

Pend Oreille GA Workgroup Meeting Notes

March 10, 2004

Attendance: Forest Service: Dick Kramer, Chris Savage, Gary Ford and Jodi Kramer. Public: Liz Sedler, Barb Best, Mike Dawson, Pat & Monica Gunter, Per Mattsson, Don Nobel, Nicky Pleass, Michael Wells, Joe Witte, Dave Vig, Tim Boden, Fields Cobb, John Finney, Jan Griffiths, John Harbuck, Hannah Hernandez, Phil Hough, Lanie Johnson, John Linch, Jason Mavity, Art & Sandy Piltch, Liz Pryor, Paul Sieracki, Sand & JoBeth Thomas, Jeff Chapman, Mark & Nancy Lowrey, Tammy Farmin, Duncan Puffer, Buck & Janae Lukezech, mary Holcomb, Rein Attemann, Bill Phillips, Kip Smith, Rick Holcomb, Scott Bortz, Chuck Guy, Allen Myers, Don Robson, Mark Linscott, Craig Carash, Marc Phillips,, Ralph Alderman, David Carlson, Rex Edwards, Russell Stevens, Chris Park, Liz Zimmerman, Logan Reichart, Alan Hison, Dylan Benefield, Stephen May, Anthony Yanik, Jeremy Owens, Herb Wiens, Olya Helms, Steve Gardiner, Adam Eich, Loyal Amstutz, Jason Thompson, Mike Cain, Larry Falk, Brian Mohn, Don Helms, Chris Shelton, Jeff Eich, James Williams, Ben Gunter, Ted Jones, Ruth Eich, Eric Noble, Jason Palmer, Carter Payne, Chuck Reeves, Matt Thomason, Dennis Harsky, Tim Farmin, Tanner Eglund, Jeff Meyer, Roy Holzhausen, Angus & Krystal Travers, Peter & Joanie Renkert, Dennis & Jeannie Yaeger, Mitch Farmin, Richard Beers, Steve Gill, Bryan Eglund, Cody Bleckwenn, Brad Woyke, Jason Meyer, Roger McCall, Bob Knowles, Terry Olver, Robert Harper, Darly Ford, Lola & Bill Bennett, matt Bloom, Ken Littlefield, Rick Harfund, Jay Cates, Justin Whitmire, Larry & Patty Peak, Bill Murray, Aaron McNall, Lindsay McNall, Allen Mangum, Dan Wanous, Karin Wentz, Donnal Capurso, Richard Warrne, David Reseska, Dennis Wanous, Bob Hefflinger, Shawn Shreffler, Clint Ducken, Brett Peterson, Marcia Wanous, John Holbert, Tim Caude, Scott Bran, Wade Burnett, Dan McNall, Cory Thompson, Michael Lindgren, Steve & Louise Wood, Brian Koch, Caren Koch, Cliff Koch, Lyle Koch, and Ryan Koch.

Dick welcomed the group and indicated, as everyone noticed, that there were a lot of new faces at the workgroup meeting, actually overwhelming about 150 people. The agenda for the evening is that everyone will go over the draft DC statements for IRAs and developed/dispersed recreation 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 will be shared at the 3/24 workgroup meeting. Following are the results of the Sensing Process on IRAs and developed/dispersed recreation:

Pend Oreille GA "Draft" Desired Condition Statements for Inventoried Roadless Areas & Proposed Wilderness

GENERALLY AGREE

What criteria of roadless areas are the most important to consider when choosing those to recommend for wilderness designation?

- The existence of adjacent wilderness, as it relates to size, both in terms of adding to existing wilderness, and establishing wilderness designations where none exist. Proximity of existing wilderness areas.
- Critical wildlife migration corridors
- Unique or rare plant species, fragile or sensitive ecological areas
- Watershed preservation
- Historical/archeological sites
- Few invasive species. Spread of noxious weeds and if occurring, methods to address or minimize.

Which of the IRAs should be proposed for Wilderness?

- None of the IRAs should be proposed as wilderness.
- IRAs contiguous to proposed wilderness areas should be part of proposed wilderness.

How should the IRAs that are not recommended for wilderness be managed?

- More management of trail access by user groups
- Not as wilderness – allowing motorized and mechanized use. Open to all types of users and uses.
- Natural wildland fires will be allowed to burn within IRAs and wilderness areas, and buffer area of 3 miles outside designated areas. Suppression of wildland fire is only permitted within 1/4 mile of private structures and property. Should have Wildland Fire Use Plans and Fire Mgmt. Plans.

- All wilderness lands will be withdrawn from future mineral entry, such as the proposed Rock Creek Mine in the Cabinet Wilderness Area.
- Manage vegetation ie. helicopter logging

How should proposed wilderness areas be managed?

- Motorized allowed in winter. Wise multiple use should be permitted (snowmobile/ATV access is important to some, but definitely not all).
- Maintain current access and uses (not necessary level of access or use, but continue it in general).
- Develop a Wildland Fire Use plan – allow natural fires to burn under prescription
- Time limits should be in place for a decision to be made in favor of wilderness or not.
- Time limits should be in place for re-evaluation as wilderness, if not designated by prior designation. Perpetual consideration is defacto wilderness, without actual designation.

GENERALLY ARE SPLIT

What criteria of roadless areas are the most important to consider when choosing those to recommend for wilderness designation?

- Critical and unique wildlife habitat, especially for TE&S species
- Sufficient size for core habitat (Grizzly bear)
- Historically a non-motorized use area
- Motorized until designated as wilderness. Look at current motorized access and whether that access is having any negative impacts to the land.
- Minimum size 50 acres
- Areas large enough to allow for minimal fire control.
- No commercial use (mining, grazing, no active management). Non-commercial value (timber)
- Low elevation unlogged areas.
- Spectrum of recreation uses available as impacted by being designated wilderness.

How should the IRAs that are not recommended for wilderness be managed?

- No ATV on single track trails.
- Retire existing grazing leases within wilderness as they are vacated or expire, and issue no new grazing allotment leases within wilderness. Recreational livestock shall be prohibited within 100 feet of lakeshores and stream banks, except during watering and through travel.
- Trail and road construction allowed.

How should proposed wilderness areas be managed?

- Same as IRAs – not as wilderness unless actually designated
- Add additional law enforcement officers to enforce non-motorized designated areas in order to protect wilderness characteristics
- Adopt The Lands Council's Forest Restoration Alternative as it applies to IRAs and Wilderness Areas.

GENERALLY DISAGREE

What criteria of roadless areas are the most important to consider when choosing those to recommend for wilderness designation?

- Natural beauty and quiet. Untrammelled by human activities
- Minimum size 660 acres
- Minimum size 5,000 acres (current direction)

Which of the IRAs should be proposed for Wilderness?

- All IRAs should be proposed as wilderness (refer to page 101-102 of AMS Tech Report)
- Current - Scotchman Peak Wilderness and Selkirk Crest only proposed
- IRAs contiguous to proposed wilderness areas should be part of proposed wilderness.
- Pack Saddle should be a proposed wilderness area. No new roads but some current roads allowed.
- Willard-Estelle (Pend Oreille GA – north of Scotchman Peak)
- Buckhorn (Lower Kootenai GA – Bonners Ferry RD – MT border)

How should the IRAs that are not recommended for wilderness be managed?

- Open for winter ORV use only
- No motorized vehicles any season.
- As wilderness, no motorized or mechanized.
- Allow some mechanized (i.e. bicycles) with gated entry to prohibit motorized.
- No logging or road building. Roadless but not managed as wilderness.
- No trail construction.

How should proposed wilderness areas be managed?

- As wilderness – no motorized or mechanized any time of the year.
- No motorized in winter
- Unroaded areas adjacent to IRAS should be managed as wilderness areas or IRAS (look for opportunities to connect larger unroaded areas using the Yukon to Yellowstone Conservation Initiative).

Should we be asking for additional roadless area recommendations?

- Yes – For watershed protection from further road damage, wildlife corridors, and to prevent human caused fires.

Pend Oreille GA “Draft” Desired Condition Statements for Developed and Dispersed Recreation

GENERALLY AGREE

Based on current condition and decision space, where are the areas in the GA where we can potentially change the current condition for:

- Build a campground at the Beehive Lake trail head
- Improve access to Green Bay, Upper Pack
- At Pack River, replace bridge that leads to Chimney Rock.
- Maintain current trails before building new camping or trail facilities.

The group then divided into 4 subgroups to brainstorm DC statements for Watersheds and Aquatic Species:

Group 1

Members: Jodi Kramer (USFS), Ben Gunter, John Linch, Eric Sieracki, Alan Himson, Liz Pryor, Herb Wiens, Paul Sieracki, Shawn Shreffler, Mark Lowrey, Jeff Meyer, Brian Moline, Jay Cates, Janae Lukezech, Patty Peak, Ken Littlefield, Kip Smith, Jason Meyer, Liz Sedler, Richard Warren, Jason Palmer, Joe Witte, Per Mattsson, Phil Hough.

Watershed Desired Condition Statements

- Streams that support T&E fish species should be a high priority for restoration – especially proposed bull trout critical habitat.
- Streams that are NPF or FAR in proposed Wilderness areas should be a high priority for restoration.
- 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.
- Continue to use active management as a tool to restore watersheds.
- Allow uses in NPF and FAR watersheds that will not further degrade them and avoid uses that will.
- Maintain 1987 Forest Plan watershed management guidance (without amendments) for watershed restoration.
- The most severely degraded watersheds should be the highest priority for restoration.

- Avoid reductions in forest canopy that will result in increased peak flows, in order to avoid stream channel destabilization.
- Avoid all ground disturbing (resource extraction) activities, except for stream restoration, ie. road obliteration, in NPF watersheds.
- 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.

Aquatic Species - Desired Condition Statements

- Restore streams so they support an abundance of fishable native fish populations.
- Non-native species that compete with native species should be reduced or eliminated.
- Fisheries should be restored to the fullest extent possible without removing improvements (dams, bridges, some culverts).
- Restore fisheries without limiting access.
- Restore fisheries without limiting access, where possible.
- 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.
- Maintain linkages (aquatic migration corridors) between Priest River and Lake PO.
- Avoid degradation (increased sediment, increases in peak flows) in tributaries to Lake PO to avoid impacts on the Lake fishery.
- Monitor native amphibians and reptile populations; avoid actions that would impact their habitat and reduce populations.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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. (from Paul Sieracki)
- Maintain/increase terrestrial aquatic linkages. (eg. Grizzly – salmon) (grizzly – cutthroat) (from Paul Sieracki)
- Place additional consideration for streams with breeding populations of harlequin ducks. (from Paul Sieracki)

Group 2

Members: Chris Savage (USFS), Larry Falk, Barbara Best, Chuck George, Jenny Owens, John Harbuck, Buck Lukezech, Loyal Amstutz, David Carlson, Sandy Thomas, Dylan Benefield, Da_e__ Ford? (This name is very hard to read), Allen Ray Myers, Jan Griffiths, Mitch Farmin, Tammy Farmin, Monica Gunter.

Watershed Desired Condition Statements

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

- Restore 'at risk' before more human use (recreation, commercial).
- Keep status quo for 'at risk' & 'properly functioning'.
- Focus watershed restoration for at risk species.
- Focus watershed restoration on repairing the cause of the problem while maintaining access.
- Any stream 'not functioning' should be closed until fixed (to emphasize to Forest Service to fix stream).

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

- Focus watershed restoration for at risk species
- Interagency cooperation (public & private)
- Focus on known or existing problems

- Consider road density vis a vis fish population and/or all other wildlife/biota
- Preserve public use and wildlife -find a balance

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

- Use biological perspective
- Land management practices must not adversely affect watershed, wildlife, flora, etc...

Aquatic Species Desired Condition Statements

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

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
- Cutthroat

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

Group 3

Members: Gary Ford (USFS), John Finney (notetaker)*, Steve Gill*, Bill Murray, Aaron McNall, Lanie Johnson*, Donna Capurso, Nicky Pleass, Carter Payne*, Dennis Yeager, Russ Stevens, Jeff Chapman, Bill Phillips, Roger McCall, Steve Gardner, Pat Gunter, Mike Dawson, Rick Hoffman, Dan McNall, Matt Bloom, Lindsay McNall, and Krystal Travers*. (*Indicates these people were involved in the review of notes via e-mail.)

Watersheds Desired Condition Statements

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

<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
8. Sand Creek	Valuable marsh wetland ecosystem Fish breeding and feeding ground Macro/micro invertebrate habitat Historically significant area Erodable Geographic features Important tributary to Lake P Oreille
Note: This creek will become a highly devastated area if proposed bypass is approved by FS and it is constructed right up Sand Creek.	
9. Lake Pend Oreille	Valuable marsh wetland ecosystem Vital lake ecosystem Fish breeding and feeding ground Macro/micro invertebrate habitat Historically significant watershed Erodable Geographic features

Look to available Avista funds from relicensing.

Things to do:

- Fix culverts and crossings.
- Graveling or paving high impact areas
- Oppose the proposed rock creek mine by blocking it from going in.
- Oppose the proposed Sand Creek overpass by blocking it from going in.

2c) Under which circumstances should watershed restoration be a primary focus and why?

- To address erosion and/or loss of soil.
- To maintain access to forest.
- To improve, maintain, stabilize diverse fish populations.
- By enforcing Forest Best Management Practices standards on Private, IDL, FS, etc
- To address all watershed restoration by ensuring their health and *preservation in future* by preventing and actively opposing the proposed Rock Creek mine operation, including redrafting a new set of tougher regulations that are prohibitive to any mining procedure in the Cabinet Mtn Wilderness so that no mining will occur in future since mining proves to be excessively damaging to all regional watersheds, rivers, lakes, marshes, lake bottoms, wetlands and streams *beyond repair or sufficient restoration*. (from Carter Payne)
- To protect the Sand Creek from having a highway built into and on it since cement infill and massive ecological disruption will result in the basic demise of Sand Creek, a most valuable wetland and creek habitat for the entire watershed ecosystem of Lake Pend Oreille and other associated tributaries and waterways. (from Carter Payne)

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

- Combine it with road improvements: whether relocation, fixing culverts or crossings, or graveling or paving.
- Integrate with fish protection.
- Put in with resource management (logging or mining or recreation).
- User fees for areas with particular problems.
- Combine with timber management.
- Pursue in connection with Recreation Trail Program (the gas tax) funding and projects.
- Integrate watershed restoration with blocking all activities of proposed Rock Creek mine by not granting any environmental approvals or passing soft environmental requirements for the proposed Rock Creek mine in order to prevent any such mining operation from going into the Cabinet Mountain resource management wilderness area since such operations would detrimentally and irreparably harm and poison all other FS watershed restoration efforts already enacted elsewhere in the region. In other words, redraft exceedingly stringent environmental regulations for any such proposed mine in the Cabinet Mountain Wilderness, a 94,000 acre pristine wilderness, one of the first 10 areas to have been designated as national wilderness, so that the regulations are exceedingly difficult for a mine operation to accommodate, exceedingly expensive to meet, and so that such regulations become a fully preventative measure impeding any such mine operation from occurring. (from Carter Payne)
- Oppose and actively prevent the proposed freeway up Sand Creek from being installed by drafting tougher environmental regulations for this proposed freeway so that the Sand Creek watershed does not become irreparably damaged from thousands of tons of cement fill and massive bank rearrangement and disturbance. Further, enact and enforce such stringent environmental regulations so that they are exceedingly difficult and expensive for such highway construction to comply with and so that they become fully preventative as a measure impeding any such environmental disaster to Sand Creek, one of the primary aquatic habitats and tributaries of Lake Pend Oreille. (from Carter Payne)

Aquatic Species Desired Condition Statements

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

- Pack River, Lightning Creek, Caribou Lake, Porcupine Lake
- Stock lakes.
- Increase species for fishable population while managing.
- 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 mentioned above by changing the soft policy stance that the Forest Service has taken in the past toward the proposed Rock

Creek mine, instead granting no approvals and setting only stringent regulations preventing said proposed mine operators from proceeding on any level with such proposed mine which will detrimentally devastate all aquatic populations in regional watersheds. (from Carter Payne)

- Sand Creek: Provide positive ecological conditions and *protection* for fishable populations in Sand Creek by not endorsing and not taking a soft environmental regulation policy stance toward the proposed freeway over Sand Creek. Grant no approvals for and set only the most stringent, enforceable regulations preventing said proposed freeway from proceeding. (from Carter Payne)

2c) What are your desired native and non-native species and why? Which fish species are important to you and why? And 2d) What do you want to see as far as the mix of species, native vs. non-native?

- All
- Kokanee, cutthroat, brook trout, rainbow trout.
- Native over Non-Native
- Definition of Native? Is native within the last 70 years and non-native within the last 20 years?
- All species should be protected from the proposed Rock Creek mine operations. Toxic chemical wastes will make all species in the regional fisheries have high levels of lead and other biologically dangerous toxins that will be dangerous to all species' health. (from Carter Payne)
- All species have a right to be protected massive, continuous disruption of a highway over Sand Creek and from thousands of tons of cement which will infill a huge portion of the Sand Creek watershed and its banks. (from Carter Payne)

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

- Yes – pretty much all in agreement that responded.
- Provide a positive, safe, non-toxic environment for this species by preventing the proposed Rock Creek mine from going into operation. (from Carter Payne)
- Provide a positive, non-devastated creek environment for this species by ensuring Sand Creek continues to be a viable, healthy and continuously uninterrupted creek habitat for this species with no freeway running above and through it. (from Carter Payne)

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

- Crawdads, crayfish, frogs, turtles, salamanders – they all fit into the system.
- Macro Invertebrates (the indicator species for healthy fisheries).
- All populations and species will be benefited by an aquatic environment that contains no risk of horrendous, toxic and irreparable mine tailing and slurry runoff which will be generated by the proposed Rock Creek Mine. (from Carter Payne)
- Viable natural habitat maintained in Sand Creek watershed will benefit all aquatic life. The Sand Creek waterway area provides critical habitat and breeding grounds for all macro-invertebrate species as well as fish species since it is a primary wetland and stream area ecosystem with diverse aquatic life that connects into other waterways and streams via Lake Pend Oreille. (from Carter Payne)

Group 4

Members: Dick Kramer (USFS), David Vig, Duncan Puffer, Logan Reichart, Larry Peak, Adam Eich, Clint Ducken, Justin Whitmire, Wade Burnett, Chuck Reeves, Scott Bortz, Stephen May, Cory Thompson, Don Helms, Karin Wentz, Angus Travers, Olya Helms, David Reseska (Notetaker), John Holbert, Tim Boden, and Fields Cobb

Watersheds Desired Condition Statements

“Draft” Forest-wide Goal 1a: Watershed Conditions- Restore and protect watershed conditions to provide the water quality and quantity and soil productivity necessary to support ecological functions and intended beneficial uses.

2a) In reviewing the Draft Forest-wide Goal (above) this group of active participants agreed that the conditions should be brought to a functional level.

- Discussion topics ranged from discussing the Rock Creek mine, to cleaning certain creeks.
- It seemed the consensus was to comfortably disagree on the definition of ‘functional level’.

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

Discussion targeted unit 303D of Lake Pend Oreille. Participants agreed to aggressively 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.)

- 1) Trestle Creek, Pack River, Lightning Creek, Grouse Creek

2c) Under which circumstances should watershed restoration be a primary focus and why?

Watershed restoration should be a primary focus. Streams should be restored.

Question~ Is protection of all species of fish too restrictive if in support of restoring watersheds?

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

Watershed restoration should be integrated with other resource management and activities with the following areas to consider:

- Stream restoration at the same time as logging sales
- User groups help with restoration in conjunction with maintaining use of areas. (Take responsibility to help with the restoration.)
- Wetlands in restoration activities.
- integrating watershed restoration with fire restoration
- Active forest management and the fire impact on watershed.
- Integrating the elimination of aquatic noxious weeds with watershed restoration.

Aquatic Species Desired Condition Statements

Draft Forest-wide Goal 1b: Conditions of 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.

2a) After reviewing the DFWG (above) many 2-3 party discussions took place.

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 should continue to exist in the currently fishable regions with appropriate accessibility.

2c) What are your desired native and non-native species and why? Which fish species are important to you and why? And 2d) What do you want to see as far as the mix of species, native vs. non-native?

Being in agreement that some native and nonnative species should be protected, the list of both should be carefully scrutinized as to which species of fish in each category should be considered. The lists generated were not consensus, just participation comments.

Desired non-native species include:

- ✓ Kokanee
- ✓ Tiger Muskie
- ✓ Bass
- ✓ Lake Trout
- ✓ Brook Trout
- ✓ German browns

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?

The discussion of what percentage of native vs. non-native species together was unclear. Everyone agreed that yes, there should be both native and non native species... It was discussed as a general consensus that the non-native variety was more desirable. It clearly depends on the restrictions necessary to choose one over the other and cohabitation contingencies.

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

The consensus discussion is that if bull trout were recovered that this would be a desirable fishable fish.

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

The restoration for amphibian populations and species created a wide variety of opinions. The discussion began as a select few amphibians were requested directly, such as the

- ✓ leopard frog
- ✓ boreal toad
- ✓ Coeur d'Alene salamander

In concluding the discussion, amphibious creatures should be considered. 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. Also, special consideration should be considered and noted regarding the easement into, on, around these designated amphibious areas.