

## Pend Oreille GA Workgroup Meeting Notes

**March 24, 2004**

**Attendance:** Forest Service: Dick Kramer, Chris Savage, Gary Ford and Jodi Kramer. Public: Paul Koch, Mark Sprengel, Fields Cobb, Larry Falk, John Finney, Jan Griffiths, John Harbuck, Olya & Don Helms, Phil Hough, Lanie Johnson, John Linch, Roger McCall, Dan & Lindsay McNall, Carter Payne, Art Piltch, Nicky Pleass, Liz Pryor, Don Robson, Paul Sieracki, Russ Stevens, Sandy & JoBeth Thomas, Dennis Wanous, Richard Warren, Duane & Karin Wentz, Justin Whitmore, Liz Sedler, Loyal Amstutz, Barb Best, Matt Bloom, Jay Cates, Mike Dawson, Cody Deane, Chuck & Alan George, Pat & Monica Gunter, Rick Hoffman, John Holbert, Richard & Mary Holcomb, Michael Lindgren, Mark Linscott, Matt Linscott, Mike & Nancy Lowrey, Buck & Janae Lukezceh, Per Mattsson, Jason Meyer, Bill Murray, Allen & Nick Myers, Brett Pteerson, Bill Phillips, Chris Shelton, Shawn Shreffler, Kip Smith, Angus & Krystal Travers, Herb Wiens, Joe Witte, John Miller, Michael Sherbon, Jack Hammack, Greg Hawks, Jason Franch, David & Debbie McCo, Ken Stevens, Kevin Stevens, Alan McNall, Eric Weisz, Mary Lee Fowler, J. Elsfelder, Jean Affermann, John Travers, Nathan Jeffers, Terry Capurso, Tabitha Lah, Mel Fowler, TJ Deis, Scott Wood, Dan Bachman, Richard & Brandon Gantenbein, Jeff & Adam Eich, Jack & Shiama Laude, Chuck Reeves, and David Mann.

**Dick welcomed the group and went over the agenda for the evening. The agenda included: everyone will go over the draft DC statements for watershed and aquatic species and indicate on their individual sheets the ones that they agree on (A), disagree on (D) and the ones they don't necessarily agree with but can live with (C). These were collected at the end of the evening and the results are included below.**

**Next meeting is April 14<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 – 8:00 pm at the District office and we will be going through the sensing exercise on Fire Risk and Wildlife and brainstorming exercise on Vegetation and Timber Production.**

Following are the results of the Sensing exercise on watersheds and aquatic species:

### Watershed Desired Condition Statements

#### GENERALLY AGREE and/or CAN LIVE WITH

**2b) Based on current condition and decision space, which of the watersheds, or watershed conditions, would you aggressively restore 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> etc. and why?**

- Maintain status quo for 'at risk' & 'properly functioning'. Maintain 1987 Forest Plan watershed management guidance (without amendments) for watershed restoration.
- Focus watershed restoration on repairing the cause of the problem while maintaining access.
- Streams that support T&E fish species should be a high priority for restoration – especially proposed bull trout critical habitat.
- Restore larger streams that are NPF or FAR before smaller streams.
- Restore tributaries first, to eliminate/ reduce impacts to downstream waters.
- Municipal watersheds should be a high priority for restoration.
- Priest River watershed should be a high priority for restoration.
- Aquatic corridors, such as the one between Lake Pend Oreille and Priest River watershed should be restored.
- Allow uses in NPF and FAR watersheds that will not further degrade them and avoid uses that will.
- The most severely degraded watersheds should be the highest priority for restoration.
- Restore the following areas for bull trout repopulation as well as other aquatic life. (Keeping in consideration the ability for human use to continue to co-exist in those areas.)  
Trestle Creek, Pack River, Lightning Creek, Grouse Creek
- Focus on 303d listed streams to Lake Pend Oreille.

**2c) Under what circumstances or conditions should watershed restoration be a primary focus and why?**

- Continue to use active management as a tool to restore watersheds.
- Preserve public use and wildlife -find a balance
- To address erosion and/or loss of soil.
- To maintain access to forest.

- To improve, maintain, stabilize diverse fish populations.
- Avoid degradation (increased sediment, increases in peak flows) in tributaries to Lake Pend Oreille to avoid impacts on the lake fishery.

**2d) How should watershed restoration be integrated with other resource management and activities?**

- Land management practices must not adversely affect watershed, wildlife, flora, etc.
- Integrate with fish protection.
- Incorporate watershed restoration with resource management (logging, mining, recreation, fire management, and/or road improvements).
  - User groups help with restoration in conjunction with maintaining use of areas. (Take responsibility to help with the restoration.)
  - Make sure you include wetlands in restoration activities.
  - Integrating the elimination of aquatic noxious weeds with watershed restoration.

**GENERALLY ARE SPLIT (Disagree and Agree)**

**2b) Based on current condition and decision space, which of the watersheds, or watershed conditions, would you aggressively restore 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> etc. and why?**

- Restore 'at risk' streams before more human use (recreation, commercial).
- Any stream 'not functioning' should be closed to access until fixed.
- Streams that are Not Properly Functioning (NPF) or Functioning at Risk (FAR) in proposed Wilderness areas should be a high priority for restoration.

<u>Priorities for Restoration</u>	<u>Historic Cause</u>
1. North Gold Creek	Mining
2. Trestle Creek	Erodable geographic features
3. Lightning Creek	Erodable geographic features
4. Grouse Creek	
5. Gold Creek	Fire & Logging
6. Granite Creek	
7. Pack River	Erodable geographic features & fire

**2c) Under what circumstances or conditions should watershed restoration be a primary focus and why?**

- Avoid reductions in forest canopy that will result in increased peak flows, in order to avoid stream channel destabilization.
- Maintain upstream/downstream connections, to allow re-colonization of upstream reaches. Connectivity is not only disrupted by physical barriers, but by warming of the lower reaches.
- Integrate and coordinate restoration efforts with the Columbia Basin Subbasin planning efforts that are currently going on in all the major drainages in the area.
  - By enforcing Forest Best Management Practices standards on Private, IDL, FS, etc.
  - No mining should occur since mining proves to be excessively damaging to all regional watersheds, rivers, lakes, marshes, lake bottoms, wetlands and streams beyond repair or sufficient restoration.

**2d) How should watershed restoration be integrated with other resource management and activities?**

- Consider interactions among keystone species in wetlands and riparian areas, e.g., large carnivores may maintain beaver-based wetland complexes, these carnivores, through their impact on ungulates may help maintain the integrity of riparian habitats.
- Maintain/increase terrestrial aquatic linkages. (eg. Grizzly – salmon) (grizzly – cutthroat)
- Place additional consideration for streams with breeding populations of harlequin ducks.

**GENERALLY DISAGREE**

**2c) Under what circumstances or conditions should watershed restoration be a primary focus and why?**

- Avoid all ground disturbing (resource extraction) activities, except for stream restoration, ie. road obliteration, in NPF watersheds.
- Obliterate roads (where necessary) in existing and historic bull trout and westslope cutthroat watersheds in order to achieve road densities established by USFWS as thresholds for avoiding negative impacts to bull trout habitat.

**Aquatic Species Desired Condition Statements**

**GENERALLY AGREE and/or CAN LIVE WITH**

**2b) Based on current condition and decision space, where do you want to see fishable populations or changes to what is currently fishable?**

- Restore streams so they support an abundance of fishable native fish populations.
- Fisheries should be restored to the fullest extent possible without removing improvements (dams, bridges, some culverts).
- Restore fisheries without limiting access, where possible. Fishable populations should continue to exist in the currently fishable regions with appropriate accessibility.
- Adhere to existing laws and regulations that protect fisheries and their habitat.
- Decisions regarding actions that have potential for impacting fish habitat must be based on the best available science.
- Restore streams and avoid degradation (increased sediment, increases in peak flows, channel instability) from future actions so they support an abundance of fishable (not just “minimum viable”) native fish populations.
- Pack River, Lightning Creek, Caribou Lake, and Porcupine Lake
- Dust abatement programs while maintaining access.
- Lake Pend Oreille: Provide positive ecological conditions and protection for aquatic populations in Lake Pend Oreille, and in all streams, lakes, rivers and all watersheds in the region.

**2c) What are your desired native and non-native species and why? Which fish species are important to you and why?**

- No non-native species
  - Prefer Native species over Non-Native species
  - Desired non native species include:
    - ✓ Kokanee
    - ✓ Tiger Muskie
    - ✓ Bass
    - ✓ Lake Trout
    - ✓ Brook Trout
    - ✓ German browns
    - ✓ Rainbow Trout
  - Desired Native species include:
    - ✓ Cutthroat
    - ✓ Red band
    - ✓ Torrent Sculpin

**2d) What do you want to see as far as the mix of species, native vs. non-native?**

- Predominately native species -no new species (non native)

**2e) If bull trout were recovered would this be a desirable fishable fish?**

- Bull trout –yes

**2f) What would you like to see for amphibian populations and species?**

- Maintain current populations
  - Crawdads, crayfish, frogs, turtles, salamanders – they all fit into the system.
  - Macro Invertebrates (the indicator species for healthy fisheries).
  - As far as restoring the historical populations of these amphibians, some historical restoration is not feasible. Historically, the population of amphibians was greater before the dam was created. In order to continue that sort of amphibious population that would consequently place our more recent restoration endeavors in jeopardy.

**GENERALLY ARE SPLIT (Disagree and Agree)**

**2b) Based on current condition and decision space, where do you want to see fishable populations or changes to what is currently fishable?**

- Fishable populations everywhere while managing the resources.

**2c) What are your desired native and non-native species and why? Which fish species are important to you and why?**

- All fish species are important.

**2d) What do you want to see as far as the mix of species, native vs. non-native?**

- Non-native species that compete with native species should be reduced or eliminated.

## 2f) What would you like to see for amphibian populations and species?

- Monitor native amphibians and reptile populations; avoid actions that would impact their habitat and reduce populations.
  - Leopard frog
  - Boreal toad
  - Coeur d'Alene salamander

### GENERALLY DISAGREE

None

### The group then split up into 4 smaller groups to brainstorm DC statements for Fire Risk and Wildlife and following are the results:

#### Group 1

**Members:** Jodi Kramer, USFS; John Finney (notetaker)\*, Liz Pryor, Jan Griffiths\*, Joe Witte\*, Philip Hough\*, Jo Beth & Sandy Thomas\*, Fields Cobb\*, Lanie Johnson\*, Mark Sprengel\*, Paul Sieracki\*, Larra Faulk\*, Mark Linscott\*, Per Mattson, Liz Sedler\*, Barbara Best\*, Nicky Pleass\*, Art Piltch. (Note- there were some members of the group that didn't get on the sign in list.) \* Indicates these people were involved in the review of these notes via e-mail.

#### Fire Risk

**“Draft” Forest-wide Goal 1c: Forest Health** – Increase the amount of forests restored to or maintained in a healthy condition with reduced risk and damage from fires, insects and diseases, and invasive species.

**NOTE:** The discussion began with some “Desired Conditions Statements” and then followed with an attempt to discuss the subparts of question 2)B), but much of the discussion overlapped. There was a comment the description of the goal should be changed from “Forest Health” to “Ecosystem Health.”

#### **Brainstormed Desired Conditions Statements:**

- Establish a comprehensive fire plan to include natural fire regimes in appropriate areas of the forest balanced by appropriate suppression efforts in other areas. Establish specific procedures suitable to each area's unique priorities. Monitoring and flexibility should be considerations in plan implementation.
- Manage fire that allows for re-population of all types of species from surrounding areas.
- Fire management use plan must take criteria into account.
- Fire is a tool to manage among many tools, as integrated with other tools (logging, thinning, etc.).

## **2B) For each of the following situations, address whether the following actions are appropriate and address other issues or concerns about these actions.**

### **A) Wildland Urban Interface (“WUI”)**

- Viewsheds protection – aesthetic appeal of area has direct economic impact, so WUI may need to extend beyond two mile area presently under consideration by Bonner County.
- Stick to the goal or charge of the WUI – protection of human life and property.
- Engage in activities for fuel reduction (thinning, prescribed burning, stand management)
- Two miles may be excessive – alternative suggested of 1 mile.
- GIS data should be provided for intelligent analysis and comments.
- Take care to mitigate the spread of noxious weeds.
- Concerned with having a set range or distance – consider topographic features and wind/weather patterns (i.e. Hope area topography).
- Mechanized fuel reduction shouldn't decrease forest health.
- Coordinate with other funds/funding available (i.e. funds for trailheads, access points, recreation opportunities).

- Don't divert government funds to protect people with private property who decide to live in or next to the forest.
- The Idaho Panhandle is narrow with cities or towns on each side of a mountain range, so the whole width may be appropriate as WUI.

### **B) Wildland Fire Use Areas (WFUA) – “Let Burn Fire Areas”**

- Include all IRAs as WFUA and exclude commercial logging or thinning from those areas.
- Manage reduction in fuels prior to adopting a let burn plan for an area (i.e. do logging, thinning first). Also do ongoing reviews of existing fuel loads.
- Non-prescribed human caused fires should be suppressed because not similar to natural fires.
- Natural fires should be allowed in Wilderness areas.
- Natural fires: let them burn in WFUA with a management plan.
- Use prescribed burns to reduce fuel loads.
- Natural fires should be allowed in proposed wilderness areas.
- Consider topography, weather, relative land in management plan.
- Consider suppression around power lines.
- Do not use forest service funds to protect private transmission facilities (they should do right of way management).

### **C) General Forest Areas**

- Suppress all fires (human or natural caused).
- Put fire back into the forest as much as we can, including prescribed burns.
- Depends on what management area(s) are involved.
- Maintain access for use in fire plans.

### **D) Forest Areas with Mixed Ownership**

- Adopt all general forest area policies (see comments above).
- Include mixed ownership checkerboard in WUI.
- Suppress all fires.

### **General Comments:**

- Different options must be available because we have diverse management areas on the forest.
- All infrastructure built in the national forests should be designed and built to let fire burn over it (houses, pipelines, and roads, etc.).

### **Wildlife**

**“Draft” Forest-wide Goal 1b: Condition for Species** – Provide ecological conditions to sustain viable populations of native and desired nonnative species and to achieve objectives for Management Indicator Species (MIS) and focal species.

**NOTE:**The discussion followed with the questions of 2)B) through 2)E).

**2B) There are almost 350 species of wildlife on the KIPZ. What changes in species have you seen over the past 20 years? Are these changes desirable or undesirable and why?**

- The number of species listed under the ESA have increased – not desirable from many points of view.
- Caribou appear to no longer be a sustainable species.
- FS take effort to maximize, not just recover or compromise species for timber management. Don't use minimum viable populations as the standards (use maximum). Maximize at all costs.
- Increase habitat to connect Yellowstone to Yukon corridor proposed by Wildlands project.
- Look at all native species and restore to healthy populations.
- Protect Grizzly Bear habitat.
- Protect Lynx habitat.
- Minimize species that threaten humans, deer, or elk (i.e. wolves, grizzly bear).

- Better education or notice to the public is needed when transplanting grizzly bears or other dangerous species.
- Maintain the multiple use of the forests.

**2C) What changes in habitat conditions have you seen over the past 20 years? Are these changes desirable or undesirable and why? What restoration or other management actions can be used to improve habitats?**

- General goal restore forested habitats that are most at risk for destruction as listed at page 48 of the TAMS:
  - Reductions in early and late succession habitats
  - Loss of fire-killed trees, large snags and down wood.
  - Significant reductions of western white pine, white-bark pine, western larch, sub-alpine larch, and ponderosa pine forest cover types.
  - Increases in the extent of Douglas-fir and grand fir, and cedar/hemlock on the IPNFs.
  - Increases in the density of trees and a shift to a largely mid-seral structure stage.
  - Reduction in riparian, wetland and lakeshore habitat (due to road construction and development) and vegetation composition changes in riparian areas (due to noxious weeds).
  - Changes in vegetation composition on big game winter ranges due to noxious weed encroachment.
- Develop a plan to replace old growth stands damaged or lost to fire or harvest (protect developing old growth stands).
- Use education and enforcement of regulations to minimize impact of motorized use to all species.
- Use education and enforcement of regulations to minimize impact of all uses to all species.
- Re-designate management areas to avoid fragmenting habitat.
- End all multiple use programs and prioritize ecological and wildlife values.
- Maintain multiple use.
- Re-open caribou closed area to snowmobiling.
- Reduce road densities to improve all wildlife habitat.
- Improve corridor habitat between Selkirks & Cabinets.
- Special emphasis on restoring white bark pine in all habitat as a food source for bears and clark's nutcrackers (they help disburse seeds).
- Maintain and restore habitat corridors between all areas throughout the forest, including designations as corridors.

**2)D) How should we manage for big game winter range in the urban interface?**

- There is an untapped resource of recreationalist for user input and information. Establish methods to gather and extrapolate information.
- Reduce road density in low elevation habitat and avoid further habitat fragment and disturbance.
- Include ungulates (caribou) winter range in consideration (ridges, mountain basins, high elevation old growth).
- Climate change needs consideration.
- Elk & urban interface – need to address damage to farmers.

**2)E) What species or groups of species are especially important to you? Are all species important for future generations to enjoy?**

- All species are important (animal and human).

**Group 2**

**Members:** Mark Grant (USFS), Dan Bachman, John Holbert, Augus Travers, Kyrstal Travers, Don Robson, Richard Gattonbein, Debbie McCoy, Jean Offerman, Matt Bloom, Alan McNall, Monica Gunter,

Scott Wood, Jack Hammack, John Linch, Richard Warren, Shianna Laude, Jack Laude, and Jim Elsfelder.

## Fire Risk

### Wildland Urban Interface

- Suppression of all unnatural (human caused) fires
- Suppression with-in 2 mile radius of private structures
- Manage some fires to restore habitat to include winter ranges
- Manage some fires if in pre approved prescription status
- Mechanical treatment----- Certainly should be used
- Prescribed fire management ----- Certainly should be a yes

### Wildland Fire Use Areas

- Allow where it does not greatly effect natural resources i.e. Scotchman Peak
- Manage remote areas not currently being managed
- Incorporate managed fire programs in disturbed areas
- Mechanical yes
- Prescribed fire yes

### General Forest Zone

- Wildland land fire use is O.K.
- Prescribed fire O.K.
- Mechanical treatment O.K.
- Look for new methods to use small wood products & hog fuel

### Mixed Ownership

- Unless a co op agreement exists ... Put the fire out
- Prescribed fire management YES
- Mechanical YES

## Wildlife

**There are almost 350 species of wildlife on the KIPZ. What changes in species have you seen over the past 20 years? Are these changes desirable or undesirable and why?**

- Too many turkeys that are undesirable in big numbers and in need of a management program.
- Grizzly bear re introduction ridiculous
- Human population more important than grizzly bears
- Wolf re introduction ridiculous
- Lynx re introduction ridiculous
- Grizzly, Wolf, Lynx, should be hunted if they cross the line of human safety
- A balanced program between cats (predators) and ranchers should be developed
- The majority feels the decline in Mule deer is associated with increase in Moose population
- More Moose tags should be issued
- More white tail deer tags should be issued to include does and a longer hunting season.
- There are too many white tail deer
- Bald eagle program is effective at its current levels

**What changes in habitat conditions have you seen over the past 20 years? Are these changes desirable or undesirable and why? What restoration or other management actions can be used to improve habitats?**

- Too much forest growth.... It I simply closing in!!!!!!!!!!
- Increase burns in the forest
- Increase mechanical thinning in forests
- Use more wildfire thinning of forests
- Youth work programs to thin forests

- Existing trails are disappearing
- Majority feeling is no more wilderness designation
- Minority feeling is more wilderness designation
- User groups should be established to maintain trails
- Use more stewardship programs

**How should we manage for big game winter range in the urban interface?**

- Prescribed burns O.K.
- Wild land fire use O.K.
- Land purchase or swap programs O.K.
- Mechanical use O.K.

**What species or groups of species are especially important to you? Are all species important for future generations to enjoy?**

- All species of wildlife are important to future generations and should be managed
- Moose
- Mule deer
- Elk
- Raptors
- White tail
- Song birds
- Coyotes
- Natural predators should be managed
- Natural predators should be included

**Group 3**

**Members:** Chris Savage (USFS), Pat Gunter (note taker), Kevin J. Stevens, Bill Phillips, Russell Stevens, Justin Whitmire, Janae Lukezech, Karin Wentz (note typist), Duane Wentz, John Harbuck, David McCoy, Paul Koch, Jason Franck, John Miller, Terry Capurso, Adam Eich, Dennis Wanoas, and K.C. Deane

**Fire Risk**

**Wildland Urban Interface**

- Suppression of fires is good and necessary.
- Adopt County Plans and continue with existing plans.
- Mechanical Treatment should be used.
- Should consider alternative to whether it would be manual and/or horse labor.
- Consider Cost when determining between mechanical or manual/animal labor.
- Consider Logging.
- Prescribed fire is good but be sure to keep it in control of designated areas.
- When prescribe burning, consider risk for existing structures and personal property.

**Wildland Fire Use Areas**

- Suppression of Natural and Human Caused Fire
- Let it Burn
- Treat Wildland Fire use area's to prevent catastrophic fire through the use of Logging and Prescribed burns
- Wilderness Area should be treated the same as WildLand Area by letting it burn, or treating through Logging and Prescribed Burns

**General Forest Areas**

- Natural and Human Caused Fires should let burn.
- Natural and human caused fires should let burn but monitor them.
- Natural and human caused fires should be suppressed.
- Use Mechanical treatment
- Use timber sales

- Use thinning
- Use prescribed fire to reduce fuels.

### **General Forest Areas Mixed Ownership**

- Manage Suppression the same as General Forest Areas, excluding those properties that are privately owned.

### **Wildlife**

**There are almost 350 species of wildlife on the KIPZ. What changes in species have you seen over the past 20 years? Are these changes desirable or undesirable and why? (Note: Desirable are marked with an \* and Undesirable are marked with an #)**

- More Turkey \* #
- More Elk \*
- More Moose \*
- More Deer \*
- More Black Bear #
- More Rabbits
- More Caribou \* #
- More Grizzly #
- More Wolves #
- Do not want any more Grizzlies
- Do not want any more Wolves.

**What changes in habitat conditions have you seen over the past 20 years? Are these changes desirable or undesirable and why? What restoration or other management actions can be used to improve habitats?**

- More Dense Vegetation/Timber # (undesirable)
- More noxious Weeds # (undesirable)

**How should we manage for big game winter range in the urban interface?**

- Thinning with control Burns for Elk and Deer Habitat and follow the WUI.

**What species or groups of species are especially important to you? Are all species important for future generations to enjoy?**

- See 2B above
- Do not import additional species
- No More Grizzlies
- No more Caribou

### **Group 4**

**Members:** Gary Ford (USFS), Don Helms, Tabitha Lough, Herb Wiens, Matt Linscott, Ken Stevens, Alan George, Mark Lowrey, Allen Myers, Nic Meyers, Nathan Jeffries, Bill Murray, Shawn Shreffler, Brett Peterson, Jeff Eich, Jason Meyer, Terry Koster, Dane Fox, Doug McClure, Bob Anderson, Tony Yanik, Kip Smith, Joedy Brown, Dan McNall, John Travers, Mel Fowler, Mary Lee Fowler, Loyal Amstutz, and Chuck George.

### **Fire Risk**

#### **Wildland Urban Interface**

- Better address the restoration and management of those areas so ecosystem is balanced as well as urban areas protected.
- Make funds more available and create more awareness for private property owners about those funds and grants if they help in conjunction with Forest Service management policies.
- Address insect infestation issues more effectively by allowing timber harvest in those infected areas.
- Better access to urban interface areas for fire suppression.
- Increase the number of access roads to urban interface areas.

- Decreased access as it addresses forest fire management where access is not needed.
- Remove dead and dying timber, rid major fuels via prescribed burn, then vegetate soil w/native short grasses.

### **Wildland Fire Use Areas**

- Never, take care of fires immediately.
- Harvest burnt timber in burned areas as soon as possible, don't wait until the timber is infested, or rotten, no timber value.
- Let naturally occurring fires burn in areas, which are full of fuels prone to burn quickly.
- In areas that don't have timber products, allow to burn.
- Consider overall area within smaller areas.
- Mechanically remove dead/dying timber beforehand.
- Stop closing the roads.
- Thin forest to its traditional historic levels, ten to twelve trees per acre.
- Suggest the Upper Pack River to the Selkirk Crest area is a Wildland Fire Use Area.

### **Forest Areas with Mixed Ownership**

- Treat similarly as Wild Urban Interface areas, but with higher priority than general forest areas.
- Road access in these areas to accomplish fire efforts here.

### **General Forest Areas**

- Stop removing roads, stop putting up gates, and earthen barriers, in order to provide better access, and removal of dead and dying timber.
- Keep roads open from drainage area to drainage area for fire access and escape purposes.
- High drive area – remove tinning personnel and employ professional loggers to do it properly.

### **Wildlife**

**There are almost 350 species of wildlife on the KIPZ. What changes in species have you seen over the past 20 years? Are these changes desirable or undesirable and why?**

- More turkey and geese here now.
- More wildlife is here now than ever before.
- Mule deer drastic decline.
- Too many moose here now, general hunting season should be allowed.

**What changes in habitat conditions have you seen over the past 20 years? Are these changes desirable or undesirable and why? What restoration or other management actions can be used to improve habitats?**

- Habitat still exists, but gates are more prevalent.
- Log more habitat areas to create more food supply for the animals.
- Brush needs to be cleared since it's overgrown in many of the roads, to improve wildlife corridors.
- No obliteration of any more roads, as it creates additional siltation, and harms fish habitat.
- Dead, dying and dense tree areas compromise the habitat.
- Keep good communication between Fish and Game and USFS.

**How should we manage for big game winter range in the urban interface?**

- For farmers in Boundary county, elk herds are a problem and too prevalent, and need to be managed.

**What species or groups of species are especially important to you? Are all species important for future generations to enjoy?**

- Big game: deer, elk, and bear
- Caribou, grizzlies, and wolves are a negative species for us here and are undesirable.

**The above DC statements will be combined if there are like comments and the workgroup will work through the sensing exercise on these statements at the April 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.**