

Draft Notes
August 23, 2005
Priest GA – KIPZ Meeting
Priest Lake Range District Cookhouse
6:00 P.M – 9:00 P.M.

Agenda

- Purpose Review
- Unfinished topics
 - How MAs were mapped
 - Hughes Fork MA 2b, Wild and Scenic River
 - Timber harvest suitability
 - MA6 allocations and suitable uses
 - MA6 adjacent to MA5
 - Connected corridor – Salmo to Selkirk
 - Other
 - Economics
 - Next steps
- As time permits
 - Travel planning question
 - Backcountry

Attendees: 25 public attended and 4 Forest Service employees

Adjacency of MA5 and MA6

Take area between Bath Creek gorge north of ridge and Hungry Mountain IRA unroaded areas currently in 6 and change to 5a.

Six sections – unroaded and change

Would preserve wildlife values

Does have a motorized trail in vicinity

Keep area described above in 6MA to preserve opportunities for future trails

Area does have high fuel loads and steep slopes – concern for restoration opportunities and fuels treatments would be easier in MA6

Hughes Fork

Proposal: Below meadow where there is 5a to west of river, lay 5a over the river to provide some ecological protection.

*Need explanation of break in wild/recreation break and why recreation, not scenic for lower part.

Proposal: Jackson Creek area west of Hughes Fork change to 6C.

Proposal: Hughes Meadows – Motorized opportunities in winter are desirable (area at cabin)

Proposal: Keep recreation designation on lower portion.

Corridor Between Salmo 1B and Selkirk 1B

Proposal: Connect the two 1B areas with a series of 5a/5b areas for the protection of wildlife values, as wide as possible. Have realistic wide corridor that allows species movement.

Proposal: Leave as is, including existing snowmobile uses – management is working. Concern for compatibility in the area for caribou/grizzly habitat types.

Maybe more ability to address this compatibility issue in 6

Science issue: Need to recognize limitations of science in decision making specific to caribou.

No new recommended wilderness

Proposed wilderness – consider state context and political action on current proposals

MA6

Combine all to one 6 and decisions based on specific conditions

Need for on the ground work should dictate intensity

Drainages may need variety of treatment/intensity

Restoration activities should be separated from timber activities (could be in definitions or through management areas).

Private land is surrounded by 6b and 6c, if we can't explain why private lands can be surrounded by different 6s, it would be a reason to collapse into one 6.

For 6s – consider a “predictability overlay” that might lead to where we might go first.

GA desired condition or comments?

NOTES

Concern about Forest Plan flexibility, if grizzly is recovered, can plan change? Can access to closed or limited areas be open? Need to answer this in plan.

Forest Plan should not appear to limit travel options without clear reason and documentation. Should leave decision and discussion open.

Maintain flexibility for future decisions based on conditions, filters that would lead to travel/suitability.