

**Pend Oreille Geographic Area
Workgroup Meeting
January 28, 2004**

ATTENDEES:

Public: Dave Vig, Mary Mitchell, Mark Sprengel, Tim Boden, Fields Cobb, John Finney, Jan Griffiths, Philip Hough, Nancy Low, Liz Pryor, Paul Sieracki, Sandy and Jo Beth Thomas, Randy Van Ooyen, Liz Sedler, Barbara Best, Per Mattsson, Nicky Pleass, Michael Wells, Rick Price, John Harbuck, and Hannah Hernandez.

Forest Service: Dick Kramer, Bob Ralphs, Gary Ford, Dave Roberts and Jodi Kramer

Dick welcomed everyone and opened with introductions.

Bob Ralphs (Forest Wildlife Program Manager)

Bob presented information about Grizzly Bear, Lynx and Caribou.

Lynx:

- Primary limiting factor – snowshoe hare and is a habitat issue.
- Another issue is linkage areas
- Another issue is groomed snowmobile routes and the potential for other predators to move up these routes and take snowshoe hare from lynx.
- Bob talked about the Lynx Conservation Strategy.
- Q. When is the closing comment date for the Lynx Amendment? A. Jan. 16th to middle of April – 90 day comment period.
- Q. What was the historic normal range for lynx? A. On the mapped, based on criteria – snow depth and relative elevation boundary (subalpine fir habitats).
- Q. How many sitings of lynx in this GA? A. Bob feels possibly 2 sitings.
- Bob distributed a briefing paper titled “Northern Rockies Lynx Amendment DEIS Briefing Paper 10/03” to describe what the amendment is going to do. **Put this on the website with the notes.**

Caribou:

- Primary limiting factor – predation; extremely small size of the adjacent herd that moves back and forth between U.S. and Canada; and effects of winter motorized recreation. There have been a couple studies done in Canada on effects of winter recreation.
- There has been a recovery plan done for Caribou. This is on the IPNF home page – www.fs.fed/r1/ipnf.
- We got a biological opinion to really address caribou in relation to winter recreation.
- There is a lot of new science that we will use in the Forest Plan.
- Strategies right now for caribou:
 - One snowmobile closure in the Selkirks.
 - Q. Has this been a successful closure? A. Not totally successful because of being able to sign this closure in this snow depth.
 - Q. Have we seen caribou in this area?
 - Q. What about the Selkirk Special Management Area?

Grizzly bear:

- Primary limiting factor – human mortality and displacement.
- Bob distributed a couple of handouts. **Put these on the website with the notes.**

- Comment: There is an excellent book titled, The Talking Bear, and it's about radio collaring bears.
- Have a recovery plan for Grizzly bears. There has been new information since this recovery plan. We are currently going through a Grizzly Bear amendment; draft Nov. 2001, which is incorporating the newer information with the Recovery Plan. Currently waiting for biological opinion from the F&WS which will fine-tune access in grizzly bear habitat and should come out fairly soon. The ROD and final EIS documents and comment period will follow this biological opinion.

Sensitive species and the tie to vegetation:

- Looking at current and historic vegetation and in regards to wildlife it's key on how man has changed this in regards to certain wildlife species.
- Bob shared that there are many laws and regulations we have to abide by. For example, in one of the laws, we are mandated to maintain viable populations of existing and native desired and non-desired native species (**sensitive??**) in the planning area. We have 300+ species on this forest. To determine viable populations we will run the sensitive species through coarse and fine filter analyses. It's really important to pay attention to our sensitive species and do what we can to not have species listed.

The conceptual planning process addresses conservation strategies as a two-step coarse/fine filter approach:

Course filter strategy - The purpose of a Coarse Filter Analysis is to provide findings that are a basis for the development of management recommendations to maintain or restore ecological communities of sufficient size, composition, structure, and distribution such that the viability for the majority of all species will be maintained (Hunter et al. 1988). The assumption is that a representative array of ecological communities of sufficient size, structure and distribution will contain and maintain the vast majority of native species. Management recommendations to provide for communities of sufficient size, composition, structure, and distribution are formulated into Forest and Grassland Plan objectives or standards.

Fine Filter Strategy - The purpose of a Fine Filter Analysis is to identify threats to species at-risk not covered by the Coarse Filter Analysis and to provide findings that support a basis for development of any needed management recommendations. It is important that the process used to identify species at risk at the Regional scale and Forest/Grassland scale be fully disclosed.

For species that are wide-ranging, we will have to look at habitat needs at a much larger scale (flamulated owl).

Wolves – Distributed a handout on what's going on right now with the process of delisting this species. All three states, Idaho, Montana and Wyoming, have to develop state management plans before the gray wolf can be delisted. Idaho has completed their state plan. We are starting to see more wolves in this area. **Get this handout on the website.**
 Q. Is there good habitat for wolves in this area? A. yes.

- How many of the BMUs currently meet the standards – meet the habitat needs? A. Look at the chart Bob distributed. We haven't completed the habitat assessment?

Dick talked about the process to start moving towards developing our Desired Condition statements for this GA:

- ◆ Dick shared the purpose of workgroups.
- ◆ Dick put together a Notebook that includes meeting notes, general information etc. that anyone can check out from him if they would like to see what has happened in previous meetings.
- ◆ The group split up into 3 groups of 8 people each to discuss the following and then we will come back together as a large group to share what they all came up with and discuss as a large workgroup:
 - Discuss the draft Forest-wide Goals and develop Strategic desired condition statements.
 - Identify areas of potential change from current condition.
 - Identify access opportunities in these areas.
- ◆ From the last meeting, the top revision topics that are priority to this group are Access and Recreation and Inventoried Roadless Areas. Again, remember that all of these revision topics are interrelated.
- ◆ Dick shared two more information resources for the group to use in development of their Desired Condition statements:
 - Map that includes BMUs, lynx units, caribou units, open roads and trails, closed roads and trails, seasonally restricted, motorized and non-motorized trails etc. intended to show current condition on one map.
 - A flipchart that gives the “Draft” information for miles of roads and trails and their designations on the district. The reason for draft for these numbers is because we’re still finalizing these numbers.

The workgroup split up into 3 groups and worked on Step 2a of the worksheet and came up with the following results:

Group #1

Dave Vig, Barbara Best, Hannah Hernandez, Mark Springle, John Finney, Sandy Thomas, Tim Boden, Phil Hough, and Dick Kramer

GOAL 4, ISSUE #1

- Long Term sustainability and eco-system health
- Reduce user conflicts
- Variety of opportunities (designated uses v. multiple uses systems)
- Legitimacy of motorized (OHV) use of National Forest, except roads currently open for motor vehicle motorized use
- Public education and signage of regulations/ concerns/ conditions/ cause and effects
- Wildlife, Water, Plant “Standards” must be met prior to developing motorized recreation.
- Population regulation – carrying capacity
- Trail design/engineering to minimize impacts or damage

Group # 2

Fields Cobb, Jan Griffitts, Rick Price, Per Mattsson, Joe Witte, John Harbuck, Michael Wells, Mary Mitchell, and Gary Ford.

DESIRED CONDITION STATEMENT: ACCESS & RECREATION

To manage motorized and no-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 generation.

Possible areas of change from current condition: Manage proposed Wilderness as wilderness.

Group #3

Liz Pryor, Randy Van Ooyen, Nancy Low, Nicky Pleass, Paul Sierackli, Liz Sedler, JoBeth Thomas, Ken Carter, and Jodi Kramer

ACCESS & RECREATION

In Proposed Wilderness Areas

- No motorized access permitted
 - Scotchman Peak proposed wilderness area
- Look at words within “rights of all individuals”
 - (In small group stmt)
- Need to consider technology
 - Advances in 15 years
 - Higher population
- Responsible Recreation
- During the plan period
 - Access standards should trend towards recovery of T&E species
- Add in statement from Subgroup pg. 15

Meeting Wrap-up:

- We will continue at the 2/11 meeting starting at 6:00 pm with the same smaller groups wrapping up their discussions on (2a) on the worksheet for Access and Recreation/ Motorized and Non-motorized, will come back together as the workgroup to discuss what everyone developed and then break up into smaller groups again to continue with 2b and 2c on the worksheet.