: Carlin Minerals Exploration project

Comments:

- *Does that determination go into the Title History? 1872 Mining Law might not apply to certain acquired lands?* There was some discussion regarding when lands were acquired, and under what authority, and whether 1872 law applies.
- *Use of existing unauthorized road to access site within IRA is being proposed.*

- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

Update: Swan Holm Repeater Site

Comments:

- *This would be an example of a situation where when presented last June, it wasn't signed and you are seeing it again.*
- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

New Project: Snowbank Underground Powerline Maintenance Project

Comments:

- *How many vaults are there?* 20, within 3 miles. It will take about 2 years to completely revegetate the area. Whitebark pine will be reseeded to compensate for the disturbed areas. They may hand dig where the trenching unit is not practical.
- *Are seedlings whitebark pine?* WBP is the main focus, but there are other species in the area.
- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

Boise Projects to carry forward to Next Commission Meeting:

- Boise River Feasibility Study

Salmon-Challis National Forest

Diane Weaver, Lost River District Ranger; Karryl Krieger, Land Management Planner; Jeff Hunteman, NEPA Planner; Julie Hopkins, Minerals Program Manager

Update: Mammoth Canyon Road Reclamation Project

Comments:

- *Are there open adits and some AML sites?* Yes, we intend to close those prior to closing the routes.

Project does not need to come back to the Commission.

Update: Ramey Creek Vegetation Improvement Project

Commission Discussion:

- After walking the site, it seems the reconstruction and construction associated with the route accessing the E Units would be considered temporary road construction and I understand this is outside a Community Protection Zone. I am not confident in how this complies with the Rule. There was a bridge outside the Roadless Boundary which could be reconstructed, but moving into the Roadless Area would qualify as road construction.
- Up to the point of where the hunters were camped, it's obviously cherry-stemmed to that point. The crossing at the dry stream bed could be a temporary bridge or whatever, but from there on we are in no man's land regarding existing roads inside of a Roadless Area and how you treat those relative to a legitimate project allowed under the Rule as to whether it fits the Administrative definition of a Temp road and that is how we are going to treat it and use it. We have conflicting advice from a policy perspective. The FS is not sure, they are not all on the same page.
    - Different folks have different perspectives on whether an existing road is an existing feature or whether it had to be a road.
    - The guidance we have, and we could keep asking and getting different answers, but from the WO Coordinator was that the existing road falls into the category that nothing we do should affect existing roads.
    - The policy should be resolved by the Forest Service and then brought back to the Commission.
    - Beyond a certain point is what's being proposed for this project – can the FS Administratively declare this a temporary road for this legitimate project under the Rule, and after the project is complete obliterate the road?
        - We've also talked about performing the paper exercise of making it a system road. And this is the feedback from WO that we can do that.
        - One issue is – how much money is used to maintain this temporary road? The next step could be to make a small group to work through this and come to the next meeting with a proposal.
        - Maintenance vs. Reconstruction vs. Construction – you could put a truck on this road right now; the roadbed is there and there is very little cut and fill. Then you hit a live stream and to cross the stream and go beyond that, which you need to do to move the material, then you have more work to do – which is more than maintenance.
          Then there is the issue of the existing road on the map (the cherry stem) which wanders off the hill. This is also something else the FS needs to determine.
    - This is pervasive throughout the State, not just this project.
    - This is Back Country Restoration, we can cut trees and build roads but it is not in a CPZ situation.
        - This is close to a Community. Cow Camp is within 1.5 miles of this project and it is real property. From that standpoint, it falls into the CPZ.
        - Is it on the HFRA list? If not, there is a process to get it there.
            - The County Commissioners say it's automatically designated according to the Rule - ?
            - Do you have a CWPP Committee? The Commissioners are.
        - This group could designate a CPZ for the area.
        - The Road you are talking about, and you walked, is on all FS maps whether it was ever formally designated or not.
- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

- *Note: The topic concerning use of unauthorized roads is one that needs further clarification from the Forest Service. The Roadless Coordinator will convene a small group of local, Regional, and WO employees to discuss and interpret this issue to provide guidance to local units and the Commission. Progress and likely outcomes will be brought forward for discussion at the next Commission meeting.*

Update: Phelan/Sharkey Farm Bill Project (Old North Zone Farm Bill Project)

Comments:

- We reviewed this on the Field Trip as well.
- *What about the requirement for decommissioning a road according to Appendix N of the Rule*? There was some direction in the Final EIS which gets back to existing roads on the landscape and the requirement to decommission pursuant to the Rule.
- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

New Project: Lee Creek Conifer Removal

Comments:

- *This is the upper end of the DC Bar?* Yes
- *If the public is allowed to utilize what is cut, is there any value in removing it for sale or harvest?* There is very little commercial material potential.
- *If you did have timber removal, where would it go?* There are no manufacturing plants in the near area.
- *This proposes full size vehicles permitted on the roads?* We're interested in getting TSI crews and their equipment onto the site. We're open to doing what's necessary and right.
- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

New Project: Big Hill Insect and Disease

Comments:

- *The Rule does not apply. Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

New Project: Westcor Exploration

Comments:

- *Is there a surface use determination that goes with that?* No, there is not.
- *Any title history performed or whether they were acquired lands?* They are not on private land, they are on FS land. We don't know how they were acquired, the locatable minerals should be something the FS would administer. The district committed to getting back to the Commission with this information.
- The Commission requested that the Roadless Coordinator provide guidance for units to determine whether the 1872 Mining Law applies to proposed projects (i.e., is it based on date of acquisition, etc.). The Coordinator will look into this and get information to units prior to the next meeting. The Coordinator will brief Commission members on this topic at the next meeting.
- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

New Project: Dump Creek Withdrawal

Comments:

- *What does withdrawal mean?* Not open to mining, no mineral entry – if someone wanted to come in and look for a precious metal they could not enter this particular area.
- *The Rule does not apply. Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

Salmon-Challis Project to carry forward to Next Commission Meeting:

- Phelan Sharkey
- Raimey Creek
- West Core Exploration

Caribou-Targhee National Forest

Garth Smelser, Forest Supervisor; Doug Herzog, Forest Planner

Update: Dry Ridge Exploration

Comments:

- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

Update: Gibson Jack Trailhead Relocation

Chief issued decision on October 2nd in Federal Register and Decision was signed the same day with implementation beginning the following week.

Comments:

- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

Update: Smoky Canyon Mine Panel G Modification

Comments:

- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

Update: Bilk Creek Placer Mining Operation

This project is cancelled by the Applicant.

Comments:

- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

Update: Dairy Syncline Land Exchange

Comments:

- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

Update: Husky 1 North Dry Ridge

Comments:

- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

Update: Rainey Creek Vegetation Restoration Project

Comments:

- We received comments from the public on visual aspects of the project, but it is planned to re-scope a smaller test patch (600 acres) to monitor visual impacts of treatment. That will be conducted under a CE with any larger projects completed under an EA.
- *Did comments come from the locals?* Yes, during public meetings
- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

New Project: Montpelier Aspen Retention Project

Identical to next project, will be discussed as a singular project.

Comments:

- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

New Project: Soda Springs Aspen Retention Project

Comments:

- *Will you remove the thinned conifers?* Post fire activities could create overly hot fires that could negate the Aspen Retention.
- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

Caribou-Targhee Projects to carry forward to Next Commission Meeting:

- Dairy Sincline
- Husky Creek
- Rainey Creek

Payette National Forest

Sandra Dingman, East Zone NEPA Planner; Joshua Simpson, Krassel District Wilderness and Recreation Program Manager; Susan Jenkins, Central Zone NEPA Planner , Jane Croff

Update: Brundage Cat Skiing Permit Updates

Comments:

- There would be no timber cutting for the routes, with the exception of hazard tree removal.
- *The Rule does not apply. Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

Update: Seven Devils Lodge Outfitter-Guide SUP Reissuance

Comments:

- The Decision Memo is due in December after the Biological Opinion has been completed and Regulatory Agency review is complete. District Rangers have returned to relieve Acting District Rangers and they will be making the decision.
- *The Rule does not apply. Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

Update: Golden Meadows

Comments:

- There were two proposed drill sites at Sugar Mountain which have been dropped due to Objections received this fall. They are now in the Objection Resolution process.
- *None of the proposed activities are in Roadless now?* Correct, there were previously 22 sites and with the 2 sites removed, the project is no longer in Roadless.
- *The Rule does not apply. Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

Update: Middle Fork Weiser Landscape Restoration Project

Comments:

- The DEIS due next month but is currently in internal review. They have completed two trail reroutes in total of 6 miles on the Mountain Council Road. There is unauthorized road decommissioning totaling 10 miles.
- *The Trailhead movement?* The purple dashed line (center of page) comes out of the campground and the reroute would go on FS and avoid Potlatch. The other, the east side of the map at Crystal Creek is the other reroute which would stay west of Potlatch (205 Trail). These are two-wheel motorized trails.
- *Does the Commission distinguish between regular and hazard tree cutting?* Any tree that has fallen or could fall across the road could be a hazard tree.
    - *I don't think it needs to be specified that the tree is a hazard tree.*
- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

Update: Snowmobile Outfitter & Guide

Comments:

- Timeline is the only changed item on this project, pushing the decision forward.
- *Will that be implemented this winter?* No, after the Objection Period we must perform a prospectus with an award season of next winter, no this winter.
- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

Update: Big Creek Restoration and Access Management Project

Comments:

- The timeline is still on track with a decision in January 2017. This could occur earlier depending on the process.
- *On the decommissioned roads, are there alternate access points for firefighting or management?* Roads within the IRA boundaries will not be retained for access. There are other main routes that could be associated with existing mining claims. They will be designed as Administrative Routes with a control mechanism to restrict public use limited to administrative use such as firefighting, or mineral activity.'
- *Is this being overviewed by Yellow Pine Collaborative?* This project originated from that Collaborative, with Alternative B being their recommendation. The Proposed Action takes the Collaborative recommendation and modifies it. Those recommendations have to do with designating routes within the IRA, and it was then modified and there will be subtle differences between the Collaborative's recommendation and our Draft EA.
- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

New Project: Big Creek Roads Plan of Operation

Comments:

- *Who is the mining Claimant? And the map doesn't correspond to where the mines are located.* The mining company is ANCO. The map reflects Placer Creek in the Blue IRA, the red line has a divot, coming down to the claims and that is the Ludwig Mine and at the bottom of the Sesesh IRA there is a 1.6 mile road associated with the Cleveland Mine.
- *There is a comment noted that there is a mapping error on this?* That is a persistent mapping error, part of a larger forest-wide boundary update. In drawing the boundaries, the ends of the switchbacks were drawn into the IRA and we have been reviewing this in GIS and compiling a list of boundary corrections to be made. We would prefer to undertake those on a larger scale rather than a piece by piece project scale.
- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

New Project: Hum Lake Trail Reroute

This has been withdrawn from consideration.

Comments:

- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

New Project: No Name Water System

Comments:

- *What is this water for?* This is for drinking and irrigation. The water right is noted in the Proposed Action; there are 3 different water rights associated with this particular intake.
- *The Rule does not apply. Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

Payette Projects to carry forward to Next Commission Meeting:

- Middle Fork Weiser Landscape

Idaho Panhandle National Forest

Karl Dekome, Forest Environmental Coordinator; Dave Cobb, North Zone Planning Staff Officer

Update: Deer Creek Project

We found some old growth that we didn't want to burn, so that has reduced the acres burned. Additionally, the zones are gearing up for fire salvage and that will impact the project.

Comments:

- *I understand the EA will be out before the end of the year?* Correct, when I typed this update we were in flux as to how salvage would impact the EA.
- *How many acres of prescribed burn?* 423 acres
- *How much was it originally?* Approximately 50-100 acres more.
- *Why wouldn't you burn in the old growth area?* High elevation spruce, subalpine fir and Whitebark pine stands that we weren't confident we could under burn without a lot of mortality occurring. The alpine fir stands are tricky to burn through.
- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

Update: Treasured Landscapes Prescribed Burning & WBP Restoration

The changed condition is due to a wildfire burning into two proposed treatment areas in the IRA. The fire burned with a hotter intensity than we desired and actually killed some of the White Bark Pine we sought to save. We may change the Proposed Action in those areas to planting White Bark Pine.

- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

Update: 2015 Fire Suppression Activities

Comments:

- *The photo you included, is that post rehab or pre?* That was during the fire, so pre-rehab.

- *Please describe the exception for emergency actions on the ground?* We had a number of resource advisors working with the Interagency Management Team to ensure suppression actions were in concert with our Forest Plan. We did have and continue to have consultation with US Fish & Wildlife Service. We consulted on Bull Trout for suppression activities; the Coeur d'Alene River has some critical habitat (not occupied) and we continue the consultation process. We did not perform NEPA during an emergency situation, but would do so in the future for weeds.
    - *Is development of unauthorized trails an issue?* We water barred the trails and we aren't aware of any concerns surrounding unauthorized motor access.
    - *It looks like good firefighting as it worked?* Yes, we also got lucky with the weather.
        - The restoration work that follows the fire will adhere to NEPA standards.
    - *Is there an Incident Command Team that works with the firefighters?* There were FS Biologists that worked alongside firefighters. We also have liaisons with the Forest and Districts and the other Agencies. You also perform some prediction as to what will happen in the near future, you do a lot of prep work prior to the season in hopes of lining up as best you can.
    - *There are no advisors as to where your dozer lines are placed?* Public safety and health is of primary concern. The concern in this case was movement of the fire down to the valley.
    - *How does the BAER activity work?* Burn Area Emergency Recovery has teams that look at immediate restoration work on the ground (sedimentation, seeding). This is a quick response with a process for approval for emergency funds and dispatch folks out immediately.
- *I would be interested in looking at these firebreak rehabilitations in a couple of years as I'm interested in how it's done. (Note – Commission members in general thought this would be a good idea – we will try to schedule this in summer 2017).*
- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

Idaho Panhandle Projects to carry forward to Next Commission Meeting:

- Treasured Landscapes

Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest

Cheryl Probert, Forest Supervisor; Norma Staaf, Forest Environmental Coordinator; Zach Peterson, Forest Planner; Lois Hill, IDT Leader; Mike Ward, CFLRP Coordinator; Joe Hudson, Moose Creek District Ranger; Marty Jones, Minerals Administrator; Brandon Knapton, Lochsa-Powell District Ranger

Update: Orogrande Fuels Project

Currently in 45 day Objection Period, with responses coming in the 45 days following that.

Comment:

- *Thank you for getting the project almost completed. Secondly, where it says you had a modification – we've not modified the protection barrier, have we?* We changed a road that had previously been decommissioned in another project and it was removed due to water issues. We did not affect the purpose of the project, which is to protect the community.

- *When will this go to sale?* Parts of it will be in 2016, with prescribed fire will depend upon windows. There was some discussion earlier on the 5 Year Plan which is constantly shifting based on changing priorities.

- *This started in 2011 and that Community has dodged the fire bullet more than once, so I would encourage you to really get this out the door.* Once we resolve any Objections, then we can sign the Decision and proceed to Implementation.

- *Are you expecting any litigation on this?* We don't have word yet. The Fish and Water Quality has been addressed, and the remaining issue is the effects to the Roadless Area immediately west of the Community which is something we cannot give up and still have an effective project.
- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

Update: Clear Creek EIS

We are still awaiting the final Biological Opinion (BO). We published a Draft Record of Decision (ROD) and Objection Process with a Decision in May 2015 and completed a FEIS and that was published in December 2015. Consultation has continued since then. We didn't feel there were significant effects due to fire in the headwaters and we are awaiting the final BO. We sent the opinion to NMFS on Monday and they were poised to sign the BO a couple of weeks ago, but none of the analysis has shown that we are pushing or reaching any thresholds in the area. The Balde Fire burned in that area and it was a consequence of respecting the Nez Perce Tribe's wish to not perform direct suppression activities in their sacred area.

Comments:

- *How much of the 44, 000 acre area did that fire burn?* 700 acres. No proposed units were burned and the vast majority was low to moderate severity.
- *Were you able to address issues brought up by the Objectors?* The RO instructed us to update the analysis, but none of them have withdrawn.
- *The possibility of litigation still exists?* Probably a high chance.
- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

Update: Forest Plan Revision

The summer fire activity affected most projects, including the FPR. To move efficiently, we needed to look at the Team Structure and we were affected by numerous vacancies. That coupled with a changed condition, due to fire, has resulted in a plan to review the structure and what will get us efficiently across the finish line. While we fill those vacancies, we will address the changed condition and other bigger picture items. For example, Lynx and Aquatic restoration Strategy along with long Term Monitoring Strategy.

- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

Update: Lolo Insect and Disease

This is being performed by the same team as Clear Creek, causing us to fall behind. The 2015 fires did burn portions of the project area. We may need to revisit policy on mechanical logging in historical corridors.

Comments:

- *Maybe by spring you may know about fire impacts?* Yes, people are reviewing in the field right now. By the time winter is here we should know.
- *Can you speak to the historical corridor and mechanical equipment?* There have been 10 years of discussion on what kind of direction and how we manage National Historic Landmarks. We've been working on how to manage to meet criteria of National Historic Landmarks which is the highest level of protection afforded. The National Park Service performed a review and this particular landmark was in the 10% considered imperiled due to management activities. How should we be managing commercial timber harvest in the landmark corridor and under what circumstances is that okay? Or, is it that under no circumstances is it okay?
- *How wide is that corridor?* It's a designated corridor on the map and it's roughly ¼ mile on either side of the trail and then it splits around Snowy Summit. It's about 60,000 acres total.

- *What happened there?* It's part of the Lewis Clark Historical Trail.
- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

Update: Lowell WUI

In December it was considered that perhaps this project could fit into a Farm Bill Categorical Exclusion (CE) and we opted to take that route. Because we made that decision, part of the landscape was outside the Governor's Insect & Disease Priority Area, so we had to amend that landscape area which took two months. We then worked with the RO to review the Project Design and repackaged as CE. We went forward this summer with a public meeting and an additional letter updating them on the status of the project. The goal is to have the decision memo by the end of the Calendar Year.

- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

New Project: ELM Placer Exploration

Comments:

- *Were any of those lands acquired outside of the purview of the 1872 Mining Law which would require a Title Search to ensure they were not acquired under some authority outside of the 1872 Law?* Not in this case, our Mineral Administrators research that information. *If there was a way to pre-identify those lands and they lay it over the IRA map, it would be useful. (See previous note – Roadless Coordinator to look into how to address this issue and get back to units and Commission).*
- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

New Project: Lochsa and Selway River PIT-Tag Array Site Special Use Permit

This would install 4 pit tag detecting sites to count fish and they would share the data with others on how many fish pass through. There is virtually no impact and it is a temporary installation. It has been scoped and there were no concerns expressed.

- *Project does not need to come back to the Commission.*

New Project: 2015 Post-Fire Road Maintenance

Comments:

- *Do you always consider not removing material from riparian zones? It can become a mess for wildlife and a pile of fuel?* That came up during our discussion; we want to ensure we don't leave a fuel loading that wasn't acceptable where the risk outweighed the benefit. We propose to provide for options of manipulation of those fuels without putting equipment in the areas and also considered some contour felling.
- *How far off the road are you going?* Up to two tree lengths based on OSHA guidance and Forest Service direction. It will be implemented based on the tree's ability to impact the road. The uphill side of the road may require the full two tree lengths to mitigate concerns.
- *Is there roadside salvage to consider?* This is roadside hazard mitigation to provide safe administrative and public access to forest service roads. It' includes recreation and administrative sites as well. We have three teams to review potential proposals for straight salvage, which is a whole different group with a different purpose and need.
- *Outside the road prisms, what did your BAER report say you needed to do within these large burn areas to stabilize them or restore them?* It's important to characterize that BAER is an emergency need impacting immediate life and property. The emergency piece is different than other restoration/maintenance/rehab that we need to perform. It depends on the BAER report – the Teepee Fire requires different culvert upgrades, resurfacing and ditch work; the Wash Fire had significant impacts to roads. We have a separate Team working on BAER implementation.
- *Is there any hazard mitigation outside the Back Country Restoration Theme with regard to hazard mitigation?*
- *Commission members would like to see an update of this project at next meeting.*

New Project: 2015 Fire Suppression Activities

There was a scarcity of resources this season and a lot of the fires were threatening homes across the landscape. On the forest side, we put our resources to the partners Idaho Dept. of Lands, the Municipal Departments and that was the right thing to do – it created on the forest a situation with larger fires in the back country. In the Clearwater Basin, it was Grangeville, Craigmont and Kooskia that were not under evacuation notice during August and September. When it was all complete, we had 190,000 acres burned on the NF and over 125,000 in the Basin including private lands. The other difference was that it occurred in a short period of time and we had very little intel – we had a smoke inversion that prevented us from flying and we had no infrared photos. So, we performed in-depth risk management on dealing with the fires. We looked at reducing firefighter exposure and utilized methods that reduced that risk.

Comments:

- *Were the fuel breaks designed to protect communities?* Yes, we designed the fuel breaks for multiple reasons. First, using logging equipment instead of a dozer is less impactive where we can walk up and down ridgetops and manipulate fuel more conducive to burning or being able to be picked up later. Additionally, we looked at ridgetops and chose logical lines according to fuel type. The Wash Fire is a good example of using previous lines (Slims Fire) and that allowed us to get into steeper ground we couldn't otherwise access. We had a masticating head on some of the Wash Fire which made a huge difference. A mechanical line was used as there were zero resources available and as we saw resources being distributed to other places, so we ordered as much equipment as possible.
- *Were all these lines constructed within a short period of time?* This was over a six week period during early August and into September. It's hard to define "short" and for us, we packed a historically bad fire season into the span of 2 months.
- *On the Blue Fire, I recognize you had to make split second decisions, but I would raise the issue of whether or not the route meets a temporary road under the Rule – as I understand that we will be sending trucks in to remove log decks – effectively turning it into a road.* We are able to perform road construction for fire suppression with the Regional Forester approval. We did not construct a temporary road, which is actually an impact of driving the equipment up the road. It was purely a secondary fire line. It was never traveled by anything other than the equipment that established it. The lower 2/3 of the line is steep, so on this part the Forest is proposing to complete NEPA on a fuel reduction project that combines getting the remaining decks off the line and tying into Comstock.
- *Based on the map, from the Blue Fire you would remove the material out to the road?* Yes
- *Are you going to send logging truck in to pick up those decks?* Yes. *So, I would contend that you have a road in a roadless area. That requires consideration.* One point, the condition the road left in will be useful and usable for the removal of those decks so there will not be any additional disturbance. Once the fire is controlled, the emergency is therefore over.
- *Will that material come out this winter?* Yes, it will come out November 24th.
- *If you read the Rule, it's clear that everything done was in compliance with the Rule. Even in Road Construction (even this isn't in the classical sense) as long as the proper authorities were checked with (the RO in this case) you can remove the material (which they did) and it will be moved over the snow (even better). If it's a temporary road, we close it under the Rule – so let's close it and do what's appropriate.*
- *Definition of a road - Does the fuel break become a road?*
    - *A road is defined in 212, not a Forest Road or anything else*
    - *This is an extenuating circumstance for an emergency act.*
    - *What concerns me is what happens afterwards. I can count hundreds of routes that have become permanent, recreation roads after the fact. I understand the concern, but I wouldn't get too hung up on it. I am more concerned about what happens afterwards and making sure the firelines constructed do not become roads in the future.*

Nez Perce Clearwater Project to carry forward to Next Commission Meeting:

- Lolo Insect and Disease
- Clear Creek
- Lowell WUI
- Forest Plan Revision
- Post Fire Road Maintenance
- Orogrande

Public Comment

- No comments

Commission Member Feedback and Critique

- I think it was a good idea to review the agenda and review which projects to carry forward. It's wasteful of the Forest's time and ours to review projects. It appears it is more difficult for the Nez Perce – Clearwater to move projects forward. We've seen a few of them too many times.
- I like the new process. Do not let our business schedule prevent anything the Forest Service needs to do – we should not impact their timelines.
- It could also mean that we only have to meet once per year instead of twice.
- It's enabled us to prioritize the projects in terms of importance to us. There are a few we need to spend more time on.
- There are some things we need to discuss more in depth, such as what constitutes a road and what doesn't.
- I hope Nez Perce & Clearwater aren't holding up progress due to us. Something that may be important to you may not be important to me – so I appreciate the process. Can we get a contact list?
- I like the prioritizing of the projects. We should have a review of some of the definitions and perhaps included in the next notebooks.
- I like the condensed format. Perhaps we can add value by having the Chairs find 2-3 projects that raise broad issues we need to cover and allocate a portion of our meeting to discussing that. The value is when we have a dialogue among ourselves. This is a huge commitment of time and money by the Forest Service; I want to ensure we are providing value. If this is just busy-work I'd like to change the format so that we aren't.
- As a new member I enjoyed the meeting. Use common sense in what you do.

- Thank you to the Regional Foresters attending. It's been 7 years since the Rule has been passed and it's taken that long to really get the inertia moving. It will become more important as Forest Plan Revisions come forward and address Roadless Areas. I'd like to see more agency awareness of a Cohesive Strategy. I like the streamlined condensed version.
- I like the new format, but I'll withhold judgment. Hopefully, we don't delay any forest projects on our behalf. Have we ever had a representative from Mike Simpson's Office? The others are always here. *There was someone on the field trip.*
- I like the abbreviated agenda on the projects if it isn't productive. I'd like to take the time and review the 7 years and see if it's working for Idaho. Are there things the FS is not using enough? Can we do some sort of Report Card?
- No additions here, I like the new format.
- I appreciate that we all work together so well. Welcome back Jim, it's good to have you here and you bring good value. Brad, it's so good to see you as well and thank you for all your efforts.

Feedback from Regional Foresters:

- Thank you, it's my first visit here and to see how it works in person. Having the discussion is useful for us in determining other ways to think about things.
- The meeting has multiple values for me – just to be in Idaho is a good experience. Getting the statewide perspective is invaluable. I was intrigued by the Field Trips and the Training – I would make more of an effort to attend a Field Trip in the future and I'm sorry I missed it. Continuing the training is really important.

Meeting Adjourned

James L. Caswell, Chair (208-365-7420) jlcaswell@q.com

Dale R. Harris, Vice-Chair (406-240-2809) dharris@bigsky.net

Summary of Idaho Roadless Projects (36 CFR 294 Subpart C)

October 2015

Table 1. Accomplishments since October 2008

NEPA Decision	National Forest	Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Exception Applied
09/15/15	Nez Perce-Clearwater	Clarke Mt OHV Trail	Siwash/BCR	Trail Relocation, armoring, and decommissioning of old trail. Cutting approximately 6 12-inch trees.	≈ 0.21	294.26(a) 294.26(c)
2015 – NEPA N/A	Nez Perce-Clearwater	Fire Suppression	Gospel Hump/BCR Mallard/BCR Hoodoo/WLR Sneakfoot Meadows/BCR John Day/BCR Little Slate Creek/BCR Rackliff-Gedney/BCR, FPSA Silver Creek-Pilot Knob/SAHTS O'Hara-Falls Creek/BCR West Meadow Creek/BCR	Approximately 24.4 miles of mechanical line construction – some along existing firelines, roads, or trails. Feller/Buncher and/or grapple skidder cut and decked trees. Most decks removed and sold.	75-100	294.24(a)(2) 294.24(b)(1)(v) 294.22(c)(1)(vii) 294.24(d)

NEPA Decision	National Forest	Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Exception Applied
2015 – NEPA N/A	Idaho Panhandle	Fire Suppression	East Cathedral Peak	Constructed 3 miles of dozer line	3	294.24(c)(1)(vii)
08/14/15	Caribou-Targhee	Dry Ridge Exploration	Dry Ridge/GFRG	Fertoz USA LLC submitted a plan for phosphate exploration on the Dry Ridge federal phosphate lease, IDI-07238.	32	294.24(d) 294.25(e)(4)
7/27/15	Idaho Panhandle	Treasured Landscapes Recreation Project	▪ Beetop/BCR ▪ Scotchman Peaks/WLR, BCR, and FPSA ▪ Trestle Peak/BCR ▪ Mt Willard-Lake Estelle/BCR and FPSA	Trail reconstruction (5.5 ac.), decommissioning (3.6 ac.), rerouting (3.8 ac.), and boardwalk construction.	≈13	294.24(c)(1)(vii)
07/21/15	Sawtooth	Redfish 210 Post-Insect Outbreak Fuels Project	Huckleberry/BCR	Prescribed burning and hand thinning to reduce stand density, improve large tree growing conditions, and protect values-at-risk (Redfish Lodge, Redfish Lake recreational complex, etc.)	280	294.24(c)(1)(i,iii-v)
07/18/15	Payette	Forgy Water System SUP	Rapid River/ Primitive	Authorize the continued operation and maintenance of a water system. No improvements or changes	0	294.26
07/10/15	Salmon-Challis	East Boulder Placer Exploration	Napoleon Ridge/GFRG	Drill auger holes and dig trenches in order to test for placer gold.	<1	294.24(d) 294.25(b)
06/30/15	Payette	2015 Range Improvement Projects	French Cr/Patrick Butte/BCR and Primitive	Installing/rebuilding fence Replacing gate/cattle guard		294.26(b)

NEPA Decision	National Forest	Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Exception Applied
06/19/15	Payette	Golden Hand EIS	Big Creek Fringe, Placer Creek, Secesh River/BCR Big Creek Fringe, Cottontail Point/Pilot Peak, Placer Creek, Smith Creek/Primitive	Cut approximately 50 trees for the purpose of providing mine timbers and to facilitate operations		294.25(b) 294.24(b)(iv) 294.24(b)(v) 294.24(c)(1)(vi) 294.24(c)(1)(vii) 294.26(a)
06/15/15	Caribou-Targhee	Smoky Canyon Mine Panel G Mod	Meade Peak and Sage Creek/GFRG.	Lease modification for a permanent overburden disposal site and temporary storage site. 280 acres added to the lease, 151 acres of new disturbance	431	294.25(e)(1)
05/21/15	Nez Perce-Clearwater	Fish Creek Weir	North Lochsa Slope/ Primitive	Reissuance of a special use permit	1	294.26(a) 294.26(c)
03/19/15	Idaho Panhandle	Big Creek Trail Reroute	Big Creek/BCR	Relocate approximately 1½ miles of trail and obliterate the replaced trail.	≈1	294.24(c)(1)(vii)
03/19/15	Idaho Panhandle	Marble Creek Trail Reroute	Grandmother Mt/BCR	Relocation x miles of trail and obliterate the replaced trail	≈1	294.24(c)(1)(vii)
01/05/15	Idaho Panhandle	IPNF and Kootenai Forest Plan Revision	Forest-wide	Forest Plan Revision	--	
12/04/14	Salmon-Challis	Upper North Fork	Allan Mt/BCR and FPSA Anderson Mt/BCR West Big Hole/BCR	▪ Rx burn ▪ Pre-commercial thin ▪ Shaded fuel break ▪ Commercial thin ▪ Meadow treatment ▪ Designated old growth treatment ▪ Temp road const. (miles) ▪ Road decommission (miles)	22,161 2 192 585 1,190 2,242 . 2.13 2.99	294.24(c)(1)(i) 294.23(b)(2) 294.28(f) 294.24(c)(1)(iv)
11/25/14	Payette	Jackson Creek Trail Reroute	French Creek/BCR	Reroute, reconstruct, and decommission several sections of existing motorized trail.	1.8	294.24(c)(1)(vii) 294.26(a)

NEPA Decision	National Forest	Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Exception Applied
10/10/14	Idaho Panhandle	St. Joe RD Outfitter and Guide Permit Renewals	North Fork, Hammond Creek, Meadow Creek-Upper North fork, Sheep Mountain-State Line, Big Creek, Storm Creek, Roland Point, Mallard Larkins, and Mosquito Fly	Outfitter and guide permit renewal		N/A
9/18/14	Sawtooth	Rusty Nugget Placer Exploration	Smokey Mountains/BCR	20 sample holes per acre	4	294.25
9/18/14	Boise	South Fork Boise River Corridor Post-Fire Restoration	Cathedral Rocks and House Mountain/FPSA and Primitive	Upland and riparian planting	2,437	NA – Activity not prohibited by the Rule
7/9/14	Idaho Panhandle	Simmons Fuels	Sheep Mt-State Line/BCR Mallard Larkins/WLR	Rx burning and planting. Small number of trees may be cut for safety purposes	7,047	294.24(a)(2) and 294.24(c)(1)(vii)
DM not required	Payette	Cuddy Mountain Repeater	Cuddy Mountain/Primitive	Repeater installation	80 ft^2	294.26(c)
6/25/14	Sawtooth	Pole Creek Road Realignment	Boulder-White Clouds/FPSA	1.3 miles of road relocated out of a riparian conservation area.	2	294.28(f)
6/24/14	Boise	GRAIP to WINe	Caton Lake/BCR	2.4 miles of road obliteration	≈ 6	294.24(c)(1)(vii)
3/11/14	Nez Clearwater	Deadhorse Trail Reroute	Little Slate Creek North/BCR and SAHTS	Reroute approx 2,000 ft of trail onto adjacent side slopes; removing 2 fords on Deadhorse Creek	>½	294.26(a)
2/25/14	Salmon-Challis	East Boulder Placer Mine Exploration	Napoleon Ridge/GFRG	Drill 50 6-inch diameter auger holes (16' deep) and four trenches (5'w x 10'lx 20'd) trenches to test for placer gold.	NA	294.25(b)
2/24/14	Idaho Panhandle	Marble Creek Splash Dam Modification	Grandmother Mt./BCR	Breach two splash dams	NA	NA – Activity not prohibited by the Rule

NEPA Decision	National Forest	Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Exception Applied
2/12/14	Payette	Idaho Power Company Big Bar-Silver Mine 12kV	Hells Canyon and Seven Devils Scenic/Primitive	New special use permit to continue operation and maintenance of a 12kV buried distribution line. No road construction, no ground disturbance.	2	NA – Activity not prohibited by the Rule
2/3/14	Idaho Panhandle	Idaho Buckhorn Burning	Buckhorn Ridge/BCR	Rx burning to improve wildlife habitat, restore WBP, and reduce natural fuel accumulations. Some tree cutting may occur for safety purposes.	2,130	294.24(c)(1)(vii)
12/18/13	Idaho Panhandle	Expedition Idaho Marathon	Grandmother Mountain, Pinchot Butte, Mallard-Larkins, Sheep Mountain – State Line, Midget Peak, and Big Creek	Issue a special-use permit to Expedition Idaho for a multiday adventure race proposed for five days in August 2013.		N/A
12/17/13	Payette	Bear Pete Trail Reroute	French Creek/BCR	Rerouting and reconstructing sections of a motorized trail to mitigate ongoing resource damage. Some tree may be cut if unavoidable.	2.5	294.24(a)(2) 294.26(a)
12/2/13	Boise	Big Creek White Bark Pine Enhancement	Stony Meadows and Needles/Primitive and BCR	Fell competing conifers within 5-20 feet of live whitebark pine trees.	1,200	294.24(b)(1)(i)&(ii) 294.24(b)(2)(i)&(iii)&(iv) 294.24(c)(1)(iii)&v 294.24(c)(2)(i)&(ii)&(iii)
9/6/13	Sawtooth	Salmon River Headwater Road 215	Smoky Mts./FPSA	Relocate trailhead and motorized trail for purposes of river restoration and to mitigate ongoing resource damage.	NA	294.28(f)

NEPA Decision	National Forest	Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Exception Applied
7/18/13	Idaho Panhandle	Dunn Peak Communications Building	Storm Mountain	Two pre-fabricated communication buildings would be installed on sites currently occupied by existing structures.		N/A
7/18/13	Idaho Panhandle	Electra Crash Site	Big Creek	Issue an ARPA permit to TIGHAR to conduct an archaeological field school on the 1936 crash site of the Lockheed Electra 10A.		N/A
7/15/13	Sawtooth	Deer Creek	Buttercup Mountain/Primitive	▪ Rx burn ▪ Handline construction ▪ Thinning for wildlife habitat/Douglass-fir stand restoration and WBP restoration ▪ Trail realignment and heavy maintenance ▪ Trailhead rehabilitation	5,150 1.2 125 3.5 miles NA	294.24(b)(1)(i)(ii)
6/11/13	Nez Perce Clearwater (Two decisions)	Roadside Hazard Tree Removal	Little Slate Creek North, North Fork Spruce-White Sands, Dixie Summit-Nut Hill, and Gospel Hump/ BCR and FPSA	Felling, removing, and selling dead and dying trees impacted by 2012 wildfires.	272	294.24(c)(1)(vii)
5/13/13	Payette	Twentymile Trail Relocation	Secesh/WLR	Relocation of trail to mitigate erosion concerns for soil and water quality	2	294.24(a)(2) 294.26(a)
4/15/13	Boise	Idaho Power Line #328	Meadow Cr, Caton Lake, Reeves Cr./BCR & GRFG	0.12 miles of existing unauthorized road and 0.2 miles in GFRG added to transportation system.	NA	294.23(f)
2/28/13	Boise	Stolle Priority Watershed Reforestation	Peace Rock/BCR & FPSA	Plant conifers and fell trees for helispots	6,500	294.24(c)(1(vii)

NEPA Decision	National Forest	Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Exception Applied
2/21/13	Idaho Panhandle	Rugg Drop Camp	Meadow Creek – Upper North Fork	Permit an outfitter to use a drop camp along the St. Joe Lake Trail 49 for 7-10 days.		N/A
8/30/12	Boise	Snowmobile Tr. Grooming in Valley, Gem, & Boise Counties	Poison Creek/BCR	Fell 10-12 trees along 0.65 miles of trail	NA	294.24(c)(1)(vii)
8/20/12	Payette	Chelsia Lode Exploration	Cottontail Point and Pilot Peak/Primitive and BCR	Excavate up to 25 sample pits that are 4' x 20' x 5' deep. Remove 1 ft^3 sample, then backfill.	57	294.25(b)
7/12/12	Sawtooth	Liberal Willow	Blackhorse Creek, Liberal Mt., Buttercup Mt./Primitive & GFRG	Reduce fuels/restore ecosystems ▪ Thinning ▪ Burning	 1,160 5,090	294.24(b)(1)(ii) and (d)
6/22/12	Sawtooth	Raymond Mine	Smokey Mts./BCR	Reopen two collapsed audits and a collapsed shaft. Underground mining.	5	294.25(b)
5/30/12	Caribou-Targhee	Whitebark Pine Protection	Mt. Jefferson/Primitive	Restore whitebark pine – lop and scatter	180	294.24(b)(1)(i)(ii)
3/7/12	Boise	Oro Mountain	Stony Meadows/Primitive & BCR	Restore whitebark pine – lop and scatter	1,510	294.24(b)(1(i) and (c)(1)(iii)
2/14/12	Nez Perce	Selway-Winter Range	Rackliff Gedney/BCR	Restore shrub fields – slash	3,000	NA
7/27/11	Nez Perce	Nut Basin	Little State Creek/BCR	Restore whitebark pine – lop and scatter; Rx burn	480	294.24(c)(1)(iv)
6/24/11	Sawtooth	Free Gold	Lime Creek/Primitive	Reduce fuels/restore ecosystems ▪ Thinning ▪ Burning	 58 173	294.24(b)(1)(ii)(iii)
6/10/11	Boise	Cache Creek	Red Mountain/BCR	Restore whitebark pine – slash; pile burn	164	294.24(c)(1)(iv)
12/21/09	Salmon Challis	Slide Hunter	Boulder White Cloud/BCR	Restore aspen – slash and burn	1,275	294.24(c)(1)(iv)

Table 2. Proposals – Scoping started

Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Road Const. (Miles)	Exception Applied	Status
Boise National Forest						
Swanholm Repeater Site	Ten Mile/Black Warrior/WLR	Set a shelter in place with attached antenna mast. No excavation and no foundation poured. The shelter will be flown in and set in place. No tree cutting. May use existing FS road 229LO.	6'x6'x8' LxWxH	NA	294.26(c)	Scoping 5/15 DM 11/15
Carlin Minerals Exploration	Grimes Pass/GFRG	Explore for locatable minerals using ¼ mile of existing unauthorized route, which will receive road maintenance. No tree cutting. Removal of 30-40 tons of mineral material	<1	NA	294.25(b) 294.23(d)(2) 294.23(e)	Scoping 5/15 DM 11/15
Boise River Feasibility Study	Cow Creek, Mt Heinen, Danskin/ Primitive and FPSA	Potential to raise Arrowrock Dam 72 feet. Final scale and scope unknown at this time. Could inundate Middle Fork Boise River Road, requiring relocation of the road.	Unknown	Unknown	294.23(a) 294.24(b)(1)(v) 294.27(b)	Draft feasibility study spring 2016 Final feasibility study winter 2017 ROD/spring 2017
Snowbank Underground Powerline Maintenance	Snowbank/Primitive	Replace approximately 2.5 miles of buried underground electric distribution feeder line serving FAA within existing 10-foot ROW (ROW is already authorized under existing special use permit).	3	N/A	294.24(b)(1)(v) 294.26 294.28(b)	Mtc. Under existing permit. Implement summer 2016
Caribou-Targhee National Forest						
Dairy Syncline	Huckleberry Basin/GFRG	Mine, reclamation plan, and land exchange ▪ Road construction ▪ Surface occupancy ▪ Land exchange	1,798 640	0.5	294.25(e)(1) 294.25(e)(1) 294.27(b)	Scoped 04/10 DEIS 06/16 FEIS 03/17 ROD 06/17
Husky 1 – North Dry Ridge Mine	Schmidt Peak/BCR and FPSA	Administrative correction – minor mapping errors ▪ 0.71 acres GFRG to FPSA ▪ 2.6 acres BCR to FPSA	NA	NA	294.27(a)	On Hold

Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Road Const. (Miles)	Exception Applied	Status
Rainey Creek Vegetation Restoration	Palisades/BCR	▪ Prescribed burning ▪ Hand Thinning 50 foot boundary buffer ▪ Juniper/Mt Mahogany slashing ▪ Aspen Regeneration Slashing	2,104 18 408 435	0	294.24(c)(1)(vii) 294.24(c)(1)(i) 294.24(c)(1)(iv)	Reconsidering proposed action based on public comment
Montpelier Aspen Retention Project	Huckleberry Basin/BCR, GFRG Dry Ridge/BCR, GFRG	Utilize a mixture of thinning and prescribed fire to remove the conifer encroachment and other vegetative competition that is adversely impacting aspen.	900	0	294.24(c)(1)(iii) 294.24(c)(1)(iv) 294.24(d)	Decision in early 2017
Soda Springs Aspen Retention Project	Stump Creek/BCR, GFRG	Utilize a mixture of thinning and prescribed fire to remove the conifer encroachment and other vegetative competition that is adversely impacting aspen.	900	0	294.24(c)(1)(iii) 294.24(c)(1)(iv) 294.24(d)	Decision in early 2017
Idaho Panhandle National Forest						
Deer Creek Project	Buckhorn Ridge/BCR	▪ Prescribed burning ▪ Non-motorized reconstruction/maintenance	423 10	0	294.24(c)(1)(vii)	Scoped 1/2015 EA 02/2016 Decision 11/16
Treasured Landscapes Rx Burning and WBP Restoration	▪ Beetop/BCR ▪ Scotchman Peaks/WLR, BCR, and FPSA ▪ Trestle Peak/BCR ▪ Mt Willard-Lake Estelle/BCR and FPSA	Prescribed fire to reduce fuel accumulations. Weed and release treatments w/ slash pull back around individual whitebark pine.	3,107	0	294.24(c)(1)(vii)	Decision Spring 2016
Nez Perce - Clearwater National Forest						
Orogrande Community Protection Project (Orogrande Fuels)	West Fork Crooked River/BCR	Reduce hazardous fuels ▪ Temporary Roads (CPZ) ▪ Fuel break (CPZ) ▪ Shelterwood (CPZ)	 18 252	2.05	294.23(b)(2) 294.24(c)(1)(i) 294.24(c)(1)(i)	Scoped: 09/11 Comment 4/15 Obj 10/15 Decision 1/16

Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Road Const. (Miles)	Exception Applied	Status
Clear Creek Integrated Restoration	Clear Creek/BCR	Rx burn with some hand-constructed fireline within CPZ. Timeline has been delayed due to fisheries consultation.	1,371	0	294.24(c)(1)(vii)	Scoped 01/12 FEIS/Draft ROD 2/15 Decision 10/15
Lolo Insect and Disease	Eldorado Cr/BCR	Commercial timber harvest to maintain and restore ecosystem composition and function. Timeline has been delayed due to additional fisheries consultation needed for Clear Creek Integrated Restoration.	340	0	294.24(c)(1)(iii-v)	Scoped 04/2013. Changed condition review 2016.
Nez Perce-Clearwater Forest Plan Revision	Forest-wide	The 1987 Forest Plans for each Forest are being revised and combined into one Forest Plan for the combined Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests.	All	0	NA – activity not prohibited by the ID Roadless Rule	TBD
Lowell WUI	Rackliff-Gedney/ BCR and FPSA	Harvest timber around the community of Lowell to reduce hazardous fuel conditions	150	½	294.23(b)(2) 294.24(c)(1)(i)	Scoped 2014 Rescoping to comply with Farm Bill Decision 12/15
ELM Placer Exploration	Gospel Hump/BCR	Claimholders of ELM claims #1-#10 propose to explore for gold by digging seven test pits or trenches and processing the excavated materials to recover gold.	<½	0	294.25(b) 294.24(c)(1)(vii)	Decision spring 2016
Lochsa and Selway River PIT-Tag Array Site SUP	Rackliff-Gedney/FPSA	Install four instream Passive Integrated Transponder (PIT) tag detection sites in the lower Lochsa and Selway rivers.	<1/2	0	294.28(f)	Scoping 7/15 Decision summer/fall 2016

Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Road Const. (Miles)	Exception Applied	Status
2015 Post-Fire Road Maintenance	Bighorn-Weitas, Eldorado Creek, Gospel Hump, John Day, Lochsa Face, Mallard, Mallard-Larkins, North Lochsa Slope, O'Hara-Falls Creek, Rackliff-Gedney, Sneakfoot Meadows and West Meadow Creek All BCR	Maintain roads, recreation sites and administrative sites throughout the forest including remove hazard trees along roads throughout the fire areas. In IRAs, this will be primarily road maintenance.	836	0	294.24(c)(1)(vii) 294.26(c)	NEPA – winter or spring 2016 Implement summer 2016
Payette National Forest						
7 Devils Lodge O/G SUP Reissue	Hells Canyon-7 Devils Scenic/Prim, Rapid River/WLR & FPSA, Cuddy Mountain/Primitive	Reissue SUP to 7 Devils Lodge for outfitting and guiding winter snowmobiling and non-motorized activities in the summer.	NA	NA	294.26(a)	Scoped 03/15 Decision 12/15
Golden Meadows Exploration	Sugar Mt./BCR	Exploration drilling (10 holes) using a heli-portable tracked LF-70 core rig or equivalent. General Mining Law of 1872. Decision in 2013, litigated, decision withdrawn. Will likely supplement the EA	0.13	0	294.25(b)	Comment Period 12/14 Obj. 9/15 Decision 1/16
Big Creek Recreation and Access Management and Big Creek Road Plan of Operation	Smith Cr, Secesh, Placer Cr, Cottontail Point, Pilot Peak, and big Cr Fringe/BCR and Primitive	Travel Management	NA	NA	294.26(a)	Draft EA 05/2016 Obj. 09/2016 Decision 01/17
Snowmobile Outfitter & Guide Tours SUP	Numerous	Authorize outfitting and guiding snowmobile tours utilizing existing open groomed snowmobile trails, as well as areas open to over-snow use for off trail riding.	NA	NA	294.26	Scope 1/2015 Draft EA 11/15 Decision 11/15

Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Road Const. (Miles)	Exception Applied	Status
Middle Fork Weiser River Landscape Restoration Project	Council Mountain/ Primitive Poison Creek/BCR (No Activities Proposed)	Sign and designate the #202 trail as open for non-motorized use. Complete needed switchback construction to mediate the steep sections. Trail is 0.8 miles in length. Re-route portions of the #198 trail near the base of Council Mountain to reduce resource impacts and improve sustainability. Reduce congestion of multiple trail junctions in this sensitive upper elevation trail network. To accommodate continued two-wheel motorized access on the entire #198 trail, change the designation of a 2-mile segment from non-motorized to two-wheel motorized use. Unauthorized route decommissioning – full obliteration, 9 segments, 0.8 miles. Trail Maintenance – 15 miles.	10-15	0	294.24(b)(1)(v) 294.26(a)	Obj. 3/16 Decision 5/16
Brundage Mt SUP Reissuance	French Cr/ Primitive Patrick Butte/FPSA and Primitive	To authorize Brundage Mountain Resort a special use authorization for outfitting and guiding with permitted activities that includes guided backcountry skiing via snowcat on approved routes.	NA	NA	294.26	Scope 2/2015 Draft EA 12/15 Obj. 04/16 Decision 08/16
Big Creek Roads Plan of Operation	Secesh/Primitive, BCR Placer Creek/BCR, Primitive Big Creek Fringe/ BCR Smith Creek/Prim Cottontail Point/Pilot Peak/ Primitive	Authorize the use of 26.3 miles of existing roads to full size motor vehicles to conduct activities associated with locatable minerals, including geochemical analysis, sampling, and geologic mapping.	NA	0	294.25	Scope 2/2015 Draft EA 5/16 Obj. 10/16 Decision 02/17

Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Road Const. (Miles)	Exception Applied	Status
Hum Lake Trail Reroute	Secesh/WLR	Build approximately 2,100' of new trail along a contour at 6,875' elevation from a switchback dropping into the Hum Lake Basin to the 4th switchback along the trail leaving the Hum Lake Basin north towards North Fork of Lick Creek	<0.5	0	294.24(a)(2)	Scoping 11/15 Decision 12/15
No Name Water System	Big Creek Fringe/BCR	Issue a 30 year SUP authorization for the continued operation and maintenance of an existing water system on No Name Creek, an intermittent tributary to Big Creek.	NA	0	294.28(b)	Decision 12/15
Salmon-Challis National Forest						
Thompson Creek Mine Land Exchange	Squaw Creek/BCR	Thompson Creek Mining Company (TCMC) proposes to exchange four parcels of private lands (non-Federal land) totaling approximately 526.17 acres within the Salmon-Challis National Forest (S-CNF) and the Sawtooth National Forest for approximately 2845.66 acres of National Forest System (NFS) land.	590	NA	NA – activity not prohibited by the ID Roadless Rule	On Hold
Ramey Creek Vegetation Improvement Project	Copper Basin/BCR	Mechanical and non-mechanical treatment. Prescribed burning. Administrative corrections to boundaries to address "cherry stem" road mapping issue.	619	NA	294.24(c)(1)(iv) 294.24(c)(1)(v) 294.26(a) 294.26(c) 294.27(a)	Scoping not started yet
Mammoth Canyon Road Reclamation	White Knob/BCR	Decommission 21 unauthorized routes (U-routes, also called unclassified, undetermined, and user-created) and 5 closed system routes in the Alder Creek drainage.	20-25	NA	294.26(a)	Scoping 5/15 Obj 08/15 Decision 09/15
Big Hill Insect and Disease	Squaw Creek/BCR	Create stands that are resilient to insect and disease agents and to reduce hazardous fuels.	< 600	NA	294.24(c)(viii)	Scoping 6/15
Phelan/ Sharkey Farm Bill Project (Old North	Napias and Phelan/GFRG	A variety of treatments will be utilized to treat up to 3,000 acres of hazardous fuels	< 3,000	TBD	294.23(c)(1) 294.23(d)(1)&(2) 294.23(e) 294.24(d) 294.26(a) & (c)	Scoping not started yet

Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Road Const. (Miles)	Exception Applied	Status
Zone)						
Lee Creek Allotment Invading Conifer Removal Project	Lemhi Range/BCR	Removal of conifers that are invading mapped sage-grouse habitat within the Lee Creek Allotment, Leadore Ranger District	317	0	294.24(c)(1)(iv) 294.24(c)(2) 294.26(a) & (c)	TBD
Westcor Exploration	Greylock/BCR	Approve, with terms and conditions, an operating plan for mineral exploration that includes temporarily re-opening an undesignated route and construction of a temporary route.	2	0.5	294.25(b)	Scope winter 2015/16
Dump Creek Withdrawal	Napoleon Ridge/ GFRG	Withdraw federal land, subject to valid existing rights, from mineral entry under the General Mining Law for a period of 20 years.	107	0	294.25(b)	Decision spring 2016
Sawtooth National Forest						
Oversnow Travel Mgt, Fairfield RD	Smokey Mts/BCR, P, FPSA Blackhorse Cr/Prim Lime Cr/BCR, Prim Elk Ridge/Primitive	Complete winter travel planning per Travel Management Rule (36 CFR Part 212, subpart C).	184,251	NA	294.26(a)	Scoping 9/15 EA and Draft Decision 10/15 Obj. 11/15 Decision 12/15 (or 3/16 if objected)
Stanley Basin Grazing	Loon Cr/BCR Hanson Lakes/ WLR, BCR, FPSA, Primitive	Authorizing variable numbers and seasons of livestock grazing on the Stanley Basin, Alpine Way, and Goat Creek allotments.	17,855	0	294.26(b)	Scoping 11/15 Comment 5/16 Obj. 8/16 Decision 10/16
Minidoka Motorized Trail Revision	Fifth Fork Rock Creek/Primitive Mt. Harrison/Prim	Add 2.25 miles of motorized trail.	< 3	0	294.26(a)	Decision 7/16

Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Road Const. (Miles)	Exception Applied	Status
Sawtooth and Boise NFs Invasive Plant Treatments EIS	All IRAs on both Forests	Implement an adaptive management strategy that includes detection, control, and management to control or reduce the presence of invasive plants and non-native aquatic invasive plant species.	Over 4M	0	294.22(d)	NOI 4/16 Comment 5/16 Obj. 8/16 Decision 12/16
Copasetic Placer Plan of Operation	Smokey Mts/BCR	Evaluate a plan of operations submitted under 36 CFR 228 Subpart A for locatable mineral exploration with associated surface disturbing activities.	6	300' new const.	294.25(b)	Scoping fall 2015 Implement 7/16
Faulkner Group 1 Sheep Allotments	Lime Cr/Primitive and FPSA	Renew the sheep grazing permit under current management (last 3-5 years) and develop an Allotment Management Plan for six allotments.	57,000	0	294.26(b) 294.22(d)	Scoping 10/15 Comment 11/15 EA/draft decision 2/16 Objection 3/16 Decision 5/16

Table 3. Completed Corrections and Modifications

Forest	Project	Description	Acreage Changes		Finalized
Payette	Big Creek Fuels Reduction	Maps mistakenly identified a Forest Plan Special Area, a Wild & Scenic (WSR) along a corridor of Big Creek. Maps did not identify an existing FPSA for the WSR corridor along Lake Creek in the French Creek IRA.	▪ Big Creek Fringe IRA – 365 ac of FPSA changed to BCR and delete 3 ac of private; reducing size of IRA by 3 ac. ▪ Placer Creek IRA – 98 ac of FPSA changed to BCR & 14 ac of FPSA changed to Primitive ▪ Secesh IRA – 1,086 ac of FPSA changed to BCR ▪ Smith Creek IRA – 14 ac of FPSA changed to Primitive ▪ French Creek IRA – 1,000 ac of BCR changed to FPSA	294.27(a)	March 2011 (76 FR 17341)
Idaho Panhandle	Land Acquisition	Lands were acquired in 2008, after the Rule was promulgated that were within or adjacent to five IRAs (Big Creek, Grandmother Mountain, Pinchot Butte, Roland Point, and Wonderful Peak). In addition, two errors were found concerning Forest Plan Special Areas that were not consistent with the Idaho Panhandle National Forest Plan.	**These IRAs were <u>modified</u> due to acquired lands and have been classified as BCR:** ▪ Big Creek IRA – Add two parcels for an additional 158 acres ▪ Grandmother Mountain IRA – Add five parcels for an additional 1,107 acres ▪ Pinchot Butte IRA – Add one parcel for an additional 80 acres ▪ Roland Point IRA – Add one parcel for an additional 60 acres ▪ Wonderful Point – Add one parcel for an additional 59 acres **These IRAs were <u>corrected</u>:** ▪ Salmo-Priest IRA – Changed 65 acres of FPSA to WLR to reflect correct width of the eligible WSR corridor ▪ Upper Priest IRA – Changed 112 acres from BCR to FPSA,	294.27(a) 294.27(b)	June 2014 (79 FR 13627)

			reflecting the correct width of the eligible WSR corridor ▪ Buckhorn Ridge IRA has been added to the Kootenai NF on the list at 294.29. This IRA is split between the Kootenai and the IPNF and was inadvertently left off the list for the Kootenai.		
Caribou-Targhee	Gibson Jack Trailhead Relocation	Move the existing trailhead, which is within the West Mink IRA (BCR), to decrease sediment delivery to the stream, improve public access and safety, and reduce conflict with adjacent private lands.	The area of the new trailhead (11.4 acres) would be removed as roadless while 18.8 acres would be added from a cherry stem road (17 acres) and a West Fork boundary piece (1.8 acres) for a net gain of 7.4 acres.	294.27(b)	Oct 2, 2015 (80 FR 59727)

Table 4. Ongoing Corrections and Modifications

Forest	Project	Description	Proposed Acreage Changes	Status
Salmon-Challis & Sawtooth	Newly Designated Wilderness	An administrative correction is needed to adjust the roadless boundaries to conform to Congressional designations of Wilderness. Implement the three newly designated wilderness areas per the 1964 Wilderness Act as amended.	White Clouds Wilderness Area (approximately 90,769 acres) Hemingway-Boulder Wilderness Area (approximately 67,998 acres) Jim McClure- Jerry Peak Wilderness Area (approximately 116,898)	Awaiting "Administrative Corrections and Modifications Process" formalization through WO before proceeding