

**Pend Oreille GA Workgroup Meeting Notes**  
**Feb. 25, 2004**

**Attendance:** Forest Service: Dick Kramer, Craig Bobzien, Gary Ford and Jodi Kramer. Public: Tim Boden, Fields Cobb, Dave, Vig, Mary Mitchell, Mark Sprengel, Ken Carter, Larry Falk, John Finney, Jan Griffiths, John Harbuck, Hannah Hernandez, Phil Hough, John Linch, Nancy Low, Jason Mavity, Art Piltch, Liz Pryor, Paul Sieracki, Sandy and Jo Beth Thomas, Randy Van Ooyen, Barb Bect, Mike Dawson, Per Mattsson, Don Nobel, Nicky Pleass, Joe Witte, Rein Attamann, Cesar Hernandez, Barry Rosenberg, Bill and Nancy Lewis, Howard Simmons, Royal and Jana Shields, Mike Hammack, David Carlson, John Brenner III, Richard Holcomb, John Holbert, Mark Linscott, Trent Bode, Shawn Shreffler, Shane Johnson, Aaron McNall, Mitch Farmin, Regina Hammack, Martin Minn, Carter Payne, Eric Noble, Donald Robson, Peter and Joanie Renkert, Steve Gill, Todd Converse, Toby Feuling, Tim Farmin, Buff Johnson, Steve Richardson, Marie and Richard Warren, Steve Elgar, Ellen Picken, and Bill Murray.

Dick welcomed the group and indicated, as everyone noticed, that there were a lot of new faces at the workgroup meeting. The agenda for the evening is to go over the draft DC statements developed at the last meeting for access and recreation and get a sense on which statements people agreed with (green dots), which statements people disagreed with (red dots), and which statements people didn't necessarily agree with but could live with (yellow dots) as a desired condition for the Pend Oreille GA. After this exercise, the workgroup would then start developing DC statements for Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs) and the rest of the access and recreation subject.

**The Desired Condition statements below are what the workgroup put green, red and yellow dots during the sensing session at the 2/25/04 meeting. After the meeting, the dots and statements were categorized into the following categories: Strongly Agree, Agree, Split (Disagree and Agree), Disagree and Strongly Disagree and they are as follows:**

**Pend Oreille GA "Draft" Desired Condition Statements for  
Access and Recreation**

**Generally Strongly Agree**

- "Draft" Forest-wide Goal: Ensure access to NFS lands through the maintenance and improvement of roads and trails, while managing within the capability of ecosystems.
- To manage motorized and non-motorized forest access in a manner which: respects and accommodates the rights of all individuals, ensures ecosystem health, encourages long-term habitat preservation, provides wildlife protection, protects water quality, allows for sustainable use and preserves public lands for future generations.
- To manage motorized and non-motorized forest access in a manner which: respects and accommodates the rights of all individuals, ensures ecosystem health, encourages long-term habitat preservation, provides wildlife protection (especially TE&S species), protects water quality, allows for sustainable use and preserves public lands for future generations.
- Need to consider technology advances and impacts of higher populations and be conservative with access due to increased use in the future.
- We need to emphasize responsible recreation, which would include standards of behavior for users, increased enforcement and increasing proper signing.

- Improve trail design and engineering standards to minimize potential impacts or damage to resources.
- Any access standard should trend towards recovery of the T&E species.
- Regulate use through seasonal closures to prevent resource damage caused by over use.
- Reduce user conflict.
- Utilize user groups and individual users for maintenance of roads and trails.
- Restricted areas such as streams, wetlands, meadows should be identified as non-motorized areas.
- Maintain road access to trailheads.
- Study and reevaluate the 7000 acres not included in Scotchman Peak PW.

#### **Generally Agree**

- To manage motorized and non-motorized recreation access in a manner which provides reasonable access for all user groups, while avoiding impacts on diverse wildlife and fish species and their habitat, the highest priority be to ensure recovery of the Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive species, and to sustain natural resources on public lands for future generations.
- Management of the forests should include a variety of opportunities (designated use areas as well as multiple use areas)
- Multiple use of the forest (by OHV, other recreational users, preservation of wildlife habitat etc) does not mean all uses are to be carried out in all locations. Consider dividing the forest into geographic areas designated for specific and limited use: (e.g.: some parts of the forest may be set aside for wildlife habitat and non motorized recreation, while other areas may be more appropriate to consider OHV trail designations.)
- At a minimum, roads currently open for motorized vehicle use could legitimately be used by OHVs.
- Wildlife, water, and plant “standards” (Recovery Goals) must be met prior to developing motorized recreation.
- Look at opportunities for closing old roads to vehicles and converting these old, unmaintained roads to ATV trails. This conversion of roads/trails should not damage watersheds and wildlife.
- Restrict snowmobile use especially in areas of new tree plantings and in wildlife habitat to reduce impacts of predators on the elk, deer, moose, caribou, etc.
- More non-motorized trail access, where it does not affect wildlife, i.e. plow the parking areas at trailheads that would be suitable for snowshoeing and cross country skiing.

- More opportunities on NFS land for cross country skiing.
- “Draft” Forest-wide Goal: Ensure access to NFS lands through the maintenance and improvement of roads and trails, while managing within the capability of ecosystems.
- No ATVs on single-track trails.
- Motorized and non-motorized must stay on officially established roads and trails.

**Generally are Split (agree and disagree)**

- Allow possible increased motorized use in Talache/Pearl/, Packsaddle, and Kilroy Lakes areas on existing roads.
- Considered potential improvements or increases to motorized access on southeast side of lake Pend O’reille.
- Allow some increase in motorized trails and areas, such as loop trails and/or widening some single-track trails to double-track trails.
- No increase in motorized trails in the GA is necessary as there are many miles on the east side of the lake open to motorized travel.
- No new roads should be built or old ones opened.
- Total road density should be decreased and open road density should be decreased to improve watershed and wildlife health. Ensure that the road density for T&E species is achieved. Especially road density in lynx habitat that meets the criteria of the F&WS.
- Use of OHVs on National Forest land (other than on designated roads) is incompatible with the other uses of the forest and therefore inappropriate.
- Develop OHV trails in the Clark Fork area to enhance economic situation.
- No snowmobiles in caribou habitat until species is recovered.
- Current winter motorized opportunities are sufficient.
- Manage proposed wilderness as wilderness meaning no motorized or mechanized access summer or winter, specifically Scotchman Peak PW.
- Allow winter motorized use in proposed wilderness.
- Motorized use restrictions should be more stringent in Proposed Wilderness than in IRAs.
- Allow no motorized access in IRAs.
- Allow some motorized access in IRAs.
- No restrictions to motorized, wheeled cross-country travel as long as no “damage” is done to the land.

- Motorized, wheeled cross-country travel should not be allowed on NFS lands. Use should be restricted to trails or specially designated “high/concentrated use” area. There is no location appropriate for a concentrated use area in our GA.

### Generally Disagree

- Consider the area immediately west of Lake Pend O’reille from around Talache south to around Faragut for potential OHV development.
- Develop an OHV trail that links the Clark Fork area with the Troy Montana area by dissecting the middle or following the perimeter of the Scotchman Peak Roadless area(s).
- Develop OHV trails for riders who are under 16 years old (they aren’t “street” legal.)
- No restrictions to snowmobile use are necessary outside of the proposed wilderness areas (Scotchman Peak and Selkirk Crest) and the IRAs surrounding them, as long as these areas are protected.

### Generally Strongly Disagree

There were no statements in this category.

**At the end of the meeting, Dick re-iterated that this was NOT a voting process but a sensing process to see which DC statements that the group could agree on and which they couldn’t. There was some concern about new people at the meeting being able to determine which statements they agreed with etc. without having been at previous meetings and knowing the history of the statements and the decision parameters. The results of the dot exercise will be shared at the next workgroup meeting on 3/10 and further discussion.**

The group then split into 4 sub-groups to starting discussing IRAs and developed/dispersed recreation and special uses. One person from each group took the flipcharts home to type up the notes and get back to Dick Kramer ([rpkramer@fs.fed.us](mailto:rpkramer@fs.fed.us)) and Jodi Kramer ([jodikramer@fs.fed.us](mailto:jodikramer@fs.fed.us)) by March 4<sup>th</sup> for posting on the website and discussion at the March 10<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **Group One**

**Group members:** Marie Warren, Randy Van Ooyen, Tim Boden, Tim Farmin, Mike Dawson, Ellen Picken, Nicky Pleass, Don Noble, Eric Noble, Sana Shields

### Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs) and Proposed Wilderness Areas

**2 –B What criteria (traits or attributes) of roadless areas are the most important to consider when choosing those to recommend for wilderness designation?**

- Critical habitat
- Unique plant species
- Wildlife corridors
- Proximity to existing Wilderness areas
- Watershed preservation
- Historical/archeological site
- Natural beauty
- Non-commercial value (timber)
- Historically a non-motorized use area
- Sufficient size for core habitat

## 2 –C Which of the Inventoried Roadless Areas should be proposed for Wilderness?

Little Grass Mountain  
South Fork Mountain  
Continental Mountain  
Skitwish Ridge  
White Mountain  
Shafer Peak  
Blacktail Mountain  
Upper Priest Lake  
Long Canyon/Selkirk Crest  
Saddle Mountain  
Mt. Willard/Lake Estelle/Katka  
Trestle Peak  
Beetop  
Packsaddle  
Blacktail Mountain

Magee  
Tepee Creek  
Trouble Creek  
Graham Coal  
Grandmother Mountain  
Grassy Top  
North Fork  
Hammond  
Mallard/Larkins  
Mosquito Fly  
Midget Peak  
Sheep Mountain State Line  
**Pinchot Butte**  
**Salmo-Priest Additions**  
**Selkirk Crest**

### **Semi-primitive Areas:**

Crooked Crown  
Lost Creek - Mt. Pend Oreille  
Savage Creek  
St. Joe Lake (part of Meadow  
Creek/Upper North Fork of the  
Clearwater)  
Stevens Lake  
Little North Fork Clearwater  
Goat Mountain  
**East Cathedral**

**NONE**

**We need more information to make a  
decision.**

## **2 –D How should the IRAs that are not recommended for wilderness be managed?**

- Sustainability, healthy forest
- More management of trail access by user groups
- Open for winter ORV use
- No motorized vehicles any season.
- Manage designated wilderness under the Wilderness Act of 1964.
- 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.
- 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 lake shores and stream banks, except during watering and through travel.
- All wilderness lands will be withdrawn from future mineral entry, such as the proposed Rock Creek Mine in the Cabinet Wilderness Area.
- Where forage is limited, require users camping overnight with recreational livestock to provide processed feeds that are free of viable noxious weed seeds.

## **2 –E How Should proposed wilderness areas be managed?**

As wilderness (see above.)

## **2 –F Should we be asking for additional roadless area recommendations?**

Yes – For watershed protection from further road damage.

Corridors for wildlife.

To prevent human caused fire.

No – Need access for fire fighters.

Enough already.

### **Access and Recreation**

**2- B 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.

### **Group Two**

**Group Members:** Jan Griffiths, Royal Shields, Barbara Best, Joe Witte, Jo Beth Thomas, John Harbuck, Paul Sieracki, Rein Attemann, Richard Warren, Ken Carter, Gary Ford and 2 unknown people

### **Inventoried Roadless Ares (IRAS) and Proposed Wilderness Areas**

**\*\*\* The following comments were not agreed upon by all\*\*\***

- To manage motorized and non-motorized forest access in a manner which respects and accommodates the rights of all individuals, ensures ecosystem health, encourages long-term habitat preservation, provides wildlife protection encourages long-term habitat preservation,

provides wildlife protection to enable TE&S species to increase to their historic carrying capacity (especially TE&S species), protects water quality, allows for sustainable use and preserves public lands for future generations.

- To manage motorized and non-motorized forest access in a manner which provides reasonable access for all user groups, which avoiding impacts on diverse wildlife and fish species and their habitat, the highest priority to be to ensure recovery of the Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive species and to sustain natural resources on public lands for future generations.
- To manage motorized and non-motorized forest access in a manner which provides reasonable access for all user groups, which avoiding impacts on diverse wildlife and fish species and their habitat, the highest priority to be to not only ensure recovery of the Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive species but to set a management goal to increase the populations of these species to their historic carrying capacity and to sustain natural resources on public lands for future generations.
- All IRAS should be considered and will be designated as wilderness.
- All IRAS managed as if they were wilderness areas.
- 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).
- Provide Yukon to Yellowstone connectivity corridor.
- Wilderness areas recommendations should be on a case-by-case basis.
- Add additional law enforcement officers to enforce non-motorized designated areas in order to protect wilderness characteristics.
- Proposed wilderness areas should be managed as wilderness.
- Some IRAS should be open to multiple use management including timber harvest on a case-by-case basis.
- Wise multiple use should be permitted (snowmobile/ATV access is important to some, but definitely not all).
- FS would do well to research and make more recommendations for additional wilderness areas during this next time period of the new, revised Forest Plan.
- We need to keep in mind that National Forests belong to the public and that 1.9 million people supported RACR (Roadless Area Conservative Rule) indicating a strong desire to protect the nation's roadless areas.
- Some of the group felt the FS should consider The Lands Council's Forest Restoration Alternative as it applies to IRAs and Wilderness Areas.
- Too much restriction of motorized use.
- His grandfather manned the Round Top Lookout in 1932-33 and built the stone & timber icebox that is still up there.

### **Group Three**

**Group Members:** Sandy Thomas, Dave Vig, Per Mattsson, Mark Linscott, Marty Mire, Don Robson, Shawn Sheffler, Toby Feulins, Todd Converse, Lana Kay, Nancy Low, Larry Falk, Liz Pryor, Mark Sprenkel, Joe Sandy, and Dick Kramer

#### **Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs) and Proposed Wilderness Areas**

**2 –B What criteria (traits or attributes) of roadless areas are the most important to consider when choosing those to recommend for wilderness designation?**

- Non-motorized
- Motorized until designated as wilderness
- All roadless area should be wilderness
- Unique habitat
- Rare species
- Quiet
- Good wildlife habitat
- Few invasive species
- Size 50 acres/660 acres ie. Ross Creek Cedars
- Untrammelled by human
- Minimal fire control (ability to have control)
- No commercial use ie. mining, grazing, no active management (extraction)

**2 –C Which of the Inventoried Roadless Areas should be proposed for Wilderness?**

- Currently proposed; Scotchman Wilderness and Selkirk Crest.
- General agreement for current proposed areas and some opposition to “any” wilderness areas
- Some attributes do not fit these current proposed areas such as fir.
- All IRAs should be proposed wilderness
- IRAs contiguous to proposed wilderness areas should be part of proposed wilderness
- IRA contiguous to proposed wilderness areas should “not” be part of proposed wilderness.
- Should Pack Saddle be a proposed wilderness area? No new roads but some roads allowed.
  - Yes or No
- Maximum amount of protection to roadless areas as they are the most ecologically sound.
- Hunting is better where there is selective logging and forest fires.
- Roads do not hurt animals.
- Having wilderness areas is good for future generations and Idaho’s economy.
- Loss of management flexibility for wildlife if wilderness.

**2 –D How should the IRAs that are not recommended for wilderness be managed?**

- Roadless but not wilderness, generally agreed to by the group.
- Some all wildernesses
- No new roads
- Manage vegetation ie. helicopter logging
- Prescribed fire protection
- Let natural fire run
- Motorized trails in IRAs – mixed feelings in the group
- No ATV on single track trails.

**2 –E How Should proposed wilderness areas be managed?**

- Same as IRAs
- Same as Wilderness
- No motorized in winter
- Motorized allowed in winter

**2 –F Should we be asking for additional roadless area recommendations?**

- We have enough
- Look for more

## **Group Four**

**Group Members:** Jodi Kramer, USFS; John Finney (notetaker)\*, Steve Gill\*, John Linch\*, Barry Rosenberg, Dave Carlson, Jason Mavity, Aaron McNall, Trent Bode\*, Hannah Hernandez\*, Cesar Hernandez\*, Phil Hough\*, Fields Cobb, and Carter Payne.

\* Indicates these people were involved in the review of these notes via e-mail.

### **Inventoried Roadless Areas and Proposed Wilderness Areas**

**“Draft” Forest-wide Goal 2a: Wilderness (Wilderness, Wilderness Study, Recommended Wilderness, and Wild Rivers)** – Maintain and improve the capability of wild lands to provide for primitive recreation and a wide array of ecological values.

**NOTE:** Time constraints during the breakout group session limited in-depth discussion. The list of questions 2B) through 2F) were the structure of our groups “comments.”

#### **OVERVIEW:**

- Certain comments were general in nature regarding Access and Recreation, not just limited to IRAs and Proposed Wilderness.
- A concern was expressed that there is no map showing existing uses (recreation) by type and/or density.
- Questions were raised as to 1) what are the definitions (legal) regarding terms such as Wilderness, Proposed Wilderness, Wilderness Study Area, Inventoried Roadless Areas, and 2) what are the impacts on the types of activities (whether recreation (all types) or forest management (logging, watershed, fire, etc.)) that can undertaken.
- There was a wide range of opinions on each question posed, and the group’s sentiments ranged from those in favor of full access and management to those in favor of severely restricted access and management.

#### **2B) What criteria (traits or attributes) of roadless areas are the most important to consider in choosing those to recommend for wilderness designation?**

- Critical habitat for TE&S species.
- Migration pathways.
- Watersheds.
- Fragile or sensitive ecological areas.
- Current motorized access and whether that access is having any negative impacts.
- Spread of noxious weeds and if occurring, methods to address or minimize.
- Low elevation unlogged areas.
- Spectrum of recreation uses available as impacted by being designated wilderness.
- 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.
- Alternatives to restrictive wilderness designation with adequate protection of the actual characteristics of the land being considered while allowing broad uses (recreation (motorized and non-motorized), logging, and other management). Example: Backcountry designation proposed by Blue Ribbon Coalition.
- Minimum acreage for wilderness. Whether a minimum is appropriate. Larger acreage may take priority for being considered as wilderness
- How does wilderness designation impact habitat concerns (ability to manage)?

- For every acre of space that is officially set aside to accommodate OHV use, whether already used as such or not, a corresponding 2000 acres of new area that is already deemed ecologically sensitive will be set aside as Wilderness, not altering what has been designated or set aside as such previously.

**2C) Which of the Inventoried Roadless Areas should be proposed for Wilderness?**

- None.
- All.
- Refer to page 101-102 of the AMS Technical Report.
- Scotchman Peak
- Selkirk Crest.
- Willard-Estelle.
- Buckhorn.
- Some requested clarification of the “7000” acres raised previously as to whether included in the Scotchman peak proposed wilderness. ?Page 101 AMS Technical Report compared to the recommendation made (ROD).

**2D) How should the Inventoried Roadless Areas that are not recommended for wilderness be managed?**

- Not as wilderness.
- As wilderness.
- No logging or road building.
- Maintain motorized access.
- Prohibit motorized access.
- No trail construction whatsoever.
- Do trail construction.
- Allow some mechanized (i.e. bicycles) with gated entry to prohibit motorized.
- Each should have wildland fire use plans.
- Fire management plans should be adopted.
- If the IRA is not designated as Wilderness, should be open to all types of uses and users.
- Consider the objectives of wilderness compared to best stewardship plans.
- Weed management plans should be adopted.
- There should be adequate funding for the plans.

**2E) How should proposed wilderness areas be managed?**

- As wilderness – no mechanized or motorized.
- Maintain current access and uses (not necessary level of access or use, but continue it in general).
- Not as wilderness, unless actually designated as wilderness.
- Wildland fire use plan.
- 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.
- Time is not the only factor that determines suitability as wilderness.

**2F) Should we be asking for additional roadless area recommendations ?**

- Yes.
- No.

**Next Meeting: March 10th, 2004, 6:00 – 8:00 pm, Federal Building Conference Room in Sandpoint.**